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ABSTRACT

NKRUMAHISM AND NEO-NKRUMAHISM

Prince Kwasi Bediako Frimpong

April 19, 2012

Kwame Nkrumah framed a model of African unity and development, which stood out in sharp contrast to the Western model of capitalist development and neo-liberal democracy. Decades after his demise, the African Union which he co-founded with other African leaders, now espouses a model of development based on liberal democracy and market principles, a radical break away from Nkrumahist thinking. This research addresses the following two questions. First, "What principles constitute Nkrumah's model and ideas on economic development and Pan African Unity?" Secondly, the paper asks, "What has accounted for the current shift from the Nkrumahist vision of Africa into the neo-liberal model of development on the African continent?" The study is significant because Africa still lacks its own model of development. It is a qualitative research which looked into a number of writings, articles, and commentaries by Nkrumah himself and other scholars. To conclude, the paper examines how Nkrumah's ideas can be salvaged and utilized today into policies of political integration and economic development without necessarily pushing for a socialist and authoritarian state.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This study evaluates the relevance of Nkrumah’s ideas as a model of development for a continent which is still grappling with finding a development paradigm. Specifically, it analyzes the ideas and their implications for Africa, particularly in light of the recent revivalist movement towards the creation of an African “mega state.” Nkrumah was a firm advocate that Africans should find their own solutions to address the socio-economic problems that were facing the continent. His idea of Consciencism\(^1\) emphasized the freedoms that Africans deserved in order to exercise independent thinking. Africa’s tragic experience with colonial exploitation and oppression made the first generation of African leaders very skeptical of the Western free market capitalist model of development. The struggle against colonialism was therefore automatically defined as a struggle against capitalist imperialism.\(^2\) Many Post-colonial African leaders therefore considered African socialism as an alternative ideology to the struggle against colonialism and capitalism.

---

\(^1\) Kwame Nkrumah, *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization* (London: Heinemann, 1964)

In Nkrumah’s view, independence referred to freedom from external interference, particularly the Western or Eurocentric narrative of the African person. Consciencism was therefore an epistemic project with a drive to dig out one’s own identity, values and institutions within “the original humanist principles underlying African society.” But it does not end with a discovery of common cultural experiences and histories of African people. Rather it sought to reconstruct this shared past and use it as building block for the present. Nkrumah underscored the leading role of African intellectuals to undertake this project. He therefore implied that Consciencism was an elitist project which involved the masses. He once argued that any “social revolution must have standing firmly behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society.” But once again, he understood political practice wedded to this intellectual experiment, very much in line with what he was doing. Here Nkrumah came close to the Marxist rendition that “philosophers have interpreted the world in many ways, the point however is to change it.” Nkrumah argued that this intellectual revolution would feed political practice in the material world. Hence, he considered the intellectual to be playing the role of a political actor too.

The challenge however was that the political economy of the African countries was different from industrialized societies where class featured as the dominant form of

---

cleavage. In fact, Nkrumah criticized multi-party politics and parliaments of the West as virtually impractical in Africa since “Democracy” is regarded as a system that protects capitalism. He noted, “the multi-party system which exists in Western countries promotes social cleavage, and the kind of class system which does not exist in African countries, is a ruse for perpetuating, and covering up, the inherent struggle between the have and the have-nots.”

Nkrumah rose to the challenge of crafting an African version of socialism which reconciles the tenets of socialism to the realities of Africa. His conviction for African socialism was unwavering in line with many thinkers like Albert Einstein. Einstein once stated, “I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate these grave evils (i.e. capitalism) namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion.”

But many scholars saw this project as political grandstanding rather than a genuine intellectual effort. Ali Mazrui, for instance, criticized Nkrumah for thinking of himself as the ‘messiah’ of Ghana and Africa. Mazrui further argued that Nkrumah “reconstructed himself into a Leninist Czar merging both the monarchical tendency which was reflected in his use of the title ‘Osagyefo’ and the Leninist vanguard tradition.”

---

Last but not least, Nkrumah was a vocal proponent of African unity which perhaps is the most important political project of his legacy.\textsuperscript{11} He advocated a union government of all African states very similar to federalism.\textsuperscript{12} Unity, for Nkrumah, entailed economic self-reliance and integration for Africa and political power to flex against other powers in Europe and America. This again became a bone of contention among African scholars and politicians, as some of whom felt it was premature and naïve,\textsuperscript{13} while others thought of it as vital and possible.\textsuperscript{14} Notwithstanding the critics, Nkrumah concretized the idea of pan-African unity when he organized the first Pan African congress in Accra. During the Accra summit, Nkrumah invited all African leaders to consider the conditions and future of Africa in consonance with his idea that independence would not be confined to Ghana.\textsuperscript{15} He later became the founding member of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) alongside Haile Sellasie I of Ethiopia, (1916-1930) and Julius Nyerere of Tanzania (1961-1985). Nkrumah also supported liberation movements throughout Africa. He provided educational and development assistance to a cadre of Africans at the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute, which was located in Winneba Ghana. Many of those who passed out of this institute later became leaders of their respective countries.\textsuperscript{16}

In higher education, Nkrumah initiated programs which provided training in Swahili as

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{11} Ben K. Aboagye, Prophesy of Kwame Nkrumah and the O.A.U (Accra: African Bureau of Biographies and Historical Research, 1983), 170.
\item \textsuperscript{12} Kwame Nkrumah, I speak of Freedom, (London: Panaf Books, 1961), xii.
\item \textsuperscript{13} Russell Warren Howe, Transition: Did Nkrumah Favour Pan-Africanism? (Indiana University Press, 1999), 128-138.
\item \textsuperscript{16} General News, “I am still a disciple of Nkrumah – Mugabe” Ghanaweb, July 2, 2007.
\end{itemize}
well as Ghanaian languages which were not previously offered in colleges. He also promoted indigenous art, culture and music. These measures were viewed as the blueprints of how an integrationist, self reliant model of development should be working for Africa.

1.2 Revivalist ideas or projects.

It is argued that the African Union (AU) represents the new Pan Africanism with long held ideals of attaining African Unity and solidarity. However, the AU project is slightly different from Nkrumah’s project of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), ruled perhaps under a vanguard socialist influence; and a continental economy geared towards self reliance and industrialization. The new Charter of the AU is more vocal about ideals such as democracy and development, more than the Charter of the OAU. It should however not be misconstrued that the founders of the OAU did not seek to develop their own models of democracy and development. For instance, Julius Nyerere was a pioneer who established “Ujamma” or African socialism where villages and farm production were organized through the direct, mass participation of peasants. But such forms of democratic participation differ from the Western models of neo-liberal democracy. Nevertheless, the OAU charter did not dwell on such models as explicitly as the new AU model did. Some of the aims of the AU are as follows: accelerating the unity of the people of Africa; promoting cooperation for the economic and social development of the people of Africa; promoting democratic principles and institutions, popular participation

and good governance; and defending African common positions in today's globalized political and economic order. 18

It is important to emphasize that the Organization of African Unity was aimed at spearheading the political freedom of the entire continent. This project attained the height of its success when when the apartheid regime of South Africa collapsed once and for all in 1994. But after securing political freedom, however, many African countries still faced slow economic growth, adverse global terms of trade, the oil crisis, and net capital flight fostered by both foreign corporations in countries like the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and corrupt local elite in countries like Nigeria. The need to reform the Organization of African Unity into the African Union therefore became apparent. The African Union envisages “An integrated, prosperous and peaceful Africa, driven by its own citizens and representing a dynamic force in the global arena.”19 In other words, the transition from the OAU to the AU by the year 2002 considered the need to make the continent a more competitive trading bloc as a means to participating in and benefitting from economic globalization which is currently underway.20

The working principles of the African Union are also different from those of the OAU. An executive summary of the Civil Society Organizations and the African Union document stipulates this difference by emphasizing that “the sacred cow of sovereignty

---

enshrined in the OAU’s credo of non-interference and non-aggression”\textsuperscript{21} is now replaced by “a new doctrine mandating the right to intervene in order to restore peace and security in specific circumstances including – genocide, gross violations of human rights, national instability with cross-border ramifications, and unconstitutional changes of government.”\textsuperscript{22} This has been the central contradiction to the OAU project, which aimed to foster unity but without allowing any room for intervention in the economic and political affairs of one member state by the other. Several armed conflicts, a series of coups d’etats and humanitarian crises over the past four decades have meant that the AU now has to now put peace and security at the top of its agenda for ensuring stability and growth on the continent. The founders of the OAU were not clear whether they wanted to effect continental unity or peaceful coexistence. Nkrumah, however, was clear from the outset that continental unity did not mean peaceful coexistence. Rather it meant creating a United States of Africa where every African community and country was governed from a political centre. But this was adamantly refused by the likes of Julius Nyerere and William Taubman who advocated a gradualist approach to African Unity government first by retaining the colonial borders of each country and fostering regional blocs before a unity government.\textsuperscript{23}

Another development which united both Nkrumah’s original project of self reliance and continental unity with the revivalists was the formation of sub-regional

\textsuperscript{22} Peter da Costa, 7-9. See also The Dispatch, Johannesburg, July 13, 2000.
economic blocks such as Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the subsequent adoption of its protocols for free movement of goods and services at regional levels. The African Union today gives more credence to the economic powers advocated by Nkrumah. The ideology meant to spearhead economic development in Africa has however radically shifted.\textsuperscript{24} While the Organization of African Unity was founded on the works of African nationalists, who were adamantly against neo liberalism, the economic blueprint for the African Union has decisively turned to free market-driven neo-liberal policies.\textsuperscript{25} The New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), the economic blueprint of the African Union, takes into account global free market competition. It therefore aims to enhance global competitiveness of African economies. In fact, it strives to attract foreign aid and trade liberalization from the West in return for African commitments to democracy and the protection of human rights. NEPAD is therefore an economic and political bargain with the developed world. While Nkrumah and his supporters underscored the need to shun the influence of Westerners and focus on self reliance, the revivalists like Presidents Thabo Mbeki (1999-2008) of South Africa, Meles Zenawi (1991 to date) of Ethiopia, and John Kufour (2001-2009) of Ghana saw the promise of Africa’s development by opening up more and more to the West.\textsuperscript{26} These were clear deviations from Nkrumah’s vision of unity and development.

\textsuperscript{25} Njoku, 379.
\textsuperscript{26} "The New Partnership For Africa's Development." 2010. 10 Jan. 2012 <www.nepad.org/about>
The shift to the neo-liberal model of democracy and African development came about during the early 1990s when the continent was undergoing a number of transformations. In Africa, the 1990s represented a new era of optimism and democracy just as the early 1960s did, when many of these countries gained their independence. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold war brought peace dividends in Africa where protracted civil wars (usually supported by either of the global superpowers) came to an end in Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique and Liberia. Military dictatorships in countries like Ethiopia (1991), Nigeria (1993), Ghana (1992), and Uganda (1986) were replaced by civilian governments. And most importantly, the end of Apartheid in South Africa (1994) and its reputable success of democratization increased the hope that African countries would gradually, but surely, transition into democracies. However, other conflicts in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Chad, Somalia and the Great Lakes region erupted in the aftermath of the Cold War. More importantly, African governments faced domestic pressures to democratize. As Claude Ake argued, “The democracy movement in Africa is a powerful, objective, historical force in that it expresses the desire of ordinary people to gain power and material improvement.” 27 The emergence of civil society groups outside governments’ control, the after effects of structural adjustment programs and their heavy social costs, and the liberalization of both print and electronic in most countries of Africa, nurtured the domestic democracy movement that Ake argued existed in the 1990s.

27 Ake Claude, “The Unique Case of African Democracy”, International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs Vol. 69, No. 2 (Apr., 1993), pp. 239-244
1.3 Statement of the Problem

This study seeks to examine the achievements of Nkrumah’s Ghana as a laboratory for the study of Nkrumah’s vision for Africa. The intent is to rethink and reappraise the strength of Nkrumah’s ideas in order to assess their intersection with African contemporary politics (particularly the challenges facing Africa in the twenty-first Century). The study builds on the already existing literature on Nkrumah and offers a new perspective in examining the work and ideas of Nkrumah. It is also worthy to note that few attempts have been made to investigate what Nkrumah meant for Africa’s sense of self-identity. This study questions some of the criticisms of Nkrumah’s vision and ideas and analyzes why African unity appears to be far from reality. In the process, the study discusses the factors which influenced Nkrumah’s vision. It offers a detailed perspective of his background and immediate environment with a view to understanding his motivations and actions.

If the problem of external influences on African politics and economy that confronted Kwame Nkrumah’s vision and work still exist, then it becomes relevant to rethink Nkrumah’s vision and work. Nkrumah’s central idea was premised on the self-awareness of Africa’s historical relations with the rest of the world. He was highly concerned with the lack of independence of many African nations and alien control over the resources and lands of many of these nations. Nkrumah also explained the logic behind the need for a different form of political economy in Africa. In what he termed as philosophical “Consciencism”, he emphasized the need to transform the African state into a modern state with more rational use of its resources in building roads, improving education,
creating an efficient public health system. Such a mode, Nkrumah believed, could help develop and industrialize Ghana in particular, and Africa as a whole.\textsuperscript{28}

It is noteworthy that the issues Nkrumah was confronted with during the liberation movement in pre-independent Africa continue to plague many African countries today. These include a lagging educational system, broken health care systems, joblessness and poverty. Recent events in Somalia and Libya are evident of the crisis on the continent. Just across the border from Somalia (i.e. in Kenya), fighting and famine have driven nearly 500,000 Somalis to seek refuge at what is now the world’s largest refugee camp.\textsuperscript{29} Also, the year 2011 crisis in Libya, which led to the overthrow of the government of Colonel Muammar Gaddafi, victimized scores of black African workers and immigrants in Libya, who were accused of supporting Gaddafi as mercenaries. Later, many black Africans were assaulted, jailed and in some cases killed by Libyans.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{1.4 Reasons for the study}

This study is therefore pertinent in light of the fact that there is a growing disillusionment about economic development models which Ghana and other African countries have pursued over the years. These models did not result in tangible improvements in the livelihoods of the people. Thus, the resultant frustration has brought Nkrumahism into the limelight as an alternative economic development model which somehow worked in the past and could be revived. Hence this study aims to reflect on

\textsuperscript{28} Kwame Nkrumah, \textit{Consciencism} (London: Panaf Books, 1964), 70-79
\textsuperscript{29} "Reports live from Somalia and talks about the disturbing hunger situation." Interview by Anderson Cooper. \textit{AC 360}, CNN. Atlanta, Georgia. 10 Aug. 2011.
whether Nkrumah’s ideas of development do have merits of their own and could be salvaged.

Secondly, the idea of African unity has become a bone of contention between leaders, intellectuals and civil society organization leaders who now see the European Union project as a successful economic and political venture that Africa, in its own way, should have emulated long ago. Hence, gradualist calls for integration by Nkrumah’s contemporaries are now viewed as outdated and unhelpful to Africa. There is more of a consensus that unity serves the continent much better and much faster than gradualism. So this study aims to show whether Nkrumah’s recommendations about African unity can still serve as a starting point for a working political and continental formula. Even more, the study enables an academic interrogation of Nkrumah’s ideals and helps bring perspective to the debate about the strength and weaknesses of his viewpoint then and now.

1.5 Theoretical Framework

This study fleshes out the theoretical works of Kwame Nkrumah in a very eclectic manner. In so doing, it first looks at his works on knowledge production, African identity and culture, much of which come under the rubric of Consciencism. The study then shifts its theoretical focus to the problem of underdevelopment in Africa and the overriding theoretical discussion about African development. But this discussion about modernity or the lack of it in Africa will be used as the backdrop against which Nkrumah’s own thoughts about self reliance, modernization, socialism in general, and African socialism in particular are articulated. Last but not least, the paper zooms into Nkrumah’s political
programs, the epicenter of which is African unity. Here again, Nkrumah’s defense of unity and his theoretical undergirding is fleshed out in detail. In short, the study dwells analyzes Nkrumahism itself as a theoretical perspective par excellence.

1.6 Research Approach and Methodology

This research relies mostly on a qualitative review of works, and documents that have directly or indirectly reflected on Nkrumah’s ideals. In so doing, the first task is to highlight and discuss his visions or ideologies for Africa’s progress. The study consults some of the available primary sources such as Kwame Nkrumah’s numerous writings, autobiographies, biographies and audio and audio-visual tape recordings. A few examples include Nkrumah’s *A Review of Ghana: Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah,* and Philips’ *Kwame Nkrumah and the Future of Africa.* There are also copious writings in the forms of newspaper and magazine articles which were produced in the 1950s and 1960s. The study also used some of the writings of Nkrumah’s peers like Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe of Nigeria, as well as other monographs and memoirs which have evaluated his career as an African leader and thinker. Furthermore, available official records of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), particularly during the formative years after independence, were accessed. Other data include secondary sources in the forms of books, and scholarly journals that give valuable support to the project.

Chapter 2 reviews the existing literature on the challenges of African economic development, as well as the theories and debates which try to explain why the continent has this far failed to create rapid and sustainable economic growth. With that as a background, the chapter explores the founding ideals of Nkrumahism, his reflections on
economic growth and modernization, as well as how this intersects with the prevailing literature about African underdevelopment.

Chapter 3 highlights the intellectual and political aspect of Nkrumah’s philosophies, his ideas about socialism and thoughts on African unity focusing on how he wanted to develop Africa using socialism and African unity. Chapter 4 also focuses attention on his performance as an African leader in Ghana which he considered as a laboratory for assessing the effectiveness of his ideas and political practices. The emphasis would be on how Nkrumah tried to develop Ghana using socialism which was the foundation of his ideological thinking. It also examines Nkrumah’s legacy, as well as the problems he was confronted with. Exploring these factors will help to evaluate the success or otherwise of Nkrumah’s policies.

Chapter 5 starts by reiterating the main research questions of the study. Following this is a summary of the theories and debates about Africa’s underdevelopment. Nkrumah’s political, economic and ethical perspectives follow these theoretical discussions. The bulk of the chapter, however, is devoted to comparing, evaluating and analyzing Nkrumah’s theory, ideology, and political performance in Ghana. The chapter ends with conclusive remarks.
2.1 Discourse on African Development: Nkrumah and Nyerere.

Africa during the post colonial era had three available routes to push forward its development agenda. The first alternative was for Africans to embrace the era of socialist revolutions throughout the world and supplant colonial economies with centrally planned and managed socialist states and economies. The second option was to go back to the traditional or pre-capitalist forms of production and societal formation. This second option has not been celebrated by most of the educated elite of the newly independent African countries who aspired to modernize the economies of these countries and create national political communities. This was because the very compositions of post-independent countries territorially and ethnically were artificial colonial constructions. In his article, “Colonial Boundaries of Africa: The Case of Ethiopia’s Boundary with Sudan,” Wondwosen Teshome argued that pre-colonial African boundaries and maps had nothing to do with the historical societal formations and alliances of the indigenous African people. Thus, it would be territorially impossible to go back to pre-colonial institutions.

---

http://eab.ege.edu.tr/pdf/9_1
Also, the first cohort of leaders of Independent African states lauded the ideals of forging sovereign “Nations” out of the amalgam of desperate peoples inhabiting their respective countries. Thus, Kwame Nkrumah’s aversion to political parties arose from his fear that the concept of the “Nation” would be imperiled if the New African States were allowed to revert to old and natural intra-or inter-ethnic allegiances and loyalties. The third option was to embrace the capitalist free market model of economic development. Given the fact that the capitalist countries were also the former colonizers of Africa, the capitalist model was soon out of favor in most parts of the continent. But Kwame Nkrumah and some of his cohorts stood out as ardent critics of the capitalist route perceiving it as the gentlemen’s method of slavery\(^\text{32}\) and further pointing out the need to develop an indigenous model of development for Africa.

Nkrumah underscored that “wherever there is economic dependence there is no freedom.”\(^\text{33}\) Therefore, his notion of economic development was based on self-initiated models designed and implemented by Africa’s leadership, as opposed to development models designed and imposed by external forces. However, Nkrumah was not the only African intellectual or head of state to grapple with the notion of defining development in ways commensurate with the existing challenges of the newly independent African countries including Ghana. Other activists and scholars such as Frantz Fanon and President Julius Nyerere also grappled with the need to find a relevant model of African


development in tune with the African historical circumstances. Especially, the left saw the Soviet Union, built on the socialist ideology propounded by Lenin, as more egalitarian. Though these leaders had similar goals and aspirations, there were differences in the way their theories were implemented. The two notable differences were between Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana.

Whereas African socialism was regarded as a political system, Nyerere in his theory and implementation of the *Ujama* noted it as an attitude of the mind. He discarded the accumulation of wealth stating that the willingness of the individual to work in African socialism provides the guarantee for his success without "hoarding wealth." He noted that the traditional African society provides a sense of security to the individual who is strongly embedded in the community. Nyerere’s model, unlike that by Nkrumah, followed the very traditional ways of life. Agriculture was carried out on a subsistence basis and capital accumulation through surplus extraction was not encouraged. However, one of Nyerere’s critics, Dismas Masolo argues that the values of Nyerere’s *Ujama* were purely an ethical value and not a political system. According to Masolo, African socialists misrepresented African communitarian ethics and perceived them as a political system. He distinguishes between ethical and political systems. Politics requires a mandate separate from the communitarian culture of mutual support.

---

37 Nyerere, Ujama, 67.
and sharing which prevails in African societies.\textsuperscript{38} It is important to note that \textit{Ujama}, the bases of African socialism created a more complex modern political state since Nyerere saw the African community as socialistic. African communities are communalistic because they work and collaborate with each other for survival. If African communities are already communal, then it makes a logical sense that their political systems should be borne out from that which is natural to them.

Nkrumah on the other hand redefined African socialism to suit the African values, opting for a continent which was united, competitive, well-educated, and developed in a clear sense of African identity. The cornerstone of his ideas was \textit{scientific socialism}; a force of modernization of what he termed “Africa for Africans.”\textsuperscript{39} Thus, he argued for \textit{scientific socialism} by means of which the African state must build heavy industries controlled by government because if the challenge was left to individuals, they would exploit it. Once in power, Nkrumah started building heavy industries in Ghana and appointed government functionaries to manage them.\textsuperscript{40} Nyerere on the other hand argued that the factors of production should not be controlled by state but by the masses. He was suspicious of creating a ‘state class’ i.e. a group of individuals who exploit surplus and do have the potential of becoming capitalist through the acquisition of power. He was

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}
however quoted to have said that leaders must not be masters.\textsuperscript{41} Like his peers, Nyerere was highly educated and influenced by his modern education.

Despite the education he had however, Nyerere still had to ask his mother who was an illiterate for his basic needs. He added, “Being a leader, I do not know always what is in your interest.” Nyerere further stressed that “I had to be informed by those I serve and I must ask questions.”\textsuperscript{42} In the past, Nyerere noted again that Clever people came and we thought that they understood what our needs were and we made them our masters but they took advantage of us. Today in Africa, we must be wiser and must not let anyone be our master since we already know what is best for us, we must share our needs, communicate our ideas and wants to our ambassador (the government) who can then work with us to the best of our abilities and reaching whatever goals and needs that we might have. No leader of his fellow human being. When those clever people are made to be masters, then others become slaves, this is the exact sort of things that we do not want to happen on the continent.\textsuperscript{43}

Nyerere was a critic of Nkrumah's model and therefore suggested that the masses should be given the power to control the factors of production. Though they agreed that African socialism should be the basis for African freedom and the model of African development, the means to attaining development was where they disagreed. Marxism was about the ownership and control of factors of production by the proletariat. This was the ideology Nyerere adopted in its totality. Nkrumah's version was refined Marxism-Leninism.


adapted to African conditions. He went for what Abdul Rahman Mohamed Babu describes as “state socialist theory of the non-capitalist road to development.”44

As Nyerere pointed out, Nkrumah’s idea had the potential of promoting elitism, closer to the ills of capitalism. Ironically, this was an idea Nkrumah spoke against in all his statements and writings. State ownership could mean the few people in positions having control over the factors of production. In this situation, it became difficult for people to trust the leadership in the promotion of their interests. Nyerere’s model on the other hand could be criticized for populism. But one can hardly imagine a ‘pure’ participatory and community-based democracy delinked from central and bureaucratized political leadership. Such a scenario, implied in the works of Nyerere, almost borders on anarchy. Though each model had its unique challenges, Nkrumah’s model has stood tall for its ability to reconcile the tenets of socialism and capitalism, and further indigenize the two models relevant to the African context, in order to ensure modernization and the rapid economic development for Ghana. There has since been an increasing literature on Nkrumah’s model, however, as most of these published works are a repetition or confirmation of what has been said before with detailed emphasis on personalities and the institutions whose commitment seemed to be skeptical in attaining the objectives of Nkrumaism. Most often, there is the tendency to solely highlight the disagreements and antagonisms without looking at the successes of Nkrumah’s model.

2.2 Post colonial discourses on African Development

Having introduced Nkrumah’s version of development, we can place it within the general context of post colonial discourses on African Development. The allure of ‘development’ was something inescapable for Africa for it has been idolized and popularized by powerful Euro-American actors and institutions. Characterizing pre-colonial Africa as an era of “primitive” societies was one undergirding assumption by all those who were excited about development. In his paper on “Indigenous People: Development in Culture and Identity” for the United Nations, Kanyinke Sena argued that the African communities were complex yet they organized themselves politically and economically in tune with the realities of their surroundings (environment). 45 The author further argued that “the direction ‘development’ would have taken for indigenous peoples in the absence of westernization would have been interesting. Arturo Escobar in the Encountering Development has referred to the term “development” as a political invention to maintain the dominance and supremacy of Western institutions. 46 Postmodern critics of Development like James Ferguson 47 and Jonathan Crush 48 further argue that the discourse of African development is essentially euro-centric, which considers the political and economic systems of non-Western societies as intrinsically ‘backward’ and ‘inferior.’ Hence the need to ‘develop’ Africa is in itself, a European

invention. The creation of development often ignores the evolution of the society,\textsuperscript{49} and therefore the different levels African societies had inherited in relation to Europeans are often not factored into the definition of development which has become a universal idea of equality.\textsuperscript{50} While quoting the works of Fredrick Lugard, Kayinka Sena’s argument becomes relevant because Europeans though had the agenda to develop Africa through their contact several centuries ago, “Africa still suffers from ‘poverty’, disease and other social ills. In fact, indigenous peoples are not only poorer, but in addition, they are alarmingly losing their lands, their livelihoods are threatened, their cultures are disintegrating and most are losing their identities.”\textsuperscript{51}

Nkrumah and his contemporaries were critical of the contradiction in this definition of development which was not compliant of Marxist dialectics. This however is not to argue that Nkrumah was duped by European powers when they wrote and debated about African development. Rather, it is to argue that the terms of the debate and the options set out for African countries to embark on were strongly shaped by foreign actors. Therefore, the term ‘development’ has become an ideologically contested notion in itself.

Dependency Theorist and Afrocentric schools of thoughts such as Walter Rodney\textsuperscript{52} and Chinweizu\textsuperscript{53} respectively have argued that the term African development

\textsuperscript{50}G.M. Meier, \textit{Emerging from poverty: The economics that really matters.} (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 1984)
signifies the capacity of Africa to operate independent of the rest of the world. On the other hand, Neo liberal African scholars such as George Ayittey\textsuperscript{54} and Chika Onyeani\textsuperscript{55} stressed how the continent could become a power broker in the participation of the global economy. Nevertheless, both Marxist and non-Marxists seem to agree on several points. What becomes the point of disagreement is the approach and the model for attaining the desired progress. Accordingly, the following subsections outline the three major options laid out on the eve of independence as models for Africa’s development.

2.2.1 The Capitalist (Modernization Discourse) (50s)

The U.S. President, Harry Truman in his 1949 inaugural address beckoned on the developed world to provide a fair deal for the underdeveloped regions of the world, proposing that capital, science and technology was key to the transformation of developing countries.\textsuperscript{56} This call is in agreement with the modernization theory that emerged in the 1950s and 60s for underdeveloped countries. Modernization theory underlies that the importation of capital, science and technology from rich to poor countries would rapidly transform developing economies. The free market discourse of capitalist development claims its ancestry from Adam Smith’s \textit{Theory of Moral Wealth}
and the *Wealth of Nations*. In his classic works, Smith argues that human beings naturally buy and sell not based on benevolence but based on attention to the objects of "self-interest." Smith further argues that human beings have always been capitalists whose choices are made based on self-interest as against the national or public interest.

One major argument that drives the capitalist discourse is the role of free market in the economic system. According to Smith, "market determines prices, including the price of labor." Smith saw the market as a useful coordinating system for harnessing economic development. In other words, capitalism is argued as an ideal model for distribution of wealth, using free market, especially in the relationship between dense population and the economic growth. For, Smith, it is in the self-interest of an individual to cooperate with functional organizations including both business and government and not in their interest to cooperate with non-functional, inefficient, and or immoral organizations. Inefficient organizations expend more time, energy, or resources.

It is immoral to waste something that is valuable because it deprives others. One can argue that the same model has succeeded in depriving many of their rights to their resources in the African society. John Mackey noted that "Capitalism relies on the assumption of capitation, limited resources and a winner takes all mentality as fundamental to business and economic activity which obviously leaves little room for ethical analysis" From an ethical standpoint, Mackey argues that there is the need to change the narrative of capitalism to show that it is about creating shared value, not for
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the few, but for everyone.” Even though some scholars think the theory of the moral sentiments and the wealth of nations go together very well and describe a form of capitalism that produces wealth within a moral system in reality they represent two contradictory views of capitalism.

The allocation of goods and services by a free market is key to capitalism. In his arguments for the free market economy, John Mills argues that the free market is believed to self-regulate in the most efficient and just way by valuing the individuality and rewarding ability and risk taking. Embracing free-market capitalism also means embracing the freedom to change, to innovate and to invent. It means accommodating change and respecting the freedom of others to do as they please with what is theirs. Furthermore, the introduction of free market in the economic sector means “new scientific theories that seek to embrace the freedom to create wealth, which is the only means to eliminating poverty”

Frederick Hayek argued that the free market economy allows for a more efficient allocation of societal resources than any other model could achieve for the people. According to him, the only system that ensures equitable production and distribution of resources through a decentralized economic system is the free market economy. In this model, human beings are able to channel their energies to asking for economic freedom, that is, lower and predictable taxes, leaner government, deepen rule of law, respect

---

property rights, remove internal barriers to trade and decentralize governance properly. These features will partly help enterprise to flourish. Hayek assumes that more freedom means more innovation and entrepreneurship in a capitalist economy because the capital owners are taxed comparatively low.

While stating the wonders of free market capitalism, the exponent seem to overlook how the same market they praise could turn out to be inefficient, leading to the market failure. When the market is left unregulated as we have seen in recent times, it sometimes results in the allocation of resources that lead to negative externalities as discussed by a neo-classical economist, Steven Medema. Madema claims that the market is unable to satisfactorily coordinate extensive set of divergences, hence the need for government to serve as efficient coordinating force. 63 In relation to Africa with specific example with Ghana, sachet water (water sealed in plastic, commonly used in Ghana) producers for instance make use of labor, capital and water as inputs. But they hardly take responsibility for the numerous sachets that litter the street and choke the drains. The market does not factor in that price when the sachet water is bought; it only factors in the price of labor, capital and the water.

The market can fail and has failed many times, but adherents of free market economy such as Adam Smith and Frederick Hayes do not believe the State is a better custodian of our resources. They rather argue that there is the need to separate state actors from the system itself, the market is simply a mechanism used to answer what is produced, how is it produced and who gets that which is produced. When Adam Smith

talked about *Laissez Faire*, he was referring to a system in which the forces of demand and supply are solely determined by the market without any form of state intervention.

For the free market system to work in Africa, African cultural traditions would have to adjust to the mechanisms of the system of Multinational or Transnational Corporations. Francis Fukuyama in his book, *The End of History and the Last Man* states that “McWorld” which represents a global capitalist consumer oriented economy, uproots people from their culture and undermines local community power and does not bring democracy to the Third or developing world. From here, one can argue that capitalist and transnational corporations are contributing to entrench underdevelopment in Africa through the control of markets and production which has now been globalized. Consequently, the richer get richer and the poor get poorer."

Africa’s economy is still mostly informal and the financial systems are also not well developed. In other words, the capitalist system has not effectively captured or penetrated African economic systems. Often, family and informal social ties are strong among Africans where everyone knows everyone else and people act on emotions rather than on the facts. Besides the individualist model, capitalism faces severe difficulties blending into African societies.
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2.2.2. The Marxist and Neo-Marxist criticisms of Capitalism

Karl Marx in his magnum opus Das Capital put forward the theory of surplus value production and accumulation in free market economies. Marx argued that capital is produced by “creative species”, which he calls labor. The profit margin in any capitalist production, according to Marx, is therefore the difference between the market value of the commodity produced by workers and the wages and salaries they get from their factory or company owners. In his analysis, Marx noted that profit margins are kept high when products sell much in the markets and wages are depressed to their minimum level.

On capital accumulation, Marx argues that there is a perpetual process of class exploitation by the bourgeoisie against the workers. This exploitation manifests itself in the form of alienation of workers from the product of their labor, the instruments of production, the process of production, and the alienation from the self. 68 Though Marx’s direct applicability to African development analysis is problematic since he did not oppose colonial exploitation of the continent, many radical social scientists have taken their cues and become more relevant Marxist theorist than Marx himself to develop what is known as neo-Marxist theories of underdevelopment (1970s and early 80s). The founder of the dependency theory Andre Gunder Frank, for instance, argues that the world capitalist system has imperial cores and satellite peripheries. 69 He refers to the

Western capitalist countries as the core of this network producing high value added industrial and technology outputs whereas Third world countries export raw materials and unfinished agricultural products which he labels as "peripheries." The anecdotes from this "Dependency Theory" by Gunder is that, the development of the "core" therefore depends on the under development of the periphery. That means, for developing areas such as Africa, to develop would require breaking their chain of dependency to the industrialized capitalist economies. Development, in Frank's theoretical analysis, should therefore start from import substitution, self-reliance and home grown industrialization.

Another famous theoretician, Immanuel Wallenstein, extends this same argument stating that the capitalist world system itself had different cores at different points in history which are conceived as centers for "the transfer of surplus value" through worldwide "unequal exchange." His argument is based on the premise that capitalism is structured by competing centers of power and influence; leading to the eventual exploitation of the rest of the World.

Wallenstein argues that Spanish and Portuguese colonial empires were for instance gradually weakened and overpowered by British and French Imperialism which were in turn undermined and surpassed by US dominance in the post World War II era. Hence Wallenstein argues that capitalism is not structured with one center or core of power and influence but with competing centers of power and influence but extending
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their tentacles of resource extraction and exploitation to the rest of the World. Unfortunately, however, the Third world has always been the mining pit of resources and cheap labor to the center. The marginalization led to extreme poverty which Africa has been struggling to overcome. The attempt to overcome this economic problem led to a prescription of the Structural Adjustment Program.

2.2.3 Structural Adjustment Programs and the Neo-Liberal Come Back

Despite neo-Marxist critiques of capitalist model of development and attempts to invent alternative theories of development by African nationalists, the end of the Cold War, the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the disintegration of the Soviet Union heralded the victory and comeback of liberalism as the predominant model of development in the whole world. In Africa, this became true with the introduction of the infamous Structural Adjustment Programs and severe economic austerity measures from the late 1980s.

In general, Structural Adjustment Programs according to Demba Moussa Dembele were tailored to divest African states and re-orient socialist leaning African economies towards free market led capitalist economies. The author further noted that African countries were forced to accept a package of policy reforms with far reaching consequences. It became clear that almost everywhere, Africans were required to privatize government owned businesses and enterprises to the private sector. Economies were forced to liberalize terms of trade by removing tariffs and protective regulations on
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imports. Hence foreign investors were allowed to come in, invest and compete with local industries and producers. This however encouraged foreign direct investment through tax holidays, free repatriation of profits, and custom clearances became the mantra of development. Furthermore, the adjustment program according to the United Nations Commission on Trade And Development (UNCTAD) report ensured that the fiscal and monetary deregulation which usually involves devaluing national currencies vis-a-vis the US dollar. Subsidies and public expenditure in education, health, and infrastructural development were severely cut. Governments were told to have “high fiscal discipline” i.e. less government expenditure in sectors such as defense and borrowing less from foreign banks.  

In Africa, SAPs resulted in disastrous economic consequences. Eboe Hutchful called the reform “flawed and unsustainable because of its frequent revision by the international financial institutions.” All over Africa, poverty and income inequality increased. Many African economies failed to generate economic growth. The quality of education and health services coverage in Africa deteriorated owing to cuts in public expenditure and subsidies. Privatization led to massive layoffs and retrenchment of labor increasing unemployment rates. Trade liberalization disadvantaged local producers who could not compete with cheaper and better quality goods and services imported from such places like China. In short, Thandika Mkandawire argues that African economies became
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weaker and more vulnerable to the changes in the world trade conditions and foreign interest."\textsuperscript{78}

\subsection*{2.2.4 Contemporary Critiques of Development (late 1990s and 21st century)}

There are many other critics of the neo-liberal (capitalistic or free market driven models of development for developing countries in general and Africa in particular). Among them are the participatory or community driven models of development which argues that development should empower communities not capitalists who tend to form a few groups of individuals with capital and power which promotes huge inequalities even in so-called developed countries of the West. Similarly, the Feminist critiques of development also argue that mainstream development has always been “male-stream.”\textsuperscript{79}

Especially in Africa, development planning and development projects ignored the vital contribution of African women both to the household and the national economies, particularly in the informal sectors. The Feminist viewpoint is that, as a result of the intrinsic suppression of females in the top levels of decision making, models which do not trace, target and enhance the potentials of African women have failed the continent repeatedly.

The sustainable development literatures (environmental critiques) such as Pearce & Warford,\textsuperscript{80} and Paul Portney\textsuperscript{81} further argue that Western economic development
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models have never considered the environmental damage that they have incurred. The rise of greenhouse emissions, the global warming problem and consequent climatic changes have put the planet in peril. Hence capitalist development has to be reinvented and become sustainable and green development.

All of these criticisms have influenced and altered the policy discourse on African development. According to the UNCTAD report, today, the agendum has changed from securing economic and social development into reducing poverty. At the turn of the Century, the World Bank began assisting Third world countries to develop Poverty Reductions Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the UN embarked on its ambitious Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). The outcomes and limitations of these new policy models will soon be evaluated and be a part of the debate about African development. 82

2.3 Complementarity of Modernization and Neo Marxist Models

Despite the differences outlined earlier, this research paper has to underscore that both socialism and capitalism should be aimed at modernization in spite of the challenges associated with them. Modernization means the transition from low income, predominantly agricultural economies into modern, industrial and service sector dominated economies. Modernization always entailed rapid industrialization. It always had industrial development as its primary objective. The difference is that capitalist

theories of development regard the private sector and private investors and capital owners (individuals, or companies) as the engine or the drivers of economic growth. To the contrary, socialist models of development regarded the state as the primary agent of capital production, accumulation and redistribution within societies.

2.4 Why did both development models fail in Africa?

While the capitalist observes that capitalism and free market had both created value and wealth in the West, the same model had run rampant in the African communities with enormous inequalities between the elites and the middle class. In his book, *The Mystery of Capital*, the Peruvian economist, discusses why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else. He gives an insight into law and contractual relations in capitalism and examines how capital could be extracted and processed from assets. In his response, Hernando noted that it is “only the West that has the conversion process required to transform the invisible to the visible. It is this disparity that explains why Western nations can create capital and the developing countries including former communist nations cannot.

The absence of this process in the poorer regions of the world—where two-thirds of humanity live—is not the consequence of some Western monopolistic conspiracy. It is rather that Westerners take this mechanism so completely for granted that they have lost all awareness of its existence. Although it is huge, nobody sees it, including the Americans, Europeans, and Japanese who owe all their wealth to their ability to use it. “It
is an implicit legal infrastructure hidden deep within their property systems of which ownership is but the tip of the iceberg."\(^83\)

In his analysis of the failure of development in developing countries, De Soto argues that though underdeveloped countries have assets in abundance what constraints their development is the dearth of well-defined property rights to enable them generates capital.\(^84\) Other African scholars such as Mahmoud Mandani have equally put the blame on Africa’s underdevelopment on slavery that introduced bifurcated state power to the entire continent. Mahmoud argues that the impact placed cultural and social impediments in Africa and has made the implementation of either the capitalist or the socialist conditions for development in the continent quite problematic. Africa after independence was hit with the dilemma of restructuring their civil society and uneven dependency on external relations and the attempt to “decentralize their despotism” which were grounded in the colonial claims of modernity, instead of a focus on developmental strategies.\(^85\)

Africa is still struggling to attain a modern economy since the post colonial era as a result of what Richard Sandbrook refers to as the “lack of conditions for capital accumulation has contributed in making African countries act in “economically irrational ways.”\(^86\) African countries over rely on agriculture, have little or no industry yet their agricultural products are far less than those of the developed countries whose major base

of development is industrialization. Though Africa is blessed with natural resources, the process and technology for putting these resources into secondary products are rudimentary and primitive. The dearth of proper means of converting the resources into manufactured goods has become a curse on the continent. In his discussion on “the Resource Cause theory,” Anka Hoeffer noted that the presence of natural resources in Africa has continued to breed and subsidize violence and has attracted enemies on the continent. In such a chaotic situation, many of the people get displaced, creating refugees who become destitute and are unable to produce, invariably depending on the limited resources of the state.

Ayittey among others is disillusioned about neo-colonial Africa and Third world leaders for their inability to make assessment of what their resources are in order to put up a realistic program to use them profitably for the development of the people. Ayittey and Chica Onyeani, two controversial figures, have become important in this discourse because they put the blame of underdevelopment on the African leaders and the people instead of the West. They may not be alone in this blame game but famous African writer, Chinua Achebe for instance has cited poor leadership in Nigeria as the main bane of their development. This lack of good governance has blocked the creation of conditionality for a vibrant civil society. Achebe argues that most Africa states controlling the means of production, has created monopoly in corporations which invariably lead to an
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inefficiencies and lack of market competition. This therefore leads to corruption and nepotism, what is often referred to as “rent seeking.” It is however important to state that no social system can work effectively when it is undermined by corruption.

2.5 Summary

This review started with a brief discussion of Nkrumah’s definition of development contrasting it to his contemporary African thinker and head of state i.e. Julius Nyerere. The chapter then dwelt on the major theoretical perspectives and models that African countries had to evaluate and embrace ahead of their independence. These include: a) modernization theory and the capitalist free market model it espouses, b) the Marxist and Neo Marxist models of development enthusiastically embraced by many of the African elite, c) the infamous Structural Adjustment Programs that African countries had to undergo from the 1980s on. It also outlined some of the explanations on why after five decades of Independence the African continent registers far lower economic growth and political stability when compared to the other parts of the world.

Kwame Nkrumah became a leader of Ghana and faced the challenge to fashion a developmental model for Ghana and Africa in general. His notion of development revolved around the idea of collective survival. While arguing that colonialism was the bane of African development, Nkrumah also conceived a socialist strategy for development but modified to fit African realities. Several years after his overthrow, Nkrumah’s voice, ideas and models continue to resonate throughout the continent even today as African leaders continue to search for appropriate model for development. It is incumbent on African leaders to revisit Nkrumah’s economic ideas and thoughts, match
them with the recent continental debates on African unity and development. Nkrumah’s ideas should be examined for what they are worth. The following sections delve into that discussion in more detail.
CHAPTER 3

3.1 Consciencism: An Introduction

Kwame Nkrumah's framework emerged as philosophical consciencism. It is about the heritage of Africa and influences from abroad. While the colonial experience had succeeded in eroding African values, the central idea of Nkrumah was for Africa to learn from the pre-colonial African societies and not to sacrifice those values for material progress. Hence his famous statement,

Self-government is not an end in itself. We have to work hard to evolve new patterns, new social customs, new attitudes to life, so that while we seek the material, cultural, and economic advancement of our people, while we raise their standard of life, we shall not sacrifice their fundamental happiness. 89

Nkrumah’s idea of a pre-colonial determinant of the African personality was in direct contrast to Senghor’s Negritude theory which attributed the idea of matter and mind to the Negro African origin. 90 Senghor was emphasizing the use of positive European values to entirely transform and develop Africa. Senghor further called for the adoption of a more embracing approach to development rather than a radical opposition. This idea of

Senghor falls into what is classified as “black psychology.” 91

Senghor and Nkrumah at this point appreciated how African societies had been influenced by Western culture. Both leaders seemed to share the same theme in terms of changes to the African reality. This was because, Nkrumah had an admiration for the Western model, but wanted it to be Africanized. Consciencism to Nkrumah became an antidote to the neglect of Africans in world history and a revolutionary challenge to White history similar to the writings of W.E.B. DuBois. DuBois was challenged to write the black history, claiming that blacks played an important role in the world and one could not write the history of the world without considering the contributions of Africans who occupy the center of the globe.92

Each of these arguments was employed by Du Bois when explaining the predicament of African Americans in the United States. If colonial subjugation was the anathema in Nkrumah’s analysis of colonial Africa, then slavery and racism were the fountain heads of black subjugation in Du Bois’s analysis of racist America. While Nkrumah insisted upon the urgent and total emancipation of all Africans from colonialism, Du Bois advocated for the rapid advancement and political empowerment of blacks in America. Du Bois was a militant Democrat who wanted black people to become socially conscious of the racial injustices, inequality, and Jim Crow treatment they were subjected to. He agitated for Black people to rise up and fight for what was inherently
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Similar forces of inequality were enshrined in colonial Africa. Nkrumah, therefore, was clear-headed while stating that the independence of Ghana was meaningless without the total independence and unity of the African continent. He saw unifying forces and factors in the African struggle for independence and unity. He also understood the case for supporting the struggle against racism and segregation in America. Likewise, Du Bois argued that integrating the “various components of African American Liberation and world peace, gender and later economic analyses were very indispensable.” The challenges of Black people, Du Bois maintained, transcended the “realm of race and racism” into “sexism, colonialism, capitalism, and American imperialism, which all remain on the radical political agenda.”

Even more, Du Bois’s classic work entitled The Soul of Black Folks and his discussions of “double consciousness” seemed to dovetail with what Nkrumah called Black Consciencism. The return to the notion of conscience, in both works, was an attempt to look at the values, norms, sanctions, psychological and affective self-images of black people looking both at themselves and their oppressors. Both Du Bois and Nkrumah noted that the challenges of the African were not only economic resources and political subjugation, but also cultural autonomy and personal self-esteem as black people. Hence both underlined the need to advance the cultures, rituals and solidarity of
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black people both within the continent and across the Atlantic. All of these ideas and encounters became possible mainly because Nkrumah was the first and the only African president who lived in the United States, came back to claim Ghana’s independence, and nurtured the connection between the black scholars of America and those of Africa. This put Ghana on the map as the center for Black and Pan-African scholarship.

3.2 Fundamentals of Consciencism

As stated by Obenga, Consciencism was highly rooted in Afrocentricity, an idea that places African people as “subjects of historical and social experiences rather than objects in the margins of European experiences.” Nkrumah’s Consciencism attacked the racist view that black people being inferior and emphasized the need to get rid of the colonial mentality that had engulfed the minds of Ghanaians even after independence. By refuting that fiction through Consciencism, Nkrumah gave an alternative view to the self-determination of the African using the Afro-American struggle as a model. He exemplified this belief in his dress code as he occasionally dressed in rich kente cloth and sometimes batakari to signify not only the unity among the Ghanaian tribes but also to build “psychological associations” within the people who had begun to develop Western fantasies. In a speech, he argued for the use of Western education to improve


the lives of Africans in the African way in order to retain what he referred to as “the African genius.” He argued:

By the African genius, I mean something positive, our socialist conception of society, the efficiency, and validity of our traditional statecraft, our highly developed code of morals, our hospitality, and our purposeful energy.99

Before Karl Marx gave the scientific basis for socialism, it was what was called utopian socialism. Marx’s dialectical materialism was what made the whole difference in grounding socialism to material realities. While Marx and Engel classified materialism as one reality, Nkrumah noted that the Cartesian duality which he referred to as “irreducibility”100 was the underpinning factor in African socialism. This therefore made Nkrumah’s call for a type of socialism tailored to reflect the African consciousness more opportune. He called this “Philosophical Consciencism.” In this theory, Nkrumah contended that conscientism “enabled African societies to digest both the Islamic and the Euro-Christian elements in Africa, and develop them in such a way as to fit into the African personality.”101 He maintained the scientific principles as discovered by Marx, but again took a deep look at the African conception of religion, of God, and Women. He found a direct expression in governance and in the nature of things to create a new harmony in the new Africa’s “triple heritage.”102
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While explaining the motivation for his philosophical approach in dealing with the African challenges, Nkrumah stressed that,

We know, of course, that the defeat of colonialism and even neo-colonialism will not result in the automatic disappearance of the imported patterns of thought and social organization. For those patterns have taken root, and are in varying degree sociological features of our contemporary society. Nor will a simple return to the communalistic society of ancient Africa offer a solution either. To advocate a return, as it were, to the rock from which we were hewn is a charming thought, but we are faced with contemporary problems, which have arisen from political subjugation, economic exploitation, educational and social backwardness, increases in population, familiarity with the methods, and products of industrialization, modern agricultural techniques. \(^{103}\)

Nkrumah like Frantz Fanon spoke very profoundly about the African personality, the hierarchy and the social order and urged Africans to fashion out their own unique style which deals with the African evolution. In this, Nkrumah divided the African society into three segments; the traditional, the Western, and the Islamic. He acknowledged that the principles animating these were often in conflict with one another and also in conflict with the socialist egalitarianism of the traditional African society. In prescribing what must be done to resolve this crisis, Nkrumah noted that the two other segments, in order to be seen, must be accommodated only as experiences of the traditional African society. Here, he insisted that the social revolution should begin in Consciencism, that social revolution must have standing firmly behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society. \(^{104}\)

Thus, more than anything, Consciencism, was his proposed framework for Africa to discover its spirit and create the African identity.
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From this, one could argue that Nkrumah noted there was no way Africans could determine their right future when they saw it in another man’s eyes. Thus, even as he did not advocate a demolition of Western and Islamic intrusion into the African culture, he maintained it would be seen only as a historical experience. The strength of this philosophy was based on Nkrumah’s insistence that the citizenry must drive and own their thinking as well as politics. It can again be argued that if Nkrumah’s model had been followed through to the latter, it would have sought a connection with the egalitarian and humanist past of the people before their social evolution was ravaged by colonialism. Yet again, Consciencism predicates its beliefs on materialist basis and does not mystify socialism but gives it a practical basis for examining its social and political value. Nkrumaism therefore, was a philosophy of self-determination by Africans; it was a perspective with a premise that Africans take charge of their own destiny.

Consciencism starts from having the freedom to exercise independent thinking devoid of external interference, particularly the Western or Eurocentric narrative of the African person. It is a project to figure out one’s own identity, values and institutions from within, what is often referred to as a “return to things native.” \(^{105}\) Secondly, Consciencism means a discovery of the common cultural experiences and histories of African people that they shared together. This project to reconstruct a shared past Nkrumah believed, was very important to building a united present. Thirdly, Consciencism is a project to be realized under the vanguard of the intellectual. Hence it is an elitist project which involves the masses. Last but not the least, Nkrumah viewed this
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intellectual project of Consciencism as something inseparable from the political leadership and political action. Intellectual revolution would feed political practice in the material world. Hence he did not make a clean break between intellectuals and political actors when he argued for the need to revive the past in the project of Consciencism.

3.3 Nkrumah on Pan Africanism and Union Government

Pan Africanism was simply seen by Nkrumah as a tool in affirming the African identity and demanding independence for the African continent. Through conferences, there emerged strategies which led to the fight against oppression and exploitation of the young generation of African leaders. Particularly, the 1945 Pan African conference held in Manchester, United Kingdom, kept alive the anti-colonial struggle which further inspired African nationalists including Nkrumah to regain control of their countries and further develop commitments towards liberating the African continent from colonial rule.\textsuperscript{106} Whereas it can be argued that the ideological roots of Pan Africanism were not in Africa but heavily rooted in the Caribbean and the United States,\textsuperscript{107} the 1945 conference redefined the values of the movement towards a concerted action for African liberation. This created the platform for Ghana, after becoming an independent state to host the first Pan African conference of independent African countries in Accra to begin the talks initiated by Nkrumah in his quest to unite the continent.


Nkrumah pushed through the Pan Africanist idea even though it was perceived as alien which was later twisted to suit the African experience. Using “scientific socialism,” Nkrumah made the concept an objective one and the means for Africa to liberate itself from the oppression of the colonialists. Two-thirds of the countries in Africa obtained independence, 15 short years after the introduction of the concept and vision of Pan Africanism on the continent. From this, one can argue that Pan Africanism became a political practice and a collective action or individual orientation working together to unite the African continent and bring liberation to Africans from colonialism and imperialism.

In other words, Nkrumah saw the political or individual orientation of Pan-Africanism as a religious idea which formed the basis to further his struggle for African unity, even though his set of concepts were regarded as “vague and did not present an actual policy for development.” His vision for Africa was modeled along the lines of the United States when he argued that “If the United States of America had remained divided into separate states, would these states collectively have had the authority in the councils of the world today?...A United Africa could be as great a force in world affairs as the United States of America...” His major drive was for Africa to be a global power broker at par with the likes of USA and the rest of the super powers. He foresaw
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political integration, the central theme of his idea of Pan Africanism, as the gateway to making the African continent stronger economically, militarily, and diplomatically. This of course conformed to the same old principle “divided we are weak; united, Africa could become one of the greatest forces for good in the world.”

Kwame Nkrumah came to America under the auspices of the church and studied at the Seminary. By the end of 1939, he had obtained his B.A. degree with a major in Economics and Sociology, and Bachelor of Theology in 1942. He proceeded to the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia for his M.Sc. degree in Education and an M.A. in Philosophy. His education at this level spelt out the road map for his eventual struggle against colonialism and white supremacy. Though Paul Lee discusses Nkrumah’s days as a student in the United States, particularly his difficult economic background and how he had to work his socks off to ensure that he completed his studies, his association with the African American at the Lincoln University deepened his interest in their history and culture. This was extensively shown in his contribution of articles such as “Negro history” in the Lincoln’s student newspaper and several other presentations. Nkrumah supported the idea that both the Negro and African survivals in America had either lost or retained their cultural contact with the African continent. His account showed that he was very much determined to study programs that could not only help him accumulate grades in the classroom, but also gave him a perspective towards his quest to the liberation struggle in Africa.

In his autobiography, Nkrumah recalled that he acquainted himself with as many political organizations as possible including, groups concerned with black rights and Africa, and the National Urban League. The research office at the NAACP, an affiliate of the National Urban League co-founded by W.E.B. Du Bois became the turning point for Nkrumah’s Pan-Africanist ideas. Nkrumah facilitated the April 1945 international “colonial conference” at the old Schaumburg Library in Harlem to prepare the grounds for the 5th Pan-African congress in Manchester, England on October, 1945. This little known conclave was something of a dress rehearsal for the historic 5th Pan-African congress, which both Nkrumah and Du Bois helped to organize in Manchester, England in October 1945. One of the Africans who assisted them later became another father of an African nation: Jomo Kenyatta, the first president of independent Kenya.

Paul Lee also argued that the years spent in American contributed to making Nkrumah a very passionate speaker, who was brilliant in using words to drive home his ideas even among those who had no formal education. It was therefore not surprising that Nkrumah was able to strike a good chord between him and the electorates. Lee also in his assessment of Nkrumah’s eloquence, which was heavily influenced by his days in the US, sourced the thoughts of other writers. Upon graduating from Lincoln’s seminary school, Nkrumah delivered the “graduation oration” on a topic dear to black nationalists for at least a century before him: “Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands unto
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God.\textsuperscript{119} Julian Mayfield, the African American novelist, who worked as a speechwriter for Nkrumah, told the writer that this unique combination of African American church, street-ladder, and traditional African oratory, greatly contributed to Nkrumah's popular appeal when he returned to the Gold Coast in 1947 and began the 'Positive Action' campaign.\textsuperscript{120}

Upon returning to the Gold Coast in 1947 to join the first political party in the country, most of the friends he met in the United States and United Kingdom also left to begin nationalist movement in their respective countries. When Ghana became the first nation to gain independence, Nkrumah decided to commit the nation's resources to help in the struggle against colonial rule on the entire continent. The likes of Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, Nnamdi Azikiwe of Nigeria, Kamuzu Banda of Malawi, and Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia visited Ghana. At this point, Ghana became a training ground for liberation movements. Nkrumah's vision for Africa was eloquently captured in his "independence speech" when he declared that the independence of Ghana was meaningless unless it was linked with the total liberation of the African continent.\textsuperscript{121} Then he moved towards the unification of the continent. Shortly after the March 1957 independence, he organized the African Congress in Accra in December 1958. Through his initiatives, the Organization of African Unity, now the African Union was formed on May 26, 1963, with a passage of the constitution of the organization in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, by the 31 independent


\textsuperscript{121} Kwame Nkrumah, "Midnight Pronouncement of Independence at Polo Ground, Accra" 5-6 March 1957.
nations. After becoming the Head of State of Ghana, Nkrumah used Ghana as the platform to implement his political vision of Pan Africanism combined with socialism. This has made “Pan-Africanism the practical, living, central plank of African liberation ideology and rooted it in the soil of Africa, such that it cannot be removed, as it is intertwined with African Nationalism.”

Nkrumah foresaw Africa as a group of small countries speaking with different voices and virtually irrelevant in world affairs. This was evidently demonstrated with Africa having no representation at the UN Security Council. Five of the members of the UN Security Council are permanent and pass resolutions which may not necessarily have the interests of Africans at heart. It was more difficult for other heads of state to accept Pan Africanism during the peak period of the debate for African unity. This led to divisions among independent African nations, leading to the emergence of the Casablanca and Monrovia Groups during the peak period of the debate for African unity. The first continental organization that embodied the aspirations of Pan-Africanists from all over the world was launched with thirty-two independent African countries in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia with Nkrumah as the architect. Though he earlier accused Nkrumah of employing the idea of a Union Government for the purpose of propaganda, Julius Nyerere later in 1997 came clean with a statement that, “Kwame Nkrumah was the state
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crusader for African unity. He wanted the Accra summit of 1965 to establish a Union Government for the whole of independent Africa but failed. One minor reason was that Nkrumah, like all great believers, underestimated the degree of suspicion and animosity, which his crusading passion had created among a substantial number of his fellow Heads of State. The major reason was linked to the first: already too many of us had a vested interest in keeping Africa divided.\[126\]

3.4 Reflections on Nkrumah's Philosophy

Nkrumahism, many argue, is "the murky and confused embodiment of his Marxist Leninist African socialist-religious philosophies."\[127\] Others talk of "Nkrumah exceptionalism", which is alien to socialist intellectual thought. Prominent amongst the critiques is Ali Mazrui. Mazrui stated

By a strange twist of destiny, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana was both the hero who carried the torch of Pan-Africanism and the villain who started the whole legacy of the one-party-state in Africa. To that extent, Kwame Nkrumah started the whole tradition of Black authoritarianism in the post-colonial era. He was the villain of the piece.\[128\]

Many of these African socialist leaders had more than a generation to achieve their "socialist transformation of Africa." One may ask, if the blueprint was sound, then why did the dream of a socialist united Africa fade after Nkrumah’s demise. Socialism of course does not admit a “leader principle”. Therefore, the death of Nkrumah or Nyerere

\[127\] DIA Intelligence Summary, “Supplement, Kwame Nkrumah, President of Ghana,”governmentattic.org. 7
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of the African Socialist Movement should not have halted the historical march to African socialism. Nkrumah, together with his compatriot, had ample time to realize the vision, if it was indeed tenable. Unless one says that Nkrumah was “exceptional”, then this goes back to the original query. But if one concedes that he was, the one shall be venturing into fascist rather than socialist territory.

It may be early to hurl criticisms on Nkrumah by attacking socialist overtures that he embarked in Ghana post-independence. Taking insights from Mao’s China, Castro’s Cuba and Krushev’s Soviet Union, Nkrumah shared the belief that any attempt to bring development and the blessings of prosperity to Ghana must be rooted in a stable form of government to allow the political ideology to gain firm root into the people. He essentially did this by outlawing multi-party system. Every questioning mind would wonder why Nkrumah who was educated in the “land of liberty and democracy” suddenly turned east to implement socialism in his country. Though it may be difficult to think and read the mind of Nkrumah, what had pervaded in the international system was obvious. First, America and Europe were singing from the same hymn book in their united front against the expansion of the Soviet Union. At the same time, European nations particularly Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal were the ones who profited from colonialism. Though America did not have a direct involvement in the African colonies, their alliance with Europe through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) made it practically difficult for America to speak against colonialism in Africa.

Secondly, the Soviet Union had no colonial footprint in the continent of Africa. And as a matter of political expediency, it decided to sympathize with African colonies and newly independent nations. This development fluxed African liberation leaders and
liberators to the East. The Soviet Union under the Secretary Nikita Khrushchev from 1953 to 1964, provided development and technical assistance as a way of tilting the balance of power to their side. China which had then become a protégé of the Soviet Union, was shining under the tutelage of Mao. All of these provided some kind of inspiration to Nkrumah that in order to bring development to his people, he needed to follow the East.

The above questions may sound highly persuasive as against the rationale for Nkrumah’s model. However, it is important to note that Socialism and largely Nkrumah impacted the liberation movements in unimaginable ways by looking at the vestiges of slavery. The human trade was effectively replaced with colonialism in the interest of the colonialists who had made socialism attractive to the leaders of the liberation struggle.  

Though social thoughts elsewhere have their downsides, on the whole, it led to the movement for an African identity and self-assertion, without which most countries in Africa would not have seen the kind of social progress they are seeing today.

Nkrumah agreed with Marx “that capitalism would collapse on its own weight.” He felt that the African by design is a socialist and not a capitalist. Put differently, the African stands on the left side of the political divide or to some moderate zone at the center and not the right side. He knew through history that saving power of this world did not lie in the Jeffersonian ideology of capitalism. To him, something alternative presented the best hope to his people. He knew that the 1920’s Great
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Depression that nearly put American economy on its deathbed was something that was a downside of capitalism. Perhaps, after forty years since his death, if he were to rise from death and hold his report cards, he would say that he did not make any mistake by turning to the east though the Soviet Union might not be there to see. He would still see China and Cuba as testimony that socialism would survive any seismic wave.

In the case of Ghana, Nkrumah made great progress in laying the foundation for a great nation. What is known is that African independence was translated by Nkrumah as a struggle against capitalism. African socialism was perceived to be the only means the continent could reconstruct its communitarian values. It was also perceived as the only model to ensure the much anticipated and debated African unity by post-colonial African leaders. African socialism and Consciencism were linked because Consciencism was Nkrumah’s call to interpret social processes using Africa’s own values and cultural institutions. He was not enthused with importing socialism from the East just as he was not satisfied with importing capitalism from the West. Instead he recommended taking the idea of socialism and fitting it or modifying it in Africa’s own reality. Therefore, it can be argued that Nkrumah’s belief in conssciencism buttressed his experiment on African socialism.

It was however, based on this principle that Nkrumah began to formulate his ideas on African unity. The African unity was not a dream or a reality shattered by colonialism. Africa was never united before. Nkrumah’s call for African unity became a dream or a vision. It was a futuristic argument, in the Consciencism, Nkrumah wanted to go back into the African traditional values and institutions but with the African unity, he wanted to move forward. He had two tendencies to look back and leap forward. In short,
Nkrumah was a traditionalist who emphasized the importance of building African personality through the search of traditional values, cultures, languages and histories. But at the same time, he was an ardent modernist and nation builder because he aspired to unite Africa, modernize it, and make it a power to reckon with at a global stage.
CHAPTER 4
NKRUMAHISM IN PRACTICE: GHANA

This chapter focuses on the attempt by Dr. Nkrumah to put into practice his theory and vision of the African state and development with Ghana as the political laboratory. The practical application of Nkrumah’s vision of Ghana provides an ample ground to assess the effectiveness of his arguments.

4.1 Pre-Independence Ghana

Agriculture was a major sector for Nkrumah’s emerging economy and the cocoa bean, “the goose that laid the golden egg”\textsuperscript{132} for Ghana, failed to attract a fair price, notwithstanding the status of Ghana as “Britain’s richest African colonial territory between 1911 and 1950.”\textsuperscript{133} On the eve of independence, Nkrumah instructed the Cocoa Marketing Board (CMB) to keep down the prices of cocoa to less than one-third of ruling
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world prices in order to enable the country raise income for socio-economic development. Members of the Asanteman Council became furious after they noted that the CMB had begun giving credits and contracts to Nkrumah’s CPP functionaries. This created a huge uproar, tribal divisions and violence.

The political dilemma that beset Nkrumah’s attempt to form a government\textsuperscript{134} was affected by blatant inter-party rivalry in the country and violence few days after the inception of the National Liberation Movement (NLM) to demand for a fair deal for cocoa farmers in Ashanti. Nkrumah regarded the struggle as a contest between “modern democratic governance and the feudal power of traditional chiefs to protect the old order.”\textsuperscript{135} The latter acquiesced to the influence of the NLM in derailing his ambition for independence. This led into anarchy when a bomb was thrown into his house. The situation alarmed the British who refused to set a date for Ghana’s independence and eventually insisted on resolving the issue through a general election. According to Meredith,

\begin{quote}
At the polls in July 1956, Nkrumah’s CPP won an outright majority, 72 of 104 seats, though only 57 per cent of the votes cast. While the CPP received 398,000 votes, the opposition tally was 299,000 votes. Satisfied with the result, Britain finally pronounced a date for independence: 6 March 1957.
\end{quote}

A few years after independence, the United Party (UP) comprising the NLM, United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC), Togolese Congress (TC), and Northern People Party (NPP) was formed to fight against cultism and dictatorship by Nkrumah after he got parliament to pass a law which made him a life time president of Ghana. Nkrumah at this
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point was said to be pushing for a CPP dictatorship. However, Basil Davidson describes this accusation as absurd since Nkrumah was only seen as oblige to the institutions of authoritarian rule applied by the British to rule their colony. He further makes the claim that what the CPP and Nkrumah did was to explore other alternatives to ensure total independence for Ghanaians and build democracy in Ghana.\textsuperscript{136}

The political tension between the CPP and NLM was more visible than what unfolded between the UGCC and later NPP. Nkrumah noted that the UGCC was not radical enough to achieve the much desired independence. Whilst the UGCC wanted self-government within the shortest possible time, the CPP wanted it right away.\textsuperscript{137} The import of this was that, the UGCC perceived the obvious success of Nkrumah and felt sidelined and thus embarked on incessant attempts to discredit his leadership. The elitism of the UGCC probably drew Nkrumah away from it. The gradual approach to independence by the UGCC did not appease Nkrumah. Nkrumah, like Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., believed in “the fierce urgency”\textsuperscript{138} of the movement towards independence. Despite its existence for a number of years, the UGCC had not been able to draw the masses into its fold.

To sum up, the political dilemma that faced Ghana towards independence was four-fold. To begin with, there was the pace of agitation for self-government. Kwame


Nkrumah and the CPP wanted self-government, whilst the UGCC wanted it within the shortest possible time. Secondly, the CPP wanted to pursue a social democratic agenda whilst the UGCC wanted to pursue a conservative agenda. Third, the CPP was a mass party, whilst the UGCC really wanted to be a party of the elite. Fourth, the CPP wanted a unitary state whilst the UGCC/NLM wanted a federal state.

Upon independence, the most eminent challenge of Nkrumah was to transform Ghana into a modern country. Even though the nation had a lot of resources; its infrastructure was not well developed. Walter Rodney argued that the British colonial rulers built cities as a strategy for controlling lines of communication and gaining access to the coast from where they exported (to Europe) raw materials and cheap labor from Africa. The level of development in Ghana was not different from what had existed in South Africa, Kenya, and Algeria. After World War II, some infrastructure was provided, but only as a means of affording leisure and comfort for the colonizing British population. While the British colonialists built luxury offices and hospitals in their setups, there were no roads for the ordinary people in Ghana to see a medical doctor. The colonial overlords did not only exploit Ghana of its vast natural resources such as cocoa, gold, diamonds, bauxite, and copper, but also imposed their way of life on the country.

Colonialism did not only hamper economic progress of Ghana, but also its cultural progress. For the colonial powers, the Ghanaian languages were unlettered. The colonial encounter also repressed the Ghanaian tribal societies by scattering and disarming the tribal armies and turning the chiefs from leaders of the people into...
instruments for implementing the laws devised by the British as tax collectors. Across the continent, the colonial experience also fomented discord between nationalities and tribes. The systems alienated the African educated elites from their culture and made them incapable of leadership. This is what is described as the "crisis of Post-colonialism in Africa."  

4.2 Measures to address Ghana’s Development Challenges

Following the transfer of power from the British in 1957, Nkrumah adopted the first seven year development plan for Ghana and Africa aiming to establish infrastructural projects such as schools and hospitals across the country. He wanted to create an industrial base in Ghana through scientific socialism. In one of his speeches, Nkrumah stated "We have embarked upon an intensive socialist reconstruction of our country." He described the British legacy as "poverty, disease, ignorance, illiteracy and degradation." The 7-year development plan was considered the road map to a modernized country. Nkrumah praised the plan stating

As I look at the content of the program and the matters it covers such as tax reform, animal husbandry, and poultry production, forest husbandry, industrialization, handicraft, banking, and insurance, foreign enterprise, culture and leisure, I am convinced beyond all doubts that Ghana and Ghanaians will full steam ahead, conscious of their great responsibilities and fully aware that
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materialization of this bright picture of the future is entirely dependent on their active and energetic industry. \textsuperscript{144}

The plan aimed to rapidly develop agriculture as the source of raw materials to feed industries. It also sought to create employment in the industrialization chain through the carting of raw materials to manufacturing companies. In broad terms, the plan sought to enable Ghana expand her agricultural output and at the same time build a growing industrial sector. \textsuperscript{145} It very much emphasized Nkrumah's inward orientation style to substitute imports and save foreign exchange.

The plan also invested in housing construction. By 1962, government had spent about 9 million Ghanaian pounds on housing construction and at least 44.5 million was needed within the next 7 years. Out of that amount, 13.4 million would go into housing those with low incomes. Funding was expected to come from government and the private sector in the proportion of 20 million pounds and 24.5 million pounds respectively. Government intended to make special arrangements with the financial institutions for funds in order to push for the provision of houses. The rationale was to build houses for workers at a cost of not more than 350 Ghanaian pounds each. \textsuperscript{146}

The success of the plan was hugely dependent on Ghana's skilled and unskilled manpower at the time. In view of this, the government undertook a strategic human resource planning to attain the required skilled labor to run affairs of the plan.
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emphasizing vocational education. The plan also sought the capacity building of employees through adult education in order to enable them handle impending diverse responsibilities. This was geared at eliminating any manpower deficiency when industrialization finally took off. “About 1.1 million fresh employees were called for by 1970 to fill the new jobs which would be created and to replace those who would leave the labor force during the 7-year period.”

4.3 Achievements of Nkrumah’s Development Plans

Although beset by a number of challenges, it can be argued that Kwame Nkrumah’s leadership laid the foundation for Ghana’s development. His vision for Ghana was so towering that at a time when Ghana was importing crude oil, he decided to build an oil refinery. He had plans to substitute expensive imported items (from primary to luxury goods) with goods and services produced within the country.

Education

Kwame Nkrumah’s vision of human resource development was informed by two seemingly contradictory strategies. On the one hand, he wanted a conscious, destiny-aware citizen, which called for an emphasis on liberal arts oriented education. But on the other hand he needed a post-colonial worker ready to embrace technical education. One can argue that Nkrumah saw the need to transform the New Ghana on the foundation of education. He ensured that the ordinary person was given adequate basic education

147 Editorial “The Famous Seven Year Development Plan of DR. Kwame Nkrumah,” Ghanaian times (September 22, 2009), 5-7.
through the Education Act which was passed in 1961 which led to an increase in the average number of years of formal schooling by Ghanaians since the era of independence.\textsuperscript{148}

The Act ensured that second cycle schools including primary and middle schools were built and maintained across the entire country to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the country.\textsuperscript{149} The education system at this point was regarded as one of the best in Africa by the World Bank. The education system, however, begun to decline from the mid-1970s onward. The Dzobo Education Review was set up to inquire into this decline.\textsuperscript{150} The committee’s report spelt out this decline in education enrollment through the following statements:

Secondary as well as technical education also received considerable support from the CPP government. The number of government and approved secondary schools increased from the 1957 figure of 38 to 59 in 1960. The number of private schools also increased from 22 to 52 within the same period. By late 1961, the number of government and approved schools had gone up to 68 out of which 24 were put up "by the Ghana Educational Trust set up in 1958 with an initial endowment of £G2V£ million from the Cocoa Marketing Board. At the time of the overthrow of the Nkrumah regime, there were 105 government and approved secondary schools, (including 11 new ones opened in 1965) with a total enrolment of 42,111. Technical institutes were set up to provide courses in carpentry and joinery, brick laying, mechanical and electrical engineering etc. By the 1964 -65 school year, the number of technical schools stood at 11 with an enrolment of 4,956.\textsuperscript{151}

Nkrumah also established teacher training colleges throughout the country as the fulcrum of his policy. He laid the foundation for higher education development by establishing the Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) and University of Cape Coast (UCC) in addition to the University of Ghana-Legon (which was established in 1948). These two universities were inaugurated to cater for science and technical education and to "meet the manpower needs of the country's accelerated education program at the time" respectively.

Nkrumah also started a community-based type of education system whereby students from all over the country could converge in a particular community. For instance, people from Accra could go to school in Tamale and still have the best quality education. This project created a system whereby students grew up together, learning the cultures and lifestyles of their colleagues. The National Boarding System was also Nkrumah's legacy. His idea of "free" Universal Basic Education has been sustained to date by various governments. For over 50 years, Ghana continues to rely on the infrastructure that was put in place during the era of Nkrumah. Not much has been done by his successors to add more universities to the ones built by Nkrumah. Besides, most of the public universities have deteriorated not in only in terms of academic standards, but also in their management. Today, many public universities in the country remain underfunded. But Nkrumah knew the importance of education and felt the need to have our own system of education in order to build our capacity and evolve our own universities with strong curricula.

Akosombo

To support his infrastructural base, Nkrumah sought a loan from the United States of America to construct the first phase of the Volta Hydroelectric Dam at Akosombo. The project was initiated in 1913 by Sir Albert Kitson, a British Colonial officer with the aim of establishing a Geological Survey Department in the Gold Coast.\(^{154}\) This project aimed to harness hydroelectric power from the Volta River by the year 1962. Upon its completion in the 1960’s, the Volta Hydroelectric Dam provided electric power for a third of Ghana’s power needs. It also helped in offering training to scores of young engineers in various technical skills. The Volta Hydroelectric Dam continued to be the main source of energy in the country until 1982 and 1997 respectively when the Kpong Hydroelectric Plant\(^{155}\) and the Aboadze Thermal Plant were installed. Nkrumah’s motivation for the construction of the Volta Hydroelectric Dam was to make Ghana the energy hub of West Africa. Today, Ghana has extended its electric power transmission system to La Côte d’Ivoire, Togo, Benin, and Burkina Faso. Perhaps, this vision is what ultimately led to the ECOWAS Energy Protocol signed on December 2003 by member states to eliminate cross-border barriers to trade in energy.\(^{156}\)


Nkrumah's Nuclear Ambition: Kwabenya Nuclear Reactor

The Kwabenya Nuclear Reactor project was also initiated by Nkrumah as a model to enhance nuclear science and technology.\textsuperscript{157} The project was set up to provide an alternative to hydroelectric energy, in the form of nuclear energy, in order to enhance national development.\textsuperscript{158} Nkrumah set up the Ghana Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC) to champion research into the use of nuclear energy and subsequently sent engineers to go and study in Russia in order to enable them acquire the necessary skills for the operation of nuclear energy.\textsuperscript{159} However, after Nkrumah's overthrow in 1966, the Government of Ghana has not shown any serious commitment to nuclear energy as argued by J. K. A. Amuzu in his research on the "Nuclear Option for Ghana."\textsuperscript{160} According to Amuzu, even though nuclear energy could have been used as a good resource to generate power supply for the health facilities, industry, agriculture, and food preservation, Ghana has not done much with the technology.

In 2007, when Ghana faced a debilitating energy crisis, a debate ensued that the country should consider developing nuclear technology in order to power its industries and households.\textsuperscript{161} The debate lost steam when the country in the same year discovered oil and gas in commercial quantities. However, it is important for the country to consider resuscitating this project not only as a means of defense (as employed in countries like
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Israel and Russia), but also an alternative energy source to sustain her socio-economic development and related environmental issues.

**Roads and Transport Infrastructure**

Today, ECOWAS (with the support of NEPAD) is close to signing an agreement to build the Trans-Africa Highway as a way of promoting the development and regional economic integration of West Africa.\(^{162}\) This project has its roots in the era of Nkrumah who was inspired by the Interstate Highway System in the United States. The West African Highway system linking Ghana to Togo, Benin, and Nigeria, was therefore recommended by him.\(^{163}\) At the end of first decade of African independence, it became clear that figures for road networks in Ghana were much higher than the figures at the end of Colonial rule.

**African Liberation**

Nkrumah contributed a lot to the liberation of the continent from the shackles of colonialism. He also tried to stamp out colonialism and supported the struggle against the Apartheid regime in South Africa.\(^{164}\) Some scholars argue that Nkrumah should have done more during his time for Ghana, but chose power over the welfare of the people, hence the conditions of Ghanaians today. For these scholars, Nkrumah’s passion for African unity drifted him away from his own people and lavished Ghana’s wealth in that
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expedition. For example, when Guinea under President Sekou Toure said “No” to General Charles De Gaulle’s notion of independence under a French community, Ghana gave Guinea ten million pounds sterling as a grant. In addition, Nkrumah gave material and financial assistance to numerous African liberation movements and allowed African freedom fighters to seek sanctuary in Ghana. Nkrumah’s critics such as Peter Omari accused him of “sacrificing Ghana on the altar of Pan-Africanism” in squandering the country’s economic riches in Pan-Africanist projects. Yet, for Nkrumah, Ghana’s economic progress was inextricably tied to the fundamental economic, social and political development of the entire African continent. He therefore noted that Ghana and Africa were inseparable in terms of destiny and future.

In his infamous book, *Neo-colonialism: the Last Stage of Imperialism*, Nkrumah wrote: “Economic unity to be effective must be accompanied by political unity. The two are inseparable, each necessary for the future greatness of the continent, and the development of resources.” Most leaders did recognize the role of Ghana and Kwame Nkrumah in their struggle against colonialism. Sam Nujoma for instance remarked,

Ghana’s fight for freedom inspired and influenced us all, and the greatest contribution to our political awareness at that time came from the achievements of Ghana after its independence. It was from Ghana that we got the idea that we must do more than just petition the UN to bring about our own independence.

Kenneth Kaunda who led Zambia to independence claimed, “Nkrumah inspired many people of Africa towards independence and was a great supporter of the liberation of
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southern Africa from Apartheid and racism.” 167 Nkrumah’s uncompromising announcement that “the independence of Ghana is meaningless unless it is linked to the total liberation of the African continent” 168 translated into moral, logistical and material support for dependent territories. The African Union has recently named its newly built headquarters (2012) in Addis Ababa after the name of Kwame Nkrumah for his unwavering stance on African Unity and his commitment to combat colonialism. 169

4.4 Challenges and Failures

African nationalists including Nkrumah faced the challenge to fashion out a “political organism” 170 which could enable Africans exercise their authority and will in determining their future. Unfortunately, Nkrumah’s model receded from African consensual democracies and finally settled on a Stalinist type European political system with a “one party statism.” 171

Stalin and Nkrumah were both Seminarians before they plunged into the political arena,” so being Priest and Prophet- politics come as naturally to them as breathing. Prior to the 1965 elections in Ghana, Nkrumah is said to have prohibited the self-declared Muslim Party of the Gold Coast from contesting as part of the struggle for power. Nkrumah exclusively picked 198 MPs in June 1965, when in Suleiman’s words “Nkrumah-weary Ghana was poised for elections.” 172

170 Frantz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth (New York: Grove Press, 1963), 185.
His desire for a one party state was noted by Ali Mazrui who stated that the idea of black authoritarianism in Africa is traceable to the personality cult of Kwame Nkrumah who believed in himself as “the ‘Messiah’ of Ghana and Africa.” Mazrui further argues that Nkrumah “reconstructed himself into a Leninist Czar merging both the monarchical tendency which was reflected in his use of the title ‘Osagyefo’ and the Leninist vanguard tradition.” 173 His critics argue that Nkrumah’s nine long years is said to be a “litmus test for communism and fascism” and that he “exploited Ghanaians of their resources for his ambitious goals.” 174 Nkrumah’s party dominated the parliament and introduced the Preventive Detention Act (PDA) in 1958 where people were reported to have vanished for certain comments they made against Nkrumah’s government, creating tension and fear in the country.

Nkrumah made the claim that there were assassination attempts on his life which were purported to have been orchestrated by the opposition. 175 Unlike Joseph Stalin who purged people whom he perceived to be threats to the Soviet edifice, Nkrumah rather incarcerated people who were not on the same page with him. But what happened in post-independence Ghana was not different from what had transpired in other countries like Guinea, La Cote d’Ivoire, and Tanzania. 176 In her article, “Single Party Systems in West Africa,” Ruth Schacter argues that most of the parties were formed by the African
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175 Nkrumah, *Ghana*, 220.
governments that were based on mass movement.¹⁷⁷ This was possible because at the time of African independence, many of these countries were too fragile to begin talking about multi-party democracy. “Whilst the Ivory Coast and Senegal purported to be multi-party states, they were de facto one-party states in which other parties had no chance of winning state power. In short, these various African states were all attempting to grapple with the same issues as Nkrumah.”¹⁷⁸ In the years after Ghana’s independence, the Cold War had reached its climax and the Soviet Union was bent on making inroads in the continent. One third of the world also supported socialism and Nkrumah was not alone in his choice of socialism. Most countries had moved from capitalism into a form of socialism.

The formation of groups and associations, based on ethnic or tribal lines which eventually became common at the era of decolonization, was Nkrumah’s main argument for establishing a one-party state. Perhaps, it can also be assumed that Nkrumah took the decision to build Ghana into a one-party state by drawing lessons from the effects of sectarianism which had engulfed many parts of the continent. Nkrumah did not want this to happen in the new Ghana and felt it prudent to ban parties on ethnic and religious lines. He did not only ban the Muslim Party, but also the likes of the Workers Party and the Northern People’s Party (NPP). Parties calibrated on ethnic and religious grounds merged to form the United Party (UP) and it was the United Party which won the election after Nkrumah’s overthrow.

Obviously, Nkrumah’s autocracy is in conflict with parliamentary democracy. Nkrumah noted this during a sessional address to the National Assembly that “the multi-party system which exists in Western countries promote social cleavage, and the kind of class system which does not exist in African countries, is a ruse for perpetuating, and cover up, the inherent struggle between the have and the have-nots.”\textsuperscript{179} In a directive to African countries, he explained in a speech to the Indian Council on World Affairs that “Africa evolves forms of government different from the traditional Western pattern but no less democratic in their protection of individuals and their inalienable rights.”\textsuperscript{180} From the above analysis, one can easily argue that Nkrumah’s Ghana morphed into what Cooper refers to as the era of “developmentalist authoritarianism.”\textsuperscript{181} It was a model designed to transform Ghana into a modern and industrial country after a long spell of colonization.\textsuperscript{182}

\textbf{The Cold War Era}

Inclining towards the Soviet Union to developing Ghana itself was however a major challenge for Nkrumah’s leadership. If one became a President in Africa after the World War II, he or she would be left with the choice of aligning either with the West or the East in order to assert political sovereignty and economic security. Kwame Nkrumah on the eve of Ghana’s independence joined other leaders such as Nehru, Tito, Nasser,  

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{179} Nkrumah, \textit{Consciencism}, 101.
\textsuperscript{180} Kwame Nkrumah, “Speech to the Indian Council on World Affairs.” (26 December 1958)
\textsuperscript{181} Frederick cooper, \textit{Africa Since 1940: The Past of the Present} (New York: Cambridge UP, 2002), 89.
\textsuperscript{182} Zolberg, \textit{Creating Political Order}, 55.
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Sukarno and Ben Bella in declaring their independent states by refusing to play to the
tune of either the Russians or the United States of America at the Bandung Conference,
which led to the emergence of the term, "Non-Aligned Movement."\textsuperscript{183}

The rationale for Nkrumah opting not to align his independent Ghana with any of
the blocs was to protect the sovereignty of the country and to be able to access economic
support from both the West and East for development. This action of the Non-Aligned
Movement became necessary because Africa over decades been under colonial rule and
after obtaining independence, Nkrumah and his contemporaries did not want to be under
any other control or dictatorship from the developed countries. In other words, the goal of
the non-aligned movement was to protect the sovereignty of newly independent countries.
In one of his speeches Nkrumah said "we do not look east or west but we look forward."
Hence his caution to the West that, "We have to modernize. Either we shall do so with
your interest and support or we shall be compelled to turn elsewhere. This is not a
warning, or a threat, but a straight statement of political reality."\textsuperscript{184} However, it would
later emerge that the "non-aligned" countries became aligned in one way or the other to
either the West or the East.

Many had expected that Western capitalist countries would maintain a certain
kind of relationship with their colonies in Africa. However, reading from Nkrumah’s
public statements, it was clear that the Britain and other Western countries were not
convinced about providing the needed support in reconstructing African economies. This
was similar to the post-Haitian revolution where Jan Carew argues that several attempts

\textsuperscript{183} Muhammad Badiul Alam, "The Concept of Non-Alignment: A Critical Analysis."
\textsuperscript{184} Kwame Nkrumah, \textit{Speak of Freedom}, p. 145.
were made by the French to frustrate anti-slavery development in Haiti. He further noted that if the French government had supported Haiti to succeed after their revolution, it would have become a norm and the drive for all countries under the slave trade to revolt for development.\(^{185}\)

Later therefore, Nkrumah’s role in the Non-Aligned Movement began to decline and he turned to the East in the search of support in his bid to build Ghana. This was as a result of the disappointment he encountered when the United States government declined to offer support for the construction of the Volta Hydro Electric project in Ghana. He said “I have stated on many occasions that the Government’s policy is aimed at evolving a socialist pattern of society, no secret has been made of this fact. I have also stated that there are different paths to socialism, that each country must find its own way and that socialism could differ from one country to another.”\(^ {186}\) He added that “Ghana intended to evolve its own socialist pattern of development adapted to its needs.”\(^ {187}\) Nkrumah noted that the state, having the monopoly of violence and resource, would be in a better position to adequately protect the masses. However, he felt this could be practically difficult and was thus imprudent to allow the individual to proceed along the line of owning massive properties.

\(^{185}\) Jan Carew, "Ghana, the Violent Change." Interview by Prince K.B Frimpong. *Memoir: Jan Carew*
\(^{186}\) Nkrumah, Broadcast. 9 October 1960. Axioms of Kwame Nkrumah.
CIA Operations on Nkrumah’s Overthrow

The Western powers including West Germany, Britain, and America are on record for instigating opponents of Nkrumah to topple his administration. The American Government was a bit "uncomfortable" a Defense Intelligence Agency document stated that continued existence of Nkrumah’s government could have far-reaching implications for US military plans and policies in Africa. Nkrumah was seen as “a nuisance, an immature politician, and a figure of ridicule than statesman” with no workable ideas. In his book *A Myth Has Been Broken*, Major Retired Ocran, a former commander of the Ghana’s southern battalion argues that Nkrumah wanted attention and that the administration in Washington should not have seen him as a threat at all. Indeed, the major mistake the American Administration may have made was their willingness to help the National Liberation Council (NLC) regime which toppled Nkrumah and to recognize it as legitimate.

The only mention of CIA involvement in the coup is a declassified document No. 253 which implicates the police and military. The CIA said in that document that it was not explicitly involved in the planning but was encouraging it with the help of the European countries "including France", through economic sanctions like loan refusal. It is again argued that “the Western powers, in collaboration with the local opposition,
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coordinated an economic and political warfare against Nkrumah.”¹⁹² The country at this point was steeply drifting back so seriously into the past hard times. “This economic embargo finally got Ghanaians to believe that Nkrumah had personally fleeced them out of the foreign reserves and had siphoned millions into his secret Swiss bank account.”¹⁹³

It would be naive to think that the spy agency (including the Peace Corps which were used to gather information to the CIA) was not aware of discontent in the country. The document covers extensively the coup and failed attempts. If the economic analysis stated in document 253 was anything to go by, Europe was instrumental in the 1966 coup in Ghana. In the end it came down to Nkrumah's own doing, his alienation of the military and police, the firing of two of his top ranking military officers including General Ankrah and subsequently, installing himself with the title, “the Supreme Commander's Baton of Office, in September 1965, a gesture intended to emphasize that he was the operational commander of the armed forces.”¹⁹⁴ The military and police became fed up with Nkrumah's despotic rule and worked together to overthrow him. Otherwise no amount of CIA/European economic sanctions could have succeeded in overthrowing Nkrumah. Of course, the 1966 push against Nkrumah would not have been carried out without the CIA and MI6 bankrolling. Failing to get the country to really understand what he wanted to do while Nkrumah criss-crossed the world made it possible to manipulate the public to kick

against his policies. It has taken a long time for the population of Ghana to understand what he stood for.

4.5 Nkrumah and His Contemporaries

One may compare the economic performance of Nkrumah’s experiments to that of his key contemporaries such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, and Félix Houphouet-Boigny of Côte d’Ivoire. Though they all shared similar colonial experiences, there were differences in terms of the economic development models they pursued. Ghana, Tanzania, Kenya and Cote D’Ivoire relied heavily on the export of agricultural goods in exchange for imported manufactured goods. Kenya was up by 10 percent in terms of standard of living when compared to Tanzania (Source). This was because while Tanzania sought to “organize its agriculture into collectives and nationalize its industries,” Kenya continued with “owner occupied small-scale farms with direct support from the Western institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF)”.

195 The authors further quote Nnoli to buttress this claim. According to Nnoli, Kenya advanced in output than Tanzania by 50 per cent in 1973 and 30 per cent faster over the decade between 1974 and 1984. 196 Tanzania began to align with the IMF in the mid-1970s because of its compelling economic conditions but it “became highly indebted and could not do much to resuscitate the Tanzanian

The impact of the IMF on Tanzania, Kenya and Cote was enormous. The debilitating economic crisis created a space for coup de tats. The political instability that characterized these countries were linked to the economic depression.

Félix Houphouet-Boigny was seen more as French appendage than an independent African as “he moved towards the free market economy and heavily reliance on French technical expertise and private sector.” Côte d'Ivoire paid more attention to agriculture than industry which proved a successful strategy. The country was once called the Switzerland of Africa but she could not sustain the economic momentum after the death Houphouet-Boigny. At this point, it can be argued that though Kenya and Côte d'Ivoire had a neo-liberal approach to their respective development different from the socialist models of Tanzania and Ghana.

Julius Nyerere’s Ujamaa concentrated on mobilizing the peasant population for production, in what is often referred to as the “cooperative/socialist enterprise.” The implementation of the Ujamma project, Saul argues led to the “economic destruction of this potentially wealthy nation.” It is interesting to note that before the implementation of the Ujamma project, Tanzania had about ten times as much natural resources as Singapore; yet, it has one of the most backyard systems in the world today”. In 1964, fixed capital formation constituted 15 per cent of the monetary Gross Domestic Product (GDP). This increased to 20 per cent in 1969 and moved up to 26 per cent in 1970. There
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were growths recorded in the industrial sector as well as an increase in the balance of payments position of the country from about 81.9 million Tanzanian shillings in 1968 to about 134.5 million Tanzanian shillings in 1969.\textsuperscript{201}

John Saul has described Nyerere’s political thoughts as idealistic or unscientific in an independent African country,\textsuperscript{202} since his model which sought to mobilize a scattered and diverse rural population to establish the social structures and Economic infrastructures for modern nationhood was considered contradictory in terms of implementation.\textsuperscript{203} This is not to indicate that Nkrumah’s model did not have a limitation, however, Tanzania is a curious case especially when Julius Nyerere was the archetypal communist and created his one party Chama Chama Mpundizi (CCM) unlike Ghana where there was a political opposition.

4.6 Summary

Given what Nkrumah did at his time and the vision he laid out, not only Ghana but the entire African continent would have been better served had his vision fully materialized. Today, three major political parties in Ghana (namely the National Democratic Congress, Convention People’s Party and People’s national Convention) are claiming to be Nkrumahist. However, Ghanaian leaders such as Dr Hilla Limann, Jerry

Rawlings, and John Evans Atta Mills who all pride themselves as Nkrumahist have not
done much in using Nkrumah’s ideas to bring about the needed improvements in the lives
of the people. It appears claiming to be Nkrumahist has become a mere approach to
wooing people who liked Nkrumah. For instance, even though it claims to be Nkrumahist,
the policies of the ruling National Democratic Congress (NDC) stand more on the right
than Nkrumah would have stood.

Nkrumah’s long term vision of course could not be realized in the short term but
the fact remains that he pioneered Pan-Africanism. He founded the Organization of
African Unity which later morphed into the African Union. Today, many of Nkrumah’s
projects are criticized as being purely driven by his latter day fascination with
Communism. Despite criticisms, the CPP’s seven-year Development Plan was one of the
most consistent development plans in the history of Ghana. Nkrumah’s overthrow, the
departure of his children into exile, and the various interruptions to constitutional rule -
all meant that Ghana had no developmental direction for the better part of 50 plus years.
Today, the country is far better than many other African countries due to its industrial
foundation and emerging democracy. However, it is still grappling with many
development challenges. Thus, although, Nkrumah had his downside by being a dictator,
his seven-year Development Plan is still touted as a model for any country in Sub-
Saharan Africa.

The state provided employment so there was nothing like street hawking and
education was free. One of the arguments now thrown at Nkrumah’s legacy is he
achievements were possible only because Ghana’s population was less than 6 million.
However, it should be noted that an increase in population could as well mean more tax
revenues and a larger human resource base. Population simply became an issue because after the overthrow of the CPP, a negation digit which was planted in almost every area it touched. The Benso Oil Palm Plantation, as well as the sugar, shoe, jute, leather, tomato and starch factories established by Nkrumah have all collapsed. Moreover, Ghana’s iron, steel and soap making industries used to be one of the most sophisticated in the world, but that knowledge has now gone down the drain.

Nkrumah stood for a "strong" state which at the time was the best for a developing country learning to stand on its feet after years of colonial domination. Although he had his flaws and is reputed as being very intolerant of dissenting views, he did not hide the fact that he lived his life to build a strong Ghanaian State and acquired nothing for himself. This is not the case with contemporary politicians of Ghana. Few of these politicians believe in leadership which says “I am going to sacrifice and leave a mark for my people; I have a vision to leave something that will last 50 years or more.” Among “die hard African political activists and Pan-Africanists, Nkrumah was and continues to remain a revered hero, committed nationalist and Pan-Africanist deserving of high esteem.” However, the West did not like Nkrumah’s ideas since they were perceived by them as a threat to their economic progress and began to interpret his vision as socialist and communist, leading to his overthrow in 1966. Those who understood development realized that Nkrumah’s vision industrialization could have put Ghana and for that matter Africa on map of international growth. Nkrumah was a symbol of African independence and the first African leader to negotiate with the British to obtain their independence. Within a few years of Ghana’s independence, most of the colonized
African countries had obtained their independence. Nkrumah pushed for development because he wanted Africa to be self-reliant.

Nkrumah’s ambition to industrialize and become a continental powerhouse was also not liked by many in the West. This was because the Western economy even after independence still regarded Ghana in particular and Africa in general as the resource base for industries in the West. Nkrumah’s attempt to form a joint African high command was also seen with a different eye suspiciously by the West. Today the situation is different. The US has launched its African High Command and is effectively monitoring all of the African security. Western interest in the continent also stalled attempts to unite the people. Departing colonial governments sowed the seeds of war and division in countries like the Congo. The first post-independence prime minister of the country, Patrice Lumumba, did not have enough time to formulate any economic program. Immediately he took over as the Prime Minister of Congo, Lumumba had to run for his life. Hence, the desire of Nkrumah to develop a relationship with a functioning government in Congo eventually became a bane to the progress of his pan-Africanist ideas.

Nkrumah never came out against Christianity. He himself was a preacher in the Christian religion and went to the seminary at the University of Pennsylvania to study theology. So his socialism was mixed with some Christian elements and principles. He realized that, Christianity was politically a weapon that Africans could use against the White imperialists. Africans constantly said that, “here is your book which says that all human beings are equal, how come you are discriminating against us and pushing us into subservient, against humanity.” They pointed out the contradictions to the white
colonialists who appeared to preach that all men were equal but some were more equal than others.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

This study sought to assess the relevance of Nkrumah's Socialist and Pan-Africanist ideas as a model of development for a continent that is still groping for a paradigm of development. To this end, Ghana was used as a laboratory for gauging Nkrumah’s application of theory and practice when he managed the affairs of this West African country as its first postcolonial leader. The first question arises as to whether Nkrumahism (or the ideology of development propounded by Dr. Nkrumah) was a potent or effective model for African development? The approach to this question is to carefully highlight Nkrumah’s achievements and failures in his own country. This was reviewed in light of the existing literature on Nkrumah and Ghana. The second major objective was to see whether Nkrumah's ideas were relevant in the context in which they were fashioned. Another important question is whether Nkrumahism could be useful today. If yes, what are the implications of this model of development for Africa, particularly in light of the recent revivalist movement towards the creation of an African “mega state”? 

As fully elaborated in chapters 3 and 4, one of the tools envisaged by Nkrumah for African development and progress was using Socialism as a model of state organization and economic progress. The system proposed state control of means of
production as opposed to deregulation. As the evidence shows, Ghana operated on this model from 1958 to 1967 with remarkable promises/successes, as well as some failures. It is important to note here that Nkrumah shifted his alliance to the Eastern bloc led by the Soviet Union after his hopes to secure funds from Western power for such projects like Akosombo Hydroelectric Power project were dashed. In this nine years period, Nkrumah’s system accomplished a number of successes. These included: investing in the manufacturing sector with such important projects like the Akosombo Hydro Electric Dam, Akosombo Textiles Factory, Juapong Textiles, Nsawam Cannery, Pwualugu Tomato factory. Nkrumah also set up the Cocoa Marketing Board’s purchasing units in several rural depots, and cotton processing plant in the Western Region. He also pioneered the idea of Trans ECOWAS Highway thereby opening up Ghana to its neighbors. With the construction of Tema harbor, the building of the nuclear reactor at Kwabenya and a host of other interventions, Nkrumah built the foundations of modern Ghana. Nkrumah's development strategy was a basically sound one but it suffered from an unfavorable colonial heritage, defects of leadership, poor implementation and adverse external circumstances. His large investment in physical and human capital built a foundation for future dynamic growth.

Notwithstanding the achievements of Nkrumah’s brand of socialism, many problems dogged his ideas. Nkrumah failed to oil the wheel of industrialization where most of the factories became white elephants for years before the country found use for them. Such basic inputs like factory raw materials were in short supply in some sectors. His attempt to realize industrialization through import substitution was hijacked by incompetent politicians who were his own party members.
The colonial experience in Africa also delayed Nkrumah’s vision of Pan African unity. It is however important to remember that countries who were not colonized like Thailand and Ethiopia, or those like Egypt that endured waves of colonialism did not fare well in economic terms in the 1960s and 70s.

While recognizing the searing impacts of colonialism in dividing and weakening Africa, we can also note that a key obstacle impinging on the development of the postcolonial state in Africa is the phenomenon of multi-ethnicity. Most colonized African nations have territorial boundaries that clustered, in some cases as many as fifty ethnic groups within one boundary. As several studies have shown, in countries with very meager resources, such geopolitical systems are wired for violent conflicts. The argument is that competition for political leadership will be based on individual and group access to special privileges which comes with power. But we can also argue that ethnicity did not derail European industrialization after two World Wars. Hence it can be argued that the major problem is the absence of leverage or control on Africa’s own resources than its multi-ethnicity.

Using the counterfactual scenario that there was no colonialism, that for example the Ashanti kingdom became a state on its own. The forged consciousness of smaller groups subsumed under the bigger Ashanti ethnic group could have created some homogeneity that would have fostered a greater level of development than the present Ghana that we have. Be this as it may, Nkrumah had much grander plans for the continent. He not only dreamt of Africa that would be completely free from colonial rule
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but one that will be devoid of parochial political linings. In light of this, he lavished Ghana’s wealth on freedom fighters in other countries. He invited them to Accra as Ghana became the Westminster of Anti-colonialism Struggle. Ghanaian universities became the Harvards and Oxfords for other nationals to come and study. He believed that training the new African personality and a new identity was crucial to the Pan-Africanism agenda. He named Ghana’s principal streets and roads and university halls after African freedom fighters to show his commitment to the cause. Some examples include Patrice Lumumba Street, Nyerere Street, Unity Hall, Africa Hall, and Katanga Hall, among others. For Nkrumah believed that, “...The task [for independence of the Gold Coast... is [was] not assured until the last vestiges of colonialism have been swept from Africa.”

Part of Nkrumah’s plans for African development involved bringing the entire continent under one political umbrella. Nkrumah strongly believed that there is strength in unity—a move he believed will make Africa stronger both militarily and politically. This belief is best captured in his popular saying that Africans should first win the political kingdom and every other thing will be added unto them. Towards this end, Nkrumah deployed Ghana’s resources into a vision his critics believed is “untenable and totally unreal when it is seen to require the loss of any fragment of national sovereignty and the relinquishing of any administrative functions to some external body.”
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was indeed "discredited" for this by pursuing a continental government which would mean giving up the "sovereignty of Ghana." These critics also argue that Nkrumah wasted his country's meager resources as he used the machinery of Ghana as a vehicle to push for that dream. Nkrumah could be shortsighted failing to recognize the diversity of the African culture as an obstacle to attaining his political philosophy for the entire continent. Evans White describes Nkrumah's political ideology as pointing more to "a globalised politics that emphasized supranational goals over national interest" and stating further that the "shifts were also limited by the political possibilities of his time."

Nkrumah's attempt at forging a union government in Africa itself was not without fault as the union has since been plagued with disagreements about whether or not a union government serves Africa better. Paul-Simon Handy argues that unlike the colonial period where Africans had to apply the principles of Pan-Africanism for total liberation from political control, the present situation presents a different kind of reality. The ideals of Pan-Africanism should be redefined to fit into the modern contemporary politics but not conspiracy theories and invisible enemies it is intended to portray.

Despite its shortcomings, proponents of Pan Africanism offer a historical analysis of Nkrumah's work and a policy illustration of how his ideas for progress have become
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the right model for Africa even today. Pan-Africanism which was the model for ensuring Nkrumah’s union government in Africa is again seen as a philosophy of Africa’s historical legacy that seeks to bring together Africans on the continent and in the Diaspora in political unity. More often than not many scholars look at the “ethnic and economic differences” among Africans as the main bane militating against the African unity. Nkrumah’s argument went, “the essential fact remains that we are all Africans, and have a common interest in the independence of Africa. If the need for political union is agreed by all, then the will to create it is born: there will be a way.”

In Ghana, the Pan-African and socialist visions of Nkrumah led to the emergence of a one-party state. Nkrumah’s intolerance of divergent political views made him a strong man making laws, implementing and interpreting them. The situation curtailed public freedom. Nkrumah politicized the chieftaincy institution so much so that a chief could only be installed upon his approval; this created a division between him and the Ashanti kingdom. His socialist ideology later gave way to capitalism when it became clear that the state alone could no longer provide for the citizens.

It can be argued that the authoritarianism that existed during Nkrumah’s era however maybe different from what is happening in the African continent today. Though many neo-colonial African leaders seem to promote democratic credentials yet they seem

to close all venues of legal protests and freedom of speech. Countries such as Niger, Burkina Faso, and Guinea Bissau have since their independence had coups d’état and counter-coups which have somewhat derailed their economic progress. Burkina Faso has a sitting government since 1987 after the execution of Thomas Sankara for more than twenty years. Corruption and misappropriation of the state laws to ensure his continuity have become endemic in Blaise Campaore’s Burkina Faso.218

In Senegal, Abdoulaye Wade first refused to step down when his term was over and only recently agreed when pressure mounted from the public. Wade now represents a politics of patronage even though his eldest son who denied Wade’s desire to hand over power to him.219 Recently, Wade just lost and conceded defeat. The Gambian leader Yahaya Jammeh wants to impose himself as monarch in the Gambia. Dictators have once again littered the continent when we look at the case of countries like Central Africa Republic (then Democratic Republic of Congo), Congo Brazzaville, Eritrea, Gabon, and Zimbabwe.

In short, while corruption and bad governance are plaguing Africans in several countries like South Africa, Uganda, and Malawi. Nkrumah’s Ghana was nowhere close to these plights. In fact, it can be argued that what Nkrumah did, despite his flaws, was exemplary. Today, one can easily argue that the kind of visionary and charismatic leadership for the people which will bring the African people out of poverty is lacking.

Kwame Nkrumah’s arguments for pan African unity and economic development could be summarized as follows:

1. Unity means greater political power and security for all Africans. The only way for Africans to take initiative and resist the power of the West is through uniting. For instance, after independence, Africa has been caught in the Cold War where rebels and guerilla movements were armed, trained and sent for a civil war usually by one of the global superpowers (the US or the former USSR). This was made possible because the continental leadership of Africa was never united and hence became an instrument of destruction amongst itself. The Congo (the Belgians, French, and the Soviets used to support Patrice Lumumba); Rwanda, Angola (Savimbi -UNITA –America) and the Dos Santos (pro-Soviet, Cuba).

2. External powers keep meddling in Africa’s internal affairs partly because Africans did not unite to muster strength and ward off such influence. Such interferences are reminiscence of the 2011 Arab Spring, particularly the Libyan case. Western leaders come in to overthrow regimes that seem not to support their interests; whereas, they refrain from acting to depose friendly dictators even when there is widespread popular discontent and uprising against such dictators. A good example could be Bahrain in the Gulf, Asad of Syria, among others.

3. Unity means a larger economy of scale. Africans can freely produce, sell, consume and distribute their goods and services throughout the continent! Africa would be a big market with potentials. Africans can also freely move around and across political borders and countries. Hence old border disputes and grudges between countries will be meaningless (e.g. Eritrea and Ethiopia, Ethiopian and
Somalia, Cameroon and Nigeria, Sudan (North and South). What is the relevance of the border when the Somali who lives on the Ethiopian or Somalia border are one and the same? Live the same life?

4. Additionally, one can argue that if well fine-tuned, Nkrumahism remains relevant today for African development. It will add more power for Africa to bargain at a global stage. The European Union project of single currency and single political community came about not simply because Europeans loved each other; but rather cold and shrewd calculation of shifts in global power since the end of the Cold War. Europe had to unite in order to create a stable balance of power against rising stars like China, Brazil, India and of course the USA. The same could hold true for Africa.

5. It is not for nothing that contemporary African leaders are still pushing for the implementation of a Union Government for Africa, to “create an economic and monetary union, establish a common foreign and defense policy, among other strategic decisions based on a set of clearly identified values” despite the “wide differences in culture, language and ideas in various parts of Africa.”

6. With inspiration from Nkrumah’s ideas on African unity and its relevance for Africa’s development, African leaders today have formed committees within the African Union after the 2005 summit to examine the “possible constitutive, operative and institutional challenges that such a Union Government would engender” and to find a remedy for them. The committee has again been “mandated to deliberate on the appropriate ways to harmonize the Union

---

Government with existing African sovereign state governments.” Former President Olusegun Obasanjo of Nigeria is quoted to have said that “the ultimate goal for such a political structure must be those of sustainable development, peace, security, growth, democracy and transformation of the continent.”

5.2 Conclusion

Nkrumah’s ideas represent not only a critique of colonial Africa but a project of modernization that was fashioned to make Africa capable of fending for itself and defending its interests. Though they seem disparate, his ideas coalesced on three major pillars of thought. First comes his penchant to effect rapid economic development throughout Africa by using the modern nation state and central socialist planning. Second, he anticipated the full liberation of all African countries and their rapid integration into a united political community. Nkrumah’s Pan Africanism was therefore a double edged sword. It was projected outward combating the footholds of European colonialism. It also looked inwards since it urged the post-colonial elite and leadership of Africa not to delay the unity of Africa but make it a reality as soon as possible! Even more, Nkrumah understood the need to tap into the traditions and cultural make up of African societies. His notion of Consciensism and African personality were meant to tease out these egalitarian ideals of many African societies.

A man way ahead of his times, Nkrumah’s vision and boldness earned him foes from within and without. Western powers who had vested economic and political interest

---

in exploiting and controlling the continent were appalled by this project of African modernization and unity. No wonder, much Western scholarship portrays Nkrumah as a titular despot with delusions of grandeur. The African elite which just saddled up its horses of power never liked the project of African unity since this also means losing the sovereignty and executive fiat it had in each of these small African countries. Besides colonial kinships between francophone, Anglophone, Lusophone and Arab Africa dogged Nkrumah’s vision for Africa. But it was on economic grounds of stalled industrialization, and increasing rural and urban poverty that Nkrumah’s vision of African industrialization failed. The 70s and 80s represented Africa’s decline in economic development and political stability altogether. Even more, Nkrumah never reconciled his interest on African traditions and egalitarian values and his desire to modernize along western lines.

As we have discussed earlier, Nkrumah’s ideals of pan African unity along socialist lines were uncomfortable to the post-colonial African elite which soon begun assuming power in each of the independent African countries. Rapid unification of the continent means this elite group would have to shed a degree of sovereignty from each member state. It also means each of the national governments will be held accountable by a supra national government of Africa. This has raised a lot of suspicion and fears on the part of many. For instance, John Agyekum Kufuor (2000-2008), former President of Ghana and Chairman of the African Union, stated that “when nations join with others in a trade or political bloc, they give up a portion of their national sovereignty.”

The AU Summit held in Accra, Ghana, from June 25 to July 3, 2007, reiterated the same concern. Following the Accra summit, another AU committee of Foreign Ministers was formed to put together a roadmap and time frame for the “construction” of
a United States of Africa. Such roadmap should achieve a formula where member states relinquish some of their but still retain some form of political autonomy and representation. Neo-Nkrumaist ideals vouching for African unity should therefore come up with an effective model of government that ensures robust unity but does not stifle the diversity and autonomy of member states.

Neo-Nkraumists also have another challenge. Once a working political arrangement for continental government is achieved, the continent faces challenges on how to mainstream its economic and social development policies. Here, Nkrumah’s fascination with socialist development and central planning has little to offer. The end of the Cold War and the demise of the Soviet camp heralded the fact that socialist modernization was founded on the premises of single party rule and authoritarianism. Africans will not settle for that kind of politics. Neo-liberalism and its penchant for private sector driven free market model of development are not the solutions either. Decades of experiments with the infamous Structural Adjustment Programs, privatization, fiscal and monetary deregulation in Africa have actually deepened poverty, increased income inequality and took away the little public services that Africans used to access from their states!

Africa therefore stands on the cross-roads struggling to develop its own ‘third way’ i.e. an alternative model of economic development to be realized through a democratic and developmental state. This is an intellectual challenge Nkrumah would have stepped up for had he been alive today. All said, Nkrumah represents a serious academic and political personality who rose up to the challenge of offering Africa’s own agenda of economic development, political autonomy and cultural renaissance.
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