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ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at analysing Azikiwe's perception of contemporary problems and to appraise the extent to which his Neo-welfarist ideology provides solutions to them. The thesis of this dissertation is that Azikiwe's totally and unquestionably Neo-welfarist ideology is not a reliable guide to economic development and political integration, even though the eclectic-pragmatic method which it suggests is attractive. The study reveals that the Neo-welfarist ideology is not precise enough in its purported assimilation of the good elements in the different ideologies and economic doctrines.

Azikiwe's perception of contemporary economic and political problems is examined. He suggests that imperialism, whether in the anachronistic form of direct colonization or in the modern/indirect form called neo-colonialism, is the root-cause of the socio-political problems besetting the world today, particularly the erstwhile colonial societies. These problems militate against the pursuit and realization of the greatest happiness by a larger section of humanity.

Azikiwe contrasts the poverty of the erstwhile colonial societies with the affluence of the technologically-advanced (imperialist) nations of the world and maintains that both the poor and rich nations suffer from alienation. This alienation is in the form of separation (in contrast with alienation by surrender) along economic and ideological lines.
which all concerned need to supersede in order to build the desirable abundant and humane world society.

Azikiwe maintains that to usher in wide-spread economic development, the various nations of the world need a new attitude of tolerance and understanding of one another. He suggests that, given the adherence to different ideologies and economic doctrines, there is need for dialogue on ideologies with a view to harmonizing them by sifting and integrating their good aspects and making them work for the benefits of man.

Azikiwe presents Neo-welfarism as the outcome of his harmonization of the good elements of the different ideologies and economic doctrines, on the principle of eclectic-pragmatism. In his view, the Neo-welfarist ideology is not only the panacea to the much-needed suitable ideology for the economic development of post-colonial societies, it is more adequate than either liberalism or communism. Thus, Azikiwe maintains that Neo-welfarism should be adopted by all nations of the world as most suitable for tackling contemporary challenges of economic development and political integration.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The fact that Africa is a grossly underdeveloped continent despite abundant human and material resources is a common view and a sad state of affairs. But that some African thinkers have assiduously tried to diagnose the cause(s) of Africa's abnormal state of non-development and have tried to prescribe remedies for it accordingly is something to gladden the heart. The basic themes of philosophizing in Africa have changed from epoch to epoch. This adumbrates the Hegelian historical truism that every philosophy is a child of its circumstances. There was a time when the main focus of African thinkers and political actors was on how to free the continent from colonial domination and exploitation. In this connection, such continental nationalists as Herbert Macaulay, Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerere, Nnamdi Azikiwe and Obafemi Awolowo could be mentioned. But with the attainment of independence by most African countries, the problem of development became the major preoccupation of African thinkers.

However, while most African socio-political philosophers seem to agree that the crux of Africa's non-development is the exploitation and misdirection of Africa by European Colonizers, and while they would agree that the path to development lies in the adoption of an adequate and effective socio-political ideology, most of them
disagree on the choice of ideology which can effectively pull Africa out of her quagmire. Hence, while people like Nkrumah espoused "Marxian Socialism", Nyerere, Kaunda and others put forward "African Socialism." Furthermore, while some thinkers argue for "reformed" capitalism or welfarism, others insist that neither capitalism, socialism nor welfarism can put Africa on the path of development. This last group believes that the best option for Africa is to chart another path to development. Those who are of this persuasion include Azikiwe and E. K. Ogundowole.

Those African thinkers who advocate a socio-political ideology which is neither pro-capitalist, nor pro-socialist, nor pro-welfarist per se, are of the conviction that no "imported" or "ready-made" ideology would be adequate for Africa's development because the experiences and thinking which gave birth to it arose from a different socio-cultural and political milieu. This reasoning is persuasive. For, since every philosophy is the product of a certain culture, it is only a socio-political philosophy which takes cognizance of the peculiar African experiences and problems that can be relevant to Africa.

It is an obvious fact that a suitable socio-political philosophy for a people must be strongly rooted in their culture. In the light of experience and reason, none of the existing ideologies is capable of ensuring economic and social security for the whole of mankind.
that each of the contending socio-political ideologies expresses some truths which will be more beneficial when harmonized with those expressed by others, consequently, he proposed "Neo-welfarism". This ideology is predicated on the eclectic-pragmatic principle of selecting and blending the good elements of apparently opposing views for the benefit of man. He sees Neo-welfarism as the most suitable ideology for economic development and political integration.

One of our major concerns in this work is to critically examine Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism as a philosophy, an ideology and an economic doctrine. We shall also discuss "eclectic-pragmatism" as a philosophical method through which Neo-welfarism is constructed.

The term "eclectic-pragmatism" is our own coinage, but it aptly describes Zik's philosophical method. It is a method which attempts to harmonize opposites not by resolving apparent contradictions (through a dialectical process) but by selecting and blending what is useful and practicable in the various opposing theories or philosophies.

This method recognizes these variants.

---

The name "Zik", by which Benjamin Nnamdi Azikiwe has come to be most popularly identified was given to him by his student-colleagues in Storer College in America as a nickname. They derived "Zik" by splitting Azikiwe into three thus "A-ZIK-IWE" on account that they found it easier to pronounce "ZIK" than "Azikiwe" (Cf. N. Azikiwe, My Odyssey, London: Hurst and Company, 1970; p.92). Thus, we can use "Zik" and "Azikiwe" interchangeably.

2 Neo-welfarism, like liberalism or communism is a philosophy; like Capitalism or Socialism, it is an economic doctrine. Like Marxism, it is an ideology.
systems of thought contain some truths but not the whole truths; and that a better picture of the world and human experiences will be achieved if the truths in the various systems are sifted and blended. Thus when the issue involved is "human nature," the method assumes that human nature cannot be pinned down to any specificity. Hence it assumes that man is both selfish and altruistic; rational and irrational; individualistic and communalistic, and so on; all of which can be delicately balanced to make for a harmonious social life. Consequently, it assumes that capitalism, socialism and welfarism as contending socio-economic doctrines express some truths about socio-economic organization, which, instead of being mutually exclusive, can best be harmonized in a practicable way so as to enable members of a society to attain a better life devoid of poverty and sufferings.

The eclectic-pragmatic method is most suitable for dealing with African problems in view of the variegated and traumatic experiences which precipitated them. Such experiences are mostly accounted for by the fact of European colonization of Africa with the attendant economic, cultural, political and even spiritual denudation of the continent. The withering effect of colonization and the consequent cultural and religious bastardization have changed the African personality beyond reversal, for certain pessimist analysts of contemporary Africa. Thus the issue
of forging a socio-political philosophy which is authentically African (in the sense of having little or no base in the prevalent socio-political philosophies) becomes unrealistic. This is because the African colonial experiences whether we like it or not, are to say the least, indefeasible. The question, then, is how to articulate a socio-political philosophy which can as much as possible, restitute the African personality and at the same time incorporate Africa’s colonial experiences and diverse foreign cultural influences.

It is in this regard that Nkrumah himself expounded "Consciencism" while Zik expounded "Neo-welfarism."

"Neo-welfarism" is a socio-political philosophy (embracing an ideology and an economic doctrine) which claims to be the harmonization of the practical and useful elements in capitalism, socialism, mixed-economy and welfarism with the pristine Nigerian (African) conception and praxis as a foundation. Pristine Nigerian economic ideology, according to Zik, "is welfarist in its purest form," i.e. what he identified as "proto-welfarism." "It promotes the idea of material prosperity for Nigerians, according to the resources of each individual. Its object is to guarantee to every Nigerian an element of economic security animated by the goodwill and humanitarianism of each kindred through the family as a unit of the clan."³

But because the indigenous conception is only suitable for small socio-political units, it has to be reoriented to meet the challenges of larger modern states.

To arrive at Neo-welfarism through the eclectic-pragmatic method, Zik had to analyse and highlight the merits and demerits of the major economic doctrines - capitalism and socialism. In favour of capitalism he recognizes, among other things, the profit-motive as an incentive for individual initiatives; the spirit of competition which brings out the best in people and encourages inventions, as well as its opposition to totalitarianism. Against capitalism, he notes among other things, the laissez-faire attitude and government non-challence under its operation; poverty in the midst of plenty, and extreme exploitation of the majority by the minority capitalists.

Also, he sees some merits in socialism which, he says, is characterized by public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange. Those merits include the promotion of public welfare, fair distribution of wealth, nationalization of public utilities for the general good, and conscious planning for development. But against it, he points out the fallacy of collective ownership, dictatorship and multiplicity of socialist factions. As for welfarism, the state's commitment and direct responsibility for the welfare of the citizens definitely speak in its favour. But the huge expenses
it involves, its tendency to make people lazy with the hope that the state will provide their needs, are among its inadequacies.

Zik rejects each of these doctrines per se, not only because of obvious inadequacies, but also on the ground that each contains only a partial truth about the best socio-economic organization and operation. Thus, according to Zik, Neo-welfarism blends the useful and practical elements of each doctrine to emerge as a more suitable conception for the development of Africa (in particular) and the world (in general). The main aim of "Neo-welfarism" is the creation of a just and humane society where everybody "will have enough, care enough and give enough" ⁴ and where man will not be exploited by his kind.

But the neo-welfarist objectives cannot be realized unless there is effective and honest leadership. Thus one of the greatest problems in contemporary Africa is how to produce such leadership in a continent which, as history shows, has a catalogue of inept and corrupt leaders. The solutions which Azikiwe has offered in this regard still leave many of the problems where they are in our opinion. This constitutes one of the major flaws of Neo-welfarism, which we hope to elaborate on in this research work.

⁴ Ibid., p. 124
Our aim in this study is to focus attention on Azikiwe's perception of contemporary problems of economic development and political integration as well as his recipe for them under the Neo-welfarist ideology. The issues to be raised include:

the genesis of these problems (especially with respect to the post-colonial societies). This will lead us to the discussion of the problems of colonization and colonial emancipation.

The second issue to be raised is the question of the meaning of colonial emancipation and why the question of emancipation still arises in the post-colonial societies. This brings us to the problem of neo-colonialism and unjust economic relations which are the main features of the contemporary world. With this arose the necessity for formulating a new socio-political theory the implementation of which is expected to usher in a new order which is more humane and just than anything the world known at present.

The fourth issue borders on how far Neo-welfarism as an ideology which embraces an economic doctrine of private and public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange as well as a belief in representative democracy, is able to overcome the lapses to be found in both capitalism and socialism.

The fifth issue is, to what extent can Neo-welfarism
be said to be a harmonization of "ideologies," and to what extent is it superior (as an economic doctrine) to, say, capitalism and socialism?

The sixth issue is: how does Neo-welfarism, as a philosophy tackle the knotty socio-political question as to the relationship between the state and the individual on the one hand, and both to property on the other?

The thesis of this dissertation is that Azikiwe's Neo-welfarist ideology is not a totally and unquestionably reliable guide to economic development and political integration even though the eclectic-pragmatic method which it suggests is attractive. Our study reveals that although eclectic-pragmatism Azikiwe recognized the value of and, indeed, paid glowing tributes to the eclectic-pragmatic method, he did not apply this method far enough in his Neo-welfarism so much that it largely lacks precision and as such can hardly serve as the most reliable guide to the establishment of the abundant and happy society which Azikiwe has espoused.

In the rest of the introduction, we shall briefly present the historical context of Azikiwe's philosophy as well as explore the concept "emancipation" which is central in his philosophy.

The second chapter discusses the "philosophy of a New Africa" which encapsulates Azikiwe's ideology for
decolonization. Here the various factors which made imperialism possible, in its classical and contemporary manifestations, and the colonial "mess" which imperialism gave rise to are philosophically analyzed to yield a better understanding of the consequent anti-imperialist movements in Africa in the 1950s and '60s. Issues discussed in this chapter put into proper perspective the economic backwardness, social and political instability which beset the post-colonial societies of Africa, Asia and Latin-American countries. It was the carry-over problems created by colonialism into the post-colonial era that Azikiwe's neo-welfarism is designed to solve.

The fourth chapter attempts to show how "eclectic-pragmatism" can be adopted as a methodological approach for solving the contemporary problems of the new states in particular and the world community at large. Such problems include tribalism, political instability and religious intolerance (for the new states), and ideological dogmas and international tensions (for the entire world).

The fifth chapter discusses the thought-ingredients which went into the formulation of Neo-Welfarism. Here, Azikiwe's critical analysis of contemporary socio-political doctrines are discussed. In this chapter we try to construe, from the little that Azikiwe said on the matter, his concept of reality and how it can be cognized. Equally, other major concepts of Neo-Welfarism, such as "eclecticism," "pragmatism" and "proto-welfarism" are discussed.
The sixth chapter deals with "Neo-Welfarism" as an economic doctrine, an ideology and a philosophy for economic development and political integration. It espouses the Neo-Welfarist state which Neo-Welfarism aims to establish.

The seventh and concluding chapter critically assesses the "philosophy of a New Africa" and "Neo-Welfarist" as complementary conceptions of emancipation under different circumstances. The first is a philosophy for colonial emancipation while the second must be viewed as an ideology for the emancipation of Africa and the world from perennial alienation. The merits and defects of these complementary conceptions are critically examined in this chapter.

Finally, we have appended a biographical sketch of Azikiwe. The is designed for readers who wish to delve into history and political science, besides their interest in Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy.
I. THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF NEO-WELFARISM

The historical context of Neo-welfarism is constituted by the prevalent conditions of the post-colonial societies. These conditions include mountainous economic and political problems. In the economic sphere, the erstwhile colonial societies are still very far from assuming the mantle of their economic destinies. They are generally poor, unskilled and still very much exploited by their erstwhile colonial masters. The key sectors are still controlled and manipulated by the erstwhile colonial masters and other industrially advanced countries of the world. Because of the subtle, but ruthless exploitative policies of the industrially advanced countries towards the less developed countries of the world (which may constitute more than two-thirds of the world population), the latter are saddled with crushing debt-burden which helps to stultify their economic growth and further lower the living standards of the people. This is accomplished by the industrialized nations through the sapping activities of their multi-national corporations in those non-industrialized countries. Thus the erstwhile colonial masters no longer need to physically occupy the

---

5 As a matter of historical fact, most colonial societies (especially in Africa and Asia) had gained their political independence by 1963.
less technologically developed countries to carry on their economic exploitation of the lands and peoples. They need only to hide under the cover of commerce, "technical assistance," economic aids, bi-lateral and unilateral agreements, and so on, and they would carry on their exploitative activities with equal efficiency.

On the political plane, most post-colonial societies witness great socio-political upheavals which manifest themselves in the frequent military intervention in the politics of those countries. Most nationalists have often accused the erstwhile colonial masters of being the invisible hands behind "coups d'etat" in the erstwhile colonial societies.

The allegation is that the erstwhile colonial masters always endeavoured to install leaders who would not initiate policies which would be inimical to their economic and political interests. Thus any leadership in the post-colonial societies whose policies threaten the interests of the industrialized nations easily becomes a target for destruction. They usually oppose such leadership through subversion, economic sanctions, open confrontation or sponsoring coup d'etat against it.

This allegation is substantiated by a cursory look at the relationship between the post-colonial societies which are technologically poor and economically undeveloped and the industrialized nations of the world which, in most cases
had been the former's colonial mother countries. Illustrations of the interventionist policies of the industrialized countries in the political processes of the less developed countries abound. We can only note some few examples. One of them is the case of Chad where France, the erstwhile colonial master of the territory, backed Hissein Habre against the leadership of the "more traditional" and "less French" G. Waddeyye. Habre, with active French support was able to oust Waddeyye. Habre is still in power as at present. Again, the bloody coup against the charismatic leadership of Thomas Sankara in Burkina Faso has been speculated to be the handiwork of the imperialists who were threatened by his revolutionary approaches to issues in his country and beyond. Besides, the continual aggression of the United States of America against Libya under the anti-Western imperialist leadership of Muammar Al Qathafi is an instructive case. America's high-handed bombing of Tripoli and Benghazi and her most recent threat to attack Libya again if she is found to be engaged in the production of chemical weapons show the extent to which a technologically advanced country can go to impose her will on the so-called "back-ward" nations by right of might.

The situations sketched above give the picture of what social and political theorists designate as "neo-colonialist" situations. And, just as colonialism brought about the colonial situations, the neo-colonialist situations were brought about by the thinking now popularly referred to as
"neo-colonialism." Neo-colonialism has its antecedent conditions in the colonial situation which we may do well to take a brief retrospective look at. This is for the important reason that the colonial and neo-colonial situations provided the ingredients for Zik's socio-political philosophy which has two complementary facets — corresponding to the two areas that greatly spurred his philosophical thinking. These two complementary facets of his philosophy are the "philosophy of a New Africa" and "Neo-welfarism." Each of these facets of his philosophy is a theory of emancipation: the "philosophy of a New Africa" is a theory of colonial emancipation while Neo-welfarism is a theory of post-colonial emancipation, economic development and political integration.

II. THE COLONIAL CONTEXT IN RETROSPECT AND THE EMERGENCE OF ZIK THE NATIONALIST

The colonial context is so well-known by historians and other interested researchers that it may be banal to begin to recount it here. The colonial context, we may simply state, refers to the prevalent state of affairs at the time of direct occupation of certain territories in the world by imperialist nations by virtue of their superior armament, guile, cunning and

---

6 "Neo-colonialism," Nkrumah maintains, is colonialism playing possum, imperialism wearing a mask. It is thus most dangerous and deadly. [Cf. K. Nkrumah, Neo-colonialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, (London Nelson, 1965), pp. 7-21.]
bare-faced hypocrisy. The physical occupation of the colonial territories guaranteed an all-round exploitation of men and material resources by the imperialist powers concerned as well as exclusive rights to all that such territories had to offer.

The colonial situation, part of which is discussed in chapter two, gave birth to some rebellious colonial subjects who fought to change the situation. Thus colonialism posited its antithesis in nationalism. Nationalist activities swept across the colonial territories of Africa in the fifties and early sixties, and by 1963 most African countries had gained their political independence from their erstwhile colonial masters either through pressurized peaceful negotiations or by outright force.

The reasons for such phenomenal rise in nationalist activities could be sought in the internal contradictions of colonialism itself as well as in certain global events such as the Second World War. The tide of nationalism brought forth such distinguished personages of African nationalism as W.B. DuBouis, Nuamdi Azikiwe, Kwame Nkrumah, Herbert Macaulay, Obafemi Awolowo, Sekou Toure, and a host of others.

7 Other factors which helped to bring about increased nationalist activities were well-chronicled by T.D.P Bah. They include the anti-colonialist policies of both the U.S.A. and the USSR after World War II, the Creation of U.N.O. in 1945, and the example of Asia [Cf. T.D.P Bah, Liberation and Revolution: An Analysis of Two concepts of Freedom in African Socio-Political Thought (Ph.D Thesis, Ibadan, 1985) pp. 14-16.7]
It is against such background that we would like to examine, in some details, the rise of Azikiwe as a great nationalist. Azikiwe is widely acclaimed as a continental nationalist whose consuming passion was the total emancipation of "Africans not only from foreign oppression but also from indigenous tyranny." From his base in Ghana (then Gold Coast) between November 1934 and July 1937, and in Nigeria thereafter, Azikiwe launched a continental attack on imperialism.

It is important to recall that Azikiwe saw journalism mainly as a means whose end was to awaken the Africans' consciousness to fight to free themselves from the iron-cage of imperialism, imperialist and local oppression and exploitation. Indeed, he used his journalistic acumen to foster and further the cause of African nationalism with an astounding drive.

Azikiwe's spirit of nationalism was stirred up early in life when he was barely sixteen years old. It all began during the brief period he spent at the Hope Waddell Training Institute, Calabar, when, by chance, he learnt about Marcus Garvey and his crusade for the emancipation of the colonized and oppressed Africans. Later, he came under consuming influence of Kwegyir Aggrey who was equally preoccupied with the freedom of Africans from the yolk of

---


9 I shall explicate this concept later.
imperialism, and for the restitution of the African personality and prestige. The talk of Garvey as a great Negro who would come with an army from America to liberate Africa cut a vivid and indelible impression on Azikiwe's young mind, as he grew up, the messianic vision to liberate Africa became his major obsession.

Azikiwe's awakened spirit of nationalism was further nurtured while he was studying in America, 1927 - 1934. During this period, negro nationalism in America and the United Kingdom gathered momentum. This was equally the case in Africa herself. Thus the nineteen twenties and early thirties witnessed the formation of New Negro movement in the United States and it later took root on the African continent. And according to Azikiwe, the stimulus to African nationalism at this period was provided by

a fermentation of ideas among scholars, intellectuals, writers, artists and politicians who sought for fairplay and improved living conditions for the under-privileged people of African descent in all the lands of the earth. 10

Furthermore, after the First World War, many protest writings by eminent Negro scholars and teachers multiplied, and many protest movements were formed and intensified. Among the latter were: The National Congress of British West Africa led by Casely Hayford of the Gold Coast (Ghana); the

Universal Negro Improvement Association led by Marcus Garvey, and the Pan African Movement started by W.B. DuBois. Among the protest writings published at this period were Kelly Miller's *The Everlasting Stain*, Kerlin's *The Negro Poets and Their Poems*, Professor Alain Locke's *The New Negro*, and Langston Hughes' *The Weary Blues*. All these greatly influenced the nationalist outlook of Azikiwe and other African students abroad. He recalls that

As a young student, I was naturally affected by this intellectual ferment ... The way these protests affected us who were putting finishing touches to our studies, both in the United States and the United Kingdom, is material here, because it laid a solid foundation for the life work of so many of us.  

It is important to note that the Pan-Africanist nature of the nationalist movements organized on European and American soil greatly influenced Azikiwe and helped to make him the continental nationalist which he invariably became. This posture was never abandoned by Azikiwe despite the frustrating experiences he had in his quest for job in both independent (Liberia and Ethiopia) and colonial African countries at that time. Nevertheless, the discouraging experiences which he had while seeking for a job had started him off on his practical lessons about African realities

---

11 Ibid., pp. 137-38
which involved being frustrated and discriminated against as a "foreigner" even by the very African countries whose service he had vowed to dedicate his life. Thus in a very bitter and regrettable way, "The Lover of Africa, fired by black nationalism was at last learning the realities of the time." The "realities of the time" in Africa then, as they equally obtain today, included tribalism, nepotism and other forms of discrimination which bred disunity among Africans themselves on account of one being an "indigene" and the other being a "stranger" in the various countries which were, as a matter of fact, mere artificial creations of the colonialists. Such divisive factors and the lethargic attitude of the Africans in fighting against imperialism came under Azikiwe's vehement attacks once he assumed the editorship of the African Morning Post in the Gold Coast (Ghana). In the same vein, the imperialists and their local collaborators came under the sledge-hammer of his newspapers. Through the pages of his newspapers, he challenged, appealed and exhorted the African peoples to unite and arise in unison to overthrow the obnoxious ascendancy of imperialism in Africa. His unrelenting attacks on imperialism, his continued exposure of its inconsistencies and the hypocrisy of its apostles were

---

devastating. So daring and so persistent was Azikiwe the nationalist who donned the befitting garb of a born journalist that the colonial authorities in the Gold Coast (Ghana) convicted him and Wallace Johnson for sedition in 1937. Fortunately, Azikiwe was not thrown into jail.

From Ghana, Azikiwe returned to Nigeria in November 1937 to found the West African Pilot which took over from the African Morning Post the onerous task of crusading for the total emancipation of Africa from the manacles of colonialism. His strong belief had always been that

The West African colonies have a common foe. So long as we think in terms of Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, Gambia and not as one United West Africa, we must be content with a colonial dictatorship instead of a government of the people by the people, namely, democracy.13

However, by the time Azikiwe began to concentrate his nationalistic efforts on Nigeria, his political career was at its inception. But before we come to discuss this transition from a pan-African nationalist to a Nigerian nationalist-cum-politician, it is important to make certain pertinent observations.

The first thing to note is that the narrowing focus of Azikiwe's nationalist activities did not mean less commitment to the total liberation of Africa. It only shows

that while his nationalist ideals were general, they needed specific areas for their immediate practicalization. Therefore, he never abandoned his pan-African nationalism in principle. What happened was that he realized that in practice, the testing of any ideas has to start from somewhere. This conclusion was sequel to the "realities of the time" in Africa which his home-coming forced him to acknowledge but not to accept. The second important point to note is that even as a fore-most Nigerian nationalist, he always had the whole continent in his mind in all his crusades for the liberation of the colonized peoples. This was abundantly attested to by his numerous speeches and lectures.

The arrival of Nnamdi Azikiwe in Nigeria with his firebrand nationalism was tantamount to a spontaneous revolution. It proved to be the most spectacular factor which engendered the realization of Nigeria's independence. For the arrival of Azikiwe ushered in the militant phase of Nigerian nationalism. This state of affairs was brought about by the Zikist philosophy for a "New Africa." This fact was emphasized by I. Nzimiro who correctly asserts that the philosophy of Nnamdi Azikiwe "gave rise to the emergence of militant nationalism from 1944 - 1950." 

---

14 This will be discussed in more details later.

That philosophy whose practical phase amounted to a crusade was propagated through the pages of the West African Pilot and other newspapers published nation-wide by the Zik's Press Limited whose astronomical growth was astonishing. Thus, as he did while he was in Ghana, he called journalism to the service of nationalism. And as Onome Osifo-Whiskey correctly put it,

Invariably, as it turned out, his nationalism and his journalism became the two sides of a coin; one promoted the other. Thus, his journalism centred on the theme of racial inequalities, and injustice and the need to right historic wrongs. 16

These historic wrongs were perpetrated by colonialists who needed to be overthrown so that the wrongs they perpetrated against Africans could be righted.

In the crusade for Nigeria's freedom from colonial rule, Azikiwe joined forces with other like-minded Nigerians from various ethnic groups such as Herbert Macaulay (Yoruba), Ernest Ikoli (Ijaw), H. O. Davies (Yoruba), to mention but a few leaders of nationalist movement at that time. It should be borne in mind that there was no wide-spread nationalist activity in Nigeria before the arrival of Azikiwe on the scene in 1937. However, prior to his arrival, the seeds of Nigerian nationalism had been sowed by his fore-runners, beginning

from Edward Wilmot Blyden and John Payne Jackson, to Herbert Macaulay and his Nigerian National Democratic Party (NNDP). In the nineteen twenties and early thirties, Lagos was the nerve centre of Nigerian politics played along European style. Invariably, Lagos became the breeding ground for Nigerian nationalists.

Between 1923 and 1938, Herbert Macaulay, founder and leader of the Nigerian National Democratic Party, was the dominant personality in Lagos politics. He vehemently attacked various government policies which he considered obnoxious through his newspaper, the Lagos Daily News, which was invariably the mouth-piece of the NNDP. However, the activities of the NNDP were confined to Lagos and so failed to acquire the true characteristics of a nationalist movement even though it often took a nationalist posture on certain issues.

Blyden and Jackson, both foreigners who had links with Liberia, could be regarded as the earliest Nigerian nationalists. In fact, Casely Hayford of Gold Coast (Ghana) bestowed Blyden with the fatherhood of African nationalism. Indeed, the "early writings of Blyden and Jackson reveal the main themes of latter-day [sic] nationalist ideology. Blyden emphasized cultural nationalism, Jackson the more political aspects of nationalism." See J. S. Coleman, *Nigeria: Background to Nationalism* (California: California University Press, 1950), p. 183.
It was against this background that Coleman maintains that between the collapse of the Congress for British West Africa movement in the early 1920's and the arrival of Nnamdi Azikiwe in the late 1930's there was comparatively little nationalist activity in Nigeria. 18

It was Azikiwe who turned the smoke of Nigerian nationalism into a roaring flame which eventually engulfed the colonialists. It was his militant nationalism and journalistic competence which rejuvenated the dying Nigerian Youth Movement (NYM) led by Ernest Ikoli. It was through Azikiwe's efforts, in collaboration with his other compatriots, that a truly nationalist movement comprising of many tribes and reaching out to all nooks and corners of Nigeria emerged.

The newly formed nationalist body had Herbert Macaulay as its first President while Azikiwe was its first General Secretary. It was Azikiwe himself who spearheaded the formation of the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (NCNC) which between 1944 and 1957 became the leading all-Nigerian nationalist organization. Within that period, the initiative in the nationalist movement was virtually in the hands of Azikiwe as the echoes of his philosophy for Africa's emancipation by the NCNC manifesto boldly attested to. Gradually, Azikiwe became a personification of the NCNC and the names "Azikiwe" and "NCNC" became correlative terms.

18 Ibid, p. 201
As the president of the NCNC from 1946, Azikiwe stamped the militant character of his nationalism on the face of this truly nationalist movement. He was so bold, so daring, so vigorous, so articulate and charismatic that he towered over Macaulay in the leadership of the NCNC. When compared with Azikiwe's radical leadership of the NCNC, Macaulay's leadership seemed moderate. For, "where Macaulay would demand his rights as a British subject, Azikiwe would talk of natural rights."\(^{19}\)

Azikiwe's rise to national pre-eminence which soon became legendary was a hybrid of his charismatic leadership, militant nationalism, provocative, innovative and stylistic journalism, and what one may call (for want of much evidence to the contrary) historical accidents or the handiwork of Providence.

It is worthy of note that on personal merit, Azikiwe deserves no less national, nay international status as has been accorded him. But it must be stressed that the providential factor to his legendary rise to national pre-eminence elevated the name "Azikiwe" beyond mere mortal nomenclature. Many people, especially the illiterate majority, regarded the name "Azikiwe" as God's baptismal name for a Black Saviour whom He sent to deliver his people from the bondage of white imperialism. Thus many people regarded Azikiwe as a black Messiah, an angel incarnate, who possessed numerous extraordinary powers such as the

\(^{19}\) Coleman, _Op. cit._, p. 266.
ability to disappear and reappear at will. In consequence, many people began to name their children "Azikiwe" across the many tribes in Nigeria.

The hands of Providence in Azikiwe's rise and popularity can be discerned in the unfolding events since the introduction of Richards' constitution in 1945. For, two months after the publication of Richards' constitutional proposals and enactment of the four obnoxious ordinances, the general strike of June 1945 occurred. 21 It was widely believed by the Nigerian masses that Azikiwe had engineered the strike. Consequently, the workers regarded him as a champion of labour. However, Coleman maintains that Azikiwe took special precautions to disavow any connection with the strike at that time but "the general consensus of opinion in the provinces was, and still is", according to Anthony Enahoro, "that Naamdi Azikiwe engineered the strike." 22 Moreover, as a result of a series of events during and after the strike, Azikiwe secured international attention, and his name and the NCNC became known in the remotest village in Nigeria.

---

20 I still remember that while I was very young, older folks used to cover at Zik's rumoured ability to be present at seven meetings holding at different places at the same time.


On the whole, Azikiwe’s ascendancy to national leadership during the immediate post-war period was based, in part, upon the following principal groups: (1) Organized and unorganized labour whose grievances he consistently publicised and who believed that he had engineered the general strike. (2) Clerks, artisans and teachers whose varied causes he always championed; (3) Youths, especially students, who were attached to him for his erudition and academic achievements, his heroic educational career, his great interest in educational development, his vigorous and relentless press attacks upon the European colonialists whose hypocrisy he constantly exposed, and his strong support for youth groups; (4) special grievance groups whose causes, for the first time found an unrelenting champion. Thus Azikiwe became the watchdog of African rights, and any African from the lowliest messenger to the wealthiest trader, resident anywhere in Nigeria, could secure immediate front-page publicity on any complaint against the government or against Europeans. Administrative Officers, even in the remotest districts, were frequently harassed by urgent wires from central, regional or provincial headquarters requesting inquiries into allegations of "brutal and inhuman" treatment, discrimination or denial of rights which appeared daily in the columns of Zik’s papers.23

23 Ibid., pp. 288-89
(5) Azikiwe's other supporters were organizational leaders whose activities received full publicity from his newspapers. This was the case with many tribal and professional unions;

(6) the sixth group of Azikiwe's supporters was the non-Yoruba educated elements, especially Igbos spread all over Nigeria, who deified him. Indeed, his name had become a legend.

It was instructive to note that Azikiwe's sources of support cut across tribal, ethnic and professional boundaries. He was the only nationalist leader at that time who had a nation-wide support. This fact is a pointer to the true nationalist qualities of Azikiwe which were made manifest more through his charismatic leadership of the NCNC.

All in all, there is no doubt that Nnamdi Azikiwe was a nationalist-giant whose stature can hardly be matched by any nationalist on the West Coast of Africa, nay the whole of African continent. For over thirty years, starting from 1934, he remained the main source of positive nationalism in Nigeria and Ghana in particular, and the African continent as a whole. His militant nationalism and iconoclasticism through journalism provided the great heat that warmed the Africans to the serious business of total commitment to the eradication of colonialism in Africa. In short, Azikiwe's popularity, continental stature and world-acclamation were stressed by Coleman who tells us that
During the fifteen-year period 1934 - 1949, Nnamdi Azikiwe was undoubtedly the most important and celebrated nationalist on the West Coast of Africa, if not in all tropical Africa. To the outside world, "Zikism" and 24 African nationalism appeared synonymous.

III. "Emancipation" and "Freedom": A Close Analysis

Because these two concepts are central in Azikiwe’s socio-political philosophy, it behoves us to undertake a brief analysis of these concepts. These two concepts are closely related but the concept "freedom" is wider than "emancipation." The latter, in T.D.P. Bah’s analysis, 25 being a negative conception of freedom, expressed as "freedom from." The negative conception of freedom ("freedom from") stands in contradistinction to the positive conception of freedom, expressed as "freedom to."

The concept "emancipation" is the noun form of the verb "emancipate." The latter, simpliciter, means "set free." Thus "emancipation" may be defined as "the act of setting free." Whenever the term "emancipate" or "set free" is used there is always a connotation of "constraint", "bondage" or "obstruction." It is the condition of being constrained, of being in bondage or of being obstructed that demands emancipation.

24 Ibid, p. 220
Now we can understand why most socio-political thinkers in Africa have something to say about colonial emancipation. "Colonial emancipation" as conceived by Azikiwe and other African socio-political philosophers means the act of freeing those territories which were under colonial bondage. It is little surprising, that most African socio-political theorists who suffered under colonial domination in one way or the other should be preoccupied with theorizing about colonial emancipation.

Apart from the colonial situation which gave birth to various theories of colonial emancipation, there is still the dire need for emancipation in the post-colonial era. This need is occasioned by the prevalent conditions in the post-colonial era which have been designated as neo-colonialist. (Some of these conditions have been highlighted above). On this score, we can understand why thinkers like Azikiwe still have a concept of post-colonial emancipation. It was Azikiwe's reflections on the post-colonial situation that made him to provide Neo-welfarism as a philosophy and ideology for post-colonial emancipation which would bring in its wake economic development and political integration.

At this juncture, let us consider "freedom" in its positive conception (still keeping to Bah's distinction)
expressed as "freedom to." In this conception, one may talk of being free to spend one's money; to go anywhere one likes and so on. It is perhaps from this perspective that Omoregbe defined "freedom" as "the capacity of self-determination, that is, the capacity to decide what to do."26 He goes on to explain that a free action is one which a man chooses to perform but which he could also choose not to perform. He observes that "freedom is concretely realized and exercised in choice or decision. Each time I make a choice or a decision I exercise my freedom."27

On the above account, we would realize that in the colonialist and neo-colonialist situations, the negative freedom or emancipation is a prerequisite to positive freedom. In other words, the colonial and neo-colonial societies would have to be free from colonial and neo-colonial bondage before they can be free to direct their affairs the way they would choose to.

However, Azikiwe talks of emancipation in the post-colonial era on a global scale. He believes that the present world needs emancipation from self-alienation which results from unjust and inequitable economic and power relations among different states in the world — especially between the industrialized and technologically advanced

---

27 Ibid., p. 21.
nations of the world and the more numerous poor nations. His contention is that the world needs a new approach and a new attitude to the problems of man as a member of a definite society as well as a citizen of the world. The world needs a new metaphysics and epistemology founded on tolerance and tending towards integration.

In Azikiwe's view, the freedom of one man or a few men is no freedom at all. Likewise the freedom of one society or few societies. Real freedom has to be total. In other words, for a society to call herself free while others are in bondage is a misnomer in Azikiwe's reckoning. Freedom, he would argue, like peace, is indivisible. It is in this understanding that Azikiwe formulated his Neo-welfarist philosophy as one which would engender economic development and political integration which would tend towards the crystalization of the abundant world-society.

We would like to acknowledge, at this juncture, that we did not delve into the classical analysis of freedom nor contrast it with determinism as many philosophers would want to do, not because such a perspective is irrelevant but because the issue seem to us to have been well-discussed and need not be much belaboured. We rather endeavoured, no

matter how brief our discussion has been, to analyse these concepts to show their relevance in our general discussion.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

We have to observe from the on-set that apart from the main texts for this dissertation which are Azikiwe's own works, few people have analyzed his socio-political philosophy. As a result of this fact, only a very scanty body of literature directly on the philosophy of Azikiwe is available. This emboldens one to make the claim that this dissertation is the first of its kind — being the first comprehensive philosophical work on the entire corpus of Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy. However, notwithstanding the scanty works\textsuperscript{30} so far done on Azikiwe's philosophy, related works abound and are duly reflected in the dissertation and set forth in the bibliography.

\textsuperscript{30} Before we consider the few available literature on Azikiwe's philosophy, we would quickly attempt an explanation of this state of affair which we view as a little surprising. We are surprised that no serious philosophical research has been done on Azikiwe's socio-political thought before this dissertation. This surprise stems from the fact that, as we believe this dissertation to have shown, Azikiwe's philosophical thought is so challenging that it ought to have attracted more attention than has been given to it hitherto.
Perhaps, one of the reasons why little interest had been taken in the philosophical thought of Azikiwe was the controversy over the existence of "African Philosophy." This controversy equally extends to the question whether there are African philosophers. The question of the existence of "African Philosophy" is a complex one and it has many variants. However, it is not our aim to delve into the labyrinth of controversies surrounding the existence of African Philosophy.  

Suffice it to note that the opponents of the existence of African philosophy are either contending that there are no individual philosophers in Africa whose joint efforts produced the philosophical corpus as we find in Western philosophy or the concept "philosophy" is a term which Western thinkers applied to their special way of thinking and as such cannot be correctly applied to the thought patterns of other people(s).  

There could be other reasons, as Momoh highlighted in the above cited article, for which the existence of African philosophy is rejected or at least questioned.

---


32 Cf. P. O. Bodunrin, "Philosophy as the Pivot in Economic, Social and Political Re-orientation of Society" being the title of a lecture he delivered at the Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies, University of Lagos, April 14, 1987, p. 2.
However, the question of the existence of African philosophy is no longer seriously posed as many might have been impressed by the fact that the question as to whether or not African Philosophy exists can only be properly settled when the disputants agree on the wider question of what "philosophy" itself means. But this latter question is still as controversial as ever. It is, perhaps, in view of the fact that the "Question" of the existence of African philosophy is already anachronistic that some researchers are now turning their attention to the fertile areas of African philosophy and philosophers.

Another reason, perhaps the most crucial of all, why little interest had been taken in the philosophical ideas of Azikiwe is the enormity of the work involved in systematizing them into a coherent whole. This is because Azikiwe's philosophical ideas are scattered in numerous political discourses and so requires assiduous, patient and careful research to sift and blend them into a coherent whole. This may explain why many researchers shy away from such an enormous task.

Furthermore, the allure of Western Philosophy has been so powerful on African and other researchers in philosophy that they can hardly turn elsewhere for their philosophical enterprises other than the West. Besides, such researchers are so accustomed to such Western philosophical system-builders as Plato, Aristotle, Kant,
Hegel and so on, that they can hardly look for philosophical ideas that are not apparently founded on rigorous metaphysical systems. Thus many socio-political thinkers in Africa who did not produce such copious philosophical treatises as are common among Western philosophers are hardly recognized as philosophers. This may explain why much research has not been done on Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy.\footnote{Indeed, a friend who asked me my area of research was quite surprised when I told him that I was researching on Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy. "Is Azikiwe a philosopher?" he asked, brow-raised in astonishment. Well, my friend's question is answered by this dissertation.}

For now, let us consider those few works on Azikiwe's philosophy. We begin with J.S. Coleman's \textit{Nigeria: Background to Nationalism} (1960). Coleman's main focus here is on the nationalist activities and ideals of Azikiwe. He presented Azikiwe's nationalist ideas as revolutionary and highlighted how the nationalist ember was fanned by his journalistic acumen and activities. Coleman did not go into a philosophical analysis of his nationalist ideas as such. He remained a historian to the core.

However, we find a more philosophical work on Azikiwe in R. Attfield's "Dr. Azikiwe's Fourth Arm" which was an article
published in *Second Oriel* (1973). Here, Attfield, a professor of philosophy, analysed only a tiny aspect of Azikiwe's philosophy as expounded in "The Samuel Jereton Mariere Inaugural Lecture entitled "Stability in Nigeria After Military Rule: An analysis of Political Theory," delivered in the College of Medicine Hall, University of Lagos, on 27 October, 1972.' In this lecture, Azikiwe had argued for the integration of the Armed Forces in the decision-making process in democratic government. The pivot of Azikiwe's argument was that the absence of the Armed Forces in the governance of most post-colonial societies was always characterized by instability whereas their presence usually ensured political stability. This point he tried to support with others to conclude that the Military should be integrated, on an experimental basis, in the decision-making machinery of a normal democracy as the "fourth Arm of the State.

Attfield, in his article, tried to analyse Azikiwe's arguments, some of which he held were inconclusive. He does not seem to be convinced by Azikiwe's arguments for the inclusion of the Armed Forces in democratic governments as he adopted logical rigour to show that Azikiwe's premises do not satisfactorily establish his conclusion. However, while we appreciate the logical rigour which Attfield brought to bear on Azikiwe's philosophical ideas as contained
in the said lecture, we hold that if Attfield had analysed those ideas against the background of his general philosophical methodology — eclectic-pragmatism — he would have been able to make a better assessment of Azikiwe's theory of "Democracy with Military Vigilance." Had Attfield known Azikiwe's general philosophical framework and situated the ideas expounded in that lecture in their proper context, he would have realized that Azikiwe jettisioned the rigorously logical for the practical and useful; he would have appreciated, the civilian-cum-military rule is simply the product of the eclectic-pragmatic mind at work. Be that as it may, we would still concede that Attfield made some useful comments on the basis of his limited knowledge of Azikiwe's general philosophy.

Perhaps, the most important philosophical work on Azikiwe so far, was that by J. Omogbe in an article entitled "The Political Philosophy of Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe: A Critical Look," published in the Nigerian Journal of Philosophy (1984). In this article, Omogbe undertook a critical analysis of Azikiwe's claim to have harmonized opposing ideologies in his Neo-welfarism. He argued that Azikiwe's claim is bogus and could not be done in view of the issues involved. We would discuss this work in some details in one of our chapters. In the meantime, we simply need to observe that while the title of Omogbe's
article gives the impression that he was taking a "critical look" at the entire philosophy of Azikiwe, the work is indeed a critical analysis of only an aspect of Azikiwe's philosophy. Omorogbe only focussed attention on Azikiwe's Neowelfarism but did not touch the "Philosophy of a New Africa" which was Azikiwe's philosophy for decolonization.

On the whole, it is our hope that with the current comprehensive study of Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy, researchers would be easily drawn into the philosophical treatises of Azikiwe. Equally, it is our belief that, the increasing appreciation that philosophical reflections are nurtured by the socio-cultural milieu of the thinkers and are often undertaken in response to the numerous problems present in the thinkers' cultures, would make African researchers to look inward to the ways their fathers, in thought, tackled the problems of their time. In this way, more researches would be undertaken in the philosophies of such prominent African thinkers as Azikiwe, Awolowo, Nkrumah, Toure, and a host of others. Finally, we hope that the healthy academic discussion which this dissertation would generate would go a long way in the elucidation of Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy so that its practical application, as Azikiwe himself believes, would serve humanity better.
CHAPTER TWO

WE WISH TO BEGIN THIS STUDY BY EXAMINING AZIKIWE'S REFLECTIONS ON THE EXPERIENCES OF COLONIAL SUBJECTS WHICH HE VIVIDLY WITNESSED. THE PART SUCH EXPERIENCES PLAYED IN SHAPING HIS CONCEPTION OF COLONIAL EMANCIPATION MAY REVEAL MORE OR LESS CLEARLY THE IDEA THAT EVERY PHILOSOPHY MAY BE SAID TO BE THE CHILD OF ITS CIRCUMSTANCES. 1 PUT DIFFERENTLY, THE VIEW THAT THE CONTENT OF ANY PHILOSOPHY OFTEN, IF NOT ALWAYS, REFLECTS THE CONCERN OF THE AGE OR THE EPOCH WITH WHICH IT OCCURS IS GREATLY CORROBORATED BY THE WAY AZIKIWE'S EXPERIENCES UNDER THE COLONIAL SITUATION LED HIM INTO PHILOSOPHIZING ABOUT IMPERIALISM, COLONIZATION AND COLONIAL EMANCIPATION. 2


2 We shall examine the meaning of "imperialism" in greater details later. For now, let us briefly distinguish between "imperialism", "colonialism" and "colonization." "Imperialism" means, in simple terms, a policy of domination of one country by another. The dominion so sought may be economic or political, or both. It can also be direct or indirect. When imperialism is direct, it results in out-right colonization and total loss of independence for the country so colonized. In this case, the imperialist nation assumes direct political control over the colonial territory. This is what happened to most African countries before 1960. But when imperial subjugation is indirect, the country or territory which falls victim to imperialism apparently retains political independence but has her economy dominated by the multi-national corporations of the imperialist nations. This is the situation in most African and Asian states today where neo-colonialism or covert imperialism holds sway. On the other hand, "Colonialism" means the policy to acquire colonies. It is a direct form of imperialism. Thus we can observe that "imperialism" is a wider concept than "colonialism". Azikiwe uses the former term rather than the latter in his discourse.
The tumultuous experiences which Azikiwe bitterly shared with all other colonial subjects and the anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist reactions which they engendered in him suggest how colonialism in Africa "dug its own grave" through its inherent contradictions. Such contradictions are evident in the practices of the imperialist nations which cherish freedom for their nationals but spoliate the freedom of the colonial peoples; in the exploitation of colonial societies and the development of the colonizers' economies; the respect of the fundamental human rights of the colonizers back home and their abrogation in the colonial territories, to mention but a few. The discernment of these contradictions by the perceptive colonial subjects later produced in them "rebellious colonial subjects" who opposed colonialism and eventually emancipated their people. This is true of Azikiwe (and other African nationalists such as Kwame Nkrumah, Patrice Lumumba, Keneth Kaunda, Leopold Sedar Senghor, to mention but a few) whose experiences informed his later resolve to fight tooth and nail not only to free Nigeria (his own country), but the whole of Africa, from the shackles of colonialism.


At the time of Azikiwe's birth in 1904, the geographical areas which Lord Lugard (one-time Governor-General of Nigeria) later united into a single political entity called Nigeria by the famous (infamous?) amalgamation of Northern and Southern Nigeria in 1914, were already under colonial British colonial administration. Thus he was born into rule and initially did not see that something was terribly wrong with his country until he began to advance in education and wisdom. He became increasingly aware of the revolting colonial situation and began to raise some critical questions about colonization. He became aware of the need to fight colonial domination in all its ramifications and to abolish colonial rule by liberating Africans from its death-grip.

According to Azikiwe, it was at the Hope Waddell Training Institute, Calabar, that he was first made aware of the need to redeem Africa from colonial bondage. It was equally at this Institute that the seed for a Messianic vision for Africa was sowed in his fertile mind, for Azikiwe had heard his father express contempt for those who "tolerated alien rule without organized resistance." His introduction to the anti-colonial writings of Marcus Garvey, the acclaimed crusader for Pan-Africanism, precipitated strong anti-colonial sentiment in

---

5 Ibid, p. 34
6 Ibid, p. 33
him. It helped him to reach unshakable conclusion that Africa needed to be redeemed. He felt personally challenged to action by the writings and activities of Garvey. Those writings exposed some evils of colonialism which Azikiwe resolved to fight. He did not quite know how this fight could be carried out — he was sixteen years old then.

However, it was after Azikiwe had attained secondary education and got employed in the colonial civil service of Nigeria that he actually came face to face with the exploitative and pauperizing realities of the colonial situation. He had joined the civil service on July 1, 1921 as an unpaid learner and on April 1, 1922, was appointed a "Third Class Clerk" in the Treasury Department with a salary of four pounds a month. As an African civil servant of a very low cadre, his experiences of discrimination against Africans were indelible and decisive in his eventual fight for the liberation of Africa. Azikiwe tells us that he

discovered that, no matter if an African had worked for twenty years in a department, as soon as a newly appointed European assumed office whether experienced or not, he automatically became the boss of the African. This anomaly was a challenge to me, my soul rebelled against what I thought was an iniquity. I was so restive that it was difficult for me to fit into the pattern designed for African civil servants.7

7 Ibid, p. 42
Literally, he could not be the ideal colonial civil servant: he loathed the economic insecurity of the average colonial civil servant and the insulting discriminations against Africans in terms of remunerations and appointments to positions of trust and responsibility. His awareness of these evils in the colonial situation made him to firmly resolve to fight to free himself and other colonial peoples of Africa.

Azikiwe noted that most Africans in the colonial civil service whose assigned lot was the junior cadre suffered severe economic hardships due to underpayment which was one of the symptoms of the colonial policy of exploitation. He narrates his personal ordeal thus:

As a young clerk, I was trapped in the vortex of economic insecurity, which was the experience of most junior clerks in those days. Earning from three to five pounds monthly, I found myself month after month unable to balance my budget, and obliged to live beyond my means, not because I was extravagant, but simply because I was underpaid and therefore could not maintain a decent living standard.⁸

Azikiwe saw the economic set-up under the colonial administration as unjust because it "concentrated wealth in the hands of the few, and made the many labour for a pittance."⁹ This realization made him, as it might have

⁸ Ibid, p. 44
⁹ Ibid, p. 44
made a few others who were reflective enough, "a social rebel." He thus resolved to escape from perpetual servitude as a wage-earner. This reasoning shows a high degree of ethical and logical reasoning for someone who never studied economics at a level higher than secondary school at that time to be able to fully appreciate the role of capital and labour in economic history. However, he points out that "as I had suffered personally from the colonial economic system I needed no university instruction on this score." 10

He began to raise some fundamental questions about colonialism and colonization such as are often raised by many nationalists at that moment of unshakable conviction that colonialism is evil and should be fought with all weapons that could be mustered. Reflecting on the realities of colonization, Azikiwe writes:

I wondered why a handful of European officials, backed by force were the autocratic rulers of my people. I questioned why a handful European merchants, bankers, shippers and miners came all the way here and monopolized our finance, trade, and industry, fixed prices and interest rates and control our purchasing power. And I wondered whether the best way to off-set the rapacious tendencies of the economic man was to analyse the forces that made capitalism possible and to re-adjust

10 Ibid, p. 44
them to a more equitable system."

This philosophizing over the colonial situation crystallized his resolve to fight imperialism as the philosophy that resulted from advanced capitalism and as an outlet that gave birth to colonization. He saw imperialism as a philosophy based on duplicity and hypocrisy. But to be able to fight imperialism both at the national and continental levels, he realized that he had to free himself from its clutches first. The first step towards this end would be to extricate himself from the strangulating colonial economic set-up which helps to "perpetuate that phase of capitalism which was obnoxious ...."

He saw the link between capitalism and imperialism but maintains that the latter has perpetuated only the worst aspects of the former. He believed, perhaps naively, that capitalism could be made more humane through the introduction of important reforms. Thus, he resolved to be a small capitalist so as to show by example that with its faults capitalism was only a means to a happy life, and it was an institution which was necessary in man's economic evolution.  

---

11 Ibid, p. 44
12 More on this later when we shall be discussing the causes of imperialism.
13 Azikiwe My Odyssey, Op. Cit., p. 45 (Azikiwe later modified his view on Capitalism as we shall see in due course).
This belief later influenced his economic philosophy of "neo-welfarism." 

The experiences of economic hardships he went through as a colonial subject made Azikiwe quite resolved to escape from being a wage-earner under the colonial situation. He surmised that this would become possible only when he had become mentally equipped. He writes that for this purpose, he resolved to

*go to the United States of America and be re-educated from my mis-education. As soon as I was re-educated, I would try to discover the secret which made successful people to be self-employed and to better the conditions of mankind.* 

*to secretly go to America in a ship* 

When the adventure failed, and he came back to Nigeria in 1924, his social awareness greatly increased. He became more critical of the colonial situation and the contradictions in European imperialism. He writes,

*Contradictions in the social order caused me to find myself in the maze of ideological confusion; I became cynical; because after contrasting the preachments of those Europeans who claimed to be trustees of the African in the various spheres of life with their actual ways of living, especially their*

---

14 This concept will be discussed in some details later.

His skepticism about Europeans and their ideals of equality, liberty and fraternity (which were not consistently pursued) increased when he realized that discrimination against Africans was not only limited to the civil service sector, nor perpetuated by white colonial administrators alone. He also found white missionaries and traders discriminating against their African counterparts. This anomaly greatly agitated him and he seriously questioned the status quo:

Why was no African thought fit by the missionaries to be full-fledged bishop with European priests under him? Why were Bishops Crowther, Phillips, Oluwole, Howels and others suffragan bishops? Why was no African appointed Principal of the Wesleyan Boys' High School and the CMS Grammar School? I wanted to know why there were no African Catholic Priests, or reverend mothers or sisters. 17

These questions draw our attention to the all-round domination of the colonial peoples by their imperialist masters.


17 Ibid, p. 65
It produces a damaging psychological state on both sides; on the side of the imperialists who feel superior to, and capable of ruling, the colonial peoples so as to bring them to the light of European civilization; and on the side of the colonial peoples who have been forced to a subordinate position and forced to feel inferior and dependent on the "benevolence" of the colonizers. Herein lay the subtle evils of imperialism.

Azikiwe was rudely shocked that missionaries could practice race prejudice despite their preachings about a supreme God who created the universe and everything in it, and before whom all men are said to be equal. He tried hard but could not reconcile the teachings of the missionaries, their purported humanitarianism in preaching eternal redemption for all, with their practice of race prejudice. These discernable contradictions between Christian teachings and the actual practices of European priests can still perplex the reflective mind today as they did to the twenty-year-old Azikiwe (in 1924).

Azikiwe said that when he also turned his searchlight on the mercantile establishments and saw "the same old bogey of race prejudice ... his mind seethed with fury and discontent."18 The same situation prevailed in all other sphere of life where the colonialists cared to show interest.

18 Ibid, p. 65
After his higher education in the United States of America, he was discriminated against by the colonial governments in Africa when he was looking for employment. No colonial government was ready to employ him — a highly educated African — with commensurate rewards as his European counterparts. In fact discrimination and governmental suspicion usually conspired to render highly educated colonial subjects unemployed or under-employed — even in their own countries. Azikiwe tells us that his spirit revolted against this anomaly and he decided to undertake a critical analysis of imperialism with a view to fully understanding the forces that made it possible as well as how it could be eradicated.

It was against this background that Azikiwe, whose awareness of the multi-dimensional ills of imperialism increased as he progressed in education and matured in thought, later articulated "The Philosophy of a New Africa."19 This philosophy encapsulates both his views on colonial emancipation and the principles for development of the emancipated territories. It is fundamentally a philosophy for colonial emancipation and the basis for a new social order. It was formulated to teach colonial societies (never mind that he usually referred to African societies, the principles equally apply to any colonial

---

society) how to liberate themselves from imperialism.

Azikiwe's dissatisfaction with the social, economic and political conditions prevalent in Africa at that time made him to begin to think of a new order, of how Africa could be turned from a colonial society to an independent society. Hence his "vision" of a "New Africa" and, probably, a new world where man would not treat his fellow men as means but as ends in all spheres of human relationship.

However, he identified two main obstacles; The first and the most dangerous was imperialism 20 while the second, and invariably the condition for the first, was lack of unity among the colonial peoples themselves. This identification of imperialism as the major obstacle made him to undertake a careful analysis of imperialism in order to elucidate its meaning, causes, ethics, problems and consequences in Africa and other parts of the world. Of particular interest to us is that Azikiwe's thorough analysis of imperialism guided his formulation of a philosophy for its eradication in Africa, and, indeed, anywhere that it holds sway.

---

20 We shall discuss this in some details shortly.
2.1 IMPERIALISM: MEANING, CAUSES, ETHICS, PROBLEMS, AND
CONSEQUENCES (POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE)

A Meaning of Imperialism:

One of the most abused concepts in modern times is "imperialism." It is so much currently laden with propagandist undertones, with the attendant confusion, that it now tends to lose all meaning. It has actually become an ideological bugbear in international politics. But whenever the concept "imperialism" is used, there is usually the suggestion or implication — whether sincere or not — of an aggressiveness as reflected in such terms as 'hegemony,' "world dominion" and similar terms with which imperialism is inseparably associated. 21

Currently, enormous literature on imperialism abounds. This is to be expected since an unprecedented wave of imperialist activities swept over more than half of the world's land surface 22 and unqualifiably affected over half of the world's population in the late nineteenth and first half of the twentieth centuries. Hence, various thinkers whether they saw its dangers or suffered under its

yoke constantly philosophized on the meaning, causes, ethics and consequences of imperialism as well as on how to thwart it. Invariably, because Africans and Asians suffered from it in its worst form, it has become one of the dominant themes in their socio-political philosophies. Consequently, most African socio-political philosophers — including Azikiwe — have contributed immensely to the literary corpus of imperialism. Also, apart from the writings of those whose territories suffered directly or indirectly from imperialist activities, the writings of the opponents and supporters of imperialism within and outside imperialist nations greatly enriched the body of literature on the subject. 23

From the study of available literature, it is discovered that there is no one generally accepted definition of "imperialism." Instead, the various definitions encountered reflect the intellectual biases of the thinkers. Thus while such thinkers as A. Hobson, V.I. Lenin, R. Hilferding, Claude Ake and most Marxist thinkers adopted a purely economic perspective of imperialism; J. A. Schumpeter, W.I. Wattz (to a lesser extent) and a few others maintained a "non-economic" 24 perspective. One notices that most of the

23 We have such pro-imperialist writers as Cecil Rhodes (Britain) andules Ferry (France) while anti-imperialist writers include, Frantz Fanon, Walter Rodney, Nkrumah, Azikiwe to mention but a few.

24 This will be elaborated upon when the causes of imperialism shall be discussed.
definitions put forward by most thinkers on imperialism are either too narrow as to exclude some of its widely accepted feature(s) or too broad and unhelpful to our precise understanding of the concept.\textsuperscript{25}

A. Meaning of Imperialism:

In order to properly understand "imperialism" which he and other African socio-political thinkers (such as Kwame Nkrumah, Julius Nyerere, Houphet Boigny, Leopold Sedar Senghor) had recognized as the main cause of Africa's socio-economic wretchedness and political servitude, Azikiwe begins with its etymology. He explains that "imperialism" is a borrowed word from Latin which comes from "imperio" and is interpreted to mean: to command, to rule, to govern, to hold in trust, to civilize, to educate, to christianize, and all other ideas attached to it since imperialism became a factor in the course of human history.\textsuperscript{26}

In a more precise expression, Azikiwe defines "imperialism" as "the enforced rule of one nation by another nation".\textsuperscript{27} In another breath, he gives what can be taken to be a more elaborate definition according to which "imperialism" means

\textsuperscript{25} However, this problem is not peculiar to "imperialism", it rears its ugly head whenever attempts are made to define any concept.


The will or ambition or plan to effect the imposition of the will of one political organization, which is backed by superior armaments upon the will of another political organization or organizations whose physical force is incapable of resisting the will of the state which is bent on a civilizing mission.28

From these two complementary definitions, one can observe that Azikiwe is referring to colonization which we have earlier on pointed out to be the direct form of imperialism. We had also pointed out that imperialism could be indirect, subtle, devoid of observable physical force and political subjugation which are evident in its direct form as colonization. Azikiwe failed to make this important distinction between imperialism, colonialism and colonization, notwithstanding their inter-relatedness. He confused "imperialism" with "colonization" as is evident in those definitions.

By and large, certain important features of imperialism are revealed in those definitions. First, in its direct form, it involves the forcible imposition of the will of one powerful political organization on the less powerful one(s). Secondly, imperialism was informed by a feeling of superiority. Thirdly and consequent upon the second feature, its perpetrators purport to be on a civilizing mission;

---

they held — naively or pretentiously — that God had fore-ordained them to bring spiritual and cultural salvation to "the benighted souls" in Africa and Asia. Thus the exponents of imperialism believed that it was the Divine Will for the strong, "civilized" and "superior" people (Europeans) to carry the benefits of civilization to the "dark continents" of Africa and Asia at whatever cost to those peoples. Civilization meant for them the forcible imposition of the will of the strong on the weak in order to inculcate their so-called civilizing values.

However, Azikiwe's definition of imperialism despite its importance in capturing its political import, is equally inadequate because it is silent on its economic aspect which many thinkers, especially Marxists, hold to be its essence — at least in its manifestations in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, he gave prominent position to economics when he discussed the causes of imperialism as we shall see shortly. This fact makes it pertinent for us to consider a few definitions of imperialism from an economic point of view.

V. I. Lenin, one of the greatest anti-imperialist writers, vaguely defines imperialism as "the monopoly stage of capitalism."\(^{29}\) This hardly says much, nor reasonably illuminates the concept. Lenin himself realized this and

\(^{29}\) V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1917/19th Printing, 1903) p. 84.
decided to attempt a more elaborate definition according to which

**Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed.**

Lenin believed that this definition is adequate because it encapsulates the five basic features of the phenomenon: the dominance of monopolies and finance capital; division of the world among international trusts; pronounced importance of capital exportation; and the division of all territories of the world among the biggest capitalist powers.

It can hardly be denied that Lenin's explanation of imperialism focuses on its 19th and 20th centuries' manifestations in all its aggressiveness, ruthless exploitation and the attendant global conflicts. Whether Lenin is justified in limiting his treatment of imperialism to its recent phase is quite disputable. However, what is of major interest here is whether, even in so doing, his definition is adequate.

---

30 Ibid, p. 84
To determine this, one may find Kenneth Waltz's criticism of Lenin's definition of imperialism useful.

Waltz maintains that Lenin's definition, and by implication other purely economic definitions of imperialism, is inadequate because it fails to properly acknowledge the non-economic factors that are essential to it. He vehemently disagrees with the conception of imperialism which essentially hinges it on capitalism. He buttresses his disagreement with the fact that some countries which were not capitalistically developed did practice imperialism and actually owned colonies in Africa and Asia. He mentions Japan and Russia (for Asia), Portugal and Italy (for Africa) as examples.31 Waltz's objection should be taken seriously because he is making his point by holding that a purely economic definition of imperialism leaves out something essential in the concept and this makes the definition inadequate.

Another economic definition of imperialism was given by Claude Ake who sees it as

the economic control and exploitation of foreign lands arising from the necessity for counteracting the impediments to the accumulation of capital engendered by the internal contradictions of the domestic capitalist economy.32


Such "impediments to the accumulation of capital" included the protectionist policies through the tariff system among the capitalist nations of Europe; limited markets within Europe for the sale of manufactured goods, surplus production of capital and consumer goods which often resulted in low profits. Here again, we see Ake's definition fall into the pit of inadequacy which all reductionist explanation of imperialism, nay, most phenomena, usually fell.

Equally, there have been some non-economic conceptions of imperialism. This has its patron-saint in J.A. Schumpeter; an important apostle in L. Woolf; and a lukewarm disciple in K.N. Waltz — to mention but a few adherents to the non-economic explanation of imperialism.

According to Schumpeter, imperialism can be defined as "the objectless disposition on the part of a state to unlimited forcible expansion." He argues, hardly convincingly, that imperialism has no definite object or target such that when it is realized, it stops. According to him, what emerges as a true picture of imperialism is that it is an insatiable tendency on the part of powerful nations and social classes to seek expansion for the sake of expanding, war.

33 Waltz, Op. cit., p. 28
34 Schumpeter, Op. cit., p. 6
Thus in order to formulate a more adequate definition of imperialism, cognizance must be taken of all its basic features which include economics, politics and certain psychological dispositions like atavistic aggressiveness. It is in this regard that Magdoff’s depiction of some most prominent features of imperialism should be appreciated.

He points out that they include "empire building," "territorial expansion," economic exploitation," and "economic and political domination of weaker by stronger powers." To these features, we can add what Schumpeter calls "atavism" or latent aggressiveness and tendency to dominate, subdue, rule and exploit. Significantly, these basic features of imperialism are recognized by Azikiwe in his treatment of the causes of the phenomenon. It is those causes, which invariably shed more light on the meaning of imperialism that we shall now turn to.

B. Causes of Imperialism

The "aetiology" of imperialism reveals that several causes may be identified. They include economic, political, military, social as well as religious causes. However, many writers on imperialism have emphasized one or more of these identifiable causes, depending on whether the writer adopted a mono-causal, a duo causal or a poly-causal approach.

---

38 Ibid., p. 5.

These causal approaches amount to attempts to explain the causes of a phenomenon in terms of one factor, two factors, three or more factors, respectively. These are more or less popular and legitimate methods of explanation in history.

With respect to our subject, the dominant theory of imperialism is the mono-causal theory. This is the approach adopted by such thinkers as J.A. Hobson, V.I. Lenin, R. Hilferding, Claude Ake, and most Marxist followers who explain all historical phenomena in terms of economics. 40 It was also adopted by Schumpeter who posited "atavism" as the cause of imperialism; by Waltz who saw the cause of imperialism in power differentials among nations whereby powerful nations exert control over the weak ones; 41 and by L. Woolf who saw imperialism as "an aspect of the conflict or clash of different civilizations in the nineteenth century." 42 Although we have not exhausted the list of the many subscribers to the mono-causal explanation of imperialism, the names so far cited point to its popularity.

---

40 This view holds, simpliciter, that all movements in history have economic cause.


The duo-causal approach has hardly been adopted by any known writer on imperialism, while the poly-causal approach ranks second in popularity to the mono-causal approach to imperialism. The poly-causal approach explains imperialism in terms of many factors.

Azikiwe himself holds the poly-causal theory of imperialism according to which the phenomenon was caused by economic, social, military and religious motives. Since his position on what gave birth to imperialism is more comprehensive and actually integrated other reductionist explanations, we shall consider it last, after considering some popular mono-causal theories mentioned above.

J. A. Hobson has been acclaimed as the father of the economic theory of modern imperialism. His economic analysis of the origin and cause of modern-day imperialism is so impressive that he greatly influenced subsequent Marxist writers on the subject, especially Lenin. Hobson's famous book on this subject is Imperialism: a Study (1902). Hobson's economic perspective on imperialism holds that surplus capital seeking higher profit returns on


44 "Reductionism" is the practice of reducing apparently many factors to one. As an explanatory device, it seems attractive, but it has some obvious limitations as would be appreciated by the end of our discussion.

45 This is to recognize that there had been older forms of imperialism which might differ significantly from the new (modern) imperialism.
investments than were obtainable in the capitalism countries led to imperialism through cut-throat competition and protectionism. His analysis of imperialism revealed a link between it and modern capitalism which, following in the wake of highly developed means of production (thanks to the "Industrial Revolution"), led to excessive production of finance capital.

In one of his many important passages on imperialism, Hobson asserts that

Over-production in the sense of excessive manufacturing plant, and surplus capital which cannot find sound investment within the country, forced Britain, Germany, Holland, France to place larger and larger portions of their economic resources outside the areas of their present political domain and then stimulate a policy of political expansion so as to take in the new areas. 46

Thus, for Hobson, it was the over-production of machinery and surplus capital which could not find high profit-yielding investment opportunities in the countries where they were produced that led to the new imperialism — popularly tagged "capitalist imperialism" — of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Over-production of capital and manufactured goods, according to Hobson, was sequel to the great improvements in the method of production, concentration of ownership and

control in the hands of the few capitalists as a result of the "Industrial Revolution." However, Hobson reasoned that there would have been no problem of excess, both of capital and manufactured goods if increased production was matched by increased consumption. This was not the case. He observed that consumption could not match production under the circumstances because the consuming power (income) was so maladjusted that the majority of the citizens who would have stepped-up consumption to keep pace with increased production were too impoverished to play such required role. On the other hand, the capitalist mode of production had equally created bands of citizens who over-saved rather than indulged in consumption in proportion to their incomes through rents, monopoly profits, and other unearned or excessive elements of income, which, not being earned by labour of head or hand, have no legitimate raison d'être. Having no natural relation to effort of production, they impel their recipients to no corresponding satisfaction of consumption; they form a surplus wealth, which having no proper place in the normal economy of production and consumption, tends to accumulate as excessive savings.47

Thus, the excessive savings were lodged in the banks to form what R. Hilferding called "bank capital," or "finance capital."48 This is capital usually made available to

47 Ibid., p. 72
48 R. Hilferding, Finance Capital (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1912), p. 78
industrialists by banks, which represented the actual owners of the capital, for investment purposes at a certain interest-rate.

The fact that more and more countries were entering into the "machine economy," Hobson observed, tended to restrict the market for manufactured goods and this led to low returns of profits on investments as well as reduced investment opportunities in those capitalist countries. This problem, he believed, was further compounded by the protectionist policies of the various capitalist nations which frantically sought to secure markets for their capitalists and businessmen. But as improvements in the techniques of production continued, it became difficult for the manufacturers, merchants and financiers of the various nations to dispose profitably of their economic resources and they were tempted more and more to use their Governments in order to secure for their particular use some distant under-developed country by annexation and protection ....

Hobson's analysis thus shows that it was the minority group of financiers and industrialists in the various capitalist nations that spearheaded the quest for imperial expansion. However, he recognizes the role which such non-economic factors like patriotism, adventure, military enterprise, political ambition, and philanthropy played in

imperial expansion. He believes that to ignore these factors in the phenomenon of imperial expansion, and "impute to financiers so much power is to take a too narrowly economic view of history." But then, the critical question is: why did the energy of these active agents take the particular form of imperialist expansion? Hobson's answer is that the financial interests of the capitalist class constituted "the governor of the imperial engine, directing the energy and determining the work..." He agrees that non-economic factors generated strong enthusiasm for imperialism. But such enthusiasm, he argues, is irregular and "blind," and so requires a clear-sighted and purposeful channelization by the financiers. He acknowledges that an ambitious statesman, a frontier soldier, an over-zealous missionary, a pushing trader, may suggest or initiate a step of imperial expansion, or may assist in educating patriotic public opinion to the urgent need of some fresh advance. But, Hobson insists, "the final determination of imperial expansion rests with the financial power which exercises great power in "high politics" and control the body of public opinion by the control of the press.

50 Ibid, p. 79
51 Ibid, p. 70
52 Ibid, p. 70
53 Ibid, p. 71
Hobson suggests that even the apparently non-economic motives for imperialism such as patriotism, adventure, military enterprise, political ambition, and philanthropy are, in the final analysis, determined by economic forces. He wrote:

Such is the array of distinctively economic forces making for imperialism, a large loose group of traders and professionals seeking profitable business and lucrative employment from the expansion of military and civil services, from the expenditure on military operations, the opening up of new tracts of territory and trade with the same, and the provision of new capital which these operations require, all these finding their central guiding and directing force in the power of the general financier ....

Hobson concludes that since economic conditions form the taproot of imperialism, the latter can be eliminated by introducing certain economic reforms. He believes that since imperialism was propelled by surplus production of capital and goods, it could be eliminated by eliminating surpluses. This can be done, he argues,

if the consuming public ... raised its standard of consumption to keep pace with the rise of productive powers ....

54 Ibid., p. 71
55 Ibid., p. 72
When this is done, he continues,

there could be no excess of goods or capital clamorous to use imperialism in order to find markets; foreign trade would indeed exist but there would be no difficulty in exchanging a small surplus of our manufactures for the food and raw materials we annually absorbed, and all the savings that we made would find employment, if we chose, in home industries .... 56

What Hobson's recommendation amounts to is that certain features of capitalism should be reformed in order to eliminate imperialism, while the capitalist system is still allowed to operate. This conclusion marks one of the important differences between Hobson's economic analysis of imperialism and Lenin's. For, while Hobson's analysis tends to vindicate capitalism as the necessary cause of imperialism, Lenin holds capitalism guilty of imperialism. In fact, Lenin sees imperialism as the logical consequence of capitalism and concludes that capitalism should be eliminated and substituted with socialism before imperialism can be eliminated. To him, unlike Hobson, no amount of reforms can make capitalism a just and humane economic system. For a better appreciation of the major similarities and differences between these two great exponents of the mono-causal economic explanation, let us examine Lenin's views.

As we have mentioned earlier, Lenin's economic explanation

56 Ibid, p. 72
of imperialism was greatly influenced by Hobson's analysis. Thus we find great similarities between their views on the cause of imperialism. In spite of this fact, some obvious differences exist between them, especially with regard to how imperialism can be eradicated. A classical expression of the Marxist explanation of imperialism was put forward by Lenin in his momentous book, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, published in 1917. Lenin, as should be expected from a Marxist, takes a thorough-going economic perspective of imperialism.

According to him, modern imperialism is the product of advanced capitalism, that is, capitalism at its monopoly stage. He argues that "imperialism emerged as the development and direct continuation of the fundamental characteristics of capitalism in general."57 He reasons that "free competition is the basic feature of capitalism and commodity production generally."58 But free competition engenders rivalry among capitalists who struggle to obtain exclusive rights to sources of raw materials as well as markets for finished goods — all in the bid to obtain higher profits on investments. This greedy motive, according to Lenin, makes capitalists to form cartels and monopolies so as to minimize, but not totally erase, competition in order to enable them exercise a greater control on the sources of raw materials and the markets in foreign lands. It was this quest for control over the

58 Ibid, p. 83
sources of raw materials and the markets for manufactured goods for the sake of making higher profits, Lenin argues, rather than the need to export surplus capital and goods — as Hobson had argued — that led to capitalist imperialism. According to Lenin,

The capitalists divide the world, not out of any particular malice, but because the degree of concentration which has been reached forces them to adopt this method in order to obtain profits. And they divided it "in proportion to capital," "in proportion to strength." 59

The monopoly stage of capitalism, Lenin argues, developed as a result of the growth of finance capital, which is the investment capital controlled by the banks on behalf of the capital owners, which industrialists borrow at some interest rate with a view to transforming it into industrial capital. 60 This finance capital, he argues, generated the tendency to dominate, annex, protect or colonize other regions of the world which are weak in order to directly control sources of raw materials and acquire markets for manufactured goods. This fact is laconically expressed by Lenin when he asserts that

finance capital in general strives to seize the largest possible amount of land of all kinds in all places, and by every means taking into account potential sources of raw materials and fearing to be left behind in the fierce struggle for the last remnants.

59 Ibid., p. 71
of independent territory, or for the repartition of those territories that have been already divided. 61

Finance capital, Lenin maintains, favours imperialism because it finds it most "convenient" and derives the greatest profit from a form of subjugation which involves the loss of independence of the subjugated countries and peoples. 62

Lenin, like Hobson, recognizes that there had been various forms of imperialism before the 19th and 20th centuries — such as the imperialism initiated for the purpose of exacting tributes — but insists that imperialism in the 19th and 20th centuries was brought about by advanced capitalism as never preceded. Thus he wrote:

The principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism is the domination of monopolist associations of big employers. These monopolies are most firmly established when all the sources of raw materials are captured by one group....63

It was this principal feature of the latest stage of capitalism — monopoly corporations — that spurred capitalists to pressurize their government(s) into embarking on imperial expansion through colonization. This is because the capitalists realized that nothing short of outright colonization of foreign territories could give

62 Ibid, pp. 77-78
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them complete control over the raw materials and markets of those areas. Thus, Lenin observes that

the more capitalism is developed the more strongly the shortage of raw materials is felt, the more intense the competition and the hunt for sources of raw materials throughout the whole world, the more desperate the struggle for the acquisition of colonies.64

Although Lenin, like Hobson, recognizes that non-economic factors played some role in stimulating imperialists to colonial conquest, he insists that they grew up on the basis of finance capital. In his own words: "The non-economic superstructure which grows up on the basis of finance capital, its politics and ideology, stimulates the striving for colonial conquest."65

So far, we have noted some similarities between Hobson's economic explanation of imperialism and that of Lenin. However, Hobson's analysis differs from Lenin's in the following important respects. In the first place, while Hobson sees the new imperialism as serving the interests of a certain capitalist group and believes, rather naively, that it can be eliminated through the introduction of certain economic reforms which would eliminate surpluses by redistributing income and restricting the profit margins of those whose interests are closely tied to imperialism, Lenin sees imperialism as closely integrated with the structure and normal functioning of advanced capitalism. Lenin strongly contends that it is only a revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and its substitution with socialism that could eliminate imperialism in the world.
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Another apparent difference between Hobson's and Lenin's analyses of imperialism can be seen in their treatment of export capital. For, although Lenin agrees with Hobson that capital exportation is a key factor in imperialism, he sees imperialism more as a consequence of the desire to obtain an exclusive right over the sources of raw materials and to get a tighter grip on foreign markets, than pressure from over-abundance of capital as Hobson maintains. We can observe here that this difference is more or less a matter of emphasis. From Lenin's perspective, emphasis is shifted from the general problem of surplus capital that characterize the advanced stage of capitalism, "to the imperatives of control over raw materials and markets in the monopoly stage." By so doing, Lenin has greatly illuminated the principles of imperialism.

The economic explanation of imperialism is popularly associated with Marxist and neo-Marxist thinkers, although a few liberal economists and thinkers like Hobson adopted similar perspective. Thus we find such African neo-Marxists as Kwame Nkrumah, Frantz Fanon, Claude Ake, subscribing to the economic explanation of imperialism.

---

66 The New Encyclopaedia Britanica (Knowledge in Depth) Vol. 4, p. 896.
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Critics of the economic explanation of imperialism are mostly those who offer non-economic explanations of the phenomenon. The chief apostle of this group is J. A. Schumpeter whose book, *Imperialism and Social Classes* (1955), became a classic exposition of imperialism. Other members of this group include L. Woolf and K.N. Waltz.

Let us begin our consideration of the non-economic perspective of imperialism with the view of Waltz. This is because he made explicit and direct attacks on the Hobson-Lenin economic interpretation of imperialism.

Kenneth Waltz agrees that the economic explanation of imperialism is persuasive but contends that it can be accepted as an adequate explanation of the phenomenon if, and only if, (1) the economic theory itself is valid, (2) the conditions envisioned by the theory held in most imperialist countries, and (3) most of the countries in which the conditions held were imperialist. 69

Applying the first of the three criteria of adequacy enumerated above, Waltz contends that the Hobson-Lenin economic explanation of imperialism does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that empire-building is needed. He maintains that

\[ \text{economic theory cannot in itself lead to the conclusion that empire-building is needed.} \]

Capital may flow of a country in search for

---

higher profits, but whether imperial conquest is required or is thought to be required, in order to secure them depends on political as well as on economic conditions at home and abroad. 70

He observes that the question now shifts from whether the economic theory explains capital surpluses to whether internal economic conditions determine external political behaviour. He maintains that this question cannot be answered by a theory about the working of national economies.

Waltz considers the second and third criteria for the adequacy of the economic theory of imperialism together. He emphasizes that for the economic theory of imperialism to be valid, most of the imperialist countries must be both capitalist and surplus-producing, and that most of the countries so described must be imperialist. But a close observation of the economic circumstances prevailing in the imperialist countries raise serious doubts about the theory's validity. For, while it is true that surplus capital production led to British and French imperialism, Japanese and Russian imperialist policies were neither as a result of capitalism nor surplus production. 71 In the light of the variety of conditions associated with imperialism which the above few instances illustrate, Waltz has, at least, succeeded in putting a serious question mark on the validity

70 Ibid, p. 24
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of the economic explanation of imperialism.

Certainly, Waltz is not arguing that capitalism cannot explain imperialist activities of certain countries such as Britain and France. What his argument revolves on is that capitalism, or economics, alone cannot explain all the imperialist activities of all nations usually referred to as imperialist. For instance, Russian and Japanese imperialist undertakings cannot be explained in terms of economic production of surpluses and the need to export capital. He acknowledges that "capitalist economies were sufficient generators of surpluses" but insists that Governments of capitalist states ... had wide range of choice and effective means of acting intentionally. How they could choose to act, however, cannot be explained by internal conditions alone. External conditions must be part of the explanation since the variety of conditions internal to states is not matched by the variety of their external behaviours. 72

Waltz concludes that the economic theory of imperialism is at best parochial. He believes that it is even more appropriate to "write of the imperialism of great power" instead of "capitalist imperialism" because

Where gross imbalances of power exist, and where the means of transportation permit the export of goods and the instruments of

72 Ibid, p. 26
rule, the more capable people ordinarily exert a considerable influence over those less able to produce surpluses.\textsuperscript{73}

He notes that historically, imperialism had been a common phenomenon. It was usually spear-headed by a people who had organized themselves effectively and had exploited their resources.\textsuperscript{74}

Another non-economic explanation of imperialism was given by J.A. Schumpeter whose arguments were mainly directed against the Marxist currents of thought in the early twentieth century. His arguments were particularly directed against the Marxist contention that imperialism grew naturally out of capitalism. Paradoxically, Schumpeter, to some extent, follows the Marxist tradition in looking for the influence of class forces and class interests as the major precipitators of social change. But in doing so, he is in fact using the instruments of Marxist thought to rebut the essence of Marxist theory.

According to Schumpeter, analysis of historical evidence reveals the following facts about imperialism: (1) that "objectless" tendencies towards forcible expansion, without definite utilitarian limits, play a very large role in the history of mankind; (2) that the urge to fight for the sake of fighting, to expand for the sake of expansion is

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p. 26
\textsuperscript{74} Ibid., p. 26-27
explained by the vital needs of situations that molded peoples into warriors for their self-preservation, as are inherent in their psychological dispositions and in the nature of social structure; and (3) the survival of such dispositions and structures that give rise to limitless expansion and war; domestic interests of the ruling class; and the influence of all those who stand to gain from war policy, whether economically or socially. He contends that although imperialism has various forms which differ greatly in detail, they all have the afore-mentioned traits in common. He insists that

Imperialism thus is atavistic. It falls into that group of surviving features from earlier ages that play such an important part in every concrete social situation. ... It is an atavism in the social structure, in individual/psychological habits of emotional reaction. 75

On the whole, he argues that imperialism has no definite object or target such that when it is realized, it ceases. Rather, we observe that imperialist tendencies are insatiable.

A critical examination of Schumpeter's position shows that it cannot be seriously sustained as an explanation of the occurrence of imperialism. For one thing, history does not show that imperialism is "objectless" or aimless as he

75 Schumpeter, op. cit., p. 65
suggests. On the contrary, imperialists have always had certain aims they wish to accomplish even if such aims lead to limitless expansion of imperial power. Thus, even if imperialist tendencies appear to be irrational and insatiable, they surely have wide-ranging factors that elicit them, that gave birth to them.

So far, we have examined various attempts to explain imperialism mono-causally — including the economic explanation in all its persuasiveness. Yet, none was adequate enough to explain all cases of imperialism. This is because the various factors which gave rise to imperialism at different epochs cannot effectively be reduced to one. Equally, the frequently-mentioned contributory causes of imperialism such as the spirit of patriotism, nationalism, a feeling of racial superiority and the drive for power, are still matters of great controversy with respect to specific cases of imperialism to allow fitting them into a general theory of the phenomenon.

It is against such background that the poly-causal approach to explaining imperialism adopted by Azikiwe can be regarded as more adequate than the mono-causal and even the duo-causal approaches. This approach recognizes that imperialism was brought about by a combination of factors one of which may predominate in a particular case. Thus, Azikiwe recognizes that the causes of imperialism may be social, economic, political, military or religious; either
collectively or in any combination. He believes that all these factors combined to effect imperialism in Africa and Asia.

Azikiwe observes that socially, imperialism may be brought about by man's inherent struggle for survival. He urges that man's inherent tendency towards self-preservation produces in him a certain aggressiveness which propels him to seek dominion over other creatures, including his own kind, as far as his power can go. He writes:

the instinct of pugnacity (to dominate) is inherent in man. It activates his emotions. It lubricates his inter-social action. It fortifies his desire with a desire to conquer. 76

Here, we find a great similarity between Azikiwe's analysis of the social cause of imperialism and Schumpeter's view that imperialism is atavistic. However, we should note that while Azikiwe recognizes man's pugnacious instinct as a contributory cause of imperialism, Schumpeter holds that imperialism can generally be explained in terms of man's inherent aggressiveness and similar psychological dispositions. 77

In his analysis of the economic cause of imperialism, Azikiwe acknowledges the importance of Karl Marx and

Friedrich Engels, and other thinkers who gave an economic interpretation of history "according to which the quest for food, shelter and clothing is the dominating factor in human society." Agreeing with the classical Marxist economic analysis of imperialism — only as a factor rather than a general explanation of the phenomenon — Azikiwe asserts the economic root of imperialism by explaining that since the Industrial Revolution has made society [European Society] to manufacture goods and commodities by machines, and since mass production is the rule not the exception, raw materials are essential for a stabilization of home industries. And since colonies produce raw materials, they are necessary to the economic life of the industrial countries.

Such was the economic cause of imperialism: the desire for markets for manufactured goods and the desire to control the sources of industrial raw materials by imperialists. To these desires, Hobson, Hilferding and Lenin would add — and they regard this to be of paramount importance — the desire to export finance capital to foreign countries where they hope to obtain higher profits on investments. This desire, according to Lenin, led to monopoly corporations which through cut-throat competition and protectionist policies, gave rise to the scramble for spheres of influence among capitalist nations which eventually resulted in direct colonization of Africa and Asia in the 19th and 20th centuries.

79 Azikiwe, Resurgent Africa, op. cit., p. 51
With regards to the political cause of imperialism, Azikiwe recognizes the illuminating views of Jules Ferry (France), Friedrich Fabri and Paul Bohrbach (Germany), Rudyard Kipling and Lord Lugard (Britain),

and other advocates of colonial possession who believe that by the imposition of the will of the superior on the will of the inferior, there must be a political symbiosis which enable the inferior to graduate from tutelage.\[30\]

In other words, the political cause of imperialism was precipitated by the belief of certain European officials and thinkers that the Europeans had been conferred with a divine mission to give the "uncivilized peoples" of Asia and Africa "the benefits of civilization."\[31\] To do so, they believed, European nations should conquer those peoples in the belief that "the strong are destined to rule the weak."\[32\]

The pretension that imperialism was actually for the good of the subjugated peoples, that colonization meant tutelage for the colonial peoples, was exposed by the actual practices of the colonialists who apparently wished to dominate for ever. (We shall discuss this in greater details later)

The belief in a civilizing mission and the divine right of might is equally stressed by L. Woolf who asserts that the

\[30\] Ibid, pp. 51-52
\[31\] Ibid, p. 52
\[32\] Ibid, p. 52
apostles of imperialism and colonization hold that the white race ... was physically, mentally, and morally superior to all other races, and God, with infinite wisdom and goodness had created it [the white race] so that it might be ready ... to take over and manage the affairs of all other peoples on earth and teach them to be, in so far that was possible for natives and heathens, good Europeans and good christians.  

P. T. Moon also agrees with Woolf that many European officials regarded colonization as a sacred duty. According to Moon, the French statesman had vehemently declared the conquest of colonies to be not merely permissible but imperative for France .... Italian patriots had proclaimed it a sacred duty ... while England had regarded it in Kipling's words as "the white man's burden" which civilized people dire not shirk ....

Perhaps, the strongest and most persuasive plea for imperialism from the official quarters was made by Cecil Rhodes who, speaking in 1895, insisted that

... imperialism ... My cherished idea is a solution for social problem, i.e., in order to save the 40,000,000 inhabitants of the United Kingdom from a bloody civil war, we colonial statesmen must acquire new lands to settle the

84 Moon, Op. cit., p. 2
surplus population, to provide new markets for goods produced in the factories and mines. The empire, as I have always said, is a bread and butter question. If you want to avoid civil war, you must become imperialists. 85

Thus, like many other European statesmen and thinkers, Rhodes saw imperialism as the panacea to Britain’s growing unemployment problem. This is because through imperialism, the teeming unemployed people would be given employment in the acquired territories. This way, some social upheavals which the unemployed and the hungry could veritably initiate would be averted.

Another factor that caused imperialism, according to Azikiwe, was military enterprise. He observes that apart from the fact that the Industrial Revolution had given Europe modern weapons of tremendous power and made military adventurism possible and desirable, the bitter rivalries among European nations made the acquisition of colonies militarily and strategically expélient. He observes that coaling stations are essential for the mercantile fleet of the imperialist countries; naval bases and fortifications are also of prime importance; not to mention the paramount need for using the colonial possessions as a reservoir of troops and as a means towards training reserve soldiers for any unforeseen struggle, and of course; for preparing the natives for the honourable role of becoming cannon

85 Quoted by Lenin, Op. cit., p. 75
fodder in case robbers fall out on the division of loot. 36

Thus, imperialist nations strove to acquire more and more colonies in order to strengthen their military bases at the expense of one another.

Finally, Azikiwe adduces a religious factor as one of the causes of modern imperialism. He argues that religion combined with trade and political force to make up the "trinitarian tragedy" in European colonization of Africa and Asia. According to him, European traders succeeded in having the flag to follow trade ... with the religious man ... to teach the native not to lay up treasures on earth; this enabled the commercial man to grab the earthly treasures; and this facilitated the role of the Government to regulate how these earthly treasures are to be exported for the use of world industries. 37

Here, Azikiwe sees the religious factor as having given rise to the psycho-physical imperialism which emasculated the colonial peoples spiritually and ensured almost a total submission to European domination.


Of all the possible causes of imperialism highlighted above, Azikiwe seems to assign a prime place to the economic factor when he acknowledges that "economics act[es] motivates human life more predominantly than any other factors." But unlike the Marxist-Leninist economic explanation of imperialism, Azikiwe does not insist that every case of imperialism can be explained in terms of economic, especially in terms of capitalist activities. However, Azikiwe might be prepared to concede that the economic factor predominates in European imperialism in Africa and Asia. This is different from saying that the economic factor accounts for every case of imperialism. Such a position would be contradicted by the facts of history since there have been various forms of imperialism in which different motives predominated. It is in this recognition that it may be appropriate to talk of imperialisms, identifiable with the predominant factor in the occurrence of a particular case. It is in this regard that Hobson talks of imperialisms and distinguished between older and modern forms of imperialism. This in turn lends some support to the more adequate poly-causal explanation of imperialism adopted by Azikiwe.

C. The Ethics of Imperialism:

It should be pointed out from the onset that there are two discernable, but related, senses in which Azikiwe

---

has employed the term "ethics" in relation to imperialism. One is the sense in which "ethics denotes morality" with the import of rightness or wrongness (goodness or badness) of certain actions and ideas. In this sense, the question of justification is involved. The second sense of the term relates to the manner of operation or the "modus operandi" or the "principle" of imperialism. In this sense, the ethics of imperialism is force. It is a general feature of imperialism, as history shows, that it is usually established by force. Invariably, it is with the first sense of ethics above that Azikiwe is more concerned, understandably because the ethics of imperialism in the second sense is fairly well-known and almost generally agreed upon.

Operating with the first sense of ethics depicted above, Azikiwe maintains that

There are two main doctrines in the philosophical analysis of imperialism from an ethical point of view: (a) the Doctrine of Exploitation, and (b) the Doctrine of Trusteeship.

This is to say that exponents of imperialism have tried to justify it with the "Doctrine of Exploitation" and the "Doctrine of Trusteeship" among others.

---
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Under the "Doctrine of Exploitation," Azikiwe lists three types of rights which the imperialists claim in their attempt to justify imperialism. These are "the right to exploit weaker races, the right to develop world resources, and the right to civilize backward races."^93

Azikiwe mentions some exponents who tried to justify imperialism on the ground that it was the right of Europeans who had a superior civilization to civilize the so-called backward races of Africa and Asia. They include Jules Ferry, Rudyard Kipling and the American President, William McKinley (who ruled from 1896–1901).

Jules Ferry was a prominent French journalist and politician. He is regarded as the apostle of contemporary colonial renaissance who maintained that "superior races have a right and duty to civilize inferior races."^94

On a similar note, Rudyard Kipling considered imperialism as a necessity in so far as it was a vehicle for fulfilling an implicit obligation to govern and civilize the backward races of Africa and Asia, which he described as the "white man's burden."^95 In one of his imperialist songs, Kipling had classified Africans as "sullen peoples, half-devil and half-child."^95

The right to exploit weaker races was implied in the assumption of the right to develop world resources. M. Paul Le Roy Beaulieu, Lord Lugard and members of Britain's

---
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Royal Colonial Institute (later rechristined the "Royal Empire Society") were some of the proclaimers of this right. Beaulieu praised colonization as "the expansive force of a nation" that enables it to submit the universe or a vast part of it to its language, manners, ideas and laws.\textsuperscript{97}

Lugard himself justified imperialism "on the necessity of economic exploitation so as to develop world resources."\textsuperscript{98}

Equally, members of the British Royal Colonial Institute championed imperialism on the ground that it is the right of a civilized state to develop the resources of the world.

The proclamation of the right to develop world resources seems to have been informed by the belief that Nature's gifts (of mineral and other resources) are the universal possessions of mankind and should be exploited wherever they are found, by any capable race for the benefit of mankind. This proclamation is persuasive, prima facie. For it would have been a marked humanism if the capable races of the world were to develop world resources for the benefits of the entire human race. Besides, such humanism would have wiped out abject poverty in which the greatest part of mankind is steeped today. It would have also minimized much conflict in the world. In fact, if this principle were practised, it would have made imperialism a noble and a humanitarian philosophy. But the verbal

\textsuperscript{97} Ibid, p. 53

\textsuperscript{98} Ibid, p. 53 (He ardently pursued this policy of ruthless exploitation while he was the Colonial Governor of Nigeria).
proclamation of the right to develop world resources for the benefit of mankind was never put into practice. Instead, the strong imperialist nations ruthlessly exploited all the resources of the militarily weaker races for their own benefits only. The progressive pauperization of the colonial peoples shows that the right claimed by imperialist was actually the right of might and that they sought to develop world resources only to their selfish ends.

The above claims in support of imperialism are equally often used to vindicate the use of "brutal force" which was the guardian angel of imperialism. It is a fact of history that imperialism thrives on force. Imperialism illustrates the truth of Thucydides's maxim that "God and men alike always maintain domination wherever they are stronger." This truism is further supported by Xenophon who declares that

It is a perpetual law amongst all men that, when a city (i.e. a state) is taken from an enemy both the persons and property of the inhabitants belong to the captors.\textsuperscript{102}

But Azikiwe found the "might-is-right" ethics of imperialism untenable and repulsive. He made this one of the cardinal reasons why imperialism must be fought and defeated.\textsuperscript{102}

The other component of the ethics of imperialism,

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid, p. 55
\textsuperscript{100} Quoted by Azikiwe, Ibid, p. 55
\textsuperscript{101} Quoted by Azikiwe, Ibid, p. 55
\textsuperscript{102} We shall say more on this later.
according to Azikiwe is "the Idea of Trusteeship." However, he points out that "Trusteeship as distinguished from Exploitation is an anomaly." 103 But he decides to allow the distinction, simply, in order to give a fair hearing to the apostles of the "Idea of Trusteeship."

The idea of trusteeship seems more humanitarian, according to Azikiwe, than that of outright exploitation. He observes that the basis of Trusteeship is supposed to be "a dual mandate. That is, a belief that exploitation involves a duty." 104 Thus the doctrine of Trusteeship was not necessarily opposed to exploitation but suggests that the exploitation of weaker races imposes an obligation on the exploiters towards those being exploited. In Azikiwe's interpretation, the Doctrine of Trusteeship says, in principle,

Exploit weaker races, develop their mineral resources, civilize backward peoples, but in so doing respect their rights and protect them. 105

Azikiwe further identified four principles (he calls them "categories") of the Doctrine of Trusteeship as follows:

(a) The rights of the backward races, (b) protection of the backward races from exploitation, (c) Appeal to a sense of responsibility on the part of imperialists, and (d) Tutelage of the backward races. 106

103 Azikiwe, *Entascent Africa*, p. 56
104 Ibid., p. 56
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However, it is difficult to reconcile categories (a) and (b) with the injunction "Exploit weaker races ..." in Azikiwe's interpretation of the Doctrine of Trusteeship. Perhaps, what categories (a) and (b) amount to, is that the weaker races had a right to be protected against exploitation that is not coupled with responsibility.

Exponents of the Doctrine of Trusteeship include J.H. Oldham, Edmund Burke, Joseph Chamberlain. The doctrine was to a larger or lesser extent accepted by the British and American officials, among others. Azikiwe notes that Oldham admits that Europeans are in Africa from economic and not from humanitarian motives; "Their object is the development of their own industry and trade, but the benefit may be reciprocal." 106

But the fact is that the benefits of European imperialism in Africa and Asia were not mutual in any significant sense. For, while imperialism promoted the economic and social prosperity of the imperialist nations, the colonial territories were pauperized and dehumanized through imperialist economic and social policies.

Edmund Burke, another exponent of the Doctrine of Trusteeship as a justification for imperialism in Africa and Asia, held that the exercise of political power should be in the interest of those over whom power is exercised. He declared,

All political power which is set over mankind

106 Ibid, p. 56
ought to be in some way or the other exercised ultimately for their benefit. 107

It is interesting to note here that Burke is speaking at the level of the ideal: what "ought" to be the case. But what "ought" to be and "what is" are often times several poles apart. This is particularly the case with the Doctrine of Trusteeship. European imperialists who assumed, sincerely or hypocritically, that God (some would prefer Nature!) put the weaker races of Africa and Asia in their trust for protection and guidance exercised their political hegemony over these races for their selfish ends. Even when professing that their exercise of political authority would benefit the weaker races in the long-run, when they are expected to graduate from tutelage to independence, the imperialists' pretentions became manifest when they denied independence to colonial societies even when they believed that they had graduated from tutelage.

If the ideal for the exercise of political authority as proclaimed above by Burke were to be practised, that is, if the exercise of political authority were to be for the benefit of the governed, the world would have been a better place. For rulers would be less selfish, less brutal, less exploitative towards their subjects. And the welfare of the subjects would have been the genuine concern of the rulers. But this is not so. The truth is that most

107 Ibid, p. 57 (quoted).
of those who exercise political authority over others do so for their own personal or group benefit at the detriment of the governed. 108

The dual-mandate principle was equally supported by some international organizations and assemblies constituted by imperialist countries. Among them were the "Berlin Convention" of February 26, 1885 — at which the partition and colonization of Africa was legitimated by the imperialist powers. This convention, in Article VI agreed to act as trustees for the preservation of the aboriginal population and the betterment of their social and moral conditions, so that they might be instructed to understand and appreciate the advantages of civilization. 109

Equally, Article XXII of the covenant of the League of Nations asserts that the backward races (of Africa and Asia) were

---

108 Thus, imperialist administrators exercised political authority over their colonial subjects for their personal and national interests. If the colonizers had ruled for the benefit of the colonial peoples, then the latter would not have been economically and socially impoverished by the former. Again, the colonial peoples would not have had to fight for their independence before they gained it. In fact, the dual mandate principle was not practiced by the imperialists. Theirs was actually exploitation without responsibility as they paid no attention to the economic and social plight of their colonial peoples. History bears witness that it was the one-sided system of economic exploitation established through imperialism that accounts for the abject poverty which bedevils the erstwhile colonial territories today. Thus we find the countries of Africa and Asia neck-deep in insolvency and vegetating economically.

"a sacred trust of civilization" who are supposed to undergo an indefinite period of tutelage before initiation into the "mysteries" of "civilization." \(^{110}\)

Azikiwe summarizes the Doctrine of Trusteeship and its bearing on Dual-Mandate principle as follows:

Man is not necessarily a wolf to every other man. Backward races have a right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The existence of a ruler who exploits the resources of a country, inhabited by backward races, attaches responsibility for the welfare of the governed. If the exploitation should be an aid towards a process of civilization, it is justifiable, but it should be carried out on the dual mandate principle — exploitation for the beneficiaries of civilization. \(^{111}\)

This summary is actually from the point of view of the exponents of the doctrines of Exploitation and Trusteeship. Azikiwe was simply stating their position.

The doctrines of Exploitation and Trusteeship present imperialism as a humanitarian policy. Their exponents present imperialism as if it were actually undertaken for the best interest of the colonial peoples. The doctrines purport to recognize some rights of the so-called "backward races" which were to be respected and protected by the colonial administrators. They included the rights to life, property and pursuit of happiness. Exponents of the Doctrine of Exploitation believed that it was justifiable because it was meant to be carried out in exchange for

\(^{110}\) Ibid, p. 57
\(^{111}\) Ibid, p. 61
the benefits of European civilization.

But the apparently fine doctrine of Trusteeship turned out to be a farce in practical terms as various European nations embarked on direct colonization of the so-called backward races to whom they conceded no real rights beyond verbal proclamations. Azikiwe observes that "the expressions of the doctrine of trusteeship are sham ambiguities"112 and quotes an authority as asserting that

All imperialists are disposed to issue mealy-mouthed and pious platitudes regarding their solicitude for Native interests. Such statements should always be taken cum grano salis as rationalizations and justifications of exploitation.113

Really, the insincerity and hypocrisy of imperialists were brought to the fore by their actual practices. European imperialism was through and through selfishly motivated and any purported humanitarian motives were but post-mortem rationalizations. Invariably, the awareness of the ruthless selfishness of European imperialists by the colonial subjects elicited serious reactions against them and the philosophy of imperialism. It was such reactions that eventually crystallized genuine liberation efforts.

D. Effects of Imperialism:

Here, Azikiwe seeks to analyse the effects of imperialism, particularly in Africa. Some of the effects were

112 Ibid, p. 61
113 Ibid, pp. 61-62 (Azikiwe did not name his "authority.")
negative (he calls these "problems of imperialism") while others were positive. We shall begin their examination with the negative results of imperialism.

(i) Negative Effects (Problems) of Imperialism:

Azikiwe analyses the negative results of imperialism and the problems it created in Africa in the racial, social, educational, economic and political spheres. 114

Racially, Azikiwe observes that imperialism encouraged racial arrogance and the assumption of racial superiority by the imperial masters over the subjugated peoples. As Azikiwe puts it,

the contact of two races which belong to an imperialist country and exploited country respectively, leads to an arrogation of superiority and inferiority, respectively. 115

Hence the English, the French, the Italian and other European nationals regarded themselves as superior to the Africans because they ruled over them. The same feeling is true of the Japanese towards the Korean or Formosan over whom they ruled. This attitude led Europeans to generally believe that they were progressive and superior while Africans and Asians were "backward" and inferior. Certain "intelligent tests" were purportedly performed to support the European claim to superiority and to further justify the policy of racial discrimination. Azikiwe observes that this state of affair "leads to clashes which do not tend to promote goodwill and inter-racial friendship." 116

114 Ibid., pp. 61-62
115 Ibid., p. 62
115 Ibid., p. 62
Equally, the assumption of innate superiority by the imperialist race made its members to articulate an unfair, a discriminatory, brutal and dehumanizing social ideology designed to impress upon the "Native" races (of Africa and Asia) their status of inferiority. Hence, there were "cases of brutality and debauchery" in Africa before and after. The fact that Africans were flogged mercilessly and at times to death by their colonial masters, buttresses this point. In this regard, Azikiwe observes that the social problems created by European imperialism in Africa show

how the seed of racial superiority has sprouted into a tree of social arrogance, which eventually bore fruit of snobbery and consequent results which must prove disastrous to both the imperialist and the exploited. 117

This prophecy was fulfilled at the dawn of nationalist activities in the colonial territories. Meanwhile, imperial domination had seriously undermined the social status of the colonial peoples, their humanity and perpetuated disharmony, selfish individualism, tribalism and sectionalism in their worst forms among them. 118

Educationally, the imperialist policy for the colonies fell short of the ideal of education. Colonial education was simply designed to serve the interests of the colonial administration rather than to enable the colonial subjects develop their potentialities and lead fulfilling lives.

117 Ibid, p. 52
118 Ibid, p. 78
European colonizers regarded the education of the so-called backward races as a "problem" partly because no matter how limited it might be, it still had the potentiality of spreading awareness among the colonial peoples. But since education of the colonial peoples was necessary in order to fully exploit them, efforts were made to "reduce education to the lowest minimum, possibly the four R's — Reading, 'Riting, 'Rithmetic and Religion." 119

Economically, the policy of an all-round exploitation made the imperialists increasingly richer while the colonized peoples became increasingly poorer. The economic interests of the imperialist countries were pursued with such ruthlessness that the economies of the colonial peoples were ruined. Imperialism did upset the local economies within which it operated. Production, distribution, consumption and exchange patterns underwent radical changes for the benefits of European imperialists. The production of raw materials to feed the industries of the imperialist nations was ensured through the labour of the colonial peoples which was usually grossly underpaid and often obtained by force.

119 Ibid, p. 63 (Invariably, colonial education was one-sided and parochial. It was such as to discourage the growth of science and technology. And since erstwhile colonial territories still retained most of the educational legacies of their former imperialist masters, it is little surprise that scientific and technological advancement in such areas is almost nil. Consequently, it created a situation of technological dependence on their former imperialist masters. This, in the main, accounts for the present neo-colonialist status of former colonies because they have to over-depend on the products of technology and the technological know-how of their erstwhile colonial masters whose exploitative policies, now most subtle, never changed since the dawn of imperialism).
This policy brought the "problems of wages, conditions of work, industrial accidents, forced labour, etc., to the fore." In addition, the colonial economic policy ensured that European goods must be distributed to the colonies at highly profitable prices to the manufacturers, while "raw materials must be bought from Natives at the prices dictated by the imperialist firms ...."  

Perhaps, one of the most serious economic effects of imperialism on the colonies was the dispossession of the colonial peoples of their lands, in many cases. Azikiwe observes that Natives' lands have also been confiscated on the ground of the right of eminent domain; among some powers, these unfairly acquired lands have been leased and subleased to plantation owners where Native labourers have suffered all sorts of inhumanity.  

Appropriation of the agricultural lands by the imperialists was a severe economic blow to the agrarian colonial peoples. This became one of the major areas of emphasis on the evils of imperialism by nationalist movements within the colonies.  

Politically, apart from the outright loss of independence by the colonial peoples as a result of the imposition
of European rulership by force, the doctrine of tutelage raised some unsettled fundamental problems. For instance, there was the question as to

Whether the period of tutelage is definite or indefinite? If it is the former, who is entitled to decide when a ward is ready to assume the task of autonomy — the imperialist state or the exploited Native? If it is the latter, is it consistent with the policy of trusteeship, and must it be accepted as revealed by law, handed down from Mount Sinai, without the Natives making just demands, in accordance with the verdict of history? 123

We can observe here that the problems created by imperialism have had far-reaching consequences in many respects. Such consequences are almost palpable till this day. First, it fundamentally weakened cultural and social life in those colonies which have now attained political independence. This was done through propaganda — educational and otherwise — which extolled everything European and denounced the things that are indigenous to the colonial peoples.

Perhaps, the most far-reaching consequences of the problems created by imperialism can be seen in the area of economics. We have noted that the imperialist economic policies in the colonies were ruthlessly exploitative. Thus, the colonies were no more than economic fields of the imperial powers which made them sources of raw materials and markets for manufactured goods. To ensure abundant supply of raw

123 Ibid, p. 54
materials on steady basis, the imperialists invariably made the colonies mono-cultural — depending on the production of agricultural raw materials for European industries as the only source of foreign exchange earnings. This ensured that the economies of the erstwhile colonial territories were, and are still, tied to the apron-strings of the economies of their former colonial masters. Thus, it was the imperialists that ensured that the economies of present African States are mono-cultural with the attendant fragility and outside dependence.

We have equally observed that the one-sided and parochial colonial educational policy is responsible for the current low level of scientific and technological growth in the former colonial territories. We further need to observe that the strong economic hold on the former colonies through subtle neo-colonial policies still allows the imperialists to manipulate the economy and politics of the purportedly independent states of Africa and Asia. Thus, through the multi-national corporations, imperialists manipulate local situations to perpetuate their exploitation of the people.

APPARENT BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF IMPERIALISM

The apparent beneficial effects of imperialism to the colonial societies were largely indirect. In many cases, the potentiality of imperialism to yield some beneficial results were stifled by the imperialists. For, apart from such minimally-provided social facilities as schools, hospitals
and roads, which were really intended to serve imperialist interest, imperialism hardly yielded much direct benefits to the colonial societies. The main beneficiaries from imperialism were the imperialist states and individuals. However, while it may not be correct to assert that colonization brought nothing beneficial to colonial societies, one should be cautious in asserting the beneficence of colonization.

Azikiwe observes that the imperialist doctrine of trusteeship had the potentiality of being of lasting benefits to colonial societies. But such potentiality was not actually realized. He has in mind the possibility of cross-fertilization of cultures which often occurred when two or more cultures came into contact. The benefits which could have accrued from cross-cultural contacts were not allowed to materialize by the imperialists who used force to subjugate and dehumanize the colonial peoples. Besides, the cultural basis for mutual contact between the imperialist societies and the colonial societies was destroyed by the assumption of superiority and racial arrogance on the part of the colonial masters over the colonial peoples.

According to Azikiwe, there are three possible relations which can arise as a result of contacts between cultures, namely, accommodation, assimilation or amalgamation. He wrote, "by accommodating the people from imperialist states, there is gradual assimilation and possible amalgamation, of cultural patterns." 124

He notes that when two cultures come into contact, the weaker culture may become imitative or emulative of the stronger culture. When a weaker culture becomes imitative in its contact with another culture, it will become assimilated into that culture. This has been the situation in most cases of cultural relations between the imperialists and their colonial subjects. Equally, when the tendency of the weaker culture in any inter-cultural contact is emulative of the stronger culture, it leads to amalgamation of cultures.

He explains that "accommodation" of one culture by another exists when two cultures come into contact and still enjoy their separate existence in an atmosphere of mutual goodwill and friendship. He observes that bi-racial existence based on accommodation implies that "members of both races lived in a world of their own; but when secondary group relationships made it necessary for both to come into contact, they accommodate themselves as separate entities." 125

On the other hand, "assimilation" is the product of an "imitative" tendency on the part of a weaker race, of the invading culture of the imperialist race. Under assimilation, Azikiwe maintains, contiguous races are able to modify their cultures and institutions without their separate entities being affected. But in the colonial

situation, assimilation entailed the super-imposition of the purportedly superior culture of the imperialists on the so-called inferior races with the serious consequence of almost obliterating the native cultures of the colonized peoples.  

The imitative attitude of the colonized peoples helped to crystallize an inferiority complex "because there was a process of Europeanization and de-Africanization." This process of assimilation invariably produced the "Europeanized Natives" who were usually contemptuous of the "Native culture-complex, and the resultant experience is the disintegration of Native social institutions." This led to loss of self-confidence by the colonized peoples who in the long run became heavily dependent on the imperialist countries in major areas of national life.

It was this deculturalization of the colonial subjects that apparently gave the impression that they acquiesced in the European presumption of superiority and the divine mission to civilize "backward races." It was such false impression that made L. Woolf to observe that "until the very end of the century, natives and heathens themselves seemed to acquiesce in this view of the design of providence and blessings of being ruled by

126 Ibid., p. 183
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Finally, Azikiwe notes that there could be a process of amalgamation between various cultural groups when they come into lasting contact. He explains that this involves "the intermixture of the races so that the dominant characteristics of the one over-shadowed and finally obliterated the recessive characteristics of the other." This entails the socio-biological destruction of racial barriers, and the symbiotic harmonization (through natural process) of the races such that, in the colonial set-up, what seems to be the best of the imperialist culture-complex is assimilated and, with the amalgam, there is an adaptive process which makes the Native to use his reasoning faculty to effect.

Amalgamation of different cultures is usually brought about, according to Azikiwe, by the process of emulation through which the different interacting cultures tend to sift and integrate what is best in each other to give birth to a higher cultural evolution. This implies the eclectic attitude which Azikiwe has favoured throughout the gamut of his writings.

Among the possible inter-racial relations highlighted above, Azikiwe favours "amalgamation" whereby the good

elements of the various cultures which come into contact would be assimilated and the discardable ones discarded to enhance the advancement of individual cultures. This usually happened naturally when the dynamics of inter-cultural association is not tempered with. This is because cultural exchange works both ways.\textsuperscript{132}

But, regrettably, cultural amalgamation was not allowed by the imperialists to take place between the European culture and the cultures of the colonized peoples of Africa and Asia. For, by arrogating to themselves a status of superiority and the custodianship of civilization, the imperialists induced a feeling of inferiority and backwardness on the colonized peoples who consequently became "imitative" in their attitude towards the imperialist cultures. This attitude well-served the interests of imperialist countries most of which designed official policies of assimilation or total Europeanization of the colonized peoples with all manners of force. Thus we find that the dominant relation between the imperialist culture and the colonial cultures was that of "assimilation" instead of "amalgamation." This was mainly the handiwork of the religious and educational organizations of the imperialists.

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid, p. 56

\textsuperscript{133} For instance, the French social polity in the colonies was to assimilate the colonial subjects into French culture.
However, Azikiwe concedes that these imperialist institutions were equally capable of producing the "emulative" attitude which would have led to cultural amalgamation. But the emulative attitude was not totally lost on the colonized peoples even though it was very minimal. The emulative spirit, by accident rather than by the design of the imperialists, later gave rise to nationalist struggles for independence which questioned the inconsistencies of the imperialist philosophy and challenged the dogma of racial superiority. 134

Generally, Azikiwe observes that imperialism brought a mixed bag of woes and few benefits to the colonized peoples through the imperialists educational and religious organizations. Among those woes were loss of political independence, economic exploitation and dislocation, socio-cultural emasculation, the inculcation of the imitative spirit which praised everything European and discredited most things indigenous to the colonized peoples, structural unemployment and the intensification of social vices. On the other hand, some beneficial influences of European colonization on the colonial peoples, though unintended, can be seen in the thirst for learning, a certain degree of detribalization, the desire for political autonomy, which education and conversion of the Natives engendered. 135


135 Ibid, p. 66
However, we should observe that Azikiwe's treatment of possible relationships that can exist when two or more cultures come into contact is not quite satisfactory. To start with, he presents "accommodation," "amalgamation" and "assimilation" as if they were mutually exclusive. But they are not. They are rather complementary in their positive and negative aspects.

In race/cultural relations, one culture has to accommodate another, either willingly, cunningly, unwillingly or by force so that contact is made. Then, the process of assimilation takes place so that the useful or dominant elements in one culture is assimilated by another. This is then cemented by amalgamation which is integrative. Even though one may hypothesize on race relations in any of those terms, it is pertinent to note that the associationist is hypocritical; the amalgamationist, forceful while the assimilationist is cunning.

Whichever way one may look at race relations the contact between the stronger and weaker races is usually dangerous for the mental and material well-being of the individuals of the weaker race and their society at large. So much that Azikiwe's preference of "amalgamation" as the best and desired race relation which should have existed between the European culture and the African culture amounts to accepting what he is rejecting in a different package. Whether the cultural process among different peoples is described as accommodative, amalgamative or assimilative, the effects on
the peoples in the weaker culture would largely be adverse because it would usually involve their loss of freedom.

To conclude this analysis of imperialism, it is pertinent to observe that Azikiwe showed interest only in the results or effects of imperialism on colonial societies. He did not, when he should have bothered to, consider the effects of imperialism on the imperialist nations themselves. However, some prominent writers on imperialism have tried to analyse the effects of imperialism on imperialist countries — often with patronizing partiality.

In this regard, we may briefly aggregate the different points made by Kenneth Waltz and J. A. Hobson. Their views are controversial in certain respects, as we shall see. First, Waltz observes that the policy of imperialism promoted employment in the imperialist countries through the export of surplus capital and labour to the colonies. This was beneficial to imperialist nations because it helped to solve the unemployment problem which beset them. In consequence, some socio-political upheavals which could have resulted from adverse economic conditions, as Cecil Rhodes, the British apostle of colonialism, had feared were averted in the imperialist nation-states.

However, Waltz and Hobson maintain that the main

\[136\] Waltz, Op. cit., p. 23

\[137\] Cf. Lenin, Op. cit., p. 75
beneficiaries from the imperialist policies were the individual businessmen and investors who made excessive gains. The imperialist nations as a whole, they contended, suffered some huge financial losses which far exceeded their gains because it involved these nations in the maintenance of large armies in the colonies and the bearing of the costs of some wars that were fought.

We should observe that Waltz and Hobson can hardly maintain their claim that "their" imperialist nations suffered huge financial losses in view of the fact that the excessive economic gains from the imperialist exploitative policies easily offset the so-called "huge financial losses." The fact which Waltz and Hobson should admit is that both the individuals and the nations that practised imperialism gained excessively from it. Waltz and Hobson's attempt to make imperialism seem more beneficial to the individual businessmen and investors — pretending as if individual prosperity is totally divorced from national prosperity — than the nation as a whole is an exercise in sophistry. It is indeed a manifest distortion of evident fact of economic history.

Equally, Waltz notes that the pursuit of imperialist policies produced social and political consequences in the imperialist nations. According to him, it led to the development of militarism or to the dependence on native
troops, set forces in motion that were antagonistic to social and economic reform, sustained and enlarged an effete aristocracy dependent on tributes from Asia and Africa, and ultimately turned many Western Europeans into parasitic people. 138 The impression Waltz is trying to give here is that the pursuit of imperial policies not only involved the imperialist nations in "huge financial losses," it also produced adverse social and political consequences on those nations. But the patronizing partiality of Waltz here is quite evident. He seems to be telling colonial societies to stop crying about the problems created by imperialism for them because the imperialist nations themselves had their own share of problems created by imperialism. But even if we concede that imperialism produced some adverse socio-political consequences in the imperialist nations, they are but a child's play compared to the numerous permanent and transient problems which imperial domination created in the colonial territories. Again, if the pursuit of imperialism had adverse effects on the imperialist nations as Waltz tries to argue, why did those nations not stop imperialist policies wilfully?

It should be observed that Waltz and Hobson's analyses of the effects of imperialism on the imperialist nations, despite their

persuasiveness, are revisionistic. This is in the sense that these authors presented imperialist nations as fellow-sufferers of the adverse consequences of imperialism, contrary to what may be called popular opinion. They are trying to belie the immeasurable gains which both the imperialist nations and the individuals made from the policy of imperialism so as to diminish the catalogue of losses suffered by the colonial nations and peoples. Their analyses in this regard seem to be propaganda-oriented. It is like telling the colonized nations not to shout so much about their woes because their "mother countries" equally sustained more losses than gains in pursuit of imperialist policies. This is a white lie because imperialism brought unprecedented prosperity and prestige to the imperialist nations while it emasculated colonized societies economically, socially and politically.

2.2 THE RISE OF EUROPEAN IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA

Azikiwe believes that imperialism was inevitable from the point of view of history. This is true to the extent that imperialism is based on the ethics of force, and force is the manifestation of an aggressiveness for self-preservation and security which are fulfilled by the existence of dominance over others.

Azikiwe also based his conclusion about the inevitability of imperialism on the evolutionist theories of the principle of natural selection and the survival of the fittest. 140

Azikiwe would agree that where there is power imbalance, weakness invites dominion, and strength invites dominion and strength seeks expression in dominion of the weak. He believes that the strong has the natural tendency to dominate the weak. 141 Thus European imperialism in Africa was accomplished by the superiority of armament, cunningly through treaties, betrayed through bribery and corruption, and divide and rule tactics, that ensured European colonization of Africa.

Furthermore, Azikiwe would agree that every human being/race is potentially endowed with the power to act and the will to act. Yet, when the two are not effectively

140 "The survival of the fittest" is one of those dogmas in the theory of evolution that are hardly challenged. But this dogma is a misnomer because it is not only the fittest that survives in a world of competition. Both the "fit" and the "fitter ... than" survive as well. The "fittest" not only survive, they prosper and dominate others. It is more proper to say that in a world of intensive competition, only the fit survives.


142 These concepts, "the power to act" and "the will to act" were not employed by Azikiwe although he implied them (Cf. My Odyssey, Op cit., p. 33). These concepts were explicitly formulated by F.D.P. Bah in his attempt to explain why imperialism took place in Africa (Cf. Bah, Op. cit.).
combined, nothing can be accomplished. In other words, when the power to act is not complemented with the will to act or vice versa, nothing can be accomplished. But an effective combination of the two can bring about momentous consequences. He seems to argue that the Industrial Revolution of the 19th century had tremendously increased the Europeans' power and will to act, and placed in their hands a tremendous force which sought expression in inter-continental conquests.

The industrial revolution which gave birth to the production of unprecedented and sophisticated weapons of war, faster means of communication and a host of other facilities, had pushed the power at the disposal of Europe far beyond that of any other continent. It was with this tremendous force that Europe imposed her hegemony on the continents of Asia and Africa which gave way in the face of a stronger force.

Azikiwe maintains that the European colonization of Africa was facilitated by the friendly, hospitable and impressionistic dispositions of Africans who readily, in many cases, welcomed and accommodated the white imperialists even at the point of the sword. But the European imperialists were dishonest and exploitative in their relations with the Africans. They exploited Africans in

all imaginable ways and made laws that undermined the social status of the Africans and their institutions. European imperialists embarked on subtle but deliberate policies which were designed to destroy the African "psyche" and make him lose faith in himself and in his capabilities as a human being. The colonized Africans were thus gradually but progressively hypnotized into almost totally acquiescing in their trumpeted inferiority complex for a long time. Thus, we can observe that imperialism thrived on tricks and dishonest practices backed up with force.

Azikiwe opines that history has revealed a strong tendency for the strong to dominate the weak. For example, Britain was once colonized by Rome; America by Britain; Africa and Asia by Britain, France, Germany, Italy and some other European imperialist nations. He thus concludes that it is desirable (since it is inevitable) — for the stronger races to rule the weaker ones,

provided the rulers will act merely as guides and guardians on the dual mandate principle — exploitation for development, trusteeship and tutelage — and provided that the ruling power is willing to surrender its suzerainty if and when the ward is convinced that he is fledged for political independence.\(^{145}\)

\(^{144}\) Ibid, p. 78

\(^{145}\) Ibid, p. 67
We have to observe the illogicality in Azikiwe's assertion that since imperialism is inevitable, it is desirable, despite the provisors. For something cannot be desirable simply because it is inevitable. Inevitability does not imply desirability. We cannot agree with Azikiwe that imperialism was desirable because it was inevitable. We should normally desire what is beneficial or good for us. Besides, imperialism is not inevitable, given the concept of free will. Perhaps, Azikiwe meant that it would have been desirable for the stronger races to rule the weaker races if by so doing the latter would be guided along the path of development and be granted independence at their request without any delay. But this was not the case despite all pretentions of the imperialist nations.

European imperialist policies in Africa have exposed imperialism as a philosophy of selfish economic exploitation and socio-political domination which thrives on brute force. Thus imperialism earned the opprobrium with which the colonized peoples have come to regard it. Its theoretical pretentions of benevolence became nakedly exposed through its actual operations.

Azikiwe observes that the imperialists did not truly regard themselves as "guides and guardians" of colonial societies with whom they would have maintained a symbiotic
relationship for economic and social development. The imperialists regarded their colonial subjects as mere possessions that must serve the interests of their owners in whatever manner that is deemed fit.

In their aggressive drive for an all-round exploitation of the human and material resources of the colonies, imperialists showed their true colours. Imperialism thus revealed itself as a predatory and dehumanizing philosophy. In so doing, it alerted some perceptive colonial subjects against its pretensions and hypocrisy. Thus, such colonial subjects, spearheaded the fight against imperialism.

2.3 NatuRAL AND LOGICAL CAUSES OF ANTI-IMPERIALISM

It is pertinent to begin this discussion with Azikiwe's most biting condemnation of imperialism. He wrote:

I conceive the cult of imperialism, anywhere it exists, as a crime against humanity, because it enables any section of the human race which is armed with the techniques of modern scientific knowledge without justification to dominate less fortunate sections of humanity, simply because the latter are unequal in the task of resisting the force which buttresses such domination ... Continuance of such philosophy cannot but be regarded by me as a chronic disease which must invite drastic remedy .... 145

He believes that the evils of imperialism were such that whatever means that could eradicate it (even force) is desirable, which we shall examine later.

According to Azikiwe, imperialism has to be eradicated because its doctrine of racial superiority and encouragement of racial discrimination contradict the basic doctrines of most religions — including Christianity which the imperialists profess, and Islam — that all men were created by an Almighty Father/God before whom all men are said to be equal. And, even if one does not accept the equality of all men on religious grounds, one would at least concede that human equality is one of the fundamental assumptions of the natural laws of any society. Thus imperialism violates the principle of human equality which is a fundamental pillar upon which society is erected.

Azikiwe refuses to accept the imperialist claim to racial superiority based on the superiority of brute force which subdued colonial societies. He insists that

If we accept [as the imperialists themselves do] that Christian or Muslim doctrine that God is perfect and man was made in the image of God, then it would be sacrilegious if not heretical to believe that we Africans/colonial peoples are an inferior race. 147

Thus, by denying the equality of all men and races,

irrespective of colour and strength, imperialism is heretical not only from the religious point of view but also from the societal point of view. For this reason, imperialism is destructive of the social basis of all human communities and has to be eradicated.

What the imperialists failed to appreciate, according to Azikiwe, was that inability to organize a stable civilization or ability to organize one is no proof of the inferiority or superiority, respectively, of the races concerned. In fact, history shows that there is no race that is bereft of a civilization if by this term we mean developed material and immaterial culture. What can be conceded is that a particular civilization may be more sophisticated and more virile than another. Perhaps, this is what can be said about European civilization and African civilization on the eve of European contact with Africa; the former appeared to be more virile and sophisticated than the latter and was able to supplant it to a very great extent.

The belief in racial equality among emergent African nationalists and socio-political philosophers was reinforced by the occurrence of the two World Wars during which African soldiers fought side by side with their European counterparts. Africans saw that the same humanity ran through both blacks and whites; both were subject to fear, hunger, agony, death from bullet wounds, execution

of bravery, and so on. The war experiences shattered the European myth of invincibility and exposed the pretense to superiority by the imperialists which only served to keep colonial societies under their exploitative grips.

Furthermore, Azikiwe argues that imperialism has to be fought and eliminated because its ethics of force, that is, that superiority of force justified the actions of its wielder, is brutish and confounds moral reasoning. The ethics of imperialism is thus an inversion of the universal sense of morality which most religions preach and which many ethicists elucidate. Thus imperialism deserved to be eradicated as an immoral philosophy.

Equally, another ground for anti-imperialism according to Azikiwe, was that it thrived on double standards, contradictions and duplicity as can be observed in the ruthless exploitation and dislocation of the economies of the colonial territories, in defending political independence in Europe and spoliating same in the colonies. The anomalies perpetuated through imperialism are evident in the human rights declaration and enjoyment by the nationals of the imperialist nations and their denial to colonial societies as well as in the Christian doctrine of equality of all men before God and the actual discriminatory policies against colonial societies by European imperialists who professed to be Christians.

Azikiwe further observes double standards in the Europeans' fight against oppression in Europe while they were
at the same time oppressing colonial societies.\textsuperscript{149} He also notes the inconsistency in the imperialists' purport to help colonial societies to mature politically and their refusal to allow them to participate in their own governance.

According to Azikiwe, the logic of imperialism was worked out on the "false belief about the incapacity of the colonial peoples to develop initiative." \textsuperscript{150} Thus the imperialist assumed the right to determine what is good for colonial societies. Observing the wrongs perpetrated under this guise by the imperialists, Azikiwe asserts that politically, British colonial policy has been to grant dependent peoples constitutions which are essentially autocratic. In spite of treaty obligations, Britain has ruled British protectorates and mandates as if they were British crown colonies. The idea and implications of trusteeship have been misapplied or flouted so that the terminology is meaningless to the colonial peoples. Denial of elementary rights such as freedom of speech and of the press and freedom of association and assembly is rife. \textsuperscript{151}

What is said about British imperialism is valid for the French, Japanese, Italian and German-imperialist policies.

Anti-imperialism also arose out of the deplorable social conditions which prevailed in the colonial situation.

\textsuperscript{149}ibid., p. 79

\textsuperscript{150}Azikiwe, Zik: A Selection from the Speeches of Naamdi
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Imperialists practised racial segregation and discrimination which dehumanized colonial peoples and robbed them of self-confidence which is vital for self-realization. The colonial educational policy was designed to cater for the very few who were required to serve colonialist interests. Social amenities were either totally lacking in most parts of the colonies or abysmally inadequate. Besides, religious intolerance was increasingly practised against colonial societies whose indigenous religions were despised and described in the most opprobrious terms. 152

Another ground for anti-imperialist feeling was the strangulating economic policies of the imperialists. According to Azikiwe

the colonial peoples have been made to appreciate that colonial possessions constitute "undeveloped estates" specially reserved as a legacy for exploitation by the colonial power in control, either through a closed door policy or a system of preferential tariff or as a dumping ground for the unemployed of the 'Protecting State.' This policy has affected the colonial peoples adversely. There exists in colonial territories a regime of monopoly which has a stranglehold on the countries' economy ... Labour is exploited and victimized galore [sic]. 153

Agriculture which was the mainstay of the colonial economies did not receive much attention. And if it received

152 ibid, p. 154
153 ibid, p. 155
any attention from the imperialists, it was only such that would ensure a steady supply of raw materials to their home industries. There was no effort to modernize agriculture in order to better the lot of the colonial peoples who were mainly farmers. The colonialists determined the price at which they purchased agricultural raw materials and fixed the price at which they sold their manufactured goods to colonial societies. In so doing, they were both the judge and the plaintiff.

The imperialists purposefully refused to introduce industrial policies in their colonies — not even for the purpose of establishing agro-allied industries. By this deliberate policy of non-industrialization of the colonies, the imperialists ensured a system of continued dependence of colonial societies for industrial and capital goods even when they had got their political independence. This was the genesis of the present neo-colonialist situation in the erstwhile colonial territories: a situation of sham political independence not based on economic self-determination — i.e., without adequate economic foundation.

Even in the mining industry which had to be carried out because of its huge financial yields, there was no attempt to mechanize it. It was sustained with the direct labour of colonial societies who worked under the most deplorable conditions and earned starvation wages. The benefits which would have accrued to their labour went to their imperialist overlords.
We can now begin to understand that, in general terms, Azikiwe's anti-imperialism revolves around two important concepts, even though he did not actually employ them. They are "alienation" and "freedom." Three classical expositors of the concept of "alienation" were Hegel, Feuerbach and Marx. By "alienation" here we mean "being estranged from a part of oneself." This is close to the meaning which the above three thinkers assign to it.

Through the imperialist economic policies, colonial societies were made to undertake production, not as a wilful and free activity towards self-creation and self-realization but for the appropriation and enjoyment of their colonial overlords. Thus they suffered alienation. This is explained by the fact that labour, is the means through which man realizes his essence. In other words, each time man engages in production, he is re-creating himself and he becomes objectified in his products. Those products are part of him and should be enjoyed by him. But when his product is taken away from him and enjoyed by another person without giving him a commensurate value in exchange, he has been alienated or estranged from a part of him — his product. This is what imperialists did to the colonial peoples. Here is a case of what Marxists call dehumanization per excellence.

It is this alienation that colonial societies must overcome in order to be free. But what is freedom? Without getting entangled with the controversies over what freedom precisely means, we wish to speak of freedom in relative terms, in particular situations, instead of taking it to be an absolute. Thus "freedom from" is conceived as freedom from a particular thing or situation; while "freedom to" also relates to particular things or situations. Hence, we may talk of "freedom to" move about, chat with friends, decide what one wants, pursue any career of one's choice, and so on.

In the context of our analysis, the colonial peoples would become free when they overcome alienation. To overcome alienation is to remove or abolish its source. For colonial societies, this would mean the elimination of imperialism which was the source of alienation. It is only then that they would attain freedom. Here, freedom means de-alienation or absence of alienation.

To talk of negative freedom implies that there is positive freedom, usually expressed as "freedom to" in contrast with "freedom from." This is what Bah, borrowing from Western classical tradition, calls "negative freedom" expressed as "freedom from." Positive freedom from colonialism would mean freedom to pursue economic, social and political life as they deem fit without any interference from within or without their territories.

To summarize the grounds for anti-imperialism from Azikiwe's point of view, we note that imperialism must be fought and eradicated because it is "a crime against humanity." Imperialism is morally wrong and offensive; socially inhuman and repugnant; economically parasitic and pauperizing; psychologically destructive, dehumanizing and degrading, politically ruinous, and logically inconsistent in its doctrines and policies. Azikiwe concludes that imperialism has to be fought with whatever means that is judged effective in eradicating it on the African continent, and indeed anywhere it rears its head.

CHAPTER THREE

ZIKI ON COLONIAL EMANCIPATION

There you have people whose thinking has evolved beyond the primal stage and who allow reason to control their thought; where you have people who appreciate their common affinity and live in a co-operative spirit; where you have people who are economically secure individually and colectively, where you have people who are creative in the social and material cultures of mankind, you cannot keep them politically subservient indefinitely.

The assertion in the above quotation sets the general tone for Azikiwe's philosophy for Africa's emancipation from imperialism. Here, some pertinent questions to which Azikiwe's answers will be examined include: what is the meaning of colonial emancipation? How can colonial societies emancipate themselves from imperialism?

It has to be observed that Azikiwe did not undertake a conceptual analysis of the meaning of colonial emancipation as he did with "imperialism." However, his many pronouncements on African liberation from colonial domination clearly illuminate his conception of colonial emancipation. What emerges from his various discussions on the subject is that he conceives colonial emancipation as a multi-dimensional issue. It means freedom from mental, economic, social and political domination by the white race or any other imperialist race(s). It is very important that colonial emancipation be tackled and realized in all these fronts because imperialism has gripped colonial societies in every facet of human life. This gives a clear perspective of the nature of the struggle for national liberation in colonial Africa - it is still the perspective which will inform the struggle to free Africa from neo-colonialism.

Azikiwe emphasizes that the achievement of freedom in one sphere alone does not amount to real colonial emancipation. In other words, political freedom without mental and economic freedom is a sham.

He further stresses that true colonial emancipation required that all colonial societies, everywhere, be first freed from imperial domination. In other words, the achievement of emancipation by a few colonial states does not amount to true emancipation so long as their brothers and sisters are under imperialism anywhere in the world. This is because freedom which is a prerequisite for peace is indivisible just as peace itself is indivisible. He argues that if we accept the oneness of mankind, we cannot claim to be enjoying real freedom while the other part is in bondage. The point is that if we accept the oneness of mankind, a part of that whole cannot be truly enjoying freedom while the other is in bondage. If there is any claim to that effect, the part making the claim is self-alienated - estranged from self and thus not free.

Again, not only does Azikiwe make total eradication of imperialism the condition for true freedom, he implies that it is not only in the interest of the colonial societies that imperialism be eradicated, it is also in the interest of the imperialist nations as well. He explains that since freedom is the condition for peace and since both are regarded as indivisible, the search for world peace by the white and yellow races since the end of World War II can hardly yield long lasting fruit so long as they still dominate and exploited other peoples. He writes:

One half of the world cannot enjoy peace while the other half lives in the throes of war. You may succeed in averting war between the blocs, but yours will be a hollow victory so long as any part of the world remains a colonial territory, it is clear that imperialism is a perennial source of war.\(^3\)

3. Ibid. p.63
On how colonial emancipation was to be achieved, Azikiwe maintains that the unity of colonial societies is a prerequisite. To him, this unity has two levels. First, a unity of colonial subjects living in a particular territory who together would launch an attack against colonialists. Second, the colonial territories which had been able to liberate themselves would unite and aid other territories still fighting to overthrow colonial domination. This would eventually lead to a total decolonization of the world, Azikiwe believes.

Azikiwe's emphasis on unity among colonial societies as a prerequisite for true emancipation is informed by his observation that European imperialism in Africa succeeded mainly because the imperialists exerted a stronger force than the Africans could resist. He seems to suggest that despite the fact that European imperialists had superior weapons, the Africans would have, through sheer determination and numerical strength, been able to resist colonization if they were united. Azikiwe writes:

... there is no other tangible evidence of the weakness of Africans as a community than their inability to realize the importance of mutual aid in their social economic and political evolutions.160

This lack of unity and co-operation among African peoples made them an easy prey for the European imperialists who isolated and conquered them in bits until the entire continent was under colonial rule.

Thus before imperialism can be overcome, colonial societies have to unite. According to Azikiwe,

... Africans are capable of achieving their place in the sun provided that they discard the spirit of individualism which has so far prevented social cohesion. It cannot be doubted that one reason why Africans seem destined to serve other races for ever is because they have no sense of oneness. 161

But why did the Africans lack a sense of oneness? We may ask Azikiwe. He suggests that it is because the Africans engaged in cut-throat competition among themselves and regarded one another as aliens. 162 But why is this so? Azikiwe does not seem to have raised this question, nor provided an answer. We can, however, surmise that inadequate communication and interaction between Africans living in various territories might have been accountable for regarding one another from various areas as aliens or even hostile enemies.

The estrangement of colonial subjects, one from another, was part of the official policy of the imperialists and they employed all types of tricks to forestall unity as a way of weakening their resistance to domination.

162 Ibid, p. 98
The balkanization of the African continent into private estates of the imperialists and the colonialists' determination to keep each colony isolated from her neighbours created that kind of alienation amongst them as Azikiwe has sketched. The British and French colonial policies in Africa were that of divide-and-rule. This prevented any joint action of colonial societies against their colonizers for a long time. In fact, the artificial administrative units and the adverse consequences which came in its wake for the indigenes, still haunt the post-colonial societies today.

Disunity among colonial peoples may be overcome by identifying a common enemy — imperialism. National or continental cause, history has shown, is capable of rallying round peoples who otherwise would never have come together. Azikiwe hopes that the identification of imperialism as a common enemy of colonial societies could become a unifying force that would eventually ensure colonial emancipation.

According to Azikiwe, the emancipation of individual colonial territories is the first important step towards continental political emancipation. This is because an emancipated African continent is the summation of the various territories in Africa which have been emancipated. It is after the entire continent of Africa has been freed from alien rule that the new order, which Azikiwe calls "New Africa," will be born. The new order has to be first
of all realized at the national or territorial level before it can snowball to the continental level. Thus, from experience and deep reflection, Azikiwe is convinced that:

the crystallization of the New Africa is inevitable after there have been a New Gambia, a New Sierra Leone, a New Liberia, a New Gold Coast, a New Nigeria, and a reascent social evolution in other nations of black Africa.

Now, if the emancipation of individual colonial territories is a sine qua non to the emancipation of the entire continent, then the pertinent question is, how can these territories emancipate themselves from colonial rule? Azikiwe answers that it requires that colonial subjects emancipate themselves first on individual basis, and then unite to emancipate their states. But how can colonial subjects emancipate themselves and their territories so that the envisioned New Africa would be born? To answer this question, Azikiwe enunciates the five tenets of his philosophy for a "New Africa." They are, "spiritual balance," "social regeneration," "economic determinism," "mental emancipation," and "political resorgimento." Let us examine these principles more closely.

163 Ibid, p. 38
164 Ibid, pp. 120-140 (See also, My Odyssey, Op. cit., pp. 252-254). We need to observe that the inclusion of "thought" among those things for which freedom is sought does not quite make sense. This is because "thought" is free already. However, it would have made much sense if Zik had talked of freedom of expression of thought. [Part of footnote 165, see next page]
(a) **Spiritual Balance**: Azikiwe coined this expression "to connote the fundamental freedom of conscience, thought and opinion."\(^{165}\) This freedom has to be recognized by the African as applying to himself as well as to others. This will predispose him to be tolerant of other people's views no matter how different they are from his own. Thus, he would realize that he has a right to think differently or express his opinion differently just as others have. He would recognize that such differences could be the result of differences in experience, orientation, and so on. Such a recognition would not allow difference of opinion to destroy friendship and co-operation\(^{166}\) as seemed to have been the case in Africa. We have to observe that Azikiwe's conception of the principle, "spiritual balance," is a bit obscure. This is especially so with regards to discussion of what he terms inalienable rights. However, we may understand "spiritual balance" to mean broad and accommodating spirit, a spirit of tolerance based on respect for one another's rights and views. It also entails a matured and open-minded approach to issues. Azikiwe insists that the cultivation of spiritual balance by Africans is necessary if the desired unity and co-operation required to eradicate alienation or estrangement are to be achieved.\(^{167}\)

---


(b) **Social Regeneration:** According to Azikiwe, this implies "freedom of association, and freedom from discrimination on account of race, colour, tribe, creed or religion."\(^{163}\) This sounds pretty good, but the big question is how it can be achieved. Also, if by "discrimination" we mean expression of preference towards one or more thing(s), or person(s) among other alternatives, why should one not prefer somebody from one's race instead of members of other races? Or why should one not prefer a person of one's colour instead of people of other colours? The same question can be repeated for tribe, religion and creed to the same effect. Azikiwe's answer seems to be that "if the brotherhood of man is a universal truth, then Africans are brothers, one to another."\(^{163}\) And on the same hypothesis, Africans are related to the inhabitants of Europe, Asia, Australia and America.\(^{170}\) But suppose the brotherhood of man is not a universal truth, what then?

The point is that discrimination on the bases enumerated above by Azikiwe seems to be in the basic disposition of man. How can man avoid what falls among his general attitudes — an attitude of discrimination on certain bases? Azikiwe does not really answer this question. Perhaps, what he is suggesting to colonial societies is that since such discrimination tends to divide rather than unite, they have to minimize

\(^{163}\) Ibid, p. 253  
\(^{170}\) Ibid, p. 123
them for the purpose of attaining unity and emancipating themselves from their common enemy, i.e., imperialism as the source of alienation or estrangement.

Social regeneration can be understood to imply a broader conception of man in relation to other men in such a way as to promote unity, and co-operation among otherwise different societies. It requires a belief in the common origin and kinsship of all men which is capable of forstering a better understanding and mutual aid among all men.

(c) **Economic Determinism**: The third plank on the bridge to a New Africa is the recognition by Africans, of the principle of economic determinism. This principle, according to Azikiwe, states that

> The quest for food, shelter and clothing have been the primal motive in the establishment of society. It was responsible for the formation of the social and political institutions of society. It is still the determinant factor in African contemporary history. 171

We need to observe here the bogus claim by Azikiwe about the motive for the establishment of society. Azikiwe does not explain how the quest for food, shelter and clothing led to the establishment of society. However, we do not agree that the said quest formed the primary motive for the establishment of society. For the quest for food, shelter and clothing do not necessarily require organized society to continue.

171 Ibid., p. 9
Azikiwe's suggestion on the primary motive for the establishment of society seems less plausible than those of the social contract theorists who posited that the desire to ensure security made men to contract to live in society. Hobbes explained that peace and security were lacking in his hypothetical state of nature and had to be guaranteed through the establishment of civil society. For Rousseau, the peace and security which reigned in the state of nature were destroyed by selfish individualism as expressed in the acquisition of private property. Thus civil society was established to try to restore peace and security which had existed in the state of nature.

Economic determinism, Azikiwe observes, is the hallmark of the economic philosophy of Marxism or "scientific socialism." For Marxists, economic determinism, simply is the view that economic factors explain every movement in history. Azikiwe seems to be so convinced about the truth of this economic philosophy that he insists that

Even capitalism with all its faults, real and fancied, cannot refuse to accept the fundamentality of the theory of economic determinism in society. 172

Azikiwe maintains that a good understanding of the principle of economic determinism and its adoption as an economic philosophy by colonial societies would enable them strive to attain emancipation from the alienating colonial

172 Ibid. p. 125 (This might have influenced his thought on Socialism since 1946. We shall discuss more on this later.)
economic system so as to be able to stand on their feet, economically, and fight imperialism.

The appreciation of this principle would make Africans realize that they "cannot create a new social order without an economic foundation" which is "the taproot of human society." Thus, before they can emancipate themselves colonized Africans have to first free themselves from poverty by conquering their environment so as to enable them to feed, clothe, shelter themselves more or less comfortably.

Azikiwe stresses that the economic conditions of a society determine their thought processes, social and political institutions and relations. He wrote:

I thought that a society which was poor was bound to determine the thought processes and social paraphernalia of its people. So, too, a society which is affluent.

It is for this reason that Africans have to change their economic conditions if they wish to change their social and political situations.

(d) Mental Emancipation: Azikiwe emphasizes the paramount importance of mental emancipation in the crystallization of a New Africa in general and the establishment of free and

173Ibid, p. 9
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progressive states in particular. What is mental emancipation? According to him, it means the freeing of the mind from the bogey of ignorance, misinformation, and superstition which are responsible for such psychological states as inferiority complex, lack of self-confidence and hopeless dependence. He believes that these factors of mental slavery conspired to put Africa in economic, social and political servitude. Thus mental emancipation is the foremost factor for the attainment of colonial freedom.

But how can mental emancipation be achieved? Azikiwe suggests a "broad educational training" which would teach the African youth to have faith in his ability; to believe that he is the equal of the people of other races of mankind — mentally and physically; to look at no man as his superior... This entails a re-education to counter the miseducation which the imperialist educational policies had brought to colonial societies.

Thus Azikiwe believes that mental emancipation is to be carried out on two fronts. One is the emancipation of the African mind from imperialist miseducation; the other is the liberation of the African mind from ignorance and superstition which had vitiated his conception of the world and the place of man in history. For the purpose of achieving

---

177 Ibid., p. 9
clarity, let us examine these two fronts through which the mental slavery of the Africans has been perpetuated in turn.

Western education was introduced into Africa, and indeed other colonial places, to minister to the needs of European imperialists. Hence, along side the training of colonial subjects to serve the colonial administration, was the subtle policy of destroying the self-esteem of colonial societies and instilling in them the inferiority complex which destroyed their faith in their own capabilities and initiatives and made them hopelessly dependent on the imperialist nations. European imperialists saw colonial races as "backward," "uncivilized," barbaric," "half-child, half-devil," and used the machinery of colonial education to impress these sentiments on them. 173

In order to alienate the African personality, Azikiwe observes, colonial education imparted wrong values to colonial subjects. Thus the average colonial subject was educated to seek only white-collar jobs, shun manual labour and to despise those who engage in menial work. With this mis-education, the recipients of colonial education were only fit for public or private employment of the imperialists who retained them as junior workers and grossly underpaid them. Azikiwe sees this as one important reason for the abject poverty which afflicted the recipients of colonial

173 Azikiwe, Zik: A Selection from the Speeches of Uman\^i
education.

Azikiwe maintains that under the prevalent mentality of colonial societies, especially among the educated class, the realization of the envisaged "New Africa" would be a mirage. What was needed was a re-education of the Africans and a re-orientation of their distorted value-systems. But who will carry out the re-education? This question is pertinent because since mental emancipation is necessary for the attainment of freedom from colonial rule, the colonial educators would not knowingly embark on self-destruction by fostering it. Azikiwe failed to specifically consider this important question but seems to suggest that it should be undertaken by the educated colonial subjects and nationalists who had been able to re-educate themselves in one way or the other. 179

Azikiwe further emphasizes that the parochial nature of the imperialist educational system makes African education lack "permanency of values." It makes them [Africans] to cling to artificialities and superficialities. 130 It also strangulates the potential leadership qualities in the Africans. Besides, most self-assigned leaders who are produced under this educational system lack "the moral stamina to balance the physical rigidity of the African, with his mental

130 Ibid, p. 134
flexibility.\textsuperscript{131} In other words, such self-assigned leaders produced under the imperialist education lack depth of thought and could not discern the difference, let alone reconcile the stout physical appearance of the African and his impressionistic mental disposition. Consequently, they could not lead colonial societies to emancipate themselves.

The above facts call for mental emancipation "so as to be re-educated to the real needs of Renascent Africa."\textsuperscript{132} This is underscored by Azikiwe's observation that the history of human progress is the history of the development of ideas. For, the development of the material aspect of human civilization was first initiated by the intellect. In fact, continuous mental alertness and exertion have led to various actions which have transformed the human environment and tremendously affected the course of the world and human history. He observes that the history of the world shows that those who are intellectually more developed have usually enslaved and dominated the ignorant and controlled their destinies.

The process of re-education requires the cultivation of the critical mind which would scrutinize the ideas obtained from foreign books and those authored by local imperialist protégés so as to be able to detect the subtle but harmful distortions and propaganda which they often embody. Bearing

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid, p. 135
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid, p. 135
this in mind, African colonial societies would endeavour to produce a meaningful body of literature about their world and their perceptions of the world in history, philosophy, science, art, music, cosmology, and so on. This is with a view to providing a more reliable picture of Africa and Africans, in order to correct the distortions wrought by imperialist propaganda.

Azikiwe emphasizes that increased literary production by educated colonial subjects would prepare the ground for mental emancipation. This is with the belief that they are more likely to present a more accurate picture about their societies than the imperialists. Literature, he stresses, is the soul of a nation. Any nation or continent which depends on the literary outputs of others for her educational system would be subjecting herself to mental slavery. This is because the mode of thinking and acting of a society are greatly fashioned by the books they read. Hence, if Africans read books which portray them as inferior, their minds would, to a great extent, be conditioned to such a reflex.

The other aspect of mental emancipation pertains to certain African traditional modes of thought which according to Zik, give room to the charge of ignorance and superstition. Such aspects include whole-hearted beliefs in the reality of witchcraft and the efficacy of magic. Azikiwe thinks that such beliefs have deleterious effects on African mentality. This is because such beliefs make Africans to seek supernatural explanation for certain observable/physical phenomena for which some sort of
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explanation is required. Here, we need to remark that when people, from their experience, have reason to believe in the reality of non-empirical forces, they cannot be rightly charged with ignorance and superstition. The same applies to religious beliefs. And, unless a person can prove the non-existence of spiritual or immaterial realities, then he cannot disprove the belief in them.

Azikiwe challenges the African to hasten to prove his belief in the reality of witchcraft and other supernormalities empirically and if not, to hasten to discard them because the so-called "African supernormality in the realms of epistemology has not been a progressive factor in African society."\textsuperscript{185} Here again, what is required is a broad-based educational training which can either enable the African to empirically prove the supernormalities which he makes claims for and by so doing contribute significantly to contemporary epistemology and metaphysics; or discard such beliefs as superstitious and mentally retarding.

(e) Political Resorgimento: By this concept, Azikiwe means political freedom for colonial societies. He argues that once the African has cultivated spiritual balance, he is socially regenerated, economically self-sustaining and mentally emancipated, then political freedom would follow as a matter of inevitability.\textsuperscript{186} This is because the satisfaction of these conditions would destroy the basis of imperialism in the colonies.

\textsuperscript{185} Ibid., p. 149
\textsuperscript{186} Azikiwe, \textit{My Odyssey}, Op.cit., p. 253
3.2 METHOD OF COLONIAL EMANCIPATION

The question of the most efficacious means to colonial emancipation has been a matter of interminable disagreements and controversies among most socio-political philosophers and nationalists. Thus while some thinkers believe that colonial emancipation could be effected through peaceful means, by way of moral appeals to the consciences of the imperialists against the evils of imperialism, a group of thinkers insist that imperialism was established by force and could only be overthrown by force. Yet other thinkers maintain a moderate position in that they believe that the task of colonial emancipation was to be carried out through peaceful means to the extent to which it was feasible, and a recourse to force was to be a last resort.

The first two groups mentioned above occupy two extreme positions. The first group that favours peaceful means of liberation, and who in no way accepts violent methods, is often described as idealistic and conservative in contrast to the second group whose members regard themselves as realistic and revolutionary. The greatest known advocate of the peaceful means of emancipation was Mahathma Ghandi whose philosophy of "Non-violence" during the Indian struggle for freedom from the British colonial rule is historic.
This is one extreme.

- The other extreme is occupied by the group which contends that colonization was accomplished by force, and imperialist oppression and exploitation perpetrated by force, and concludes that it is only through force that colonial emancipation could be effected. Members of this group argue, persuasively, that colonial freedom can only be achieved through force because the apostles of colonialism can never be persuaded to relinquish their hold on the colonies voluntarily except through force. They advocate violence as a legitimate and most appropriate method for attaining freedom from colonial domination and other forms of exploitation and oppression. Members of this group are usually referred to as revolutionaries or radicals. Their argument is quite persuasive but the foreseeable and unforeseeable consequences of violence have often dissuaded many people from accepting it as the best means to colonial emancipation.

137 Prominent among them are Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, V.I. Lenin, Frantz Fanon, Walter Rhodney, Kwame Nkrumah, Seku Toure and other Marxist thinkers. Events in the political liberation days in Africa and Asia partly vindicated this radical point of view that imperialism requires violence to force it to relinquish its grips on its victims. Many colonial territories had to fight to emancipate themselves from alien rule. But some, such as Nigeria, Ghana, Cameroun and Sierra Leone gained their independence through negotiations.
Yet, there is a third position which is somewhat eclectic in outlook in that it prefers peaceful means of emancipation, but at the same time does not reject violent means, where peaceful means fail or prove to be ineffective. This is the position which Azikiwe seems to adopt, although he feels very reluctant to compromise his preference for peaceful approach to colonial emancipation.

Azikiwe believed that the conscience of the imperialists could be appealed to by calling attention to the immorality and injustice perpetuating imperialism in Africa and Asia. Hence, he constantly called on the imperialists to respect the alleged universal fatherhood and brotherhood of man in God, and on this basis to eschew man's inhumanity to man by retracting from their ruthless exploitation and domination of colonial societies. In the same vein, he advocates the cultivation of "inter-racial mind" as the panacea to the problems of colonial domination and oppression. Such a mind would remove racial prejudice and encourage racial association and accommodation. The cultivation of "inter-racial mind," he believes, would be crystallized through the mental emancipation of mankind. 139

Azikiwe believes that through appeals to the conscience of the colonizers, steady constitutional reforms would be

made such as to eventually usher in the much desired independence of colonial territories. However, when he observed that the colonial masters were not appreciating the constitutional and peaceful means to decolonization being adopted by nationalists, he began to have qualms as to whether the imperialists would ever be persuaded to willingly relinquish power to colonial subjects. He wrote:

It raised the issue: whether it was wise to continue adopting constitutional methods in trying to solve the problems created by European imperialism in Africa, especially in view of the fate of previous delegations to the United Kingdom with position-carrying delegates. 190

This doubt, the efficacy of continuing to adopt peaceful and constitutional means towards colonial emancipation was heightened by his increasing realization that "there is no conclusive evidence for me to believe that those who have power will be disposed to surrender their swag; and experience has taught me that I have misplaced my confidence." Consequently, he concludes that

If constitutional reforms must come in drabs at the pleasure of the colonial ruler, and not be regarded as a logical sequence in the historic

190 Azikiwe, My Odyssey, Op. cit., pp. 277-73 (Here, Azikiwe is referring to the failure of the 1920 Delegation to Britain in the same manner that the previous ones had failed).

evolution of any people towards statehood, then such a people must agitate militantly within the law.

... 192

One may be at a loss to understand what Azikiwe precisely means by militant agitation within the law. For it appears paradoxical, if not contradictory, to talk of agitating militantly within the law. Perhaps what he means is the employment of such means of expressing grievances as strikes which are permitted by the law. Beyond this, Azikiwe seems to endorse more radical and revolutionary approach to decolonization provided that it does not lead to bloodshed and anarchy. He recognizes that

Radicalism and Revolutionism may be identified with changes, but these changes need not be the type usually connected with bloodshed and disregard for law and order. 193

In other words, although radical and revolutionary changes have to be experienced in order to have a new order, the means of bringing about the desired changes need not be violent and anarchic.

Azikiwe stresses the importance of agitators (he indeed was one!) in the attainment of colonial emancipation just as he emphasizes the importance of mobilizing the masses for the

same purpose. An agitator, he explains, is one who "stirs up" other men for the attainment of a certain purpose. The purpose of agitators may be noble or ignoble. Thus, while Azikiwe would not argue that all agitators are beneficial to mankind, he maintains that some agitators are indispensable to human progress despite the odium attached to the term "agitator."

To conclude our discussion on the method of colonial emancipation, we have to observe that Azikiwe favours peaceful means. But even in case it proves ineffective, he would not disapprove of radical and revolutionary method so long as it does not lead to bloodshed and anarchy as we said above. Experience might have taught him that force is required in some areas before independence could be attained. His general position seems to be that all peaceful avenues to decolonization should be explored, but when this fails, colonial societies may have to adopt radical and revolutionary means, if they would be more effective.

3.3 THE QUESTION OF CONTINENTAL UNITY:

After many African countries had won political independence, the need for closer co-operation amongst them was realized. This need was probably emphasized by the realization that without continental unity, the independence of individual states could still be assaulted. But the
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nature of co-operation and association envisaged for independent African states became much controverted. In consequence, many schools of thought on the question of African unity emerged. This situation led to some confusion.195

The various views on the nature of African unity can be broadly subsumed under three schools of thought, namely, one that favours immediate political union of African states; another that favours the association of African states on the basis of community interests; and the third school which favours regional alignment on a rigid or loose basis.196 Members of the first group are usually referred to as radicals or revolutionaries, while those who advocate for a loose alignment of African states, whether on regional or continental levels, are often referred to as conservative and reactionary thinkers by members of the first school.

Azikiwe himself strongly appreciates the need for continental unity. His excursion into the history of the rise and fall of early African empires leads him to conclude that

African empires and kingdoms disintegrated, partly as a result of disunity created by fratricidal


196 Ibid., p. 71
struggles for power and partly because of slave trade. 197

Thus he emphasizes that the attainment of continental unity is essential for the realization of true independence of African States. This notwithstanding, he does not believe in the "political union of African States now" as Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Sekou Toure of Guinea and other self-styled revolutionaries insist upon.

What Azikiwe favours is a systematic and gradual attainment of African unity. It is to be carried out in stages. This requires the attainment of unity within individual African states first; then the attainment of unity among neighbouring African states; and finally, the social and economic integration of the entire African states which would eventually, in the distant future, lead to a political union of the entire African states. He maintains that regional integration on social and economic bases is more feasible and prudent at this point in time. Such would form the basis of socio-cultural and economic association of all states in the continent. This approach to continental unity, he argues, is to be favoured over and above the pressure for immediate political union of African States because the latter

197 MacSuku, Op. cit., p. 60
approach, apart from involving the problem of possible reluctance which many nationalist leaders of the various states may feel towards surrendering the leadership of their new states to one ruler, has the enormous problem of incorporating diverse societies of diverse cultural idiosyncracies that might look at one another as aliens. In such a situation, the intended peaceful and beneficent association could be impaired.

To conclude this chapter on Azikiwe's concept of colonial emancipation, we need to observe that if Azikiwe's multi-dimensional approach to decolonization is adopted, it would lead to freedom as opposed to a sham political independence divorced from mental and economic freedom. His insistence that mental emancipation "was more potent as a foundation for the superstructure that must inevitably be built" is a sign of philosophic insight of a remarkable socio-political thinker. One may agree with Azikiwe that with the attainment of mental emancipation, with a consciousness of, and working in accordance with the principle of, economic determinism, colonial societies would overcome their alienation.

One would equally agree with Azikiwe that emancipation is not merely a political act. For political independence that is not founded upon economic self-determination is incomplete. Consequently, mental and economic emancipation are the prerequisites for true political emancipation. The validity of this position is reinforced by the objective situation of political independent African states which are still economically and mentally dependent on their erstwhile colonial European masters. This is what is now designated as a neo-colonialist situation.

"Neo-colonialism" is a term frequently employed by many socio-political thinkers in erstwhile colonial territories to designate a situation whereby a country which purports to enjoy political independence in economically and mentally controlled by their former colonial masters who subtly exert strong influences on a country's socio-economic status. In the final analysis, it is often said, he who controls economic power, actually controls political power. Thus the political power which is purported to belong to former colonial societies is an illusion because the real power, which is the economic power, does not reside in their hands. This is the unfortunate estranging situation in which post-colonial societies find themselves despite the illusion of political independence.

It is in recognition of the veracity that there can be
no real political freedom without economic freedom; and that virtually all post-colonial States dream of enjoying whereas it is political freedom devoid of economic self-determination, that most African socio-political philosophers in the post colonial era found it expedient to focus their thoughts on the type of economic philosophy which would enable their societies to gain control over their economic destinies. Thus African socio-political philosophers have been grappling with the formulation of a more adequate philosophy which would enable their States, and by the logic of international relation, all nations of the world, to be in real control of their social and economic lives within one world community.

The question of a more adequate economic, and invariably socio-political philosophy that can really emancipate the economically oppressed peoples of our contemporary world has produced many schools of thought among African socio-political thinkers. Hence, we have African thinkers in the Marxist "trail" who strongly contend that the panacea to Africa's neo-colonialist economic domination is the adoption of one interpretation of Marxist socialism as a socio-political philosophy. Thus we have Nkrumah, Fanon, Rhoney, Toure, Nyerere, etc.; as prominent African thinkers who have expounded one form of the doctrine of socialism under various aliases. But another school of thought, to which many ruling groups in Africa
sincerely but secretly support, upholds the retention of capitalism as the best economic doctrine. However, some members of this group insist that capitalism should be reformed in order to remove certain obnoxious elements in it.

Finally, there is a third school whose members are not so many but whose contention is gradually gaining more adherents and a better sympathetic hearing. This school holds that neither capitalism, nor socialism, nor welfarism per se can provide the much-needed economic freedom for African societies and for other economically and politically dominated societies of the contemporary world. The solution to the problem, this school contends, is a middle path in socio-political philosophy which would incorporate the good elements to be found in the contending socio-economic philosophies. It is suggested that the good aspects of capitalism, socialism, and welfarism should be eclectically integrated into a workable philosophy which can liberate the economically and politically dominated societies of today's world. This is, simpliciter, the view of Azikiwe in his philosophy of "Neo-welfarism" which we shall be discussing in the remaining parts of this research.
CHAPTER FOUR

ECLECTIC-PRAGMATISM: A DYNAMIC METHODOLOGY

In the course of this research work, we shall try to show that despite the defects that can be found in Azikiwe's "Neo-welfarism," its method is best suited for dealing with the multi-faceted reality of contemporary societies, especially contemporary African societies. In this chapter, we wish to elaborate on eclectic-pragmatism as a dynamic and realistic methodology as well as how it can be applied to solve such problems as political instability, tribalism and religious intolerance.

4.1 ECLECTIC-PRAGMATISM: A DYNAMIC METHODOLOGY FOR ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL INTEGRATION

Eclectic-pragmatism is, Azikiwe suggests, the most suitable method for dealing with the multi-faceted reality, especially in economic and political matters. It is a method which attempts to harmonize apparently opposing views, not by resolving the contradictions but, by selecting and blending what is useful and practicable in each for the purpose of attaining the desired goal(s).

This method recognizes that various systems of thought express some truths but not all the truths. It also recognizes that a better understanding and development of

---

This is our own coinage but it aptly describes Azikiwe's philosophical method (Cf. Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria, Op. cit., pp. 111 - 120.)
man and the world would be achieved if the truths expressed by various systems are eclectically sifted and pragmatically blended as experience and reasoning suggest. Thus when the issue involved is "human nature" the conception of which most thinkers have based their socio-political theories, the method assumes that human nature cannot be pinned down to any specificity.

Hence, eclectic-pragmatism accommodates the fact that man is selfish and altruistic; rational and irrational; individualistic and communalistic; and so on; all of which can be delicately balanced to achieve a harmonious social life. Consequently, this method would recognize that capitalism, socialism and welfarism — as opposing doctrines — express some truths about socio-political organizations. Such truths, instead of being regarded as mutually exclusive, can best be harmonized in a practical way so as to enable members of the society to attain a better standard of living and to attain happiness.

Eclectic-pragmatism is most suitable in dealing with African problems, in particular, in view of the variegated traumatic experiences which precipitated them. Those experiences were engendered by European colonization of Africa, which brought in its wake economic, political, cultural, and, even, spiritual denudation of the continent.
The distorting effects of colonization, especially in the cultural and religious spheres, have changed the African personality almost beyond reversal. The effects of colonialism, especially with the alienation which it has brought, have become indelible on colonized societies. Those effects have combined with local elements to put the erstwhile colonial societies in a dilemma which has for long inhibited their progress. This dilemma is produced by the allure of the indigenous culture and values on the one hand, and that of the foreign, imperialist, culture on the other.

Apart from being the appropriate method for overcoming the colonial "mess," eclectic-pragmatism is equally the best method of dealing with certain persistent problems which include tribalism, frequent coup d'etat, religious strifes and the recurrent question of an effective developmental ideology. Eclectic-pragmatism can lead to a realistic solution to each of these problems. Azikiwe suggested how this can be done. Let us, thus, re-examine his suggestions on the basis of the eclectic-pragmatic methodology.

We begin with his recipe for the problem of tribalism which appears to be unresolvable in many of the new states. Tribalism has been one of the major threats to national unity, national cohesion and development in most states.
It is apparently opposed to nationalism. The term "tribalism" is very often used perjoratively, especially in relation to the new states. Hence to call a person a "tribalist" is to derogate from him. Yet it is a fact of society that families, villages, clans, tribes convolute into a nation. This, according to Azikiwe, suggests that tribalism can actually be made a veritable instrument to national unity which it appears to be opposed to.

The term "tribalism" is formed from the word "tribal." The latter is the adjective of the word "tribe." What is a "tribe"? What is "tribalism"? For the first question, Azikiwe gives two lexical definitions without specifying his sources. The first definition is that tribe is "a social group comprising numerous families, clans, or generations together with slaves, defenders or adopted strangers."^2 The second definition is that "tribe" is an endogamous social group held to be descendant from a common ancestor and composed of numerous families, exogamous clans, bands, or villages that occupies a specific geographic territory, possesses cultural, religious or linguistic homogeneity, and is commonly united under one head or chief.^3

---


^3 Ibid., p. 7.
As for "tribalism," Azikiwe does not give any definition. But we can simply take it to mean tribal feeling or a strong attachment and loyalty to one's tribe.

Azikiwe's contention is that tribalism is not incompatible with national unity as many people seem to think. He maintains that tribal feeling can be harnessed into a strong instrument for national unity if only the eclectic and pragmatic approach is adopted. To harness tribal feeling for national unity and progress requires a recognition that tribalism is a reality and that national unity can be a reality if the strong feeling towards the tribe is eclectically and pragmatically channelled towards the nation. How this can be done, Azikiwe expounds as follows:

Every nation in the world is made up of tribes. Every tribe is an aggregation of clans. Every clan is an aggregation of villages or cantons. Every village or canton is an aggregation of families. Every family is composed of individuals. Now an individual's duty is first to himself, second, to his immediate and extended family, then to his village, clan, tribe and last to the nation. This seems to be the natural order of loyalty except something drastic happens to change the pattern of loyalty.

Ibid, p. 2
It seems very much the case that in most of the new states, tribal loyalty took the place of national loyalty. The order is tribe first and nation last. But such order of loyalty does not conduce to national unity and progress. However, history shows that many nations have been able to replace tribal loyalty with national loyalty to achieve national unity.\(^5\)

Azikiwe maintains that the "reality of tribalism can be adapted to the unreality of national unity to make it a reality"\(^6\) if individuals can be made to see and experience even higher benefits from the nation than accrue to them from the tribe. Azikiwe suggests that the reason for tribal affinity when members of one tribe come into a permanent contact with those of other tribes in the same geographical location is the tendency to regard one's mother tongue as the only magic wand which can provide beings with an environment where, by intermingling in their closed circle, they can obtain spiritual happiness and material prosperity under the protective umbrella of the tribal leviathan.\(^7\)

---

\(^5\) In this connection, Azikiwe mentions such nations as the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and Switzerland (Cf. Tribalism: A Pragmatic Instrument to National Unity, Op. cit., pp. 3 - 4).

\(^6\) Ibid, p. 2

\(^7\) Ibid, p. 13 (The term "Leviathan" is Hobbesian even though Azikiwe did not acknowledge him).
He reasons that for national loyalty to replace tribal loyalty, individuals of various tribes should enjoy "certain permanent guarantees of a constitutional, political and economic nature." By this, Azikiwe is suggesting that the State should guarantee, through constitutional provisions and effective monitoring, the fundamental rights of every individual irrespective of tribe, equal opportunity for all and the welfare of all, as we showed earlier.

Azikiwe seems to believe that the solution to the problem of tribalism, anywhere it occurs, is not to seek to obliterate tribal feeling totally but rather to exploit that feeling and channel it to the nation as what we might call "the Tribe of tribes." Thus he recommends the federal system of government as the political structure which will concede the existence of all linguistic groups and accord them the right to co-exist, on the basis of equality, within a framework of political and constitutional guarantees, that would protect their individual freedom under the rule of law and thus preserve and sustain the particular linguistic group from extinction.

---

8 Ibid., p. 13

Such guarantees and assurances by the State would allay the fear of domination of one tribe by another and destroy mutual suspicion and tribal antagonism which militate against national unity.

From Azikiwe's point of view, tribalism which many people would regard as an unmitigated evil can be turned around to serve national ends through eclectic-pragmatism. For he reasons that there is no way one can do away with tribe and tribal feeling. Since tribes aggregate into a nation, the only way of replacing tribal loyalty with national loyalty is for the State to provide strong inducements such as were never provided by the tribe. These have to come in the form of economic, social and political security to be guaranteed by the State. With this, and given proper educational curriculum, individuals would begin to see that they have more to gain by paying greater allegiance to the nation than to the tribe. Strong feeling for the tribe would be replaced with a stronger feeling for the nation. Hence, the realization of national unity.

Also, the eclectic and pragmatic approach is the most suitable method for carving out national identity which cements national unity. We appreciate that each of the tribes constituting a nation may have a distinct culture, language and/or race which it cherishes and would guard jealously. But by interacting with other tribes, a
particular tribe may find her culture being permeated by certain elements in the culture(s) with which it comes into a reasonably long contact. In other words, acculturation has taken place.

However, Azikiwe observes that "When a tribe is subjected to an impact of another race, language or culture, the tendency is to produce a crisis of existence..." 10 The crisis of existence is usually engendered by the fear of domination. This in turn creates suspicion and mutual distrust which erode national unity. But if each tribe were to adopt "tolerant skepticism" and employ the method of eclectic-pragmatism in their cultural interaction, it will be seen that each culture has got something of value to offer and some aspects which ought to be jettisoned completely. The sifting of the best elements in each cultural complex and their being integrated on the basis of pragmatism would give birth to a higher culture of richer quality. Such cultural complex would cement tribal bonds and promote mutual understanding and inter-tribal co-operation which conduce to national unity.

4.2 Eclectic - Pragmatism And National Stability

Another recurrent problem in the new states, especially African states, is that of political instability as evidenced by frequent military interventions in the political process of these states. Coup d'etat has become

10 Ibid, p. 3
so frequent in the new states and military dictatorship so rampant that the states under civilian rulers are few and far between. This recurrent political phenomenon has for long tasked the minds of political philosophers and political commentators in the new states.

Azikiwe attributes the root cause of political instability in Nigeria, as "in other African, Latin-American and Asian countries," to the prevailing circumstances in which the excesses committed by the parties in power had discredited them and created a crisis of confidence in the capacity of those who rule to maintain good government. 11

So, failure of the parties in power is accountable to the frequent military intervention in the politics of the new states.

Azikiwe observes that parties in power in most of the new states "usually assume larger-than-life image and party interests are usually superimposed on those of the entire people." 12 By so doing, the interests of the electorate suffer. Hence, most African States do not show such evidences of good government as the enjoyment of individual freedom or fundamental human rights under the law,


12 Ibid, pp. 8-10
economic prosperity to live above the minimum subsistence level, social happiness to ensure healthy living, and education of the head, heart, and hand, in addition to security from the vagaries of life — like unemployment, ill-health, accident, physical disability and personal old age.13

The failure of civilian regimes to give good governance and the bitter rivalries among political parties which often degenerated into actual warfare account for the political instability which beset most of the new states. This is what the military coup planners usually presented as their justification to intervene directly in politics.

On the basis of the continuous political misdemeanours of civilian regimes, which usually led to instability and frequent military intervention "to restore stability," Azikiwe concluded that the military factor in the politics of the new states has become an indispensable factor, at least in the meantime. Consequently, he sought to accommodate the military factor in a desirable democratic state through the eclectic pragmatic method.

Actually, Azikiwe has faith in representative democracy.
as the best means of effective government which can guarantee individual freedom, economic security and social harmony. However, he recognizes that representative democracy requires strong discipline to practicalize its principles. That much desired strong discipline, he discovers, is totally lacking in the new states (just as it is lacking in various degrees in some other countries of the world). This is why the political process is usually attended by chaos and instability which the military rulers usually claim to be fighting when they stage coups. The Armed Forces, Azikiwe surmises, has the effective force to restore peace and stability whenever the political excesses of the civilian administrators threaten national unity and security.  

Hence, Azikiwe concludes that the realization of true democracy in the new states requires the kind of discipline such that can only be injected in the political process by a military presence. Hence, his proposition of "Democracy with Military Vigilance." But how can the two apparently incompatibles be combined? We know, as Azikiwe himself realizes, that military regimes are authoritarian while civilian regimes can be more or less democratic. How can we combine the autocratic and the democratic? Here again, eclectic-pragmatism presents itself as the most

Ibid, pp. 10-11
suitable approach for some important reasons. Firstly, the military factor in the politics of the new states is an unavoidable reality as at now. Thus, it would be unwise not to seek how to turn this apparent hindrance to democracy into a veritable instrument for its survival in the new states. Secondly, democracy is most desirable but only when practised according to its rules. Yet, practising democracy according to its rules, like playing a game according to its rules, requires the important factor of discipline which the Armed Forces in the new states is required to enforce just as a referee does in a game. Thirdly, there is a desirable element in the military which democracy needs to survive; that element is discipline. This discipline is what the military presence in politics is expected to infuse in the politicians.

Amikiwe's main point is that since the political conditions in most of the new states are such as to warrant continual military intervention in politics, experience and reason dictates that the Armed Forces should be more involved in the decision-making process of the states under a democratic setting so as to ensure stability and good government. He observes that the permanent exclusion of Armed Forces in the decision-making bodies of a democratic state is a paradox because whilst politicians and their functionaries made
law, executed law, and interpreted law, they relied on the armed and security forces to enforce the law. So that the former and the latter are symbiotic.  

It is this reliance on the Armed Forces to enforce the law that places her at a vantage position to overthrow the civilian regimes at pleasure.

The enforcement of obedience to the law of the state without which chaos and instability would ensue is a vital role which the Armed Forces perform under a democracy apart from the normal function of territorial defense. On this account, Azikiwe believes that the traditional conceptualization of the three arms of the State — the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary — should be revised to include the armed and security forces as the fourth arm of the State. He adds a caveat:

Unless this new dimension in political theory is recognized, no state in the modern world can be secure from internal convulsion which could lead to violent change. 

Azikiwe, thus invites modern nations of the world to recognize the significant role which the armed and security forces are destined to play in contemporary politics and

---

15 Ibid, p. 2

16 Ibid, p. 3
accommodate them within the sanctuary of power — even if only as the supervisor of the democratic process. In this way, Azikiwe hopes that the incessant military coups would be avoided.

It is not only the fact that the Armed Forces has become an indispensable factor in modern politics that recommends it for incorporation in the decision-making bodies under a democracy, Azikiwe argues persuasively that the soldiers and the police who make up the armed and security forces are, first of all, human beings. As such, they are part and parcel of the society seeking democratic rule and should have a right to participate in its governance. Again, being human, the soldiers are prone to similar ambitions and love for power as civilians are. History shows the leadership role the military has often played in various nations of the world.\textsuperscript{17} Besides, the military leadership in modern societies has become so highly educated and skilled that to exclude them perpetually from the seat of power, knowing how ambitious and power-thirsty they could equally be, is to perpetuate the unwholesome phenomenon of frequent military intervention in the political processes of the nations.

On the above score, Azikiwe elucidates his recommendation of the Armed Forces as the "Fourth Arm of the State."

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid, pp. 22-23
He opines that the modus operandi for integrating the military into civilian government, especially in those States where military coups have become a sort of part-time, is to co-opt four heads of the armed and security forces into the exercise of the executive and legislative power. In the executive, they would be Ministers without portfolio while they should also belong to the parliament as ex officio Members.

As members of the cabinet the four heads of the armed and security forces would stand guard against any policy initiated in the cabinet which could adversely affect the basic freedom and fundamental human rights, particularly (4) the Rule of Law, (2) the Democratic Process, (3) Individual Freedom, (4) the Right of Dissent, and (5) the Instrument of Veto .... 18

In these five sensitive areas, should the four heads of the armed and security forces unanimously agree that a proposed policy is likely to endanger the stability of the nation, then their unanimity should constitute a veto on that particular issue. This provision notwithstanding, 

made these four heads of the disciplined forces "equal in all respects to their civilian counterparts." 19 It is only in those five areas that their unanimity would give them over-riding power over their civilian counterparts.

18 Ibid, p. 4
19 Ibid, pp. 4 - 5
Thus, the Fourth Arm of the State is envisaged to be the watch-dog over those matters affecting individual freedom under the law, the violation of which has usually been among the main reasons adduced for military take-overs, particularly in Africa.

But when the Armed Forces are effectively brought into decision-making organs of the State, it would be unjustifiable for the Armed Forces at anytime to accuse the politicians of incompetence and bad government and, on that basis, stage a coup. This is because the military would be part and parcel of the Government. In such a circumstance, any coup attempt should be regarded as an act of mutiny against the military hierarchy and a treason against the State.\(^\text{21}\)

The above, in effect, constitutes Azikiwe's recipe for the problem of national instability, bad government and frequent military coups. However, he suggested a diarchy (civilian-cum-military government) on an experimental basis. He envisages the military presence in a democracy as a "temporary measure to ensure good government and stability."\(^\text{22}\) The experiment on a combined civil and

\(^{20}\) Ibid, p. 5
\(^{21}\) Ibid, p. 4
\(^{22}\) Ibid, p. 4
military government" should be tried for five years after which period the continuation of such a regime should be reviewed in the light of experience and reason."23 Whether or not the diarchy should be continued as a political model should be determined through a national referendum.

The issue so far discussed bears testimony as to how an eclectic-pragmatic mind can work. Since the problem is national instability, occasioned by bad government and the attendant military coups, Azikiwe sought a realistic solution to this obvious hindrance to progress. The solution which he preferred was informed by a thorough analysis of the problem of instability and bad government during civilian regimes in most of the new states, and the constraints imposed on individual freedom during military regimes. He thus tried to explain how democracy needs military policing to be effective and how the Armed Forces can be co-opted in a democratic government in order to assuage the ambitions of its men to exercise political authority.

Azikiwe's recommendation of a well-defined diarchy is a spirited attempt to tackle a nagging problem which is worth experimenting on. To dismiss or deride it with the argument that military presence in a democracy is an anomaly because the dictatorship which the Armed Forces stands for is antithetical to democracy, is to allow
conceptual fixities to rob one of a possible panacea to a persistent problem which experience suggests. In fact, the view that the proper role of the armed forces is territorial defence was first expressed by Plato (often regarded as the father of political philosophy) and stupidly accepted by the West as a "fait accompli." It is true that the terms "military" and "civilian" are apparently antithetical terms. But in reality, the military man was once a civilian, with similar emotions, desires, ambitions and values as other civilians. As a military man, he still retains those basic qualities of human beings. On the other hand, civilians have often been found to possess some attributes which military institutions are designed to inculcate. Besides, the military and the civilians live in the same society, and share similar experiences.

So, on account that the man who was once a military man can at another time become a civilian, and vice versa, behaving appropriately on each occasion, the radical distinction between the military and the civilian collapses in the face of reality. Thus it can be appropriately argued, as Azikiwe himself has done, that the exclusion of the Armed Forces from the exercise of political power by the civilian governments which invariably rely on it for the maintenance of peace and stability, is the main cause of frequent military takeover of governments in most of the new states. It is this fact that makes the
members of the armed and security forces, that are equally ambitious for power and all its trappings like their civilian counterparts, to wait on the wings for the slightest excuse to overthrow the civilian regimes.

Azikiwe argues that the admission of the armed and security forces into the sanctuary of political power would leave them with little option than to co-operate with their civilian counterparts. The hope is that as time goes on, the supervision of the democratic process by the Armed Forces and their co-operation with the civilian administrators would gradually crystalize the desired democratic practice and lead to the realization of the goals of democracy. Since military presence is usually supposed to ensure stability in the new states, and its absence is often characterized by instability, Azikiwe argues, it is necessary to bring military presence to bear on democracy so as to ensure discipline, stability and good government.

4.3 Eclectic – Pragmatism and the Problem of Religious Intolerance

Religious strife and intolerance are among the major problems in the new states. This phenomenon is the child of imperialism as the various peoples of the new states experienced in the religious sphere. For one of the most subtle imperialist policies was to subjugate the minds of

For some criticisms and their rebittals, see Azikiwe, Democracy With Military Vigilance, op. cit., pp. 24 – 70
men as a permanent guarantee for their material exploitation, so the religions of the imperialists were launched with a characteristic aggressiveness, covert or overt, in the areas of their control. Hence, the religion of the imperial masters, in most cases, came to supplant the indigenous ones or to struggle for supremacy with them.

But by far the commonest precipitator of religious intolerance is when two or more foreign religions are introduced in a particular territory. Each of these alien religions engages in aggressive campaigns for "the souls of men" in that territory as well as their pockets and loyalty. Adherents of one religion might seek to weaken the other and deride it as a false religion. This is often the cause of religious strife and intolerance.

We can very well emphasize that religious intolerance and strife usually ensue between adherents of two or more foreign religions, for example, Christianity and Islam. In fact, we can safely assert that religious intolerance and strife hardly ensued between adherents of the indigenous religions and those of the invading religion(s). The reason is that imperial domination of colonial societies usually weakened their religious and cultural stamina for any effective fight against the invading religion(s) and culture(s). Societies under imperial domination, overtly or covertly, that still adhered to their traditional religions were, on the above score, often content to practice
their faith unmolested — without boldering to seek
for more adherents.

Religious intolerance which we can, simpliciter, take
to mean the refusal of the adherents of one religion to
recognize the rights of those of other religion(s) to hold
articles of faith contrary to their own, is mostly the
result of mental and attitudinal fixities, the type which
also accounts for ideological intolerance which, we shall
see. It is one of the precipitators of the present tensions
in the world. It is these types of fixities that lead one
to think that one's thoughts, ways and values are the
best and the only true ones. Those of others are then
discarded as false. Eclectic-pragmatism discourages this
way of viewing reality.

The question which we wish to consider is how the
eclectic-pragmatic method can solve the problem of religious
intolerance, not only in the new states but all over the
world. Azikiwe wants us to believe that eclectic-pragmatism
can lead to the solution of the problem of religious
intolerance in the new states in particular, and the whole
world at large. The basis of this optimism is the
assumption that the principles of eclectic-pragmatism are
such as to discourage fixed attitudes which constitute the
root-cause of intolerance and strife. The eclectic-
pragmatic approach invites adherents of opposing religions
to open their hearts and ears to their counterparts so as to
appreciate their points of view.

By reasoning with one another and adopting an attitude of "tolerant skepticism" a better understanding might be achieved among apparently opposing religious adherents. Eclectic-pragmatism entails that adherents of different religions should maintain an open mind, reason with one another and avoid condemning one another without a fair hearing. The cultivation of broad-mindedness, which is an important requirement of eclectic-pragmatism, could enable the adherents of various religions to differentiate between the spiritual essence of most religions and their doctrinaire-cum-cultural aspects. They might discover that their disagreement stemmed from the latter and not from the former.

When religious intolerance is discovered to be a matter of intellectual and cultural conflict, the eclectic-pragmatic approach of sifting and harmonizing the good elements in each culture would remove such conflict.

Besides, the "tolerant skepticism" which eclectic-pragmatism implies is the obviously banal recognition that no matter how contrary one view is to another, each might still have something of value to offer which, when synthesized would become more adequate than each of the separate contributing views. On this score, what the adherents of each religion need to show is the practicability and usefulness of their religious doctrines as factors
which speak in favour of their religion rather than seeking converts by force.

For example, let the adherents of Christianity demonstrate the principles of love for all and self-sacrifice which this religion preaches as a way of winning converts and let the Moslems demonstrate the principles of discipline and the universal brotherhood of man which Islam professes as a way of winning converts to their religion. Part of the reasons for religious crises anywhere in the world is the competition to win "the souls of men" by adherents of the different religions, not necessarily through deeds but through words. But what can really show the truth of any religion, one may assert, is the extent to which its adherents practicalize its tenets such that its non-adherents benefit from such practice. This would be a demonstration of the seriousness to which they hold their faith and would equally serve as an invitation to those outside their religious faith to embrace it.

In this way, the intolerance which results mostly from doctrinaire preachings by the adherents of different religions should be discarded in favour of practical demonstration of the deeper truth revealed by religion as a way of winning the "souls of men." Hence the value and truth of any religion would be established not through force but the appeal which the practice of its doctrines by its adherents has on its non-adherents.
Indeed, religion as a mental and emotional commitment to a Supreme Deity or super-natural power, does not require intolerance and the strife which often accompany it. It rather requires persuasion since it seeks to establish some spiritual truth in "the soul of men." And, because religion has a fundamentally personal, private element, men cannot be really drawn into it by force. Any such attempt would always meet with failure because even if one is forced to practice the externals of a religion, what really matters is one's personal conviction. Thus, the tolerant, ready-to-accommodate and ready-to-understand approach should be adopted in matters of religion as in matters of economic and political life.
CHAPTER FIVE

TOWARDS ZIK'S NEO-WELFARISM

In view of the numerous cross-currents of ideas which informed Zik's "Neo-welfarism," it is pertinent to first highlight these ideas in order to clear the way for our understanding and appreciation of this philosophy. In this regard, we shall discuss (at times in brief) such concepts as the metaphysical and epistemological foundations of Neo-welfarism, capitalism, socialism, welfarism, proto-welfarism, eclecticism and pragmatism.

5.1 The Metaphysical and Epistemological Foundations of Neo-welfarism

It is essential to any philosophy that it must make certain assumptions about the nature of reality both at the cosmic and human levels. The question "what is the nature of reality?" when narrowed down to man, "what is the nature and destiny (if he has any such thing) of man?" is usually asked and answered by metaphysical systems either explicitly or implicitly. It is on the basis of such assumptions that certain economic, social and political theories are formulated to give the concept of reality in these spheres. It is in recognition of this fact that we begin this chapter with the exploration of the metaphysical foundation of Neo-welfarism.¹

It may be surprising that, strictly speaking, Azikiwe did not articulate a metaphysical system in the manner of such known metaphysicians as Plato, Hegel and other system-builders in Western Philosophy. However, Azikiwe's metaphysical position can best be seen in a socio-economic context. He wrote:

Since attaining manhood, I have had to fend for myself in a world where idealism and materialism are usually opposed to each other. In the course of my life's odyssey I have been convinced that I must be idealistic to justify my existence as a human being, but I must also be materialistic to adapt myself to the concatenations of a materialistic world. To steer between these two, it became necessary for me to be eclectic and pragmatic: to draw the best from each philosophy and make it work to my advantage in the light of reason and experience.

From the above quotation, it is evident that Azikiwe is neither a whole-hearted idealist who reduces all reality to the "mental" nor a thorough-going materialist who regards matter and its cognates as the fundamental reality. He rather seems to regard both idealism and materialism as giving a more adequate picture of reality when the truth that one expresses is harmonized with that of the other. The truths which each of these metaphysical systems express are to be "eclectically" and "pragmatically" sifted and harmonized.

---

"in the light of reason and experience." But when the best in idealism and materialism are eventually harmonized, what do we have? A kind of dualism?³ Azikiwe did not say what the eclectic and pragmatic combination of the best in idealism and materialism should be called. But a close look at his sympathetic exposition of the fairly general Nigerian/African communal world-view shows that it is a kind of dualism.

But before going further, let us ask Azikiwe what is the "best" that can be drawn and integrated from both idealism and materialism? He did not ask and did not answer this question directly but he seems to have implied that the spiritual dimension of reality recognized by idealism should be complemented with the material dimension exclusively emphasized by materialism in order to achieve a more adequate understanding of reality. Again, he did not personally elaborate on the spiritual and the material aspects of reality although he gave the Nigerian/African communal view of the former.⁴

According to Azikiwe, the Nigerian metaphysical-cum-religious thought

conceives God as the Great Spirit which pervades the universe, embracing the spirits of the dead, which invigorates the spirits of the living.

³ The view that reality is both spiritual and material.
⁴ Most of the things to be said about Nigerian communal metaphysics are more or less equally applicable to that of other African societies.
The ancestral spirit serves as a link to reconcile the living with the dead.\footnote{N. Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria: Capitalism, Socialism or Welfarism? Op. cit., p. 9}

This suggests a belief in the integrated wholeness of reality. There is no broken point in the hierarchical chain of existence. Everything is essentially linked to God, the Supreme Spirit, on the one hand, and with one another on the other. Even such inanimate things as stones, rivers, sand, and other non-human beings as trees, birds, animals, are believed to possess a spiritual force by virtue of which they are in existence. The spiritual force is given to every being by God who is the source of life and existence. Because spirits are believed to be capable of existing in or outside of matter, it is often pertinent to distinguish between spirits qua spirits (unembodied spirits) and spirits in matter (embodied spirits) in the African metaphysical belief system. Unembodied spirits are thought to be superior to those embodied because the former are not fettered by space and time which bind spirits in gross matter. Thus, there is a hierarchy of spirits at the apex of which is the Supreme Spirit (God), followed by "divinities" which are "in the ontological category of spirits,"\footnote{J. S. Mbiti, African Religions and Philosophy, (New York: Doubleday and Company Inc, 1970), p. 98.} followed by the spirits of the dead (ancestral spirits), the spirits of the living, the spirits in animal bodies, the spirits of other animate beings, and
Lastly those of inanimate beings. In this hierarchy, spiritual vitality differs from one level of existence to another and diminishes as one moves from the apex to the base.

It is interesting to note that in the African world-view, there is no radical separation of the spiritual world from the material world as is the case with the dualism of Plato, René Descartes and other Western dualists. Equally, the African world-view does not reduce all reality to the "mental" as idealism does, nor to matter as is the case of materialism. It regards both as real although it seems to hold that spirit is superior to matter. This position might have been suggested by the belief that it is the spirit which constitutes the life force which animates matter. But in the final analysis the spiritual and the material dimensions of existence form a continuum in African world-view. Chinua Achebe lanomically expresses this belief when he asserts that

The land of the living is not far removed from the domains of the ancestors. There was coming and going between them ... 8

In consequence, it is commonly believed that "the spirits of our ancestors permeate the fabric of our society" 9 and are supposed to guide our thoughts and actions in the right

It is this belief in the existence of the spirits of the dead members of each family and their continuous influence on the living members — for good or ill — that led to ancestral worship in Africa. The ancestral spirits are regarded as links between the living and the various divinities leading up to God. They serve as vehicles that carry supplications of the living to the higher divinities who in turn carry them to God if they are incapable of meeting the requests. Ancestral spirits are, however, believed to be capable (on their own) of protecting or harming human beings in certain circumstances. This is why their benevolence is usually sought through sacrifices and other rituals.

With the above brief excursion into African communal world-view, let us now consider Azikiwe's answer to the related and important question, "what is the nature of man?" This question is very important, especially for the neo-welfarist philosophy, because socio-political philosophies are constructed to serve man. For any of them to serve him well, it must take cognizance of his nature and must be based on it. Hence, socio-political philosophers have tried to construct their philosophies in accordance with what they perceived to be human nature. 10

The belief that there is a fixed "essence" or "nature" common to all men, in all ages, and for which man, is as old

10 A cursory look at the socio-political philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau and a host of others amply illustrate this point.
as philosophy itself. Many thinkers in the ancient, medieval and modern periods held it to be self-evident that there is something called "human nature" which is constituted by the "essence" of man. 11 But the crucial questions are: What does the expression "human nature" or the "essence of man" mean? Is there any such thing as a fixed human "essence"? If there is, what is it?

The concept "human nature" or an "essence" common to all men has been employed by various philosophers from antiquity. Yet the concept is still far from being satisfactorily clarified. For instance, it is not quite clear whether by the term "human nature," what is meant is simply a certain attribute or a cluster of attributes which all men share and which also distinguishes them from other beings; or, rather, something fixed in which this attribute or a cluster of attributes inheres. The former seems to have been the concept most of "human nature" with which philosophers have theorized even though they tended to suggest that their concept of human nature means the latter. This can be observed from the definitions of man in terms of certain essential attributes that we shall consider soon.

Perhaps, the most widely-acknowledged essential attribute of man, at the various periods in the history of philosophy, is his rationality. Man, most philosophers would assert, is "a rational being." 12 Rationality, then, is

12 Ibid, p. 5
regarded as the essential attribute which all normal men share and by virtue of which man is distinguished from other animals.

Rene Descartes not only stressed that rationality is common to all men, he maintained that all men are naturally and equally endowed with reason. Difference in reasoning among men, he held to be consequent upon the fact that men follow different lines of thought and do not focus their attention on the same objects. He concluded that the essence of man is thought: "I am a substance whose whole essence or nature consists only of thinking ...." 13

Descartes' assertion that all men are equally endowed with reason is an assumption rather than a proven fact. But he seems to be treating an assumption as a proven fact. However, this assumption does not seem to pass muster because if all men are by nature equally endowed with reason, all men would, at least, be able to reason and understand the same object or situation in the same way. But we find that the thought of men regarding the same object or situation may as varied as be the number of men present.

For long the rational essence of man was hardly questioned until Sigmud Freud and other behavioural psychologists made scientific studies of man's profound irrationality. Thus from various evidences of man's irrationality one cannot

but agree that "Man may be rational ... but the causes of
his irrationality, remains [sic]\(^\text{14}\) an embarrassing
question to exponents of the rational essence of man.

However, even if it is argued that the claim that the
"essence" or "nature" of man consists in his rationality
does not mean that man cannot exhibit some elements of
irrationality but, rather, that it is in the nature of man
to reason; it is still doubtful whether this satisfies
our curiosity about the "essence" or "nature" of man. This
doubt increases when one remembers that one can still
legitimately talk of the "essence" of man to which his
rational capability belongs.

Another view on the nature of man is that he is
gregarious. Man is a zoon politicon, a social being whose
mode of life involves association with others in both formal
and informal organizations.\(^\text{15}\)

Surely, this essential attribute of man cannot be denied,
but this definition is of little help in telling us about
the essence of man — especially in the sense of a fixed
essence. For one thing, zoological researches have shown
various animals, other than man, to be gregarious. The most
prominent of these, according to researchers, is the
chimpanzees which live in social groups.

Equally, the essence of man has been defined in terms of his productive capacity. In this vein, he is defined as a *homo faber* or "the animal that can produce." In fact, Karl Marx and his followers insist that the essence of man is labour, that is, to produce or to reproduce himself materially through labour. But here again, although we would acknowledge the productive capacity of man as an essential attribute, we equally do know that some other animals produce too — at least, in the widest meaning of the term "produce." Thus, the definition is too general to be of much help to our understanding of the nature of man. Not while even when the qualification is made that/some animals produce instinctively, it is only man that produces in accordance with thoughtfully evolved plan and that it is only man that makes tools to increase his productive capacity. This definition still does not satisfy our question about the essence of man.

Furthermore, E. Cassirer and some other philosophers of Symbolic Forms have seen the essence of man in his capacity to make symbols. They thus defined man as "a symbol-making animal" whose most important symbol is the "word."  

The various attributes of man in terms of which he has been defined — reason, gregariousness, sociability, the capacity for production and symbol-making — are no doubt essential, but they do not seem to really constitute

---

15 Ibid, p. 5 ("homo faber" may also mean "a tool fabricating" animal).
17 Ibid, p. 5
the answer (singular or collectively) to the question: "what is the essence of man?" This is in the important sense that the "attributes" of a thing do not constitute its "essence" but rather belong to its "essence". In this consideration, the question "what is the "essence" or "nature of man?" would require such answer as "man is spiritual" or "man is material," or "man is both spiritual and material." It is to such identified essence of man that the various attributes would belong.

The fact that the essential attributes of man given above do not really define his "essence" is attested to by Fromm's observation that

Given all these attributes, man could be free or determined, good or evil, driven by greed or ideals; there could be laws to govern his nature or there could be no such laws; all men could have a common nature aside from these attributes or they might not share in such a common nature; there may be values common to all men or there may not be.18

This consideration shows that we are still left where we started. We are still perplexed at the question as to whether, apart from these general attributes, there is something that could be called "human nature" or the "essence" of man.

Amidst this perplexity, a way of escape seems to have been provided by a number of philosophers from Kierkegaard and Marx to William James, Bergson, and Teilhard de Chardin

18 Ibid, p. 6
who maintain that "man makes himself; that man is the author of his own history," and invariably the creator of his own essence. The existentialists (Sartre, Heidegger, and others) further reiterate this view when they maintain that man has no fixed essence over and above what he makes himself in the course of his daily existence. This way of escape from the problem of what the nature of man is, may be attractive prima facie, but a deeper consideration would reveal its inadequacy. For one thing, if man has no fixed essence but has only such essence as he makes of himself — and, since men have the capacity of making themselves differently — it follows that there is no "essence" common to all men, in all ages.

But the denial of a fixed essence common to all men, in all ages, creates more problems than those implied by a belief in a fixed human essence. For, if there is no essence common to all men, then the oneness of men and the universal validity of the fundamental moral norms cannot be plausibly argued for. Again, without a belief in a common nature among men, such "sciences of man" as psychology and anthropology would not have had any basis for existing. We are thus faced with two equally unsatisfactory alternatives: of assuming that man has a fixed and unalterable essence, or the relativistic assumption that man has no fixed essence but only shares with other men his biological attributes.

19 Ibid, p. 6
From the above discussion, it is evident that to accept that there is a fixed essence common to all men in all ages is as problematic as its denial. Again, if by the term "human nature" we mean, not something fixed but, certain principal features common to all men, then we should enlarge the concept to include not only the above highlighted major attributes, but certain pervasive tendencies and capacities such as rationality, gregariousness, creativity, selfishness, altruism, bravery, cowardice, scalability, meanness and so on. In this conception, "human nature is not only a principle but a capacity"\(^{20}\) (one should rather say principles and capacities).

At this stage, we can appreciate the fact that "man is not wholly definable,"\(^ {21}\) and that what we regard as his essential attributes, tendencies and capacities can hardly give us a clear understanding of what human nature is. Consequently, one may agree with Michael De Montaigne that human nature is "fluid":

> if by chance you fix your thought on trying to grasp its essence, it will be neither more nor less than if someone tried to grasp water; for the more he squeezes and presses what by its nature flows all over, the more he will lose what was trying to hold and grasp.\(^ {22}\)

\(^{20}\) Ibid, p. 10  
\(^{21}\) Ibid, p. 10  
It is obviously in recognition that there is no one essential attribute, tendency or capacity with which man can be adequately defined or his entire nature illuminated, that Azikiwe asserts that human nature cannot be pinned down to any specificity:

Human nature is so remarkable that its make up is still unfathomable. One may orate on certain phases of human nature. One may theorize on other phases of it, but in the final analysis it is impossible to make a categorical statement as to what constitutes human nature.23

From this observation, Azikiwe's conception of "human nature" is broad enough to include not only his essential attributes, but also his tendencies, capacities and dispositions. Thus, he included meanness, self-preservation, acquisitiveness, selfishness,24 and altruism in his conception of human nature.

We can observe that Azikiwe does not conceive human nature in terms of something fixed but in terms of certain attitudes and characteristics that are distinctly human. A deep reflection would reveal that there is no fixed and permanent attitude or tendency in man. Hence, man can be selfish at one time and altruistic at another, exhibit rationality on one occasion and irrationality on another. Furthermore, man can be productive at one time

---

24 Ibid, pp. 73-74, 39, 95 and 202.
and at other times unproductive. Azikiwe suggests that any theory based on the concept of human nature which loses sight of such diversities that human nature encompasses would invariably be one-sided and inadequate. This is one of the principal grounds for which he considers capitalism, socialism and welfarism inadequate since each focusses only on a particular aspect of human nature which excludes others. Thus, to construct a more adequate socio-political philosophy for the good of mankind, the diversity of human nature has to be appreciated and taken cognisance of. This is what Azikiwe claims to have done in his Neo-welfarist philosophy.

Equally, from the epistemological point of view, we should observe that Azikiwe did not explicitly construct a theory of knowledge. However, statements which suggest abound his epistemological position/about in his works. In the first place, it is evident from his view that both idealism and materialism present reality from different standpoints which are not mutually exclusive, he accepts rationalism and empiricism — their epistemological cognates respectively — as valid sources of knowledge. In fact, his emphasis on "experience and reason"\(^\text{25}\) as the ultimate guides explicitly states his epistemological position.

In his characteristic eclectic and pragmatic approach, he rejects rationalism as well as empiricism per se. Each standing on its own can only give us knowledge of certain aspects of reality but cannot yield true knowledge in all aspects of reality. An adequate knowledge of reality can be achieved, he seems to suggest, by the combined working of reason and the senses. Invariably, the truth revealed by reason must be corroborated by sense experience in order to pass the muster of pragmatism.

To him, knowledge claims must have empirical relevance to be acceptable. For how can one assent to a knowledge claim with an empirical import but which fails the scientific test of demonstrability? For instance, Azikiwe recalls the report of African Morning Post of September 19, 1935 which carried the story of how one Alabi from Abeokuta escaped from prison through certain magical formula. It was equally posited that with such a formula a soldier can go to war without being harmed by bullets or matchets aimed at him. The bullets would fall by his side harmlessly and knife-thrusts would have no effects on him. All he needed to make these happen, it was

26 This is the view that the mind has power to know some truths that are logically prior to experience and yet not analytic.

27 Empiricism stands in opposition to rationalism and holds that all knowledge derive from sense experience.
alleged, was to possess a certain charm to recite "it is nothing at all, kokoyam." This is why Azikiwe demands empirical demonstration of the ascription of reality to "supernormalities" in what is rightly or wrongly termed African "Super-Science." Such super-normalities, which are not peculiar to the African belief-system but which have a great number of adherents in Africa, include witches and wizards, potent charms, dead people who came back to life and live among men. He thus challenges adherents of "African Super-Science" to demonstrate it. "Otherwise, it is Superstitious to continue to have faith in a reality which may be unreal." For if "African Super-Science" is a reality it should be demonstrable.

As one who subscribes to pragmatism, he would no doubt make "practicability" and "usefulness" the criteria for valid knowledge. This is because pragmatism as a theory of truth emphasises the practical and the useful. True knowledge must lead to practical application. For as Francis Bacon suggested, "knowledge unapplied in action is a pale academic vanity." Bacon was a scientist whose

29 Ibid., p. 150
emphasis on experience and results expresses the fundamental character of English philosophy and eventually culminated in pragmatism.

It is worthy of note that Azikiwe's emphasis on experience as an important source of knowledge and arbiter in knowledge claims reflects his cultural perspective to knowledge. For most African societies place high premium on experience as the ultimate validator and basis of knowledge. In fact, in some African societies, like the Igbo's, direct experience is particularly emphasized. This is borne out in the Igbo adage that "whoever knows what he has not experienced, knows by fraud." However, it has to be observed that very wide and controversial claims are made by Africans about what can be experienced. For instance, ghosts, effects of witchcraft, magic and the like, are claimed to be experienceable by many Africans. It is this claim, that Azikiwe has challenged its proponents to demonstrate.

So far, we have tried to glean some information on the kind of epistemology which might have informed the Neo-welfarist philosophy. It may rather be disappointing that Azikiwe did not construct elaborate metaphysical and epistemological systems and by such omission left much to conjectures. But it seems that his eclectic and pragmatic approach does not actually permit system-building. For

---

31 This adage is common in Onicha, Oha-Ogwa L.G.A., Imo State (Nigeria).
building. System-building tends towards dogmatism which eclectic-pragmatism is opposed to.

At this juncture, let us begin the exploration of other concepts which influenced the formulation of Neo-welfarism. Let us begin with the economic doctrine of "capitalism."

5.2 ZIK ON CAPITALISM

One of the roads to Azikiwe's Neo-welfarist philosophy passes through capitalism in the sense that what Azikiwe judged to be the good aspects of the latter are incorporated in the former. Perhaps, one may wonder whether anything good can be found in capitalism. However, Azikiwe, though not a thorough-going capitalistic, feels that in spite of the fact that capitalism has become an ideological bugbear in the thinking of its so-called socialist opponents, and despite the opprobrium it has attracted among the socialist thinkers/critics of the world, it still has some good sides and not bad ones only. His chief concern with capitalism is to analyse it as a major contemporary socio-economic doctrine with a view to sifting its good aspects for the purpose of constructing a more adequate philosophy that can usher in a better human society. For this purpose, he tries to analyse the meaning, essential features, merits and demerits of capitalism.

(A) MEANING: What is "capitalism:”? And what is a capitalist society? According to Azikiwe, capitalism is an economic doctrine/ a philosophy (which crystalized into
a doctrine) and which he believes, may be comprehensively and essentially defined as

The economic system under which the ownership of the means of production is concentrated in the hands of a class, consisting of only a minor section of society, and under which there is a propertyless class for the sale of their labour-power, as a commodity, is the only source of livelihood.\textsuperscript{32}

This definition, though with a Marxist, anti-capitalist coloration, does not essentially differ from another definition according to which capitalism, also known as "free enterprise," or euphemistically, "economic humanism" is an economic system,

in which the ownership of land and natural wealth, production, distribution, and exchange of goods, employment and reward for human labour are all entrusted to private rather than public control.\textsuperscript{33}

The difference in emphasis between the above two definitions is noticeable. For, while the first definition emphasizes, in a typically Marxist fashion, the class distinction inherent in capitalism, the second stresses the absence of State control of the productive, distributive, and exchange processes within the economy.

\textsuperscript{32} F. Elliot and M. Summerskill, \textit{A Dictionary of Politics, 56} (Hampstead: Penguin, 1957) quoted by Azikiwe in \textit{Ideology for Nigeria} op.cit., p.11

Furthermore, Azikiwe's description of a capitalist society equally sheds some light on the meaning of capitalism. According to him,

when a person lives in an economic system that is characterised by private ownership of capital goods whose production, distribution and prices are determined by him, motivated solely by the profit he envisages to make in the bargain, in a free market and without unreasonable state interference, we say that such a person lives in a capitalist society.\(^{34}\)

Capitalism can be said to be the oldest economic doctrine in comparison with socialism and welfarism. At least, some of its principles have been operative, in varying degrees, in all economic contexts. James D. Forman tells us that it is only capitalism, among its rival systems of communism and socialism, that evolved naturally and peacefully as a normal economic doctrine. It was not forced on man, it is claimed, with the barrel of the gun nor through any other form of violence as is claimed about communism and socialism in modern times. Rather, capitalism "simply grew as a way of doing business, and ultimately, a way of living."\(^{35}\) In other words, capitalism was born, not made. It was not the


creation of intellectuals and theoreticians as socialism and communism are known to be. However, Forman is not denying that there have been economists and philosophers who have been expounding the workings of capitalism. His point is that capitalism "has developed in a pragmatic rather than a theoretical fashion."  

According to Azikiwe, there are three main features of capitalism. These are: individual or corporate ownership of capital goods; investment with the sole motive of making profits, and price determination of manufactured goods through the forces of supply and demand.

Elaborating on these three main features of capitalism, Azikiwe points out that ownership of the means of production 37 is by individuals or corporations. An individual may own the means of production and may set up and manage a business enterprise. This is known as "one-man business" or "sole proprietorship," in economic parlance. Equally, two or more persons may form a liability company or a partnership with the object of manufacturing and selling a particular commodity. The essential point here is that ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange under a capitalist economy by private individuals who are not absolutely dictated to by any state

36 Ibid, p. 9
37 Azikiwe employs the term "means of production" to cover such factors as land, factories, machinery and natural resources. (Cf., *Ideology for Nigeria*, Op.cit., p. 11).
planning agency.

Private control of the economy under a capitalist economy is contrasted with state control of the economic life of the people under a socialist economy. The emphasis on the freedom of producers and consumers, and on non-official interference in the economic process under capitalism is a principle expressed as "Laissez faire! Laissez passer!" ("Let them do as they wish! Let them pass") 38 Thus government control of the economy is an anathema under a capitalist economy while it is the cornerstone of socialism.

The second feature of capitalism identified by Azikiwe is the profit motive for investment. What is meant by this is that the hope to make profits, rather than any altruistic considerations, is the sole motive for investments. Also, under a capitalist economy individuals are free to invest their capital anywhere and on anything without state control, apart from the ordinary legal processes. Their main reason for investing their capital in the business is to enable them to earn dividends, that is, to make profits. 39 Thus the hope to make profits is the sole incentive which directs investments under a capitalist economy. This

feature embodies the selfish and exploitative traits which most critics of capitalism harp on. For the profit motive easily drives the capitalist to extreme individualism and selfishness which becloud any humane considerations for others in his pursuit of economic life.

The third feature of capitalism expounded by Azikiwe is that the prices of manufactured goods are determined through the forces of supply and demand in a free and competitive market. In his own words,

the manufactured goods under a capitalist economy are sold at a price which is fixed by the factors of supply and demand, in addition to the costs of producing, distributing and managing goods sold, including labour.⁴⁰

In other words, the price at which a manufactured good is sold depends on the market situation; on what the buyer is willing to pay for the good supplied and the seller's consideration of the costs of production as well as the profit he hopes to make. It is expected that if the buyer offers to take the good away at a price above the marginal cost of production, the seller would sell the good since he would be able to make a marginal profit on the good. But the forces of supply and demand can only operate effectively within a free and competitive market situation.

⁴⁰ Ibid, p. 11
That is to say that there should be no conscious human intervention (official or monopolistic) in the market operations.

Without any undue interference, the free market enterprise is believed to have a self-adjusting mechanism as if impelled by an invisible hand. Adam Smith, the father of modern economics and an anti-mercantilist\(^{41}\) theoretician, had expressed the conviction that business left to its own devices, would achieve a system responsive to natural economic laws, and hence one that worked for the mutual benefit of all.\(^ {42}\)

The above conclusion, Forman tells us, rest on three basic assumptions:

first, man is selfish; second, that man if left on his own, will be the best judge of his own self-interest and maximize it; and finally, that the welfare of the society is the sum of all these individual welfares.\(^ {43}\)

However, these assumptions are not totally correct. For, if we examine the first assumption that man is selfish, we notice that it is a generalization about the behavioural disposition of man. But granted that man has a tendency to be selfish, he also has a tendency to be

---

\(^{41}\) Mercantilism "had insisted that without governmental supervision, economic activity would lapse into chaos." (Forman, *op. cit.*, p. 25).

\(^{42}\) Forman, *op. cit.*, n. 25

\(^{43}\) Ibid., p. 25
altruistic.\textsuperscript{44}

Second, although there is some truth in the assumption that a man is the best judge of his self-interest but the moral status of such self-interest is beyond his personal determination alone. Thus although a man may be the best judge of his personal interest, such self-interest may conflict with the self-interests of other members of the society and a clash of interest would result. This would eventually lead to the disintegration of societal order. For this reason, the assumption that man, if left alone will be the best judge of his self-interest and will maximize it is mistaken because the conflicts which the pursuit of divergent self-interests by various members of the society would generate would eventually frustrate their attainment and maximization.

Finally, it is erroneous to assume that the welfare of the society is the sum of individual welfares. For one thing, individual welfares are hardly quantifiable such that they would be summed up to arrive at the welfare of

\textsuperscript{44} In fact, the history of mankind is dotted with some individuals whose actions were motivated by altruism or selfless consideration for others. We only need to recall a few names such as Indira Gandhi, a lawyer and hero of Indian nationalism who, rather than engage in a lucrative legal practice for personal aggrandizement, opted to fight relentlessly for the independence of India — unmindful of the severe personal costs he incurred. Again, we still have a living epitome of altruism and patriotism in the person of Nelson Mandela, the anti-apartheid Crusader who refuses to accept personal freedom in exchange of the independence of black South Africans.
the society. However, while we would accept that the individual welfares are not separable from that of the society, it is incorrect to assert that the latter is the summation of the former. What we rather observe is that there is a progressive and mutual relationship between individual welfares and societal welfare. They may mutually promote each other.

The above observations show that the free enterprise economy or capitalism has some faulty assumptions about the nature of man and societal welfare. This partly explains why capitalism has failed in some ways to produce the desired socio-economic relations for man. This calls for some efforts to squeeze out some truths which capitalism contains while its errors should be discarded.

Unfortunately, the proponents of capitalism or the free enterprise economy seem to have either not detected the weakness of their basic assumptions or simply glossed them over. Thus the chief apostles of the free market economic were religious in extolling its virtues. Hence, Adam Smith, the best known of these exponents, strongly argued that the free market economy is not a chaotic one. According to him, it is naturally regulated by man's self-interest. He observed that self-interest leads to an exchange of value, with the belief that what is received is more valuable to the
recipient than what he offered for it.\textsuperscript{45}

In this way, he argues, individuals tend to improve their lots by obtaining maximum satisfaction of their wants and invariably maximize public good as well — since it is assumed that the welfare of the society is the sum of all the individual welfares.\textsuperscript{46}

He maintained that this process is inevitable as long as the natural system is not tampered with. Consequently, the proper role of government in a free enterprise, it was argued, is to

maintain justice, furnish national defense, erect public works, and provide the institutions that were too complex for individuals to create.\textsuperscript{47}

Incidentally, Adam Smith did not envisage the rise of monopolies and the eventual interference with the free market mechanism.

Increasingly, the emergence of monopolies within the capitalist economy eroded the sovereignty of the consumer which has been one of the basic assumptions of a free

\textsuperscript{45} Ibid, p. 25
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid, p. 25
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid, pp. 25 - 26
market economy. Monopoly, which V.I. Lenin and other Marxist thinkers believe to be an inevitable child of capitalist development, actually negates the desired free competition which is an important tenet of capitalism.

Monopoly can be achieved by the individual as well as by the State. In the case of the former, Forman observes that

A monopoly may occur naturally when one competitor, by fair means or foul, absorbs all competition and becomes the sole source of a certain product or service. 43

As for state monopoly of the means of production, distribution and exchange, Forman points out that this is the hallmark of communism and socialism. Under a socialist economy, monopoly is enforced through the use of state power. Forman points out that since both communism and socialism have

more faith in the state than in the individual, both seek to place the means of production in the hands of the government, and the result is a form of state capitalism. 49

The pertinent point to note, however, is that in both individual and State monopolies, the public's choice is limited since the monopolist can control output and influence price. In this way the monopolist, in a way,

---

48 Ibid, p. 10
49 Ibid, p. 10
usurps the sovereignty of the consumer and by so doing, disrupts the supposed self-adjusting mechanism in a free enterprise economy which earlier economic theorists had expounded.

The other point we need to mention here is that the concept "capitalism" has been greatly enlarged from that of a single "economic system of free enterprise" which, paradoxically put, was conceived so as to exist "apart from politics," to a conception of it today "not only as an economic but as a socio-political system," (because of the need for State control). Capitalism today, like socialism is not merely an economic doctrine, it integrates politics and social relations as well.

(ZIK THE PRO-CAPITALIST)

Having examined the meaning and characteristics of capitalism, Azikiwe proceeds to consider its good and bad aspects so as to select the good and discard the bad in his formulation of Neo-welfarism. In the first place, Azikiwe notes that one of the arguments in favour of capitalism is that it helps to diffuse power, though more or less awkwardly, in the society by placing wealth in the hands of property owners rather than in a single authority like the State. This function of diffusing power in the society can be best appreciated if we remember that economic power greatly determines

50 Ibid. p. 11
political power as is evident in the popular adage which says that "wealth is power." However, not only do we recognize that this adage can be turned the other way round: "power is wealth" but the power diffused in the hands of property-owners may be as good or as bad as that in the hands of the State.

It is a much vexed question in modern economic thought whether wealth should be in the hands of a single owner — the State who ipso facto can exert unlimited power over the people.\textsuperscript{51} Proponents of capitalism answer this question in the negative. They contend that the means of production, distribution and exchange should not be concentrated in the hands of the State as their sole owner because it could lead to the confiscation of individual liberties by the State. But socialist advocates (of a State-controlled economy) would like to dismiss the fears expressed by the capitalists as unfounded. They would argue that a State-controlled economy, would actually enhance individual liberty and well-being. However, empirical observation of the state of individual liberty and well-being in those countries which today claim to be socialist or communist tend to justify the fears of opponents of a State-controlled economy.

Notwithstanding this observation, a Marxist explanation would maintain that in the transition period from capitalism to communism through socialism, this experience is inevitable.

Another argument in favour of capitalism, according to Azikiwe, is that "a free market economy is natural and more preferable than [sic] a command economy" under socialism or communism. This argument is buttressed by the contention that capitalism evolved naturally along with liberalism as a way of doing business and a way of living. Over the years, individuals have found themselves in a world of economic interdependence where their attempts to satisfy their ever-increasing wants naturally draw them into contributing their own quotas in the productive process — each according to his relevant skill, ability and personal volition. This is the story of the development of capitalism with the attendant division and specialization of labour.

However, we need to observe that the argument that capitalism evolved naturally as a way of doing business could be valid only if it can be shown that the social relations arising from social labour were natural and not conventional. This matter has remained highly controversial and so is the question as to whether

---

52 Ibid., p. 12
capitalism is natural or conventional.

The freedom of workers to expend their productive energy in any area they desire which the free enterprise economy guarantees, is abrogated in a "command economy."\(^{53}\) In the latter case, the State dictates to "individuals where to work, what to do, what to produce, what price to charge, what to invest and what to save? [sic]."\(^{54}\)

Hence, proponents of capitalism emphasize that it is voluntary and democratic in character while socialism and communism are mandatory and authoritarian.

We can also observe that the contention by the proponents of capitalism that it is voluntary and democratic in contrast to the authoritarianism which both socialism and communism imply is only correct in part. This is to the extent that the authoritarian character of the capitalist economy is covert and not overt as in socialism and communism. Nonetheless, the specialization which is attendant upon division of labour implicitly determines where individuals work, what they do, what wages to earn as well as what to spend and to save. What we are saying is that both the capitalist and socialist systems have authoritarian characters. The difference appears in the fact that one is covert and the other overt.

---

\(^{53}\) The so-called totalitarian economy such as the socialist's (or eventually communist's) is what Azikiwe refers to as "command economy."

Furthermore, Azikiwe recognizes the important argument that free competition and the profit motive inherent in the capitalist system serve as an incentive to greater efficiency and improvement in production. This is because a better improvement in the technique of production, leading to better quality products at lower cost prices, would no doubt lead to increased profits.

Azikiwe notes that the profit-motive has been an incentive to efficiency. This has resulted in better "products, lower prices, better services, which would ultimately lead to higher standard of living." The exponents of this point maintain that self-interest, or in the business sphere, profit motive, has been inherent in the nature of human beings, all over the world, at all known times of history.

Stressing how the profit-motive leads to increased efficiency and better services, exponents of capitalism have argued that since every business venture involves the possibility of making losses instead of profits, the average businessman knows this to be a calculated risk. But since experience has shown that in all known business ventures, efficiency yields profits while inefficiency leads to losses, it is expected that the capitalists would
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strive to be efficient so as to make profits. 56

It has equally been argued, very vehemently by
Galbraith, that capitalism, with progressive efficiency,
would lead to the emergence of an affluent society which
would undoubtedly "secure to all who needed it, the
minimum income for decency and comfort." 57 Such an affluent
society, it is argued, would ensure that the needy are
taken care of and there would be no need to enforce the
rule that a person who did not work should not eat as socia-

dism and communism would have it. It is only in a poor
(society, argued Zik) 58 that such a rule is relevant.
He concedes that there is nothing to force the affluent
society to cater for those in want but he argues that
such a society would not have much justification for the
callousness which its neglect of the needy would amount
to. 58

Another argument in favour of capitalism (though not
mentioned by Azikiwe, but which may be relevant here) was
expounded by Ludwig Von Mises. According to him, capitalism
has made goods and services, undreamt of before, available

56 Ibid., p. 12
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to both the common man and the rich. This is true, but one can equally point out to him that with the availability of such goods and services, man still yearns for more. He agrees that the more man enjoys those everyday goods and services, the more he desires them, but he insists that such is the nature of man: the more he has, the greater his desire to have more. He sees the insatiable nature of man to be an important propeller to societal betterment. He believes that the attempt to satisfy the ever-increasing wants of man spurs the capitalists to invent better and more efficient means of production and, in so doing, continually engender economic and over-all human progress.59

We need to observe here that Zik does not appear to make any new contribution to advance the cause of capitalism. He rather highlighted some classical arguments in favour of capitalism. He seems convinced by these arguments as he did not say anything to the contrary. It is perhaps, these points in favour of capitalism that Zik believes should be harmonised with those of socialism, welfarism and proto-welfarism. At any rate, Zik's presentation of the arguments for capitalism is more or less journalistic than critical. This perhaps accounts

for his repeating the slogans of the exponents of capitalism without criticizing them. But Zik the anti-capitalist takes care of this weakness.

(8) ZIK THE ANTI-CAPITALIST

Here, Azikiwe identifies many arguments against capitalism. He acknowledges the severity of the criticisms which evidently led him to the conclusion that capitalism as an economic and socio-political system cannot lead to his envisioned "abundant society which would make it possible for all to have enough, to care enough, and to give enough."60

One argument against capitalism is that it encourages a debilitating exploitation of workers by their capitalist employers and allows the latter to live parasitically on the sweat of the former, for workers are not given rewards commensurate with their labour input in production. It is the labour of workers that creates wealth in the form of surplus value. But instead of the workers to enjoy the products of their labour, their capitalist employers appropriate all the profits to themselves and give workers little stipends (in form of salaries) just enough to keep them alive. This is consequent upon the fact that the largest share of the fruits of labour goes to the management, share-holders, speculators, middlemen and other extraneous elements, who did not directly labour in order to produce what has

---

60 This has been cited earlier.
enabled the business to operate at a profit. The fact that they supplied the capital with which the production was ... is no justification for the under-payment of wages to workers.\(^5\)

In the classical criticism against capitalism, it is said that by continual appropriation of surplus value to themselves, the capitalists grow wealthier. They live in luxury while the workers live in penury. Hence, the gap between the rich capitalists and the poor workers ever continues to widen. Based on this fact, many critics have maintained that capitalism gives rise to a society which seems "organised in the interest of the rich, thereby leading to grave inequalities of wealth and opportunities."\(^5\)

Such a society is an unjust one, and Marx and other like-minded thinkers suggest that the cause of inequitable distribution of wealth in the capitalist society is that a few capitalists selfishly and unilaterally appropriate to themselves the surplus value created by labour. Karl Marx strove to justify his contention that the employers of labour have no right to appropriate to themselves the surplus value which they did not create. But since their only claim to it was they owned the means of production,

---

\(^{5\text{1}}}\) (However, in most underdeveloped economies of Africa and Asia where neo-colonialist capitalism operates, most workers are actually starving. This is the case in such countries as Nigeria where hyper-inflation has pushed most workers to the fringes of starvation).

\(^{5\text{2}}}\) Ibid, p. 14
Marx and other socialist thinkers advocate that workers should own the means of production in order to enjoy the fruits of their labour. This contention is the kernel of socialism and communism.

Another criticism, similar to the one we have given above, holds that capitalism gives rise to a situation in which "the means of production are monopolized by a few to exploit the many." On this account, critics advocate that the ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange should be concentrated in the hands of the state which would control them in the interest of the public as opposed to the selfish interests to which private owners of the means of production usually employed them. This suggestion was informed by the belief that while capital is necessary in the productive process, the individual capitalists are not; hence, the advocacy of the socialization of the means of production. It was from this that the word "socialism" derives its essence.

Furthermore, capitalism has been criticized as encouraging cut-throat competition. Here it is argued that "competition is unnecessary, because it often leads to injustice and the crushing out of small competitors." Opponents of competition argue that it leads to in calculable waste, extravagance, and duplicity as one competitor tries...
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to edge out the other(s) in business. Also, when unrestrained, competition tends to lower wages, causes overproduction of goods, encourages the production of cheap materials, and creates unemployment. 66

These evils of unrestrained competition made critics to advocate the abandonment of competition and its substitution with the principle of co-operation. This should be accompanied by the principle of "equality of opportunity and equality of rewards."

Further criticism against capitalism as highlighted by Azikiwe draws its strength from the conception of man as depraved, selfish, acquisitive, vicious and vindictive. It is then argued that under capitalism which allows full reign of economic individualism, man's depraved nature manifests in all colours.

By allowing such an unethical being to live in a society, which encourages economic individualism, it accentuates man's weakness and gives full play to his dishonest motives. 67

To avoid this undesirable situation, the argument goes, it behoves the state to intervene in the economic life of the people in order to rationalize economic institutions, chart an economic path so as to cater for the well-being of the weak and the vulnerable.

66 Ibid., p. 15
67 Ibid., p. 15
However, we should observe here that while it cannot be reasonably denied that there are certain depraved and vicious tendencies in man, we do not agree that such negative tendencies give an adequate conception and characterization of man. For, as we have pointed out earlier, man equally has within his nature certain positive dispositions for love, charity, philanthropy, altruism and so forth. Again, it is not true that man is unethical as the above criticism suggests because by the term "ethical," we mean knowledge of what is right or wrong, good or bad. It is rather correct to say that man's knowledge of what is right and what is wrong does not guarantee, contrary to Socrates' claims, that he would do what is right and refrain from what is wrong. He needs a strong incentive of reward or threat of punishment to act rightly and refrain from acting wrongly.

Another criticism (by socialists) against capitalism is that it has no inherent mechanism for intelligent planning. Thus the capitalist system has turned out to be an anarchist system, especially as monopolies, oligopolies and cartels have all conspired to thwart the postulated "invisible hand" which Adam Smith and his followers had taken to be the natural principle of order within the capitalist system. Thus "it is not always possible to devise a systematic and coordinate economic life so as to prevent the anomalies of contemporary
Azikiwe notes Laidler's lamentation over this situation. According to Azikiwe, Laidler lamented that the phenomenon of poverty and unemployment among many Americans was not due to lack of resources but due to abysmal failure to inaugurate a planned economy for the interest of the community rather than the profit of the few.

Finally, the capitalist system has been criticised as encouraging the acquisitive tendency in man. The profit-motive has turned the capitalist into an acquisitive maniac whose desire to acquire more wealth increases with the more wealth he acquires. Thorstein Veblen whose criticism of this feature of capitalism is discussed by Azikiwe, maintained that capitalism has produced ferocious, self-seeking, brutish, parasitic, fraudulent and predatory 'captains of industry' who employ business enterprise as an instrument to capture and control

Laidler's lamentation can be amplified ten times for Nigeria and most poor countries of the world where, in spite of theoretical and ideological mutilations, capitalism operates in its most ferocious form. For, the human and material resources which nature bestowed on Nigeria most bountifully are still in self-debilitating chaos, crying loudly to be mobilized through proper planning. Thus in Nigeria, worst than in America or any European capitalist country, the operation of foreign-manipulated capitalism has given birth to an unprecedented poverty, unemployment, violent crimes, official corruption, acceptance of toxic waste for money and other sundry vices which beevil the Nigerian society today.
industrial inventions and processes in order to amass wealth for purely selfish purpose. He reproached the wealthy for making money to make more money by restricting production, eliminating competition, decreasing efficiency, adulterating products, and misleading consumers by useless duplicating and unproductive advertising.69

Indeed, capitalism nurtures a business culture which negates such fine ethical values as consideration for others, limited egoism; abhorrence of cheating, violence, fraud, embezzlement and the like. Capitalism, thus, gave rise to the depraved maxim that "There is no morality in business." The fallacy in this maxim is evident when we recall that the issue of morality (the rightness or wrongness of human actions) is always present whenever a certain relationship exists between two or more people. Such a relationship could be economic, social or political. In fact, the issue of morality pervades all aspects of inter-personal relations.

Here again, we need to observe that Azikiwe's treatment of the arguments against capitalism is more or less reportorial than analytical and critical. He made no additional contribution to the already classical criticisms of capitalism. He appears to be in too much hurry to get to Neo-welfarism than to think of other possible arguments against capitalism. Perhaps, this is one of the instances

69 Ibid, p. 16
in which Zik the journalist swapped places with Zik the socio-political philosopher.

In view of the above-highlighted vices which are present in the capitalist system, Azikiwe rejects it as a suitable system under whose auspices the much desired abundant, humane and just society can be built. However, his analysis of capitalism reveals that there are some of its features which can be adapted in the effort to articulate a pragmatic philosophy for the establishment of a better society. Those features are such that encourage individuals to put in their best in any endeavour; promote efficiency in production and allow some measure of individual freedom which also recognizes the freedom of others. We shall later appraise how successful Azikiwe is in appropriating the good features of capitalism while discarding the bad ones in his formulation of his Neo-welfarist philosophy.

5.3 ZIK ON SOCIALISM:

As was the case with capitalism, Azikiwe analysed socialism in order to assess its adequacy as a socio-economic doctrine that can usher in a better society. His interest in the theoretical explanation of socialism was heightened by the fact that its advocates especially in the under-developed countries of Africa and Asia, have been making their voices loud in proclaiming socialism to be the panacea to under-development and abject poverty. They present it as a kind of magic wand which is capable of
turning this exploitative and inhuman world of the economic man into a paradise where exploitation of man by man would be a bad dream; where everyman would have according to his needs rather than according to his ability; where the productive essence of man will be fully realized solely for his own benefits and the products of his labour enjoyed by him.

Azikiwe himself had been a sympathizer of a brand of socialism usually qualified as "Fabian." He had been attracted to socialism since his undergraduate days in America. He discloses that his exposure to the discipline of Economic Theory and consequently to Christian and Fabian brands of socialism gave him deeper insight into the Socialist doctrine. He hardly knew which to adopt at that time probably because both impressed him alike.70

However, when he returned to Nigeria, and after following closely the efforts of the British Labour Party, most of whose members were Fabian socialists, at liberating the colonies he decided to be an ardent sympathizer of Fabian Socialism. He explains that his decision to be an adherent of Fabian Socialism was "both sentimental and substantial."71 On the sentimental plane, he was impressed by the life and tactics of Fabius Maximus Verrucosus. Fabius, nick-named the "Delayer," was famous for his tactics of waiting for the right time in order to strike the

70 Ibid, p. 93
71 Ibid, pp. 93-94
hardest blow at an opponent. It was this tactic which characterized Fabian Socialism. This principle enjoins one to wait for the most opportune time to act in order to achieve the desired result.72 Hence, Fabian Socialism advocates a gradual attainment of socialist goals through constitutional reforms. Marxist socialists would regard this as day-dreaming since they are convinced that the socialist order cannot be brought about except through a social revolution.

On the substantial level, Azikiwe might have been attracted to Fabian Socialism because it preached peaceful reforms that could better human society and remove numerous social and economic injustices. Again, Azikiwe saw the Fabian tactics of waiting for the right time as a principle of patience which he had grown to admire. He confesses that he had ever adopted Fabian tactics as a guiding and practical philosophy of life.73

Later, when Azikiwe became active in politics, he and other like-minded trade unionists and intellectuals were able to persuade their party — the National Council of Nigeria and Cameroons, later named National Council of Nigerian Citizens when Northern Cameroon decided (in a plebicite) to join their Southern counterparts — to provide, in its constitution of 1955 the goal of achieving a "Socialist Commonwealth."74 This goal was to be pursued
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according to the principles of Fabian Socialism—through gradual and peaceful reforms. He confessedly states that on several occasions, he never hesitated to clarify that "when contrasted, socialism was the path for Nigeria, as against capitalism." It was a real conviction. But after observing certain events in many countries of the world, especially the ascendancy of the British Labour Party which comprised many Fabian Socialists, Azikiwe claims to have seen "some of the glaring defects of socialism. These call for an alternative ideology adaptable to Nigerian circumstances." But what are these glaring defects of socialism which were betrayed by the activities of its adherents in the British Labour Party and by socialists elsewhere? Azikiwe's answer is given in his analysis of the defects of socialism to which we shall turn later.

The questions which Azikiwe seems to be seeking answers to, with regards to socialism include: what is the meaning and nature of "Socialism?" what are the merits and demerits of socialism as an economic-cum-political philosophy? Let us begin our analysis with the first part of the question which calls for a definition of socialism. According to Azikiwe, Socialism means an economic system in which the means of production, distribution and exchange together with the administration of social services are concentrated in the hands of

---

77 Ibid., p. 96.
of the state and dispensed from each according to his ability to each according to his ability
\[\text{sic}\].\textsuperscript{73}

The last word in this quotation appears to be a typographical error. For it would amount to a useless
tautology to talk of "from each according to his ability to each according to his ability." The appropriate
word to be used in the above context is "work" and not "ability." This correction holds because it is a
popular socialist ideal of establishing a society where each will have according to his work rather than
according to his ability, that Azikiwe incorporates in his definition.

In another breath, he asserts that "socialism is a
system of society in which there is no private property."\textsuperscript{79}
Here, we need to observe that this claim is manifestly
bogus and can hardly stand the test of searching
criticisms. For, when we understand the term "private
property" in its widest sense as "material possessions,"
it includes such things as clothes, items of furniture
and other personal effects, it is doubtful whether any
avowed socialist would subscribe to such a conception of
socialism. Perhaps, what Azikiwe meant when he defined
socialism in terms of absence of private property, is that
under socialism, individuals do not own the means of
production, distribution and exchange.

Even with the above clarification, the socialist

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., p. 6
\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., p. 19
position on private property has to be properly understood. One way of doing this is to let the founders of modern-day "Scientific Socialism" speak on the issue. Here, many would be surprised to learn that Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (fathers of modern socialism) did not conceive socialism as a socio-economic system in which all forms of private property is absent. The type of private property which these socialist "gurus" believe socialism would abolish is the private possession of industrial capital as a factor of production. Small artisans and peasants can still own private property which accrue directly from their personal labour. The thinking is, perhaps, that such small possession of private property is not, and cannot be, the creator of extreme inequalities and unfair distribution of products which the socialists seek to redress. In this regard, Marx and Engels wrote:

Hard-won, self-acquired, self-earned property! Do you mean the property of the petty artisan and the small peasant, a form of property which preceded the bourgeois form? There is no need to abolish that ...

The above quotation clearly shows that even the arch-apostles of socialism do not mean that there would be no form of private property under socialism. Petty private property holdings would still exist among artisans and peasants.

30 "Scientific Socialism" is contrasted with speculative or utopian Socialism of Thomas More and his ideological colleagues (See Forman, Socialism, p. 21-23.)

This is a point which modern theorists on socialism seem to miss when they expound the anti-private property character of socialism. Such omission further removes socialism from the level of human realities and, consequently, unacceptable to many.

Equally, there is a problem of logic when we take the first and second definitions together. This is because the concentration of the means of production, distribution and exchange in the hands of the state as definition one states to be the case under socialism, does not logically entail the absence of private property as the second definition requires. What can be said, according to the first definition given by Azikiwe above is that socialism requires the state to have an over-riding control over the factors of production, distribution and the means of exchange.

Still on the definition of socialism, Azikiwe quotes a definition which he claims to be universally acceptable. According to this definition, socialism is

"a political and economic theory according to which the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned and controlled by the people, everyone should be given an equal opportunity to develop his talents and the wealth of the community should be fairly distributed." 32

We would agree that this definition contains the gem of socialism but Azikiwe's claim to its universal acceptability is questionable. For one thing, there is hardly any definition of a concept which is not subject to disquisitions. For another, the many brands of socialism — utopian, Fabian, scientific, African — betray conceptual disagreement which makes Azikiwe's claim erroneous.

The conceptual problem of socialism notwithstanding, Azikiwe observes that the aim of socialism is: the reorganization of society for the purpose of "owning and managing land, capital and the means of production, distribution and exchange" so as to promote equality of opportunity and the socio-economic welfare of all. Implicit in this, is the desire to stamp-out exploitation and inequality in the people's socio-economic relations which have been the results of a system of private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange.

Socialism, Azikiwe maintains, is altruistic in concept. This altruistic character is emphasized by its demanding the "expansion of State activities ... to ensure freedom and justice to the individual." in economic and social matters. The altruism or more concern for the general good of all members of the community inherent in socialism, its demand for consideration for others, for equitable distribution of wealth among all members of the

---
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society, sharply contrast with the promotion of rugged individualism, selfishness and exploitation which are the hall-marks of capitalism.

Furthermore, Azikiwe emphasizes the universality of the principle of socialism and frowns at any cultural or personal limitation of the concept. He views with distaste such tags as "African Socialism" and sees it as "absurd to isolate socialism as it is practised in Europe as it is practised in Africa." Following his reasoning, it would be absurd to talk of "African Socialism" just as it would be to talk of "African Capitalism" or "African democracy," because "Socialism" "Capitalism" and "democracy" are universal concepts.

However, Azikiwe maintains that his rejection of continental or cultural description of socialism does not amount to a denial that a people (be they Europeans or Africans) can adapt socialism to suit their way of life. True, Socialism is adaptable to a people's way of life but this fact should not warrant a cultural tag such as "African Socialism." For, Socialism's opposition to exploitation and oppression in the society as well as its fight for socio-economic justice and equality of all have universal applicability irrespective of race and culture. Such is the universal character of socialism.  

85 Ibid, p. 63
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Azikiwe says he is impressed by Julius Nyerere "as one of the few African leaders who understood the intrinsic values of socialism that can be adapted to the African way of life"; and who did not by that give it a restrictive meaning. But Nyerere's Ujamaa (Socialism?) in Tanzania, Azikiwe claims, failed to achieve an economically and socially vibrant society where security, equality and abundance prevail. We need to observe, however, that the failure of Nyerere is not, ipso facto, a failure of socialism. The failure of people to approximate a doctrine in practice does not necessarily mean the failure of that doctrine. Azikiwe did not make this important distinction. Equally, Azikiwe maintains that failure was the fate of other African countries such as Algeria, Egypt, Ghana, Guinea, Senegal, Tunisia, Zaire and Zambia, "which adapted socialism under different aliases." The failure-story of socialism in Africa seems to convince Azikiwe that it is not the path to the envisioned better society which African states are yearning for. It convinced him that an alternative path to both socialism and capitalism must be followed by African States, nay any state in the world, in their quest for development and the establishment of a humane and prosperous society. The third path which Azikiwe constructed is his "Neo-welfarism." We shall turn to it later.

37 Ibid., p. 68
38 Ibid., p. 72
Really, one can criticise the tag "African Socialism" from a slightly different viewpoint than that of Azikiwe. For if by the expression "African Socialism" one is referring to a uniform doctrine which encapsulates Africans' adaptation of the universal principles of socialism to suit the African way of life, then such a cultural or continental description of socialism would have been justified contrary to Azikiwe's thinking. Perhaps, it is more meaningful to talk of "African Socialisms" instead of "African Socialism". For there is no uniform doctrine to which the name "African Socialism" refers. Even the Dakar Conference on African Socialism in 1962 failed to produce a workable definition of "African Socialism." Again, the problem of the precise meaning of "African socialism" is compounded by the fact that whatever content the expression might have, it is not "the product of a single thinker," neither is it distinctively and uniquely associated with any particular African leader or thinker.39 Yet the term has been widely employed by Africans and non-Africans to designate what is taken to be a peculiar socialist ideological orientation which modern African States are adopting in order to tackle their

developmental problems. "African Socialism" as it is presently conceived is at best a mere geographical expression, a lazy way of emblocking the various adaptations of socialism by many African leaders and thinkers.

At this point, let us leave the question of "African Socialism" at that and now turn our attention to what merits and demerits Azikiwe finds in Socialism. He claims to have incorporated the merits of socialism in his Neo-welfarist philosophy while he discarded its demerits.

(A) ZIK THE PRO-SOCIALIST

Azikiwe highlights the following arguments in favour of socialism:

(i) promotion of public welfare; (ii) fair distribution of wealth; (iii) public ownership of productive and distributive ventures as well as (iv) demand for scientific planning. Let us briefly examine these arguments in turn.

(i) In the first place, proponents of socialism have strongly argued that socialism is essentially a humanistic and altruistic socio-political doctrine which seeks the over-all economic and social well-being of individuals and the society. Socialism as a socio-political philosophy outlines the principles through which the human and economic resources of any nation can be harnessed and managed for the benefit of all. In the main, socialism advocates that the state as an aggregation of individuals should assume direct

90 These arguments are equally valid for the various forms of socialism.
ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange so as to ensure equitable economic and social relationship among members of the society as well as to ensure equal rights and enjoyment of the resources of the state.  

(ii) Economic equality, socialists emphasize, is the only guarantee to political and social equality. The humanism and altruism which socialism embodies are manifest in its emphasis on co-operation, equality and mutual aid among men as opposed to competition and selfish exploitation which capitalism perpetuates. The ideal of socialism to bring about an exploitation-free society where just socio-economic relations obtain, and where everyone would put all his ability in the productive process but take from the output only what he needs is the highest theoretical elevation of humanism and altruism. We need to observe here, that expressions "economic equality" and "social equality" are difficult to understand. What do they mean? Not even those who use them can say precisely, what they mean. They appear to be nothing more than slogans.

(iii) Furthermore, it has been argued in favour of socialism that it enjoins that the wealth of a nation be fairly and equally distributed. Socialists argue that unfair distribution of wealth is characteristic of the capitalist system and is the source of injustice and division of society into antagonistic classes of the rich and the poor; employers

and workers; masters and slaves. Lop-sided distribution of wealth in favour of the industrialist—employer class and the consequent pauperization of the workers, socialists argue, is the root-cause of class antagonism which will be totally eliminated when wealth is equitably distributed. Equitable distribution of wealth, it is further contended, is only possible under the aegis of the socialist State in which all wealth belong to the people and is enjoyed by each according to his needs rather than according to his ability. It seems to us that Azikiwe is here merely repeating the slogans of socialist exponents without questioning them. For instance, what does it mean to "fairly" and equally distribute wealth of a nation? Or put differently, what does "equitable" distribution of wealth mean? These are mere slogans.

(iv) Equally, it has been contended that another advantage of the socialist system is that it has no room for economic wastes which result from competitive advertising, planlessness and duplicity which are the main features of the capitalist system. Socialism ensures effective utilization of available resources through meticulous planning and proper channelling of resources for the welfare of all.  

(v) Also, it has been argued that the socialist principle of nationalization of public utilities so as to make them serve the public interest as opposed to that of a few

92 Ibid, p. 19
individuals constitutes another point in its favour. Public ownership of such utilities as Post Office, telegraphs, telephones, coinage, docks, harbours, markets, forestry, the supply of electricity, corporations which operate the steel and coal, broadcasting and television, railways and airways and the like, would ensure that the public for which they are meant are not exploited by individual proprietors as is the case under capitalism. Again, the sole aim for the provision of such services under the socialist system is the satisfaction of the wants of the people and not for any motive of making only profit.

The merit of the socialist argument for public control of corporations is increasingly being recognized even by the capitalist states. For in most capitalist countries like the United States of America and Britain, there are many public utilities, such as those mentioned above, which are owned by the government so as to protect public interest. In other words, socialism has through this principle, spotlighted "the need to reform the capitalist system." It is in obvious recognition of the merits of the socialist doctrine that such capitalist states as Britain and America are increasingly reforming capitalism in the form of welfarism.

Finally, from Azikiwe's analysis, socialism recognizes and stresses the need for scientific economic planning.

93 Ibid, p. 20
Socialism stresses that man's economic life should not be left to blind chance-play of the forces of demand and supply which is the principal cause of economic exploitation and inequitable distribution of wealth. Man's socio-economic life should be thoroughly planned to ensure the desired economic growth and distribution of wealth. According to Azikiwe, socialists believe that "under scientific and rational control, the economic needs of society could be accurately estimated and the available land and capital fairly apportioned." Effective planning is made possible because under socialism the whole economy is centralized into one huge enterprise. Thus effective planning, one eliminates anarchy in economic life which has been one of the banes of capitalism.

(Z) ZIK THE ANTI-SOCIALIST:

Here, Azikiwe discusses the following arguments against socialism: (i) fallacy of collective ownership, (ii) multiplicity of socialist factions and (iii) the encouragement of totalitarian governments. Let us take these arguments one after the other.

(i) The charge that socialism involves the fallacy of collective ownership is two-pronged: one aspect is economic and the other is political. From the point of view of economics, critics assert that it is false to hold, as socialists do, that "private property in land and the control of the instruments of production are morally and economically wrong."

94 Ibid., p. 19
The contention, Azikiwe opines, is that "it is not true to human nature to substitute individual ownership for collective ownership." It is only through force that such a change from individual ownership to collective ownership can be effected, it has been argued. Thus, a denial of private property ownership under socialism is seen to be tantamount to a denial of man's natural economic drive and disposition. But, because ownership of private property is natural to man, even in communal living, one is constantly trying to manifest this natural impulse even within the iron cage of a socialist government. 96

In addition, the doctrine of collective ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange is — in practice — an illusion since what obtains is that the wealth of the nation is concentrated in the hands of the rulers whose enjoyment of it is according to "equitable" distribution of wealth, i.e. each according to his ability/merits. For, in practical terms, the peasants and workers have no access to certain facilities as the rulers whose standard of living is far above what the ordinary people can dream of. Consequently, although the claim is made for collective ownership of all resources under the socialist system, the degree of enjoyment of certain facilities or their

95 Ibid, p. 22

96 Perhaps, this is what Tito saw and allowed to prevail in Hungary which has been one of the most liberal socialist countries of Eastern Europe.
outright unavailability to the masses really expose the fallacy of collective ownership. For, if all the resources in a state are really collectively owned then they should be available to all citizens who need them. Thus, it seems that controllers of the nation's wealth under a socialist system are the leaders who can dispense with it as they deem fit, always in the guise of serving the interest of all.

The political dimension of the fallacy of collective ownership, Azikiwe maintains, relates to apparent over-estimation of the capacity of the government to run business efficiently. This is borne out by the experience of failures of the state to efficiently manage public utilities "due to the bureaucratic nature of its administrative machinery." 97

97 Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria, op. cit., p. 22 (Yet, this is not to deny that a very few public corporations in Nigeria may not have been well-managed "but it is obvious that, due to the essentially political nature of their existence, most of them have been distinct disappointments either at the Federal or Regional level."

At any rate, one may retort to Azikiwe that his reference to managerial incompetence and ineffectiveness on the part of government managers of public corporations in Nigeria is not an appropriate illustration of the incapability of the state to manage business under a socialist system. This is because Nigeria is not a socialist country nor does she pretend to be one. Socialists may point out to Azikiwe that the failure of public corporations in Nigeria and other countries is the necessary corollary of trying to ingraft some fine principles of socialism on a decadent capitalist system. Such has to be the case because embezzlement, bribery, corruption and other sundry causes of the failure of government-owned corporations in such ideologically-confused countries are but symptoms of the capitalist system.)
However, it can be conceded that the government may be in a better position to regulate and control business, but in practice, it has not demonstrated the capacity of competently and effectively managing business. Azikiwe holds that this argument can be easily sustained with reference to Nigeria where most public corporations managed by the government, such as the Airways, Railways, the National Electric Power Authority, and many others, perform badly and are wasteful due to poor management which is aggravated by the polluting influences of charges of tribalism, nepotism and corruption (proven or imagined) which are constantly levelled against government officials.

The above observation notwithstanding, there have been similar management problems - more in the forms of corruption and negligence than outright incompetence - with regards to public corporations even in the most acclaimed advanced socialist countries. An important admission to this effect was made by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in his January, 1987 Speech during which he decried the nonchalant and parochial attitude towards public property. He lamented the situation whereby, as in Nigeria, people tend to regard government property as "no man's property, belonging to no real owner and therefore could be stolen, left carelessly, or used to derive some personal profit ...."\(^\text{93}\)

---

Further, Gorbachev was quoted to have observed that consequent upon such an attitude,

the huge advantage offered by the socialist economic system, primarily its planned character was used inefficiently. In this situation irresponsibility struck root, and diverse bureaucratic rule and instructions were devised. Day-to-day practical activities were supplanted with decree-making, show of efficiency and mountains of paper-work.  

(ii) Another major weakness of socialism according to Azikiwe is the multiplicity of the school of thought which propagate it. Some of these even sub-divide into sects, factions and denominations. There are utopian socialists, christian socialists, Marxian socialists, guild socialists, Fabian socialists, democratic socialists, and what have you. Then there are socialists who prefer to employ evolutionary methods to achieve their objective; while others would use revolutionary means. Then there are those who regard themselves as scientific socialists as opposed to idealists and visionaries.  

In the eyes of its critics, socialism has become a house of babel which confuses the very people for whom it is meant to appeal and to save. In this way, socialism tends to lose its important message of socio-economic freedom for all in the variegated sectarian doctrines which have been associated with it.

99 Ibid., p. 13 (Gorbachev's observation equally holds true for most socialist and non-socialist countries where government owns enterprises. It really has much resemblance to the situation in Nigeria.)

Again, closely associated with the socialist sectarianism is the issue of personality cult. In Europe, as in Africa, each socialist sect or school is built around a certain person or persons. Asikiwe observes that even Marxian socialists (followers of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels) experienced further fission and polarization which introduced such personality cults and nomenclatures as Marxist, Leninist, Trotskyist, Stalinist, Titoist, and so on, into the dictionary of socialism. He points out that "This has been so confusing that some sympathizers of this humanistic ideology have been perplexed and disillusioned."\(^{101}\) This makes it all the more difficult for people to know whose socialism to accept and adopt.

However, the problem created by the existence of different schools of thought in socialism seems to me to have been exaggerated. Moreover, the charge that "socialists are always critical but not constructive"\(^{102}\) is not true. In the first place, although there are many schools of thought in socialism, there is hardly much disagreement over the goals which it is meant to achieve. In most cases what divides socialists is more a matter of method than of the goals to be pursued, even though it has to be conceded that the method for the attainment of the goals of socialism is equally as important as the goals set.

\(^{101}\) Ibid, p. 23

\(^{102}\) Ibid, p. 24
The problem of adopting socialism is not so much a matter of which of its different schools that should be followed. This is not, however, to deny that the presence of different schools apparently creates some confusion mostly among socialist intellectuals.

Equally, it is manifestly an untenable generalization to assert that socialists always criticise but do not construct. This view is immediately disproved by a cursory look at the achievements of socialists in Russia, China, Cuba, Bulgaria and other countries of the world where state-socialism is practised. The fact that one can see failure to act among some socialists does not warrant the fallacious generalization that they only criticise but not construct.

(iii) The final case against socialism by Azikiwe is that it tends towards totalitarianism. This is because, since its demand for altruism is not in the overall nature of man, it can only be effected by force. The attempt to inculcate the minimum discipline required to make man altruistic is of such a kind that leads to totalitarianism. In this vein, Azikiwe points out that

The experiences of the most successful socialist states, especially those situated in Eastern Europe, show definitely that unless discipline is engendered in the community by means of totalitarian methods, which need not be brutal necessarily, human beings do not voluntarily serve with a spirit of altruism. 103
These defects in socialism are, in Azikiwe's thinking, the grounds for its inadequacy as a doctrine capable of ushering in a realistic and humane society which can cater for the various interests of man, and where everybody will have enough, give enough and care enough; where individual initiative engendered by self-interest is harmonized with altruistic motive to serve others. Because of those inadequacies, Azikiwe urges that socialism should be partly abandoned while a more adequate philosophy for development should be sought. At the same time, he believes that socialism is not to be dispensed with totally. This is on the account that it has some merits which are to be incorporated with other realistic views of man in order to produce a more adequate socio-political philosophy.

5.4 ZIK ON COMMUNISM

A separate discussion would have been unwarranted but for the need to clarify the subtle but important differences between communism and socialism per se. This is because all the arguments in favour and against socialism apply to communism as well, yet some subtle differences exist between the two concepts which most people have often overlooked. Azikiwe himself implied that there are some differences between socialism and communism but failed to discuss such differences. But before we try to clarify the main differences between socialism and communism, let us briefly consider Azikiwe's definition of, and specific criticism against communism.
According to Azikiwe,

Communism means a society where the ownership of all the means of production, distribution and exchange of goods, together with the establishment and maintenance of social services is concentrated in the state and distributed to the workers, from them according to their ability to them according to their needs.\footnote{104}

This definition is essentially the same with that of "socialism" which Azikiwe gives as

an economic system in which the means of production, distribution and exchange together with the administration of social services are concentrated in the hands of the state and dispensed from each according to his ability to each according to his need.\footnote{105}

However, we notice that Azikiwe conceives communism as "a society" rather than an economic doctrine which he ascribes to socialism. But it seems to me that he is very much mistaken in viewing communism as a society rather than an ideology which it actually is. Communism properly conceived, is a socio-political ideology which seeks the establishment of a "stateless society"\footnote{106} where governmental institutions are non-existent (because they are no longer necessary superstructure) and where all the resources of the

\footnotesize{\begin{flushleft}
104 Ibid., p. 2  
105 Ibid., p. 6  
106 Ibid., p. 26
\end{flushleft}
society would be commonly owned and equally enjoyed by all. This is the ultimate ideal of the founding fathers of communism, Marx and Engels. For all communists, socialism is but a transitory phase in the march towards communism.

Thus the first important distinction between socialists, properly so-called, and communists is that the former regards the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, as well as the abolition of exploitation and socio-economic inequalities as the main goals of socialism. Thus, socialists (not in the Marxist tradition), do not conceive of any other stage beyond the socialist stage. 107 Socialists do not doctrinate on the withering of the state as the communists do, probably because it is rather the state which should control all the means of production, distribution and exchange. Thus while the existence of the state is necessary to socialism, it is not under communism at its highest stage.

On the other hand, while communists are in perfect agreement with the socialists about the characteristics of a socialist state, and while they see socialism as crucial and inevitable, they nevertheless regard socialism as only a passing phase towards a communist society. Thus the socialist stage is only a means to an end. The end is a communist society where government, law and other "superstructures" would be unnecessary. Here, again, we can observe another fault in Azikiwe's definition of communism.

107 Forman, Socialism, Op. cit., p. 4
He defined communism as a "society where the means of production ... are concentrated in the hands of the state ... " But the communist society as conceived by Karl Marx and his followers is one where the State (understood as government) would have withered away.

Another important difference between socialists and communists is that whereas the latter emphasize the use of violence as the inevitable means to attain their goals, many socialists believe in peaceful means of attaining their objectives.\textsuperscript{103} The communists believe that the only way to overthrow the antagonistic class of bourgeoisie exploiters by the proletariat is through a violent revolution. This conclusion was reached by the reasoning that the bourgeoisie class would not want to relinquish their wealth and power to the proletariat without a fight. Contrary to the communist stand, Fabian socialists and other so-called utopian socialists believe that violence is not necessary for the establishment of socialism. Hence, they emphasize gradual, peaceful reforms along socialist lines.

At this stage, let us consider some two main reasons why Azikiwe rejects communism. One is that it is an ideology which preaches violence and bloodshed and the other is that the experiences of the countries which purport to be communist have so far shown communism as a failure. Let us briefly consider these two direct arguments against communism.

\textsuperscript{103} \textit{Ibid}, p. 4
It has been mentioned above that communists believe that it is only through violent revolution that communist society can be established. This conclusion was reached through the thinking that the bourgeoisie class which must be overthrown before communist society can emerge, cannot surrender its grip on the masses without fighting. But this emphasis on violent revolution by communists has made the communist ideology an anathema.

Azikiwe himself criticizes communism thus:

The fact that the practicability of its [communism's] concept rests on violence and bloodshed is an indication that it breeds social instability and authoritarianism. 109

According to Azikiwe, there are some thirty communist states in the world today, distributed over four continents of Europe, America, Asia and Africa. 110 For him such ideals of communism as the inauguration of an exploitation-free society where economic security and abundant opportunities would obtain; where some men would not be superlatively rich while others are, no doubt noble and worthy of pursuit. To be fair to such countries as the Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia which fervently believe in communism, Azikiwe concedes that tremendous economic and social progress have been made. He agrees that the citizens

110 Ibid., p. 30
of some of these countries enjoy a more equitable distribution of wealth and numerous welfare schemes which are rare to find in non-communist countries. But side by side with the improved socio-economic well-being of the citizens of those communist countries are unparalleled abuses of fundamental human rights in spite of constitutional provisions to uphold them.

The abuse of such fundamental human rights as freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, in both communist and socialist states is really not quite unexpected in view of communism and socialism being turned into dogmas. Azikiwe carefully documents numerous complaints by communist citizens with regards to perpetrated abuses of the fundamental human rights by the State. \(^{111}\) He blames such abuses on communism being turned into a dogma which in turn led to extreme inflexibility and totalitarianism. He observes that once communism had become a dogma any deviation was regarded as heresy ... No room was left for reasonable adaptation to local circumstances. Deviants were regarded as apostates and identified as revisionists and compradors of capitalism. \(^{112}\)

It was further believed by die-hard communists that any deviation from the principles of communism as expounded by

\(^{111}\) Ibid, pp. 44-54

\(^{112}\) Ibid, pp. 40-41
Marx and Engels was tantamount to mental abnormality which needed a psychiatric treatment. It is reported in the West that many psychiatric hospitals in some communist states (especially the Soviet Union) are peopled with political prisoners whose offence was that they were not communist enough. 113

As a result of the observable abuses of the fundamental human rights by states which purport to be truly communist, among others, Azikiwe contends that communism, in practice, has to be a failure. 114 He thus rejects communism as the much needed socio-political ideology which could usher in a humane and just society. He would then take the fine ideals of communism which experience and reason have shown to be practicable and incorporate them in his formulation of neo-welfarism.

However, one may be inclined to question the logical validity of Azikiwe's judgement against communism, just as can be repeated for other ideologies which he had judged to have failed. In this vein, it can be argued that the failure of the adherents of an ideology to practically and fully realize its ideals does not necessarily mean the failure of that ideology. This is because man may be able to attain varying degrees of success in his pursuit of the ideals set. But if the degree of success attained is low, it does not necessarily mean that the ideals are unattainable, nor

113 Ibid, p. 41
114 Ibid, p. 55
that they have failed. Hence, Azikiwe should not blame the ideals but the weaknesses in man which prevent him from attaining them.

But when we recall the eclectic and pragmatic position of Azikiwe, we can easily understand his views about those ideologies discussed above. He is concerned with the practicable and the useful. He would not see much sense in believing in any ideal which cannot be put to practice. He would rather discard such an ideal and seek the one which is practicable and useful. After all, ideals are meant to serve man, to guide him towards higher levels of life. But they can only serve him to the extent that they are realizable. And to the extent that they are not, Azikiwe's view is that we abandon such aspect(s) and reformulate our ideals along practicable and useful lines.

At this stage we need to observe the wrong impression created by those countries which claim to be communist — a wrong impression which Azikiwe himself followed. This is to the effect that those countries which claim to be communist are actually practising communism. It has to be pointed out that there is no country in the world today that has actually reached the communist stage as theorized by Marx and Engels. At best what those countries (and Azikiwe) can correctly claim is that they believe in communism as the ultimate. Indeed, even the most enthusiastic champion of modern day communism, Russia, is still very far from perfecting the socialist stage which communists regard as the last rung.
on the ladder to communism. Thus, Azikiwe's judgment that "in practice, communism has proved to be a failure" is incorrect. For communism has to be practised first before we can assess whether it has failed or succeeded. But our contention here is that there is no country in the world today which practices communism. At best, some countries are just at the socialist stage which must be superseded before the arrival of the final, communist stage as Marx and Engels had theorized.

5.5 ZIK ON WELFARISM

Another important socio-political doctrine which influenced Azikiwe's formulation of the neo-welfarist philosophy is welfarism.115 Azikiwe explains welfarism as follows:

A state is said to be welfarist when it prescribes minimum standards, and provides equal opportunities, in education, health, housing, pensions, rehabilitation, etc. to reinforce individual and other charitable or philanthropic efforts in these social enterprises. A welfare state protects and promotes the social and economic well-being of its inhabitants, through systems of laws and institutions ....116


Thus, the major thrust of welfarism is its demand on the State to care enough for the economic, social and political well-being of the citizens. Thus a State's welfare scheme often includes the establishment of national insurance against unemployment, industrial accidents, ill-health, old-age and destitution.

According to Azikiwe, the United Kingdom adopted welfarism as a state policy (in 1955) after the publication of the "Beveridge Report" on social insurance in 1944. The Report had recommended the introduction of a comprehensive system of social insurance which would wage war against, inter alia, poverty, disease, ignorance, filth and unemployment. The recommendation was meant to apply to the entire population. However, the areas of the citizens' welfare which the State was expected to cater for were indeed many and only circumscribed by the availability of funds. This means that the areas of the citizens' welfare covered by the social insurance scheme may vary from one welfare state to another on the basis of the availability of the means to implement the scheme.

There is something which Azikiwe failed to note about welfarism; namely, the fact that it is not an economic ideology in itself but is in close alliance with capitalism. Welfarism does say how economic activities should be carried out in a state, nor who should control the factors of production, distribution and exchange.

\[1\text{17}\]

Ibid, p. 79
Welfarism does not equally denounce exploitation, especially of the many by the few. Nor does it indicate how the wealth of a nation should be distributed.

Welfarism only demands a social programme articulated by the state to ensure a minimum and decent standard of living for all citizens. It is a moral out-growth on capitalism, so to say, which requires the government to wade in and save the people from the deplorable living standard into which a capitalist system might have plunged the people. Welfarism is a kind of State philanthropy through which the government through progressively graduated taxation, tries to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor. All in all, state welfarism is a humanistic face of capitalism.

(A) ZIK THE ANTI-WELFArist:

Apart from the above observation, welfarism faces some serious problems as a social philosophy. First, there is the problem of fund and competent personnel needed to implement the welfarist social policy. Actually, the financial resources needed to successfully run a welfare state can be quite staggering, and the major issue is how to raise such fund and acquire such personnel.

Essentially, the government may try to raise funds for welfare programmes through taxation which may be heavy or abnormal if it must amount to anything substantial. Equally, proponents of welfarism argue that increased productivity
which is bound to result from the implementation of welfare programmes would usually swell the wealth of the country and invariably make more fund available to the state. However, the experience of such countries as Britain and the United States of America, which according to Azikiwe had adopted welfare policies, is that there is inadequate resources to fully run a welfarist state. This probably accounts for each country's selection of certain areas of individual welfare to be covered by the social policy. However, it is erroneous to count America as a welfarist State as she does not pretend to be one.

Another problem of welfarism is the question of determining individuals who are genuinely in need. This is because indiscriminate application of welfare policies without determining actual needs would lead to a waste of (scarce) resources at the disposal of the State. In this regard, it can be argued that it would be uneconomical for a government to provide health services free for all citizens on the basis of equality. Rather, there should be a sort of mean test to distinguish between the needy from the fairly well-to-do with a view to the State subsidizing for the poor while allowing the rich to fend for themselves since they can afford to.

Furthermore, man's tendency to abuse any social amenity declared to be free presents yet another problem to the successful operation of welfarism. Thus some free social services are usually obtained by those who could have afforded them at some cost, but who now enjoy them at the expense of the State. This creates the enormous problem of

113 Ibid, p. 31
119 Ibid, p. 31
over-stretching the (meagre) resources at the disposal of the State. History shows that this often frustrated the successful implementation of some well-conceived welfare policies.

Azikiwe maintains that his personal experience as the former Premier of Eastern Nigeria testifies to how man's greed for free social services can actually frustrate well-conceived welfare programmes. He goes on to narrate how the free education scheme initiated by his Regional Government was frustrated by ever-increasing number of school-enrolment as soon as it was known that education was free. 120

Experience has shown, according to Azikiwe, that "Any social service is bound to be inundated with drop-outs, idlers, adventurers, spivs and their collaborators, apart from the genuine sector of the population concerned." 121

Finally, Azikiwe observes that experience in Europe and America has shown that despite many welfare services to alleviate the "stings of capitalism" on the majority of the people, poverty, ignorance, ill-health and destitution still prevail. This fact made Azikiwe to conclude that

There is need for a more positive action to liquidate these factors which make life a bane to the greatest number of our people. Thus we are back to square one! in our search for a more adequate ideology for a better society. 122

120 Ibid, pp. 34-35
121 Ibid, p. 86
122 Ibid, p. 87
(B) ZIK THE PRO-WELFARIST

The above shortcomings notwithstanding, welfarism has something valuable which any meaningful socio-economic philosophy should embody. This is, essentially, its humanism. Its demand that the needy members of the society should be catered for through the collective charity of the more privileged members of the society, under the patronym of the State, strikes a cord of familiarity in the mind of Azikiwe. That cord is that of the extended family system\(^{123}\) which he considers to be indigenous to every African society, and which functions on the same principle of welfarism, nay "proto-welfarism" which we shall discuss shortly. Welfarism is essentially attractive because it promotes the principle of mutual aid on a humanistic basis. But in view of its shortcomings as discussed above, it cannot be adopted wholly as an adequate ideology.

5.6 "PROTO WELFARISM"

"Proto-welfarism" is an important concept, the discussion of which will enhance our understanding of Azikiwe's neo-welfarism. What is "proto-welfarism"? According to Azikiwe, proto-welfarism which he identifies as the pristine Nigerian (indeed African) economic ideology, is welfarism in "its purest form." He further explains that

\(^{123}\) Ibid, p. 78
Its objective is to guarantee to every Nigerian an element of economic security animated by the goodwill and humanitarianism of each kindred through the family as a unit of the clan.124

Proto-welfarism is believed to promote the idea of material prosperity of every individual member of the society according to his resources.

Although Azikiwe did not elaborate on this concept, proto-welfarism can be essentially understood as a socio-economic system of mutual aid and care on the basis of familialhood and kingship. Under this pristine ideology (if it can be properly so called in view of the fact that it was not then conceptualized), food, house, wife (in the case of man who could not afford to marry by himself) may be jointly provided by family members for the needy ones. The same principle of joint effort for the overall welfare of every member of the society obtains at the village and clan levels. The welfare of every individual is the concern of everyone else. One is not expected to care less about the plight of members of the other family or clan.

Proto-welfarism places the burden of finding solutions to the socio-economic problems of the society squarely on the elders who are regarded as the guardians of traditional African societies. The elders as an embodiment of the communal spirit usually constituted the think-tank in the

traditional African societies. They always saw it as their assigned duty to see that the welfare of all was maintained.

One can see, then, that Azikiwe's "proto-welfarism" is simply a term which he used to designate the principle of communalism which was the hallmark of African traditional life before European colonization and the consequent disruption of Africa's economic and social life. It was, indeed, a humanistic principle of living which was a quintessential demonstration of brotherly love and fellow-feeling.

However, the drastic changes in the socio-economic relations within African societies as consequences of the process of acculturation which came in the wake of European colonization, have rendered proto-welfarism inadequate for meeting the challenges of modern organization of State and business. But its important principle of care and fellow-feeling could, if properly worked out, form the basis of a more adequate socio-political philosophy for contemporary African (and the world at large). It has to be the magnet around which the iron-filings of the good elements in capitalism, socialism and welfarism should be attached.
5.7 ECL ECTICISM

Eclecticism is an epistemological approach which Azikiwe adopted in his formulation of Neo-welfarism. He describes it as a term used in philosophy to identify a composite system of thought which incorporates ideas selected from other systems. It does not modify but blends opposite views. According to an authority, its essence is the refusal to follow blindly one set of formulae and conventions with a determination to recognize and select from all other sources those elements which are good and true, either in the abstract or in the concrete, so far as they are practicable and useful.\textsuperscript{125}

He further explains that eclecticism does not attempt to reconcile or combine irreconciliables. Rather, it leaves the contradictions unresolved but blends incompatibles to make them practicable for utilitarian purposes.\textsuperscript{126}

When critically, examined, Azikiwe's description of eclecticism suffers the defect of logical incoherence. For, while one may not quarrel with Azikiwe's assertion that eclecticism does not seek to reconcile or combine

\textsuperscript{125} Ibid, p. 111 (However, Azikiwe should have named the "authority" he seems to be paraphrasing above for cross-reference).

\textsuperscript{126} Ibid, p. 111
irreconciliables and that it leaves contradictions unresolved; it offends against good logic to assert in the same breath that "it blends incompatibles to make them practicable for utilitarian purposes."

In order to reveal the faulty logic and confusion in his description of eclecticism, let us examine the meaning of the following relevant terms: "irreconcilable," "contradiction," "incompatible" and "blend" using the Chambers (Everyday) Dictionary (Revised Edition). To start with, the meaning of the term "irreconcilable" is given as "incapable of being brought back to a state of friendship or agreement: inconsistent." Equally, "contradiction" is defined as "act of contradicting; denial: inconsistency." Further, the meaning of "incompatible" is given as "not consistent, contradictory: incapable of existing together in harmony, or at all: (as n. pl.) things which cannot co-exist." Finally, the word "blend" is defined as "to mix together: to mix so that the elements cannot be distinguished." The word also means "to harmonize." A cursory look at the definitions of the first three terms above reveal a constant element in their meaning. That element is "inconsistency," which means "not agreeing." On this account, we find that "irreconcilable," "contradiction" and "incompatible" can be

127 Since Azikiwe does not claim that he is using any of these terms in a sense other than that of "Standard English," we are justified in seeking dictionary meaning to aid our understanding of how the words are normally used.
used synonymously to denote "not agreeing." Hence, if 
celecticism "does not attempt to reconcile or combine 
"irreconcilables," then how can it blend incompatibles "? 
Since "incompatible" means "incapable of existing in harmony" 
and "to blend" means "to harmonize," it does not make sense 
to talk of blending "incompatibles to make them practicable 
for utilitarian purposes."

The point is that, from the meaning of the terms 
involved, "incompatibles" cannot be "blended." It is 
rather "compatibles" that can be blended— or 
harmonized. Perhaps, this is what Azikiwe actually meant: 
that amongst apparently opposing systems, there are 
certain elements in each which are compatible with other 
elements in the others. It is such elements that can be 
blended or harmonized in order to achieve a richer and more 
adequate perspective about the object of our inquiry. This 
view can be corroborated by Azikiwe's philosophical position 
which sees some compatibility between idealism and materialism 
in certain respects, just as he is strongly convinced that 
some elements of capitalism, socialism and welfarism can 
be combined to achieve a more adequate socio-political 
philosophy required for the building of a better society. 
This is also in consonance with the eclectic spirit which 
seeks to select and blend what is best in apparently 
opposing systems.

From the foregoing, it has to be observed that when
eclecticism is seen, as Azikiwe does, as blending "opposite views," it is somewhat confusing. This is because, it is not really opposite views that are blended but the covertly compatible elements within those apparently opposing views. Hence, we shall see in the outcome of Azikiwe's "harmonization of ideologies" that it is not capitalism, socialism, welfarism per se that are harmonized but the best elements in them which are compatible. It is the compatibility of such elements that determine the efficacy of the blending.

The point can be further explained by saying that when the humanitarian principles of welfarism and socialism are blended with the socialist principle of collective ownership (which will become limited) and the capitalist principle of private ownership (again, which will be limited), it is not capitalism, and socialism and welfarism that are being harmonized but some of their principles. For there will still be some essential elements in each which are left out or discarded. Such selected elements, when successfully harmonized, will be seen to be actually compatible in the first instance; otherwise, they would not have been harmonized. Again, it is the compatibility and effective harmonization of such diverse elements that is the condition for the efficacy of the new system.

Azikiwe extols the merit of the eclectic approach as
lying in the fact that by applying it,

any person or group of persons can add, subtract,
multiply or divide any idea and adapt it to their
situation or historical circumstances. 128

Despite the sweeping generalization apparent in the above
assertion, what Azikiwe is saying is that the eclectic
approach gives one the freedom to select and combine ideas
for practical and utilitarian purposes.

The eclectic approach implies a recognition that some-
thing of value can be found in apparently opposing systems.
Such valuable elements are to be selected and harmonized in
order to achieve a better understanding of the issues
involved. In this way, eclecticism is opposed to dogmatism.
It inculcates an openness of mind for the purpose of
apprehending the ever-emerging fragments of truth as revealed
by experience and reason. It is a banal recognition that
dogmatism is an absolutist attitude which pretends that truth
is absolute and can only be apprehended through one way — that
which the dogmatist favours. Eclecticism rejects this
position in favour of the view that reality is many-sided and
ever-revealing itself in diverse ways.

Furthermore, eclecticism embodies the spirit of tolerance
and compromise. Azikiwe commends the eclectic spirit as
having been vindicated by history

for it practicality because while human beings can rationalize any topic, wisdom and common sense dictate that life can be more meaningful by compromising idealism with realism to approximate what is the truth, empirically speaking.129

Azikiwe himself is a great lover of the spirit of compromise and this inherent principle of eclecticism is probably one of the reasons why he is attracted to it. Thus when critics of his political life see his readiness to compromise as a weakness, Azikiwe's answer is that,

We made compromise to allow the nation to succeed. Without compromise, could this world progress? When two incompatibles meet, they co-exist by agreeing to agree on certain issues and agreeing to disagree on other issues. This has been my guideline all my life.130

129 Ibid., p. 112. [We should, however, observe that Azikiwe talks of "wisdom" and "common sense" as if they are different things whereas "wisdom," ordinarily understood as "the quality of being wise," includes common sense — which though is not actually common. Besides, he can be criticized for using the terms "idealism" and "realism" without explaining their meaning. In simple terms, Idealism is defined as "a doctrine, or set of doctrines, to the effect that reality is mental." On the other hand, "realism" can be defined as "any view which emphasizes the existence or role, of some kind of thing or object ... in contrast to a view which dispenses with the things in favour of words ( nominalism), ideas (idealism, conceptualism) ..." (A.R. Lacey, A Dictionary of Philosophy: London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1975) p. 36 and p. 130 respectively.)

As has been remarked earlier, incompatibles do not blend. Rather, it is the compatible elements in apparently opposing views or systems which can be blended. For compromise presupposes elements of compatibility. The "agreeing to agree" of opponents on certain issues is possible only on the basis of certain compatible elements which a careful observation would reveal in them.

Azikiwe strongly recommends the eclectic approach as a vehicle of the spirit of compromise, harmony, and adaptability. This approach should be applied to the various contending ideologies in order to harmonize and adapt them to the benefit of man. This recommendation is borne out of his strong conviction that a blind worship of any particular ideology cannot ensure amicable relationship among human beings, on the one hand, and nations, on the other to ensure the promotion of social stability and world peace.  

Thus, the eclectic spirit, is a more adequate attitude to life and all it has to reveal. This is what the world has ignored to her own disadvantage.

Azikiwe recognizes the strong view of the critics of eclecticism to the effect that

It seeks to compromise to the point of absurdity ... because in the sphere of abstract thought, every system of philosophy is theoretical, which often leads to endless disputations, according to

the whims of the dialecticians.\textsuperscript{132}

But against this criticism, it can be argued that eclecticism does not "seek to compromise to the point of absurdity."

This is because "to seek" in the above context means the same thing as "to aim at". Eclecticism does not aim at compromising just anything but the best and invariably compatible elements selected from various views or systems.

We should note, however, that Azikiwe did not refer to any specific critic to authenticate the criticism mentioned above. But it has to be admitted that eclecticism may give rise to a vacuous theoretical construct, at least from the practical point of view. Perhaps, this is why Azikiwe had to "police" eclecticism with pragmatism to ensure its practical relevance.

Before we turn our attention to "pragmatism," let us note that Azikiwe recognizes those whom he regards as leading exponents of this philosophical approach known as eclecticism. They include Victor Cousin, Gottfried Leibniz and Claude Adrian Helvetus whose views on eclecticism he briefly states.\textsuperscript{133} However, he fails to say the extent to which his view on the subject was influenced by theirs.

\textsuperscript{132} Ibid, p. 112
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid, pp. 113 - 114.
5.8 ZIK ON PRAGMATISM

Pragmatism is an essentially American philosophical movement which developed in the late 19th century and has ever waxed stronger to become a dominant philosophy on the American continent. It has increasingly gained adherence in many parts of the world. Pragmatism has its three titans in Charles S. Peirce (1839 - 1914) who is usually acclaimed as the founder of the movement, William James (1842 - 1910) and John Dewey (1859 - 1952). 134

The first formulation of the pragmatic philosophy was made by C.S. Peirce in an article entitled "How to Make Our Ideas Clear," published in the Popular Science Monthly for January 1873. But the greatest elaboration and popularization of pragmatism was done by William James on August 26, 1898 when he delivered a lecture entitled "Philosophical Concepts and Practical Results" before the Philosophical Union of the University of California. 135

Peirce's main interest was the development of pragmatism as a theory of meaning according to which the meaning of concepts and the sentences in which they occur is exhaustively yielded by the effects they could have on experiences and actions. Thus pragmatism is a a theory of


meaning according to which concepts or ideas are meaningful if and only if their being acted upon leads to anticipated practical consequences; otherwise the concepts or ideas in question are meaningless. Hence, to determine the meaningfulness of concepts or ideas, empirical verification has to be undertaken or must be theoretically possible. This is done by acting according to the concepts or ideas in question to ascertain whether or not they lead to the anticipated practical consequences. Peirce's pragmatic theory of meaning very much resembles the logical positivist's criterion that the meaningfulness of any proposition is dependent on its empirical verifiability. This resemblance is to the extent that Peirce lays stress on the verifiability criterion of meaning as the logical positivists do. But he differs from them by directing such verification on the practical consequences which follow from acting according to the concept or idea whose meaningfulness is being sought. Thus, Peirce's pragmaticism is actually "an experimental or psychological theory of meaning." 135

Apart from being a theory of meaning, pragmatism is, more importantly, a theory of truth. This aspect of pragmatism was fully developed by William James who took the cue from Peirce's view that truth is "the opinion which

136 Ibid; p. 96
is fated to be ultimately agreed upon by all who investigate."

However, unlike Peirce, James included and emphasized, in his truth, the effect of concepts on our senses and emotions.

Truth, according to James, is agreement with reality: it is also what works and satisfies us. James explains that truth and falsity form one part of our experience; objects form another. In this view, for a proposition in which an idea or concept is expressed to be true, it must correspond to reality. Hence, a proposition is true if it successfully leads us to the object we wish to get to. At such point, the successful leading to the anticipated result by a concept or idea is said to be satisfactory.

In more laconic terms, the pragmatic theory of truth asserts that since our ideas are of objects, an idea is indeed of the object if it successfully leads up to the object. In other words,

If the idea as a plan of action towards the object works successfully as a plan, it leads us into a satisfactory relationship with the object so that we are in with it.\(^{138}\)

Hence, James often refers to the truth relation by asserting that an idea is true if it "works" or successfully leads to the objects which it purports to express - when practically investigated. Usually, we feel satisfied if our ideas

\(^{137}\) Ibid, p. 171
\(^{138}\) Ibid, p. 162
successfully lead to the objects they express. Thus "satisfaction becomes another key term in describing the truth relation."\footnote{Ibid, p. 162} Other key terms are "working," "successfully leading" and "agreeing."

It is important to note that James, like Peirce and Dewey, and other major pragmatists, maintain that no idea is absolutely true. We cannot confirm the truth or falsity of any concept except after we have completed a practical investigation about it. We can only accept to its truth if it has worked successfully as a mental plan which leads us to its mental object.

According to the pragmatists, truth is not a relation that obtains or holds from all eternity; it is a relation that is made and it is made by experimental process. "An idea becomes true or is made true by events."\footnote{Titus and Smith, \textit{Op. cit.}, p. 459} This suggests that truth is constantly being made and remade in the light of experience. This idea that truth is relative and that it grows was given a forceful expression by James when he declared that

\begin{quote}
The truth of an idea is not a stagnant property inherent in it. Truth happens to an idea. It becomes true, is made true by events. Its verity is in fact an event, a process, the process namely of its verifying itself, its verification. Its validity
\end{quote}
is the process of its validation. 141

In other words, it is the process of investigation that can establish the truth or falsity of an idea or concept.

Equally important in the determination of the truth of an idea is the consequence to which it leads when acted upon. The pragmatist would readily accent to the truth of an idea if it leads to satisfactory consequences — the consequences anticipated.

With the above clarifications, let us now attempt to define pragmatism. Here we shall consider the definitions given by Harold Titus and William James. According to Titus, pragmatism is an attitude, a method and a philosophy that uses the practical consequences of ideas and beliefs as a standard for determining their value and truth. 142

In similar terms, William James defines pragmatism as the attitude of looking away from first things, principles, 'categories,' supposed necessities, and of looking towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts. 143

143 W. James, Pragmatism (New York: Longman, Green, 1907) pp. 54 - 55.
From these definitions, the important characteristics of pragmatism emerge. They include the facts that pragmatism is more of an attitude, a method, than a systematic philosophical doctrine. It is an attitude of openness towards all things with the conviction that reality is ever-unfolding itself through human experience which expands with time. Again, it is a method of experimental inquiry which places practical experience above abstract thought. It is in close league with the sciences, especially the biological and social sciences. Its aim is to utilize the "Scientific Spirit and scientific knowledge to deal with all human problems including those of ethics and religion."  

Pragmatists have been critical of older philosophical systems such as idealism, materialism and realism. They maintain that these systems of philosophy are mistaken in looking for ultimates, absolutes, eternal essences, substances, fixed principles and metaphysical "block systems." Pragmatists jettisoned all these and are rather concerned with the changing world of the empirical sciences and its problems. They see nature as the all-inclusive reality beyond which we cannot go. Thus, "pragmatism is a philosophical theory of dealing with things which are real."  

Azikiwe was deeply impressed by the pragmatic realism which emphasizes the practicable, workable, successful and

---


satisfactory. Its scientific methodology of testing through practice greatly appealed to him and encouraged him to conclude that capitalism, socialism and welfarism have all shown, in practice, to be incapable of leading to the ideals which they profess. Since practical results, as the pragmatic criterion requires, must validate ideas or concepts, Azikiwe's pragmatic leaning led him to conclude that neither capitalism, socialism nor welfarism has been successful in leading man to attain the ideals which they proclaim. What the practical experience about the working of these ideologies shows is that there are some aspects of each which are valuable and which can be sifted and harmonized with those of others in order to achieve a better society.

Furthermore, the conciliatory spirit of pragmatism, its rejection of absolutism, fixity, and dogmatism must have endeared pragmatism to Azikiwe. In James' formulation, pragmatism is opposed to extremes such as those represented by idealism and its epistemological cognate, rationalism; and dialectical materialism, the epistemological cognate of which is dialectics. James rejects both extremes but believes that they can be reconciled in pragmatism. He says

I offer the oddly-named thing pragmatism as a philosophy that can satisfy both kinds of demands. It can remain religious like the rationalisms, but at the same time, like empiricisms, it can preserve the richest intimacy with facts.146

Here, we can see the eclectic element implicit in pragmatism. It is an element characterised by an openness of the mind to receive truth from whatever that discloses it. Hence, it does not dismiss an idea off-hand as false or accept it as true a priori without looking at its practical consequences or the way it has worked successfully to the satisfaction of our desires.

By emphasizing practicability and workability, pragmatism appealed to Azikiwe in his quest to construct a system of philosophy which works to the advantage of the many and not that which speculates to the disadvantage of the many when assessed by its practical results, politically, socially, economically.  

147

Here, one may wonder why Azikiwe talks of satisfying the many rather than all. But we should bear in mind that he is concerned with what is practicable, what is achievable. He seems to believe that nothing can satisfy everybody. We can agree with him on this.

One final point on pragmatism is that it has had its many critics. One important criticism relates to the metaphysics of pragmatism. Pragmatism has been criticised as having an inadequate metaphysics because it rejects

ultimate or absolute reality. The search for ultimate reality is despised by pragmatists as speculative. But their making truth relative also raises questions about the nature of reality. For, if reality is what is experienced as the pragmatists suggest, then pragmatism may tend towards the subjective form of idealism. 148

The other important criticism against pragmatism concerns its conception of truth as man-made, without independent reality as realists and others have claimed. Critics maintain that while "true propositions work in the long run," to turn the statement round and claim that "all propositions that work are true" does not logically follow. These critics argue that some true beliefs cannot be verified, while others are not useful. Furthermore, these critics argue that truth is not man-made. They contend that

As truth is ordinarily understood, we do not create it by living right; we live right by grasping and following the truth. 149

The above criticisms notwithstanding, pragmatism has much to commend it as a living philosophy and a philosophy of life. Its emphasis on testing the truth of our ideas through the practical consequences they lead to; and the

149 Ibid., p. 472
suggestion that truth is progressively built through lived experiences are in consonance with the continually unfolding drama of life. Adherence to the pragmatic philosophy would enable us to select practicable and useful ideas from whatever source and to integrate them in such a workable combination to enable us attain a higher view of reality. This is probably what makes pragmatism most attractive to Azikiwe.

So far, we have highlighted the cross-current of ideas which informed Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism. We have followed Azikiwe's analysis of capitalism, socialism and welfarism in terms of their merits and defects. His proposal is that the principles of eclecticism and pragmatism should be applied to the good aspects of each doctrine so as to harmonise them into a workable system. This is what he believes he has done in propounding Neo-welfarism. However, we wish to restate our earlier observation that Azikiwe advanced no new arguments in favour or against capitalism, socialism or welfarism. He seems to have merely presented the classical arguments in these regards. Also, his treatment of eclecticism and pragmatism did not go beyond their classical exposition. Invariably, Azikiwe appears like a workman who assembles the tools he needs for his work. He did not make the tools himself but knows how
to employ them. We look forward to the next chapter on Neo-welfarism before we can say whether or not Azikiwe has been successful in his claim to have combined the various elements highlighted above.
CHAPTER SIX

ZIK’S NEO-WELFARISM: AN IDEOLOGY FOR POST-COLONIAL EMANCIPATION

We shall begin our discussion in this chapter by first considering the post-colonial situation and the need for emancipation. This will be followed by a brief discussion on "ideology": its meaning, nature and relationship with philosophy. Next, we shall examine the meaning, goal and presuppositions of the economic, political and educational aspects of Neo-welfarism. Our task here is mainly expository. Our critical assessment of this ideology will form part of the next chapter.

6.1 The Post-Colonial Situation in the New States\(^1\) and the Need for Emancipation

The second Chapter deals with Azikiwe’s analysis of the colonial situation and the need for colonial emancipation. One may wonder why we still talk of emancipation in the post-colonial era. But a thorough examination of the post-colonial situation reveals the dire need for emancipation. Emancipation from what? one may ask. Azikiwe answers, "emancipation of Nigeria from the manacles of muddle and drift, which conspired to form part of the remote causes of

\(^1\) By the term "new states" we mean erstwhile colonial societies which have now gained their political independence.
it devised to accomplish this was to heavily saddle the new states with debt burden through the adroit manipulation of the international economy in favour of the technologically advanced nations of Europe and America. This situation is propped up by the multinational corporations which, in the current era of neo-colonialism, have replaced the army of occupation in the colonial period with equal, if not more, efficacy.

Thus the strangulating debt situation in the new states adds to foreign manipulation of their economies, low productivity, mass-poverty, hunger, disease, and draught, to further pauperize them. This situation, theorists in the new states believe, will be ameliorated if the people take control of their economic destiny. Hence the economic situation in post-colonial societies reveals that colonial emancipation had been partial, merely a political phenomenon devoid of the economic foundation which would have guaranteed it. As a result the issue of emancipation still remains important and urgent in the post-colonial era.

Even though the new states apparently enjoy political independence, Azikiwe's analysis of true emancipation (in the second chapter) reveals that there cannot be true political independence without a strong economic foundation. Politics is said to be a superstructure erected on the
foundation of economics. The extent to which economic power can influence political power is all too apparent. Even in internal political situations, it is usually the economic power that invariably determines political power. In many contexts, it is the financiers who actually control and manipulate political behaviour. Thus political power is simply an outgrowth of economic power.

In the new states, since the economic power resides in the hands of foreigners, they too manipulate political power to suit their whims and caprices. This has given rise to great political instabilities in the new states. Such instabilities often manifested themselves in the cyclical military coups which have become a constant feature in the post-colonial politics of the new states. The net results is that the people of the new states are not in control of their political destiny just as they lack grip of their economic life. Indeed, the political independence of the new states has largely been an illusion. For the autocratic regimes in most new states are propped up by foreigners who choose and impose their surrogates on the people.

The chaotic situation attendant upon the political instabilities in the new states further worsen the economic conditions of the people. Economic and political subjugation is almost worse in the post-colonial era than in the colonial period because it is more subtle and with active connivance
of the indigenous people. This shows the need for post-
colonial emancipation which the people of the new states
could ignore only to continue paying the price with their
lives.

The realities of the post-colonial situation in the
new states have been tasking the minds of many socio-politi-
cal thinkers in adequately explaining this state of
affairs as well as seeking solutions to them. In Nigeria,
many thinkers at a time, blamed the country's underdevelop-
ment wholly on colonial domination and the subsequent
exploitation and pauperization of the colonial people.

But, gradually, the emphasis has shifted from blaming
Nigeria's erstwhile colonial masters for her numerous
socio-economic woes to an inward search for the causes of
problems and possible solutions. In this vein, most socio-
political theorists in Nigeria have come to identify the
problem of Nigeria's underdevelopment with the absence of
an effective and realistic ideology. It became popular among
socio-political thinkers that an urgent formulation or
adoption of an effective ideology would pull Nigeria out of
the under-development quagmire and launch her into a verile
path to development. The critical question then became:
what ideology can bail Nigeria out of her socio-economic
threatdom? Is it that of capitalism, socialism, welfarism
or a different ideology yet to be formulated? This question
led to a serious debate and controversy among socio-political
thinkers in Nigeria.

At this juncture, it would be enlightening to undertake a brief historical survey of the problems of ideology in Nigeria. We would recall that the administrative unit which bears the name "Nigeria" was a convenient creation of the British colonialists. Before the British colonization of those parts of West Africa now called Nigeria, the different principalities and petty-kingdoms which were agglomerated to form Nigeria had their ideologies. But with British colonization, the colonialist ideology of exploitative capitalism and the superiority of the white race came to supplant those indigenous ideologies.

From then, Nigeria, like other colonial territories, was violently drawn into the vortex of European mercantilism as well as European beliefs and values. With the attainment of independence, Nigeria, like other new states, has ever been lost in the dilemma of continuing capitalism without capital.

4 Perhaps, we should have used the word "confusion" instead of problems," but if we grant that "confusion" is in a sense a problem, then we feel justified in our dictation. Again, we have used the word "problem" in its plural form to connote that the question of ideology for Nigeria does not only border on adopting or formulating an ideology suitable for her emancipation and development, but also involves choosing an ideology which would less antagonize her with the world community.


6 This is what Musa Jam-Jam implies when he asserts that "in Nigeria there are no true capitalists because the people who parade themselves or who are being referred to as capitalists are just mere agents of international capitalist monopolies." (Alhaji Musa Jam-Jam, "No capitalist in Nigeria," in *New Nigeria*, Kaduna, April, 1977, p. 4.)
or adopting socialism without efficiency and political will. In the alternative, should Nigeria abandon all foreign ideologies and return to the indigenous ideologies, perhaps in reformulated form? But there is no appreciable way in which the erstwhile colonies can abandon the influences of their former masters who have stamped their marks indelibly on them. This makes the question of returning to the indigenous way of life and mode of thought, shorn of foreign coloration impossible. In an apparent recognition of this paralyzing dilemma, the Nigerian constitution of 1979 specified "mixed-economy" as the economic "ideology" of the country. But the concept "mixed-economy" is not only bogus, it is amorphous, imprecise and vacuous.

It is within the context highlighted above that Nigeria's ideological problems, like those of other new states, which precipitated heated debates on ideology should be considered and appreciated. Incidentally, while most Nigerians are unanimous in stressing the importance of a clearly defined and workable ideology for Nigeria,

The crux of our ideological problem is whether we should commit our country to any specific ideology, say capitalism, socialism or welfarism. The numerous and divergent answers given to this question constitute the far-ranging debate on ideology for Nigeria.

Thus while some thinkers are of the persuasion that

---

"moralized" or reformed capitalism is good for Nigeria, others like I. Nzimiro and O. Nnoli pitched their tent in the socialist camp. Yet others argued that welfarism is the more adequate ideology for Nigeria. In the great debate on a suitable ideology for Nigeria, exponents of scientific or Marxian socialism spit fire in their outright condemnation of capitalism whether reformed or not. Exponents of socialism are vehement in their assertion that the only viable path for Nigeria's development, and indeed the proper development of any society for that matter, is socialism. They equally deny that there is a "third path" to development apart from capitalism and socialism, and contend that any such purported "third path" is, in the final analysis, a disguised form of capitalism.³

It was in the heat of this debate that Azikiwe proposed the Neo-welfarist ideology as the one more adequate for Nigeria's and the new states' post-colonial emancipation and development. Beyond this, Azikiwe puts forward the Neo-welfarist ideology as more adequate for contemporary societies than any of the existing ones — capitalism, socialism and welfarism.

Before we go on to examine Neo-welfarism it would be helpful to seek to understand the meaning and nature of

ideology as well as its relationship with socio-political philosophy.

6.2 Meaning and Nature of Ideology:

The term "ideology" is a highly emotive concept in contemporary socio-political discourse. For, while it is a favourite and a potent theoretical concept in the thinking of many, especially Marxist thinkers; it is a bogey to others who view it with disfavour and distaste. Because of its highly emotive nature, the term "ideology" has almost lost its meaning. But what is ideology? Again, the bogey of precisely defining this concept stares us in the face. Hence, it has been defined in many ways. Let us begin our exploration of its meaning by going into its root.

Etymologically, the term "ideology" is the English translation of the French word "ideologie." "Ideologie" was first used by the French philosopher, A.L.C. Destutt de Tracy at the time of the French Revolution which erupted towards the close of the eighteenth century. Tracy had employed the concept "idéologie" "as a short name for his science of ideas." Tracy had claimed that he adopted his science of ideas from the epistemology of such philosophers as John Locke and Etienne Bonnot de Condillac for whom all knowledge was knowledge of ideas.

Since Tracy introduced this term, the subject of ideology

---

has been controversial and diverse. The controversy partly derives from a disagreement over the definition of "ideology" itself. The New Encyclopaedia Britanica (knowledge in Depth) gives two ways of using the term "ideology" — one loose and the other strict. It tells us that

In the loose sense of the word, ideology may mean any kind of action-oriented theory or any attempt to approach politics in the light of a system of ideas. Ideology in the stricter sense stays fairly close to Destutt de Tracy's original conception, and may be identified by five characteristics: (1) it contains an explanatory theory of a more or less comprehensive kind about human experience and the external world; (2) it sets out a programme in a generalized form and abstract form, of social and political organization; (3) it conceives the realization of this programme as entailing a struggle; (4) it seeks not merely to persuade but to recruit loyal adherents, demanding what is sometimes called commitment; (5) it addresses a wide public, but may tend to confer some special role of leadership on intellectuals.  

From a close examination of the above ways of using the term "ideology" a more concise definition emerges according to which

An ideology is a form of social or political philosophy in which practical elements are as prominent as theoretical ones; it is a system of ideas that aspires both to explain the world and

---

10 Ibid, p. 194
to change it.  

Another definition of ideology which I. Nzimiro affirms sees it as a system of ideas concerning phenomena especially those of social life; the manner of thinking characteristic of a class or an individual.  

This definition is very close to that given by Azikiwe according to whom ideology means a systematic body of concepts, especially about human life or culture. It includes a way of life and the thinking characteristic of an individual or a group of social relations.  

The above three definitions underscore the fact that there is no unanimity as to the meaning of this highly emotive concept. Disagreement over its precise meaning adds to the fact that since Napoleon Bonaparte, ideology has come to play the  

---

11 Ibid, p. 194  
12I. Nzimiro, "History of Ideology," In New Nigerian, Kaduna, 19 April, 1977; p. 11  
14 Because Tracy assigned to "the science of ideas" high moral worth and purpose, the term ideology was bound to possess for him a strongly laudatory character. But because Napoleon blamed the defeat of the French in 1812 on the ideologues (those who expound ideologies) and linked the name "ideologie" with the most detestable elements of Revolutionary thought, he invested the word with all his feelings of disapprobation and mistrust. (See, The New Encyclopaedia Britannica, p. 194).
double role of being both laudatory and abusive. This accounts for the extreme emotion and confusion which the term evokes. However, it has to be remarked that "ideology" as a systematic body of concepts which encapsulates both the ideal and the means of attaining the ideal, especially in socio-political matters. Thus as the first definition above states, an ideology lays claim to being both theoretical and practical. In fact, what is uppermost in the minds of many people nowadays when the term "ideology" is mentioned is, "a theoretical programme of action" in any or all fields of human endeavour leading to the attainment of some ideals.

An ideology is like a map which shows specific locations and how to get to them. Man is a curious being who, in addition to seeking ultimate explanation about things, uses his rational capacity to set ideals or standards towards which his kind should strive. What encapsulates such ideals or standard worthy of the elevated human dignity, and which well-defines the means of attaining them, is now usually designated with the term "ideology." In this thinking, every human society — primitive or modern — could be said to have an ideology. This is in the sense that every society has a set of values or standards towards which individuals and the entire members of the society strive; every society has a notion of the good life for man and the supposed means of attaining it. We assume that every society recognizes that

the supreme good for man is happiness. But the question of what happiness is and how best it can be attained, individually and collectively, has engendered innumerable controversies and has tended to divide men into various ideological camps.

At this juncture, we have to observe that the term "ideology" is mostly associated with socio-political life in the contemporary period. This is so much that the term "ideology" now covers all aspects of socio-political life. Consequently, ideology is fast becoming synonymous with socio-political philosophy. The reason for this is that socio-political philosophy has become more ideological, and ideology has become philosophical so much that the two terms may be employed synonymously without distorting their meanings.

This point is underscored by the conception of ideology according to which it is a form of social or political philosophy which emphasizes the practical as well as the theoretical, which seeks to explain the world as well as to change it.

Ideology, which was formerly employed more restrictively and specifically for certain area(s) of socio-political reality (and thus narrower in scope than socio-political philosophy) is now often employed to encompass more areas of socio-political reality traditionally covered by socio-political philosophy to warrant their being used interchangeably to designate the theoretical and practical concerns for the establishment of a better socio-political order.
Indeed, the issues which Azikiwe treats under the neo-welfarist ideology very well qualify as socio-political philosophy in so far as they characterize the good society and recommend means which he considers appropriate for its realization.

Although attempts have often been made to distinguish political philosophy from ideology by stressing the abstract and more general nature of the former and the equal importance which the latter attaches to theory and practice, this appears to be spurious in view of the fact that if by the term "abstract" it is being implied that political philosophy is less concerned with the practical, then we can note that hardly any socio-political philosopher ever theorized just for the sake of theorizing. Rather, most socio-political philosophers have the practical ends of their philosophies as their ultimate motivator. In fact, the history of socio-political philosophy from the time of Plato up to contemporary times buttresses the view that the various socio-political philosophies put forward by different thinkers have always aimed at theoretically characterizing the good society which man aim at establishing.


Pettit seems to have recognized the inseparable link between the theoretical nature of socio-political philosophy and the practical concerns of the socio-political philosophers when he notes that

although it [political philosophy] is abstract, the discipline is important. For if one cannot say how a society should be organized in an ideal world, how can one know what changes should be wrought in its mundane equivalent?\(^\text{13}\)

Thus the socio-political philosopher is equally concerned with the practical end of his theory. On this score socio-political philosophy has the same concern with ideology which is an action-oriented theory about socio-political reality. In short, when socio-political philosophy is conceived to be abstract, ideology is taken to be its public face. Invariably, we observe that a clear-cut line cannot be drawn between ideology and political philosophy in contemporary thought.

6.3 THE NEO-WELFARIST IDEOLOGY: MEANING AND PRE-SUPOSITIONS

What is neo-welfarism? According to Azikiwe,

Neo-welfarism means an economic system which blends the essential elements of capitalism, socialism and welfarism in a socio-economic matrix, influenced by Nigerian mores, to enable the state and private sector to own and control the means of production.

\(^{13}\) Ibid., p. xii.
distribution and exchange, whilst simultaneously enabling the state to assume responsibility for the social services, in order to benefit the citizens, according to their needs and officially-specified minimum standards, without prejudice to participation in any aspect of the social services by voluntary agencies.\textsuperscript{19}

In another breath, Azikiwe tells us that Neo-welfarism is a verbal and dynamic interpretation of welfarism and its synchronization into a social matrix of the best elements in the universally recognized ideologies of capitalism, socialism and welfarism.\textsuperscript{20}

Indeed, Neo-welfarism is an economic and political ideology which purports to blend the best elements in socialism, capitalism, welfarism and indigenous ideologies through the eclectic-pragmatic method.\textsuperscript{21}

From Azikiwe's writing, we can discern the following as the fundamental assumptions of neo-welfarism:

1. That reality is many-sided and can best be apprehended by a receptive broad mind which sifts and harmonizes the

\textsuperscript{19} Azikiwe, \textit{Ideology for Nigeria}, \textit{ibid.}, p. 4

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid, p. 127

\textsuperscript{21} Whether this is successfully carried out or not will be assessed in the next chapter.
various facets of reality yielded by experience and reason. 22

2. The truth of any proposition is determined with reference to its practicability and usefulness. Truth is not absolute nor static such that it can be discovered once and for all, rather, it is ever-emerging, and constantly being revealed through sense-experience and reason. 23

3. All existing socio-political philosophies embody some truth but not the whole truth about socio-political matters. 24 However, the truth contained in each socio-political philosophy may be embedded in some chaff and thus needs to be sifted and harmonized with the truth disclosed in others for the benefit of mankind.

4. The method of sifting some truths embedded in each socio-political philosophy is eclectic and pragmatic. This method promises to give a more adequate view of reality in general and socio-political matters in particular, than any other.

5. Furthermore, Neo-welfarism presupposes that socio-political philosophy is dynamic just as the phenomena with which it deals. Thus, just as assumption (2) above suggests, no socio-political philosophy can be valid at all times, in all places,

24 Ibid., p. 111.
but would need to be reconstructed to meet emergent truths and the new situations unfolded by experience and reason.

6. Neo-welfarism also pressupposes the possibility of perfecting social systems through an experimental and integrative approach. Hence, it purports to integrate those aspects of any system which are shown to be practicable and useful.

So far, we have noted Azikiwe's definition of "neo-welfarism." We believe that this ideology would be better understood after we have discussed its economic and political aspects. We wish to discuss these facets of neo-welfarism piece-meal for the purpose of clarity.

6.4 THE ECONOMIC ASPECT OF NEO-WELFARISM

Neo-welfarism is essentially an economic doctrine. However, we cannot really separate economics from politics. For economics is the pivot of all social and political institutions and relations. But we wish to discuss neo-welfarism as essentially an economic doctrine. One way of doing this is to examine the economic aim of neo-welfarism as well as the prescribed arrangements of economic forces necessary for its realization.

According to Azikiwe, the economic aim of neo-welfarism is the crystalization of an abundant society, organized on the basis of the economics of abundance, as opposed to an affluent
society, organized on the basis of the economy of scarcity. 25

The abundant society, Azikiwe hints, would be characterized by

abundant food, abundant shelter, abundant clothing,
abundant necessities of life and abundant amenities,
within reasonable cost and within the reach of many. 26

This implies that an abundant society is one in which the majority of the citizens have access to those things necessary for minimum comfort and decent living 27 at affordable cost; one in which the desired goods and services are both quantitatively and qualitatively available and affordable by those who need them.

The abundant society which Azikiwe envisages would be welfarist. The welfare policies which the abundant society would encourage, Azikiwe believes, will insulate her citizens from poverty, disease and other sundry maladies which vitiate the lives of the many. This is in sharp contrast with the affluent society established through care-free capitalism "which is a paradox, where poverty co-exists with wealth." 28

25 Ibid, p. 128
26 Ibid, p. 124
27 We recognize that these are relative. But we have in mind decent shelter, balanced diet, adequate clothing, alongside individual initiatives and personalities.
28 Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria... op. cit., p. 124
The above contrast gives a clue as to the distinction between an abundant society and an affluent society. Prima facie, there is no difference between them as both are rich societies. But Azikiwe tried to make a fundamental distinction between them. According to him, the abundant society is organized on the economic principle of abundance (as we have tried to explain), while the affluent society allows scarcity in the midst of plenty.

The affluent society, Azikiwe observes may be the product of either the capitalist or the socialist ideology. It is characterized by the co-existence of abject poverty with superlative affluence. It tends towards the affluence of the few and the abandonment of the many to the harsh forces of supply and demand as manipulated by the wealthy few who control the means of production, distribution and exchange. The capitalist affluent society, Azikiwe explains, promotes the welfare of the few individuals at the expense of the many.²⁹ For, while the total output of goods and services in the capitalist-oriented affluent society may be very high enough to ensure a decent living for all members of the society, accessibility to those goods and services by the average citizen may be very difficult owing to their concentration in the hands of a few industrialists and merchants who stockpile them to create artificial scarcity so as to charge higher prices — all in pursuit of the profit-motive.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 124
Equally, Azikiwe asserts that socialism tends towards the establishment of an affluent society. He concedes that the affluence which socialism tends to promote is not individual affluence, even though a few individuals may still be affluent. This is in contrast to the affluent society which capitalism seeks to establish. However, Azikiwe observes that notwithstanding the fact that socialism aims at the affluence of the many, rather than the few, the sectarian lines are so many that people are easily confused as to which one to follow in attaining socialist goals.

But in the abundant society which neo-welfarism seeks to establish, the state would ensure that the essentials of decent living are made available to all according to needs and irrespective of ability. This is equally the avowed goal of communism. Hence, one hardly sees the distinction between the affluent society of socialism and the abundant society of Neo-welfarism. Perhaps, the distinction lies in the fact that while there are many forms of socialism which create the problem of knowing which one can lead to the socialist goal, Azikiwe implies that Neo-welfarism presents a uniform doctrine which leads to its goal. Even at that, the difference is not quite clear since it is equally possible for Neo-welfarism to develop into sects after some time.

At this juncture, let us ask Azikiwe how the abundant society can be established. According to him, it is through
the neo-welfarist ideology. Neo-welfarism, Azikiwe claims, is the product of a harmonization of the ideologies behind capitalism, socialism, welfarism and proto-welfarism.\textsuperscript{30} This harmonization of ideologies is accomplished through the eclectic-pragmatic method.\textsuperscript{31} Hence, neo-welfarism will have the ingredients of capitalism, socialism and welfarism; but it will not be capitalist, it will not be socialist, and it will not be welfarist per se. Rather, it will be a harmony of opposites a top of our \textquote{extended family system} to further the frontiers of state responsibility, for the welfare of all its citizens.\textsuperscript{32}

Azikiwe maintains that neo-welfarism, as an economic ideology embraces belief in private enterprise, reinforced by State participation in the private sector and State collaboration in management technology for competently and efficiently administering, on a profitable basis, statutory corporations and parastatals, commercial enterprises, including Government-owned, government-controlled and Government-sponsored companies.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{30} The ideology behind capitalism and welfarism is \textquote{liberalism," that behind socialism is \textquote{communism," while that behind proto-welfarism is \textquote{communalism."}


\textsuperscript{32} Ibid, p. 125

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid, p. 127
Thus while the means of production, distribution and exchange are to be both privately and publicly owned in neo-welfarist states, and while the State would engage in profitable as well as purely welfarist economic and social ventures, through its corporate agencies, private individuals would be allowed and encouraged to embark on profitable economic ventures under the protection of the law. The collaboration of the State and private individuals in pursuing common economic objectives would ensure the crystallization of the abundant society which neo-welfarism aims at.

The provision for private participation in the various economic activities under the guidelines of the Neo-welfarist State is a banal recognition of the profit-motive in private-ownership as an incentive to the development of individual initiatives which usually results in increased productivity and efficiency. But the Neo-welfarist State will not condone an official attitude of laissez faire for the exploitation of human beings by their kind. Rather, it will stimulate the assumption by the State of specific responsibilities so as to insulate citizens from the bogey of hunger, disease, ignorance and want.\(^{35}\)

\(^{34}\) Ibid, p. 127 (This has been ignored by socialism to its utter discredit).

\(^{35}\) Ibid, p. 128
Despite the fact that this sounds very much like a slogan, we should not fail to recognize what is being implied here: the role of the State in the economic life of the people under Neo-welfarism is both participatory and regulatory. In this way, the State will be able to monitor and direct economic activities towards the welfare of all.

Azikiwe observes that in the capitalist economy where Government's participation in, and control of, economic activities is minimal or totally absent, individual capitalists are lords unto themselves. Led by the insatiable and ever-increasing desire to make profits, the capitalists often team up, under monopoly, to control output and price to the detriment of consumers. Thus the capitalists may possess goods and services that could ensure the minimum comfort of all, but they put them at prices far above what many people can afford. This situation gives rise to the paradox of scarcity amidst plenty. Thus, while the wealth of such a capitalist state would give the impression of affluence, such affluence belongs only to a few members of the society — mostly the capitalists. This is why Azikiwe decries the affluent society established through the capitalist system. For it manifests the co-existence of abject poverty with superlative affluence.

He maintains that under neo-welfarism, Government,
notwithstanding its engagement in profit-oriented economic ventures, would always attempt to balance economic forces such that they would be conducive to the welfare of the people. Government's direct participation in the productive process, he seems to suggest, is geared towards making goods and services abundant and easily affordable by the citizens. In this way, Government would forestall the downright exploitative economic activities of private individuals. The latter, in order to make profits and stay in business, would have to resort to developing better techniques of production so that goods and services can be mass-produced at lower costs. In this situation, a margin of profit can still be added to the costs of producing goods and services, and their prices would still remain low and easily affordable.

We may ask Azikiwe here whether there would be no exploitation of the people in the neo-welfarist state. This appears to be his suggestion when he asserts that the State (Neo-welfarist) "will not condone the official attitude of laissez faire for the exploitation of human beings by their kind."

But this is nothing more than a slogan. For, the exploitation of man by man seems to be inevitable so long as there are economic interactions among human beings — no matter how minimal.

36 Ibid, p. 123
The above consideration suggests that exploitation of man by man cannot be totally eliminated, even though it may be carried out under different guises — some of which may be very subtle and may appear innocuous. Hence, the best that can be hoped for, with regards to exploitation, is to minimize it. Thus, it is more appropriate to hope that the balancing of the economic burden between Government and private individuals within the Neo-welfarist State would minimize exploitation, especially, when compared with what obtains in the Capitalist State.

According to Azikiwe, Neo-welfarism requires the joint participation of Government and private individuals in the productive processes. But the critical question is: to what extent should the State be involved in the economic life of the people? Posed in another way, the question is: apart from regulating the economic lives of the people through official policies, to what extent should the State be involved in the production processes? Again, are there some limits to private ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange? These are very crucial questions which Azikiwe failed to address. This omission constitutes a great flaw in the Neo-welfarist ideology. Yet these questions are vital to any philosophy which purports to harmonize the major ideologies behind capitalism, socialism and welfarism. Indeed, such a philosophy may stand or fail,
depending on the extent to which it is successful in addressing these questions.

We have to recognize that one of the major problems confronting economic theorists in the contemporary world is how to effectively balance the selfish individual interest of man with the desired general economic well-being of all. This problem draws us into the knotty question of the organization of the socio-economic life, and invariably, into the question of ownership of the factors of production. Usually, the interests of the owners of the productive means dominate the economic life of any society. The question then is, should individuals be allowed to solely own the means of production in a state? Exponents of capitalism answer with a deafening "yes." But we have noted, in the previous chapter, the demerits of such an arrangement. On the other hand, should the means of production, distribution and exchange be owned and controlled solely by the State? Socialists answer "yes" while capitalists answer "no." Again, we have noted some of the weaknesses of such an arrangement.

However, we noted that each of the above possible arrangements of economic forces within a state has equally got some merits. Hence, it is reasonable to harmonize them. It was this line of thought that gave birth to Akiwe's Neo-welfarism. But it is one thing to identify what needs to be done, to do it is quite another. It is not enough to realize that a better economic arrangement would evolve if the factors of
production are owned by private and public concerns. The crux of the matter is how to share the scarce means of production between the private and public sectors so that all would produce to create the envisaged abundant society for the well-being of all. This is not satisfactorily tackled by Azikiwe. We shall return to this in our next chapter, where we shall undertake a critical assessment of Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism.

6.5 THE POLITICAL ASPECT OF NEO-WELFARISM

It is not really appropriate, nor is it easy, to separate the political doctrine of neo-welfarism from its economic doctrine. This is for the simple reason that, as we have emphasized earlier, economics is the foundation of politics. This fact has become so evident in the contemporary world that, even on the intellectual plane, economics and politics can hardly be discussed in isolation. This is evidenced in the creation of an academic discipline known as "Political Economy." The only reason for discussing the economic doctrine of neo-welfarism separately from the political doctrine is just an attempt to make our topic clearer.

Under the political doctrine of neo-welfarism, we shall explore the extent to which Azikiwe answers the ever pressing questions in political philosophy such as the question of the ideal state, the nature and purpose of the state; the meaning, origin, nature and purpose of law; the question of rights and duties, the meaning and nature of rights, as well as the ever recurring question of balancing individual
interests with those of the community. We may begin by first trying to understand what Azikiwe believes to be the political goals of neo-welfarism in Nigeria, nay, in any society in which neo-welfarism is adopted.

In an apparently unambiguous way, Azikiwe states that the aims and objectives of neo-welfarism in Nigeria are to restore democracy by building a new political Leviathan where there will be political freedom, economic security and social equality ...

From this, we can discern that the ideal state, for Azikiwe, is the Neo-welfarist State. This state is also a democratic state. This implies that democracy is to be the principle of governance in the Neo-welfarist State. But what is democracy? We shall return to this question after trying to explain the meaning of the term "State."

What is a State? There are, perhaps, two main senses in which the term "State" can be used. In one sense, a state is a political unit under a single authority. This is a broader concept of "state" because it covers both the territory and people living therein. The second and narrower sense of "State" is that according to which it is synonymous with the term "government." In this sense, the term "State," usually with a capital "S," is used to designate the body (or bodies) of persons that exercise political authority over a given territory or territories. However, it is currently more appropriate to employ the term "society" to designate the first

37 Ibid, p. 129
sense of "state" given above.

Azikiwe retained the above-mentioned senses of "state." For instance, he employs "state" as synonymous with "government" when he asserts that the existence of a State depends on the goodwill of the people for the State, just as the existence of the people depends on the goodwill of the State for the people."\(^\text{33}\)

However, while one can agree with Azikiwe that the existence of the State depends on the goodwill of the people, it is manifestly false to assert in the same breath, that "the existence of the people depends on the goodwill of the State for the people." What Azikiwe can correctly assert is that the people need the goodwill of the State to be able to pursue their well-being individually and collectively.

As a matter of fact, the people can exist with or without the goodwill of the State. If a people do not enjoy the goodwill of the State, they will still continue to exist. The existence of a people is, in no way tied to the existence of the State.

A people can exist without the State, even though there may be anarchy amongst them.

In another breath, Azikiwe used the term "State" as synonymous with "society." This usage is explicit in his assertion that

... Governments are nothing but an agglomeration of persons who are given powers to act on behalf of several units of the agents of the state. 39

With regards to the origin of the State (in the sense of society) Azikiwe did not set forth any systematic doctrine. However, he implies that the instinct of self-preservation among human beings was at the root of societal evolution. He sees the quest for security as a major concern of man. He opines that man's ideas and practices may be motivated by the forces of economics, yet in the final analysis there is one philosophical basis — preservation of the group. 40

It is this factor of mutual aid among animals and primates, Azikiwe agrees with Kropotkin, that necessitated the hard instinct and the more refined gregarious instinct. It is mutual aid, Azikiwe believes, that helps preserve individuals and groups. Mutual aid, Azikiwe suggests, is the moral foundation of any society. This is characterized by "self-sacrifice and co-operative spirit." 41 He maintains that mutual aid has helped man and other animals to survive the struggle for existence. However, it is not forgotten that

39 Ibid, p. 75
40 Ibid, p. 89
41 Ibid, p. 248
species are often directed against one another, or that among mankind there are warfare and other sources of social disunity but "the end finds the survivors succouring one another and offering mutual aid." 42 This is exemplified by the observable tendencies among men to help one another after such calamities as wars and natural disasters such as earthquake, draught, accidents and so forth.

Among mankind, mutual aid have been more consciously encouraged with the institution of the State (government). The various agencies of the State tend to promote individual and collective interests. Some policies of the State are geared towards the promotion of mutual assistance for individual and collective well-being.

The State, Azikiwe suggests, is a convenient creation of man to enhance his individual and group security so as to enable him pursue the goal of life. The goal of life, Azikiwe affirms with other philosophers such as Aristotle, the utilitarians and hedonists, is happiness. He declares, "To every man or woman on this earth, there is one goal — the quest for enjoying life more abundantly." 43 This probably consists in the enjoyment of security to life and property as well as political, economic and social rights guaranteed by the State. He suggests that the quest for liberty,

42 Ibid., p. 247
43 Ibid., p. 42
property and happiness are quests without which life becomes dismal. But what is "happiness" which Azikiwe has characterized as the goal of life?

Azikiwe failed to give any explicit definition of happiness or what it consists in. He further compounded the problem of imprecise meaning of happiness by frequently writing as if the quest for liberty and property were distinct from the pursuit of happiness. Again, it seems that he equates happiness with "enjoying life more abundantly."

This phrase is too vague as to give us much insight into the meaning of "happiness" even if we are to accept Azikiwe's implied suggestion that they can be used interchangeably. What does it mean to enjoy life more abundantly? Perhaps, it means easy access to the necessities and amenities which ensure decent living standard and promote the over-all well-being of the individuals and groups.

However, the phrase "enjoying life more abundantly" seems to suggest that he equates the goal of life with pleasure-seeking, especially sensual pleasure. This interpretation is reinforced by his constant reference to the desire of every man to enjoy the good things of life — both the basic necessities and luxuries of life.

But to equate pleasure with happiness, as Azikiwe seems to

44 Ibid., p. 42
have done has obvious limitations in the sense that things that are said to give pleasure are often great sources of happiness. For instance, sexual pleasure is sometimes succeeded by a great unhappiness if one (or both) of the sexual partners has contacted venereal disease in the course of intercourse. Thus, even though sexual intercourse can give immediate pleasure, it is often followed by a great pain which causes unhappiness. This brings us to another basis for which "pleasure" has been distinguished from "happiness": pleasure is transient while unhappiness is not. Happiness, some classical Greek philosophers like Plato thought, is the state of mind at the attainment of perfection. In this view, "happiness" like "perfection" is eternal. But whether "happiness" so conceived is attainable by man is a matter of interminable disputes among philosophers.

Furthermore, Azikiwe's silence on how happiness can be pursued further seals our hope of finding any clue to his precise conception of happiness which he has accepted as the goal of life. He does not say how happiness can be pursued or attained but rather asserts that all that the individual needs is "freedom to pursue happiness in the best way possible."46 This suggests that individuals are at liberty to determine what makes them happy and the best

way to pursue it. This tends to make happiness relative and subjective to individuals. But this conclusion may be quite far from what Azikiwe intended. For he seems to have an objective conception of "happiness" according to which the enjoyment of economic security, political freedom and social equality would guarantee happiness for all members of the Neo-welfarist State.

He maintains that liberty and security are indispensable factors in the attainment of happiness by all. Analysing the concept of liberty, he asserts that

Liberty implies the right to live according to the choice of the individual, so long as the individual respects the liberties of others as decreed by the State.  

Liberty, he further stresses, also implies the right to enjoy the amenities available in any organized society.

Social security, another prerequisite to the attainment of happiness, Azikiwe states, "implies a right to live and enjoy liberty to the extent that one's right to pursue happiness is guaranteed."  It implies that the individual must be secure in his life and property. This means that he is free from any arbitrary interference in his life, property and fundamental rights.

47 Ibid. p. 43
48 Ibid. p. 43
(A) **Democracy As The Political Goal of Neo-Welfarism:**

We now turn to the central political aim of Neo-welfarism: the restoration of democracy. What then is democracy? According to Azikiwe,

Democracy means the rule of the people by its majority inhabitants and includes a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation, usually involving periodically held free and fair elections. 49

We need to first observe that "democracy" is not "government" but a procedure for producing a government. Hence, we can have a parliamentary or presidential democracy. Azikiwe's definitions of "democracy" suggest that he is confusing a procedure with the outcome of that procedure!

The concept of majority-rule is central in any democracy. But it has largely remained an ideal which is still very far from being realized anywhere in the world today. This is because, even under an electoral system and enlarged suffrage in which the majority of the people in a given state are believed to freely chose their representatives, there may still be manipulation of the will of the electorate through propaganda and misinformation or distortion of information. In this way, the elections cannot be free.

---

and fair" in the strict sense because the decision of the people have been teleguided. Again, "free and fair elections" as the above definition emphasises constitute an important lubricant of a true democracy. But the issue of rigged elections, brazenly carried out in its most crude form in the "new states" and subtly perpetrated in the more democratically advanced countries, destroys this fundamental basis of democracy.

Even if elections are "free and fair," that is, when there is no rigging of elections in any form, the elected representatives usually constitute themselves into cliques of self-seekers and often neglect the interests of those who elected them. Although it can be argued that when this happens, such representatives may be changed during the next election, there is no guarantee that the new ones would not behave like those they replaced. Thus, it may turn out to be a vicious circle.

Furthermore, we need to observe that "democracy" is a polymorphous concept. It has many brands. Hence, it is fashionable to talk of "Western Democracy," "Eastern Democracy" and more recently, "African Democracy." Azikiwe attempted to define each of these brands of democracy. He defines Nigerian/African democracy as a representative government of the generality of Nigerians, by elected or selected counsellors, who represent their kindred or
families, and who comprise elders or spiritual leaders or titled persons, irrespective of their station in life, for the commonweal.\textsuperscript{50}

He defines "Western Democracy" as government of the people by their elected or selected representatives comprising socially stratified leaders for the welfare of the electorate.\textsuperscript{51}

Finally, he defines "Eastern Democracy" as government of the people by their elected or selected representatives, mainly workers or commissars, for the welfare of the proletariat.\textsuperscript{52}

The above definitions do not differ quite remarkably from one another. However, from the definitions, "African Democracy" appears to be more comprehensive and all-embracing in its target than both Western and Eastern democracies which mainly aim at satisfying the electorates and proletariat, respectively. This remark notwithstanding, these brands of democracy all presuppose that the elected or selected representatives of the people should act in the interest of the people they represent. In practice, things may be different but in principle, the representatives of the

\textsuperscript{50} Ibid, p. 7

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid, p. 7

\textsuperscript{52} Ibid, p. 7
people in a democracy are supposed to put the interest of the people above personal interest. But this supposition invests an exaggerated altruism on the representatives. This is why the representatives of a people more often than not pursue their selfish interests rather than the collective interests except where the personal and collective interests meet.

It should be noted, at this point, that Asikiwe did not explicitly state his aim of giving the definitions of the various tags on democracy which we can call "continental" tags. But we presume that he meant to distinguish, essentially, "Western Democracy" from "Eastern Democracy." This he failed to accomplish either through their definitions or by discussing them expressly. However, the two brands of democracy can be briefly distinguished: by "Western Democracy" one is referring to the conception of democracy prevalent in the European and American capitalist countries. Here, democracy is essentially conceived in terms of political and social rights:

free elections; a free press, freedom of political association; freedom of religion, and speech; equality before the law; the right to oppose the government, the right to choose one's job; the right to form free trade unions; the right to move freely within one's country, go abroad temporarily, or emigrate permanently.53

On the other hand, "Eastern Democracy" refers to the conception of democracy widely accepted among such communist countries as Russia, China, Romania and others according to which the proletarian dictatorship entails the ownership of the means of production by the State. Hence, democracy "real democracy" (the communists emphasize) involves not just political rights but hinges essentially on economic rights. Thus, when a communist speaks of democracy he has in mind not government of the people, nor government by the people, but the formulation and implementation of policies in the interests of the people — the overwhelming majority of the people. Thus when a Westerner employs the term "democracy" and an Easterner employs same, they often differed, in broad terms, on the meaning of the concept.

Generally, democracy as a socio-political method hinges on the concept of majority-rule. It upholds that a people have the right to decide how they are to be governed, who governs them and what they expect of the government. In fact, the ideal of democracy, Western, Eastern or African, is for every member of the society who has attained a certain age to take part in decision-making on matters which affect him singularly and collectively.

Representative democracy is the nearest approximation to

54 Ibid., p. 140
collective rulership, since it is impossible for all members of any given society (in its modern enlarged nature) to come together — and take decisions — on regular basis — on matters affecting them all. Consequently, the people have to delegate their rights to decide on matters of individual and collective interests to a few people whom they have elected or selected to act on their behalf.

Those elected or selected by the people to act on their behalf constitute the government. This implies that Governments derive their just powers from the will and consents of the Governed. In its essence, that form of Government which represents the will of the Governed is democratic because the 'demos', that is, the people are the ultimate criteria of justness and unjustness of the acts of Government.  

The raison d'être for any democratic government is the ascertaining and implementation of the will of the people. Ideally, all governments are constituted to serve the interests of the people. And one of the major interests of the people is to have a conducive atmosphere to pursue happiness. This entails the provision of social security by minimizing areas of conflicts among individuals in the society whose pursuit of diverse interests often generated social insecurity and warfare. One way which government can ensure social security is by balancing as effectively as possible individual interests with collective interests.

through legislation, so that most of the time personal and collective interests synchronize.

The above point brings us to an important element in any democratic government: the rule of law. What is "law?" What is the "Rule of Law?"

Democracy And The Rule of Law:

Incidentally, Azikiwe did not say what law is. Perhaps, a conception of law as the express formulation of enforceable rules by the appropriate law-making body in a state, for the purpose of balancing and safeguarding individual and collective interests, may not be far from his heart. He states that law and legal institutions exist "to prevent one person from enjoying his liberty, unchecked at the expense of the other person."\(^{56}\)

The rule of law is essential in any form of democracy. It is defined by Azikiwe as "the expression of the will of those who govern with or without the consent of the democratically constituted electorate."\(^{57}\) He explains that if the former is the case, then it is a parliamentary act, whereas in the latter case, it is an authoritarian decree. It implies that a people be ruled in accordance with their constitution and the laws enacted under its aegis by a legislature whose members were elected by a

\(^{56}\) Ibid, p. 121

democratically constituted electorate, through the secret ballot.\textsuperscript{58}

It also implies that no person or group of persons is above the laws of the land.

Laws, he emphasizes, are to be formulated on the principle of natural justice, equity and fair-play. Thus dispensation of justice has to be ethical, equitable and fair. The principle of natural justice demands that a standard process of legal dispensation be always adhered to no matter who is concerned. More importantly, it requires that justice be dispensed according to the principle of morality. Again, the dispensation of justice should be equitable and fair. This means that law formulation and execution should be such that laws appropriate to a person or persons punishment(s) or reward(s) according to his/their desert without partiality.\textsuperscript{59}

The legal system under a Neo-welfarist State, Azikiwe hopes, would make adequate provisions for the fundamental rights of the citizens. Among the fundamental rights of the citizens, Azikiwe includes the rights to life, right to human dignity, right to personal freedom, right to trial and Appeal, right to privacy, religion, freedom of expression and freedom of the press, freedom to peaceful

\textsuperscript{58} Ibid, p. 143
\textsuperscript{59} Ibid, pp. 143 - 44
assembly, freedom from discrimination, right to property.\textsuperscript{60} (These are not different from those professed in a capitalist state). Although there could be restrictions to these rights, the circumstances under which such restrictions may hold are usually well-specified in the constitution of the country. The fact that there are circumstances under which those categorized fundamental human rights of the citizens can be abrogated corroborates Azikiwe's conviction that "Men have no absolute rights. Their rights are relative."\textsuperscript{61}

Apart from the above fundamental human rights which are the prerequisites to political freedom, Azikiwe maintains that the Neo-welfarist State would guarantee, through the appropriate legal machinery, social equality among the citizens. According to Azikiwe, it is only through the State guarantee of such social rights as the right to education, right to health, right to shelter, right to rehabilitation (for the handicapped citizens), right to employment as well as right to public utilities that social equality would be guaranteed. However, social equality does not mean that every citizen has equal amount of wealth as the other. It rather implies that all citizens have equal opportunities and equal right to the social

\textsuperscript{60} Ibid, pp. 145 - 48
amenities of the State.

A substantial part of Azikiwe's conception of the role of education has been discussed in the third chapter under the sub-title "Mental Emancipation." We simply need to add a few things here. Generally, Azikiwe's conception of education is informed by pragmatism. Accordingly, he sees education as a means of inculcating knowledge in men to better equip them to live a meaningful life in this world of challenges. Hence, education is a means of acquiring knowledge which is both practical and useful. The knowledge which is aimed at through education has meaning only if it enables man to live by, adapt, and/or change his ideas, control circumstances and improve his environment.

Essentially, Azikiwe conceives education as an agency for liberating people from ignorance and superstition as well as from mental and material poverty. He sees education, conceived in its broadest sense of both informal and formal, as an instrument that shapes man's character and makes him a master over, or at least able to cope with, his environment. For this, Azikiwe "believes that education should differentiate human beings from the beasts of the jungle," by expanding man's knowledge and vision of himself, his world and his position in that world.

In broad terms, Azikiwe conceives the following as the aims of education:

(a) Producing "citizens who are capable of adapting themselves not only to their surrounding but also to the world environment."

(b) Inculcating in individuals knowledge, skill and a sense of duty to the community, and

(c) inculcation of such moral standards as honesty, purity, unselfishness and love, on the principle of what is right and not who is right. 64 Azikiwe calls these moral standards "absolute," by which he means "universal."

To achieve these educational aims, education of the head, hand and heart would be emphasized. Education of the head probably connotes the inculcation of theoretical knowledge; education of the hand, practical skill; while education of the heart implies the inculcation of moral principles and broad-mindedness on the recipients of education.

Towards the production of a citizenry that is well-developed along the above lines, the educational system of the Neo-welfarist State is designed to encompass and emphasize religious education, vocational education as well as continuing education. According to Azikiwe, religious education should instil in our children moral values and ethical conduct in their

64 Ibid, p. 253
relationship with fellow human beings; vocational education should train offspring to be knowledgeable and acquire skill to adjust themselves and earn an honest living in the struggle for the survival of the fittest, continuing education should make them adaptable.  

Education as a veritable instrument for an all-round development of the human personality is to be made free at the primary and secondary levels in the Neowelfarist State. However, in return for this, students "shall be engaged in some sort of social services and development projects. At the secondary and tertiary levels, students are to be introduced into basic military training for the intermediate and upper echelon cadres of the armed forces. This is with the aim of instilling in the students a sense of duty and discipline as well as an awareness of their responsibilities as members of the community.

We should observe that Azikiwe is silent on the "hows" of his educational system, i.e., the funding of tertiary education. One appreciates the fact that he envisions free

65 Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria, Op. cit., p. 155 (we have earlier observed that the fittest not only survives, it dominates and rules. The "fit" survives and the "fitter than" survives better than the "fit.")

66 Ibid., p. 155
education up to the secondary level in the Neo-welfarist State but he is silent on how to make higher education accessible to students who have completed their secondary educational training. Or does the right to education end at the secondary level? Perhaps, he is implying that basic education can be obtained up to the secondary school level and anyone wishing to go further has to pay for it. It is wise for the State to assume responsibility for the basic education of her citizens in view of economic constraints which obviously make it impossible for her to implement a free education programme at all levels and at the same time implement other welfare programmes.

But availability and affordability of higher education are still very crucial factors in the success of any educational system. Azikiwe's silence on how to make higher education accessible to many is difficult to understand in view of the crucial roles he envisages for high-level researches within the Neo-welfarist State. Such researches can only be carried out during higher education. He mentions that one of the distinguishing features of the type of education envisaged under Neo-welfarism is that each of its universities or academies shall make it compulsory for all students to devote the first two years to basic studies of a general nature so that they will have a background in the arts and sciences as they relate to Nigeria or the country in question. 67

The purpose of this, according to Azikiwe, is to produce graduates with enlightened leadership. This leadership would inspire development in all aspects of societal life. It would direct the society towards abundance.

Perhaps, it is not in dissonance with the general tone of Neo-welfarism to suggest that the State would ensure, through official guidelines, that higher education is not so expensive as to discourage many from aspiring to it. Thus the State would make sure that although the students had to pay fees to obtain higher education, such fees would be low so as not to discourage aspirants to higher education. Besides, the Government could institute many scholarship schemes, bursary awards and loan schemes to help the needy and deserving students.

The educational curriculum of the Neo-welfarist State would be broad-based in the arts and science disciplines.\(^6\) It would be so designed that the students would be trained in the basic aspects of arts and sciences before specializing in the various areas. In this way, a student would be free from the intellectual parochialism which specialization tends to foster. The educational system of the Neo-welfarist State aims at wholeness of knowledge: at enabling students to appreciate the inseparable link between the theoretical and the practical, between arts and science as giving

\(^6\) Ibid. pp. 155 - 162.
complementary insights about the objects of experience and the nature of reality.

(C) Neo-Welfarism and the Question of Leadership

For an ideology which essentially aspires to be the vehicle for post-colonial liberation of the new states, the question of leadership has to be posed and answered satisfactorily. For many commentators on the problem of lack of appreciable development in the post-colonial era of the new states have strongly rested their case on the lack of a knowledgeable, strong, honest and dynamic leadership. For instance, Chinua Achebe in his small but powerful book entitled The Trouble with Nigeria, emphatically asserts that "The trouble with Nigeria is simply and squarely a failure of leadership." Also, Jide Osuntokan asserts that "If we Nigerians can solve the leadership problem, Nigeria would find herself on the threshold of greatness." These views illustrate what is fast-growing

69 Azikiwe did not conceptualize the qualities of leadership required in the Neo-welfarist State despite its implicit importance. But we would select his views on leadership elsewhere and apply it to the Neo-welfarist State. We feel justified in doing this by the fact that his thoughts on colonial and post-colonial emancipation greatly overlap.


into a consensus among most intellectuals in the new states: that the poverty of their states reflects the poverty of leadership. And, although Osuntokun maintains that "leadership need not be ideological to be effective," many thinkers hold that the issue of leadership is ideology-dependent. Such thinkers believe that it is an ideology which specifies the goals towards which leadership should strive as well as how the desired leadership can be produced.

We have hinted above that one of the goals of education in the Neo-welfarist State is to produce an enlightened leadership that would pilot its affairs and ensure that its goals are realized. But what does Azikiwe mean by an enlightened leadership? How can such an enlightened leadership be produced? What are the qualities of an enlightened leader or leadership? This last question would lead us to a consideration of what Azikiwe designated the "sixteen canons of rectitude in public life."

Azikiwe did not expati ate on what he meant by the term "enlightened leadership." But a closer look at the term within its context would reveal that he probably meant a leadership that is well-informed and knowledgeable as a result of a broad-based education. Such a leadership would imbibe a sense of duty and commitment to societal goals in a most altruistic manner as a result of an enlightened vision of making life
better for others. Thus an enlightened leadership would always cater for the over-all well-being of the people as a fulfilment of an implicit covenant between the governor and the governed.

The means of producing an enlightened leadership has been suggested above: it is through a broad-based education at the higher level. This seems to suggest that education can inculcate the desired virtues in man. But sometimes, one wonders if this is really so, especially when one considers the misdemeanours of those who are thought to be highly educated and are in control of the affairs of the State, particularly in the new states. Such people embezzle public funds entrusted into their care, and connive at fraud and all forms of corruption in the most selfish manner.

Perhaps, Azikiwe would not describe such people as "educated" properly so-called, just as E.S. Peters, one of the famous philosophers of education, would not. Azikiwe would insist, like Peters, that such people are merely learned or literate. For, according to Peters, education involves the inculcation of something valuable and no one can correctly

---

72 Azikiwe, *Resascent Africa*, Op. cit., p. 57 (However, this seems to be an exaggerated altruism. This is because selflessness is rare among human beings. We would take be a virtue which Azikiwe recommends for man.)
be said to be educated except he has changed for the better.73 Education is actually a veritable instrument for individual and societal transformation. However, education may be misconceived and its lessons lost. In this case people simply get literate and not educated. They thus would employ their literacy at cunning and other selfish devices that negate the virtues which education aims at.

This consideration brings us to the qualities/virtues which an enlightened leadership should possess. These are encapsulated in what Azikiwe designated as the "sixteen canons of rectitude in public life," to wit, that public officers should not be dishonest and fraudulent; they should not be envious, they should not deliberately exploit the ignorance of the people; they should not seek the downfall of the upright; they should not conceal or distort the truth; they should not pervert the course of justice, they should not be corrupted; they should not worship ill-gotten wealth; they should not aid the conviction of the innocent, or mislead the innocent; they should expose wrong-doing in all shapes and forms; they should be constructive in all they say and do; they should resist injustice with all their might; they should commend merited achievement; they should serve selflessly and

be willing to relinquish their positions in a democratic manner.\textsuperscript{74}

These canons sound very much like commandments. They tend to emphasize the moral purity expected of the leadership in the Neo-welfarist State.

The leadership of the Neo-welfarist State is to be courageous and firm when matters of principle are concerned. It would stand for the truth no matter the cost. It is equally expected to have a vision of the good for the society and to pursue it vigorously without wavering or compromising. It should have the drive and ability to lead the people to the attainment of their ideals. It should be clear-sighted and not be led by the nose to "worship the trappings and paraphernalia of ephemeral oddities"\textsuperscript{75} even if the members of the society are inclined to them.

We agree that the above-enumerated qualities of good leadership are commendable but the question which Azikiwe should address is how such a leadership can be produced. Important as this question is, Azikiwe did not address it, at least not directly. However, we know that he favours

\textsuperscript{74} An Inaugural Speech delivered at his installation as the Premier of Eastern Nigeria, in Eastern House of Assembly, on October 1, 1954, Zik: A Selection from the Speeches of Nnamdi Azikiwe, Op. cit., pp. 90 - 91.

\textsuperscript{75} Azikiwe, Renascent Africa, Op. cit., p. 35
democratically-elected leadership through the secret ballot when the election is free and fair. But we do know as well that democracy, even in a supposedly free and fair election, has not always — indeed rarely — produced the best leadership. The history of mankind has even shown that most leaders of courage and vision who are altruistically-inclined have often imposed themselves on the people by force in the first instance before they gradually gain acceptability. We only need to recall a few of such leaders as Napoleon Bonaparte in France, Lenin in Russia, Thomas Sankara of Burkina Fasso, and Murtala Mohammed of Nigeria.

Indeed, the non-recommendation of an effective, if not scientifically conceived, means of producing the desired leadership in the Neo-welfarist State is one of the yawning gap in Neo-welfarism as an ideology. We shall say more on this in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

AN APPRAISAL OF ZIK'S SOCIO-POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

So far, we have presented Azikiwe's conception of colonial and post-colonial emancipation. We now need to critically appraise his views. Since, we made many critical comments along our discussion of Azikiwe's views, it is now necessary to attempt an overall assessment of his conception of colonial and post-colonial emancipation.

Azikiwe's recipe for colonial emancipation, which he termed "the Philosophy of a New Africa" rests on five tenets, namely, "spiritual balance," "social regeneration," "economic determinism," "mental emancipation" and "national (political) resorgimento." Concerning post-colonial emancipation, Azikiwe proposes "Neo-welfarism" as an ideology for emancipation for not only the new states (in particular) but also for other societies.

For purposes of clarity, let us undertake our appraisal of Zik's socio-political philosophy along the following lines:

(1) We shall examine other scholars' criticisms of Zik's philosophy as well as present our own;
(2) We shall show the merits of Zik's philosophy.

1 We have discussed these concepts in some greater details in Chapter Three.
7.1 Criticisms of Zik's Socio-Political Philosophy

(a) Criticisms by Other Scholars:

In this regard, J. I. Omoregie's criticisms of Zik's socio-political philosophy is an article entitled "The Political Philosophy of Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe: A Critical Look," are our main focus. However, despite the general title of his article, he actually took a "critical look" at only an aspect of Zik's socio-political philosophy, i.e., the Neo-welfarist ideology. Our objective here is to appraise his major criticisms of Zik's Neo-welfarism.

One ought to commend Omoregie's understanding of the doctrines of Neo-welfarism as demonstrated in his summary. But we have an axe to grind with his concerning his "critical look" at the Neo-welfarist ideology. In the first place, we can observe that his "critical look" is one-sided, pointing out what he considers as the defects of Azikiwe's doctrine of Neo-welfarism and hardly noticing its merits. He declares that

Zik should be commended for his effort to find

---

via media between capitalism and socialism, an eclectic
harmony of opposites, which he has found in neo-welfarism.

He quickly adds the caveat: "Unfortunately, however, such a via
media does not exist." But we see no reason why Omorogbe
should commend Zik "for his effort" to find what does not exist.
For he says that the via media which Azikiwe is trying to find
between capitalism and socialism does not exist.

Omorogbe would have been more consistent if he did not
"commend" Azikiwe at all. For it was tantamount to commending
an exercise in futility. Why commend a "wasted" effort: an
effort directed at what "does not exist?"

Omorogbe strongly contends that no via media can be found
between capitalism and socialism. He declares,

For there is no via media between capitalism and socialism
any more than there is any via media between injustica
and justice, or between vice and virtue.

We need to observe that to equate the relationship between
capitalism and socialism with that between "injustice and justice,"
between "egoism and altruism" or between "vice and virtue" is
largely incorrect. For it is being implied that capitalism stands
first for the conjuncts of these contrasting pairs, while socialism stands

3 Ibid., p. 9
4 Ibid., p. 9
5 Ibid., p. 9
for their last conjuncts. The picture which 
tries to paint is clear if he means that capitalism 
is evil while socialism is good. But Azikiwe's position 
is that capitalism is not all vices without virtues, 
while socialism is not all virtues without vices as 
its exponents are claiming.

Azikiwe insists that the good elements in both 
capitalism and socialism can be eclectically and 
pragmatically harmonized because they reflect some 
aspects of human nature just as their bad elements do. 
Their bad elements should be discarded as undesirable 
while their good features should be integrated for the 
benefits of man.

Our argument is that capitalism and socialism stand 
in a different relationship from that implied by 
"injustice and justice," "egoism and altruism" or "vice 
and virtue." We would observe that these contrasting 
pairs are moral concepts are diametrically opposite. 
"Injustice" and "justice" can be appropriately compared 
to two parallel lines which can never meet. There is 
actually no via media between "injustice" and "justice", 
between "vice" and "virtue". But a via media can exist 
between "egoism" and "altruism" even though the former is 
a negation of the latter as we shall explore later. 
However, it cannot be correctly asserted that 
capitalism stands to socialism as vice to virtue. For, 
while some people may choose capitalism as the best econ
doctrine and some others choose socialism, no reasonable person would choose vice when asked to choose between it and virtue.

As Azikiwe's analysis has shown, there are some good elements in both capitalism and socialism which recommends each to its exponents. It is such good elements which Azikiwe regards as complementary rather than mutually exclusive that he seeks to encourage in the Neo-welfarist State.

The individualism and selfishness which critics of capitalism accuse it of promoting and the altruism which socialism purports to promote are two extremes. Egoism is one extreme which is undesirable because it could be destructive of society. But it is a fact of life which has to be brooked. It is the crude pursuance of self-interest which leads to it. On the other hand, altruism is another extreme. It is desirable but hardly realistic on the ground that it requires the suppression of the self, i.e., it requires selflessness.

A via media can be found between these two extremes. This middle course can be termed "limited egoism" or "enlightened self-interest." This can be defined as the pursuance of self-interest which takes cognizance of public well-being. For instance, an army general may be obsessed with becoming a hero and so may stake his life to save his
people from an enemy's attack, or a philanthropist may provide a school or a hospital for his community so as to be conferred with a chieftancy title. Thus, by pursuing their self-interest, they serve the interest of the public.

The fact that a person is an individual first and a member of the society second, suggests that he would value his self-interest most. But when he realizes that, as a member of the society, his interest would best be served if the society continues to exist in harmony, then he is likely to help to uphold the interest of the society.

We need to emphasize that altruism in the sense of selflessness is very difficult in practice. To believe that all men can be made to be altruistic is to be under a great illusion. The observation of actual human societies has revealed that, more often than not, men have acted for the satisfaction of their self-interests rather than for a selfless consideration for the interests of others. In fact, men hardly, willingly, act altruistically. This is why socialist states apply some pressure to induce men to act altruistically but with limited success.

From the above consideration, the economic arrangement which best suits man's diverse nature is that which takes cognizance of his individual as well as his social nature; that is, the economic system which balances his self-interest
with the interest of the society. This is what neo-welfarism is designed to accomplish. Its accommodation of private and public ownership of the means of production and exchange provides the proper milieu for man to pursue his self-interest and at the same time promote collective interest by participating in public ventures.

Another critical comment made by Omoregbe on neo-welfarism is that "it is in no way different from the welfarism we all know." According to him, Azikiwe's neo-welfarism "turns out to be an old wine in a new bottle." We do not agree with this contention. At least, we can mention two significant respects in which neo-welfarism differs from classical welfarism. The first is that while Neo-welfarism emphasizes private and public ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange, welfarism emphasizes fairness in the distribution of wealth. Secondly Neo-welfarism is an eclectic and pragmatic harmonization of the good elements in capitalism, socialism, welfarism and proto-welfarism.

In another breath, Omoregbe maintains that "Perhaps the only new thing about it is Zik's claim that it was practised by our ancestors." He further states that It is inaccurate and even anachronistic to say that our ancestors combined capitalist and socialist elements in their political system, or

even that their political system was socialist in structure but capitalist in content. 7

We wish to counter this objection. We think that it amounts to a misrepresentation to state that Azikiwe claims that neo-welfarism was practiced by our ancestors. It was rather proto-welfarism that he claimed that our ancestors practised. 8 He did not claim that our ancestors practised neo-welfarism. Rather, proto-welfarism which he claims was the economic ideology of our ancestors informed his neo-welfarist ideology as one which has root in the way of life of his people. Apart from the above correction, we wish to observe that Omorogbe dismisses Azikiwe's claim that the pristine African socio-political systems harboured both capitalist and socialist elements without proving his point. We feel that Azikiwe's claim is accurate.

The traditional African economic organization had the ingredients of capitalism and socialism. This is evident in the fact that communal ownership of such means of production as land is pro-socialist, while the existence of private enterprises is pro-capitalist. Hence, private property existed side by side within public/communal property. On top of this, the welfare of every member of the society is the concern of all, especially within the extended family.

7 Ibid., p. 9

Thus Azikiwe proposes neo-welfarism as an ideology which harnesses the best elements in the indigenous ideology and harmonizes them with those of capitalism and socialism for the purpose of adequately meeting the challenges of modern life.

Furthermore, Omorogbe argues that one of the questions which serves as the dividing line between capitalism and socialism is how the common goods of the society is to be distributed. Should the goods be distributed equitably or inequitably? Should the society allow a few powerful and greedy people to have more than their fair share of the common goods at the expense of others who are thereby deprived of their fair share? Capitalism allows this while socialism rejects it as injustice.9

Few observations are necessary here. Omorogbe does not explain what he means by "common goods." Does he mean by it goods produced by all? Or does he mean the natural resources in a given society? It seems more probable that he means goods commonly produced.

If we are right in assuming that by the term "common goods" he means the ones commonly produced and therefore

commonly owned, then we need to point out that his separation of the question "who gets what?" from "who owns what?" seems to us spurious. The question how goods are distributed and that of ownership of the means of production cannot be meaningfully separated. Thus his "two questions" the answers of which divide capitalism from socialism actually boil down to one question: the question of who owns the means of production, distribution and exchange.

It is true that capitalism believes that the means of production, distribution and exchange should be privately owned while socialism advocates state ownership. Experience has shown that some problems arise. In the capitalist arrangement there is the most nagging problem of mass-poverty amidst plenty as well as rugged individualism due to a one-sided definition of man as a selfish being which ignores his social nature. In the socialist setting, there is also the problem of inefficiency as a result of the marginalization of the individuals which results in non-challenge towards public property. Experience and reason suggests that a better socio-economic arrangement would arise if a via media is found between man's individualism and social demand. This is the rationale for Neo-welfarism.

Again, we need to observe that Omoregbe's claim that
But man's creation of political societies makes certain demands on him, so that those societies could not collapse and he would have the security he needed to pursue his self-interests. Those demands tend to balance individual interests with collective interests. But a man's willingness to co-operate with other men is usually dictated by the extent to which that cooperation would be conducive to the realization of his self-interest, either directly or indirectly.

However, man's realization of the importance of collective living carries with it a tendency towards enlightened self-interest which would be properly realized under a conducive socio-political arrangement which recognizes and encourages his dual tendencies, that is, egoism and altruism. When the socio-political setting is favourable, man helps to realize the common good by trying to realize his personal interest. It is such a socio-political setting that Neo-welfarism seeks to produce.

Also, Omoregbe tries to counter Azikiwe's objection to socialism on the ground that it requires force and totalitarian methods to maintain the high standard of discipline needed for its successful implementation. According to Omoregbe,

If the members of the society are educated to see
the true nature of life—together in society they will strive voluntarily to cultivate a sense of justice and altruism. Once they are convinced that that is the way things ought to be they will endeavour voluntarily to meet the demand. Once they understand that it is in their own interest, the use of totalitarian methods will be unnecessary.\footnote{Ibid, p. 11}

However, this does not effectively counter Azikiwe's objection.

The hypothetical nature of Omoregbe's attempt to rebut Azikiwe's objection weakens his (Omoregbe's) position. His contention remains highly probable. Given this formal structure of his argument: "if ..., "Once...", Suppose that the members of the society cannot be so educated be so convinced what will happen then? Socialism will have to rely on force and totalitarian means to pursue its objectives. The practice of socialism, or at least the claim to this effect, does not suggest that members of the society can be so educated or convinced as to attain the standard of discipline required by the successful practice of socialism. In effect, socialism would still rely on force and the use of totalitarian methods for its sustainance.

This is because man is being asked to subordinate the "I" to the "We" whereas he might feel it natural for the "I" to come first and the the "We", last.
Our remarks notwithstanding, one ought to acknowledge the veracity of some of Omogbe's criticisms of Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism. He is right in his observation that "Zik does not seem to be quite clear about the relationship between socialism and communism." 14 But as we have observed on this issue in Chapter Three, Azikiwe probably meant to distinguish between socialism which believes in communism as an ultimate end and that which is an end in itself. We may refer to the first as Marxist socialism. Even at that, Azikiwe further exhibits his confusion in relation to these terms when, as Omogbe observes,

On the one hand he treats them as two distinct political systems that can exist simultaneously, side by side while on the other hand he calls all the countries practicing socialism all over the world "communist States," which seems to imply that socialism and communism are synonymous terms. 15

Again, Omogbe rightly observes that Azikiwe's definition of socialism as "a system of society in which there is no private property" is erroneous. For "neither socialism nor any other political system prohibits the ownership of private property." 16 At least, not in such

14 Ibid., p. 11
15 Ibid., p. 11
16 Ibid. n. 10
Finally, Omorogbe Azikiwe criticises for using the terms "ideology" and "philosophy" interchangeably "thereby giving the impression that ideology and philosophy are synonymous terms." In this regard, we agree with Omorogbe partially. It is actually misleading as Omorogbe suggests, to use "ideology" and "philosophy" interchangeably without some qualification. This is like calling a part a whole. Ideology, as we have observed in Chapter Four above, "is a form of socio-political philosophy in which the practical elements are as prominent as the theoretical ones...." Hence, an ideology is philosophical.

There is an indirect attack on a component of the methodology of Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism which we deem pertinent to consider here. This attack was made by E. K. Ogundowole on the eclectic approach to the problem of a workable developmental ideology. In his book entitled Self-Reliance: Philosophy of a New Order, he vehemently criticises the eclectic approach in the following terms:

It is just like the case when a glass of milk is mixed with another glass of lime juice. The result is obvious — incompatibility. 'Mixed social-economic system' will invariably advance to a stage where the whole system becomes frustrated and

17 Ibid, pp. 11 - 12.
eventually collapsed [sic. and destroyed].

He further opines that "Mixed Systems" based on an eclectic methodological approach can never lead to the attainment of self-realization because, like the mixture of water with oil, both the 'good' from capitalism and the 'good' from socialism will never get blend.

He feels that it amounts to "mental laziness" to seek to "balance" capitalism and socialism on the sheet of compromise.

We have tried to explain that the "good" elements in capitalism, socialism and welfarism can be harmonized through the eclectic-pragmatic method. After all, those elements depict human tendencies under different settings. Since man has the capacity to actualize them under different arrangements, and since they are judged to be good and desirable, an arrangement can be worked out to encompass the specific conditions necessary for the realization of the good elements in both doctrines.

The analogy between the eclectic approach to the good elements in capitalism and socialism, and the mixture of milk and lime juice is not quite appropriate. It would have been more appropriate to compare the mixed economic

---


19 Ibid, pp. 26 - 27
system as advocated for the Neo-welfarist State, with grafting an orange stem on a mango tree. The orange stem blends with the mango stem yet each bears its own fruit. What the eclectic approach calls for is the balancing—blending of the good elements in the apparently opposing systems. However, Azikiwe tried to ensure the workability of the product of his eclectic approach by giving it a pragmatic bend. He sought to blend those good elements of capitalism, socialism and welfarism which have actually worked in practice.

The eclectic approach is not an evidence of "mental laziness!" Nor is the eclecticism of Neo-welfarism merely a means of reaching a compromise between capitalism and socialism. It is rather the result of a deeper reflection on the undeniable tendencies of man which each of these ideologies captured in parts. The eclectic approach is that of a mature mind which is ready to see the other side of the coin and appraise it accordingly with an eye on appropriating whatever good it has to offer.

The eclectic approach is not an all-comer one. It requires maturity to employ it to a fruitful end. This maturity is displayed by Azikiwe when he cushioned eclecticism with pragmatism to yield the eclectic and pragmatic approach.
(B) Other pertinent criticisms against Azikiwe's socio-political philosophy:

Let us discuss the criticisms against the "Philosophy of a New Africa" separate from those against "welfarism for the sake of a better understanding.

(i) Objections against "The Philosophy of a New Africa"

One of the defects in Azikiwe's "Philosophy of a New Africa" is that it suffers from conceptual obscurantism. Such concepts as "spiritual balance" and "political resorgimento" are really obscure and useless terminologies which do not in any way help our understanding of the "philosophy of a New Africa."

Equally, we find Azikiwe's poly-causal explanation of imperialism, a momentous phenomenon in history, quite contradictory to his "equivalence in the concept of economic determinism which, according to him, holds that "the quest for food, shelter and clothing has been the determinants of history."

This is because the concept of economic

---

determinism must needs lead to a mono-causal explanation of historical events.

To accept the doctrine of economic determinism, and at the same time offer a poly-causal explanation of any historical phenomenon is, ipso facto, contradictory.

Furthermore, Azikiwe's interpretation of the doctrine of economic determinism as asserting that "the quest for food, shelter and clothing has been the primal motive in the establishment of society"\(^1\) is simplistic, to say the least. This is because the quest for food, shelter and clothing does not necessarily require an organized society before it can be undertaken by man, talk less of being the primal motive for the establishment of society. Human beings would still have continued this quest were there no organized society. For instance, the early men continued their peripatetic search for food, shelter and clothing even though they were not living in an organized society.

The doctrine of economic determinism as expounded by Karl Marx whom Azikiwe acknowledges, implies already existing societies. This is because Marx' emphasis is on "the mode of economic production and exchange being the determinant of social relations and political institutions. One of the strongest expressions of the doctrine of economic

socialism—determinism holds that

in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form

\(^2\) Ibid. pp. 9 and 125
the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch ...  

Simpliciter, we can understand Marx as saying that economic forces explain the political and intellectual history of a people at any given time. But to talk of a people implies an organized society. Hence, Azikiwe and Marx are not saying the same thing, strictly speaking. For, while Azikiwe maintains that the quest for food, shelter and clothing — economic forces — is the raison d'être for the establishment of society, Marx simply maintains that economic forces explain the political and intellectual status of every historical epoch. Yet, Azikiwe suggests that he is following Marx in stating the doctrine of economic determinism.

Also, Azikiwe seems to be naive and simplistic in his insistence on peaceful means to colonial emancipation. Many radicals would regard Azikiwe's pacifist "philosophy of a New Africa" as analogous to using bare hands to catch a wild lion. They would contend that imperialists do not understand the language of peace; that imperialism is perpetuated by brute force and can only be eradicated by force. Indeed, one is surprised that Azikiwe, after recognizing that imperialism is sustained by brute force, hopes that it could be eradicated through peaceful/constitutional means. Perhaps this is why

---

Azikiwe did not maintain an absolutist position on the question of whether peaceful or revolutionary means should be employed in the quest for colonial emancipation. He would no doubt recommend more radical means to emancipation if the peaceful means proved ineffective. However, he insists that, though radical and revolutionary changes are necessary for the emergence of a new order, he "never advocated that these radical and revolutionary changes should be crystallized through foul means." 24

But what does Azikiwe mean by the term "foul means?" He did not explain. This leaves the question open to conjectures. Does he mean by this term bloody violence? Or does he mean that radical and revolutionary changes should not be pursued by force? If the latter is his meaning, is he talking about force in general or force which entails bloodshed? It seems that Azikiwe is not totally against the use of minimum force, if need be, to achieve a new order. By "minimum force" we should understand force in the form of social or political pressure which does not entail bloodshed. That Azikiwe does not condemn all types of force in pursuance of colonial emancipation is adumbrated by his advocacy of

24 Ibid., p. 35
"militant agitation within the law." Agitation involves some force. What Azikiwe seems to be vehemently opposed to is the kind of revolutionary changes which must be achieved through bloodshed.

(ii) Objections Against Neo-welfarism

The first objection we may raise against Neo-welfarism is that it fails to stipulate which good elements in capitalism, socialism and welfarism should be pragmatically harmonized atop the indigenous African economic ideology which he called "proto-welfarism." It is true that Azikiwe highlighted arguments in favour or against each of these economic doctrines, but he seems to have only played the role of a moderator. Like a moderator in a debate, he simply states the cases for or against such

---

25 We have analysed this expression earlier in the second chapter.
economic system without telling us whether he accepts all or rejects some. For we know that each of the case made either for or against any of those systems can still be controverted. An example is the argument in favour of socialism which holds that “Socialism hopes to wield power to remedy injustice and wastefulness that feature in the capitalist system.”

We observe that the fairness in distribution of wealth and prudent management of resources which is the main contention associated with the above argument is still much controverted. It can be argued that the issue of fair distribution of wealth in such countries which claim to be socialist as Russia, China, etc. is still much a dogma. Besides, the socialist system also harbours much waste like the capitalist system. Just recently Mikhail Goberchev, the leader of the Soviet Union which many regard as the most advanced socialist state, admitted, in his January 1987 Speech to the Supreme Soviet, that much waste of resources is going on in his country as a result of negligence and nonchallance towards public property as well as through corruption and embezzlement.

The non-specification of the good elements of the various systems which Neo-welfarism has incorporated makes

---

this ideology almost fluid and vacuous. It makes Neo-welfarism an amorphous ideology. It is thus a name without precise content. Even though Azikiwe claims that the Neo-welfarist State would operate an economic system which has the ingredients of the adjudged good elements of the different economic doctrines, and which allows private and public ownership of the means of production, he failed to say the extent to which individuals and the public would go in acquiring productive means such that the profit-motive to individual initiative would be encouraged and at the same time the State would not condone the exploitation of man by his kind.

We recognize that Azikiwe holds that the social policy of the State would be a realistic welfarism and would operate public utilities for the benefit of all citizens who genuinely need them. But he fails to explain how the State would discourage the acquisitive and exploitative tendencies which the profit-motive engenders. Nor does Azikiwe explain the extent of State participation and interference in the economic life of the people without becoming authoritarian to a greater or lesser degree.

Our argument is that the Neo-welfarist ideology has not been able to adequately address the major ideological question which borders on the relationship between the

---

27 We may take this to mean welfarism operated with such care to ensure that only those in actual need benefit from the State welfare programmes.
individual and the society, and both to property. We know that various economic systems have tried to answer the question one way or the other. But the Neo-welfarist ideology has emerged after the answers given by both capitalists and socialists have been criticized as unsatisfactory because they are one-sided. Arkin, who believes that Neo-welfarism provides a more satisfactory answer to the question, fails to give a precise articulation of that relationship apart from merely stating that the Neo-welfarist economy would embrace private and public ownership of economic resources.

Closely related to the above criticism is the fact that the Neo-welfarist ideology did not explain how individual and collective interests can be balanced. It failed to explain whether the interests of the individuals always synchronize with the interests of the community, or, if not, when they can be at variant and what happens in such case(s). We observe that the interests of individuals, even when we take exceptions of deviants, in any given society do not always synchronize. In the circumstances when the interest of the individual conflicts with collective interest, the question is: how can the State balance them without suppressing the individual and thereby becoming tyrannical and at the same time forestall the pursuance of individual interest which is detrimental to that of the society? This question was not tackled by
the Neo-welfarist ideology. Let it be a fundamental question in socio-political philosophy.

Another defect of the Neo-welfarist ideology is its silence on how the publicly owned economic resources can be efficiently and profitably run for the over-all well-being of the people. It is now a recognized fact, even in some socialist quarters, that public corporations are not usually run with the desired efficiency and in the interest of the public. If the Neo-welfarism is to lead to the establishment of an abundant society, then both individual and corporate efficiency must be ensured.

But under an economic arrangement where private-ownership of the factors of production is encouraged alongside public ownership, and where there is no strong provision against sacrificing public interest at the altar of selfish interest, there is no guarantee of efficiency. Hence, inefficiency, fraud, embezzlement and waste which characterize many public corporations may still be the lot of the Neo-welfarist State.

Furthermore, the neo-welfarist ideology failed to tackle the issue of efficient leadership which would ensure the realization of its social, economic and political goals. This defect is more acute when we realize the high premium which Azikiwe places on dynamic and efficient leadership in the realization of the objectives of the neo-welfarist...
In this vein, Azikiwe remarks that "All we need now to realize the goals of Neo-welfarism is to produce leaders with vision and courage to build this new society." 28

We recognize that Azikiwe favours representative democracy as the approach for the political doctrine of Neo-welfarism. It is a political process, as envisioned by him, in which the representatives are directly chosen by the people, through the secret ballot system, and from time to time, to see to their general well-being. 29 But we observe that the democratic process does not guarantee efficient leadership. More often than not, it has produced ineffective leadership, especially when it is manipulated, as it is usually more frequently done in the less developed countries of the world, by a band of fortune-seekers and power-monsters. The democratic process does not guarantee the emergence of the type of leadership which the Neo-welfarist State requires in order to realize her objectives. Yet the issue of producing the efficient leadership necessary for the realization of its objectives is what any worth-while ideology usually tackles. The successful resolution of such an issue is one of the factors which usually recommends an ideology. For no matter how

29 Ibid. n. 132
plausible the aims of an ideology may be, if it is not backed up with the necessary type of leadership, they are but wishful thinking.

Another criticism which might be levelled against Neo-welfarism is that Azikiwe did not explain the difference between Neo-welfarism and the "mixed economic system." More so, since private and public ownership of the means of production and exchange encouraged by the mixed economic system is what Azikiwe claims would obtain in the Neo-welfarist economy. On this basis, many may be inclined to dismiss Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism as a mere neologism for "mixed economy" which Azikiwe himself defines as an economic system in which some factors in the means of production, distribution and exchange are privately or publicly owned and it includes an economic system which allows individuals or corporations or statutory bodies or parastatal organizations to own, sponsor, control or manage any aspect of the economy as a gain or profitable concern.

It is true that the economic aspect of Neo-welfarism and "mixed economy" have certain things in common.

30 Ibid., p. 127
31 Ibid., p. 4
For the latter purposes to retain certain elements, perhaps the good ones, of various economic doctrines. But when we recall that there is no specific demand on the state operating the mixed economic system to be welfarist, and that it is mandatory for the Neo-welfarist State to ensure the welfare of all citizens through appropriate legislations and practices, then the difference between them is made clearer.

7.2 **Merits of Zik's Socio-Political Philosophy:**

Just as we did in "criticisms against Zik's philosophy", let us consider the merits of the "Philosophy for a New Africa" and those of "Neo-welfarism" piece-meal.

(a) **Merits of "The Philosophy of a New Africa"**

As our discussion in the Third Chapter shows, the "Philosophy of a New Africa" is Azikiwe's ideology for colonial emancipation. His major concern was the formulation of an effective philosophy for the decolonization of Africa. But to come up with this, he had to analyse the
raison d'être of imperialism which is the philosophy behind colonialism. His analysis shows that apart from the unethical use of force by the imperialists to subjugate and exploit colonial societies there were some glaring shortcomings on the part of colonial societies themselves which inadvertently facilitated colonization. These include, apart from the inferior force of arms in the face of the more sophisticated ones used by the imperialists, lack of co-operation among colonized societies which manifested itself in their selfishness, clanish and tribal chauvinism, lack of faith in their personal and collective abilities, as well as lack of a proper interpretation of the socio-economic dynamics which precipitated the colonial situation.

On the basis of the analysis of the conditions which facilitated imperialism, Azikiwe became convinced that colonial societies must first of all change their attitudes and mentality, before they could change their situation. Towards this end, Azikiwe recommended that colonial societies should (a) cultivate "spiritual balance" which produces broad-mindedness, understanding and co-operation; (b) experience "social regeneration" so as to operate ethical, just and equitable social systems; (c) recognize the principle of "economic determinism" so as to properly understand social dynamics and the economic motivation of human actions; (d) experience "mental emancipation" by re-educating themselves about their distorted past and their uncanny present as a basis for future regeneration, the development of self-confidence and
the assumption of control over their collective destiny. These four principles form the planks through which "national resorgimento" (independence) would be attained. Once those four are realized, Azikiwe contended, the political freedom of colonial societies would inevitably follow.

One of the merits of Azikiwe's "Philosophy of a New Africa" is its recognition of the multiple factors which made imperialism possible wherever it occurred. Among them were the economic, social, political, military and religious forces in both the imperialists nations and their prospective colonies. Awareness of these factors of imperialism enabled Azikiwe to discern that attack on colonialism must be launched at many fronts. The poly-causal explanation of imperialism enabled Azikiwe to recommend a comprehensive remedy to the problems created by imperialism as well as how to totally eradicate it.

Another merit of the "Philosophy of a New Africa" is its emphasis on mental and economic emancipation as preconditions to real political emancipation. Azikiwe observed that imperialism has been sustained by both mental and economic enslavement of colonial societies. He observed that at home,

the imperialists employed the machineries of education to foster a feeling of superiority of their people to colonial societies. In the colonies, education apart from being much limited, was manipulated by the imperialists to impress upon colonial societies a status of inferiority to the imperialist races.

The imperialists made the education of colonial societies an effective means of mental colonization. Mental colonization finds expression in the lack of self-confidence among colonized societies as well as in their readiness to accept the things and ways of the imperialists as the best. Hence mental emancipation, from the miseducation given by the imperialists, as well as from ignorance and superstition, is the first step to real emancipation. This is to be accomplished, according to Azikiwe, through re-education\(^3\) perhaps by an enlightened leadership which has gained insight into the realities of the colonial situation.

Economic emancipation, we can rationalize, would follow mental emancipation. This is in the sense that when the minds of colonial subjects are liberated from miseducation, ignorance and superstition, they would begin to appreciate the economic motive of various movements in history\(^4\) including the phenomenon of colonization. It is only then

\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 135
\(^{4}\) Ibid., p. 125
that colonized societies would begin to fight for control of their economic destiny as the corner-stone for their political independence. When colonized societies assume control over their economic circumstances, then they would be in the best position to organize the productive forces, so much, that they would satisfy their economic needs. Since economic relations greatly influence other relations, colonized societies, freedom from economic manipulations in the hands of the imperialists would enable them to organize themselves as they deem fit.

But how can colonized societies emancipate themselves economically? We recognize that Azikiwe wants them to be aware of the economic dimension of their condition which would spur in them a desire to change it. But after being aware of the economic forces at work, what practical step(s) should colonized societies take to change their economic circumstances which facilitated imperialism? Azikiwe did not consider this question directly. He rather suggests that colonial subjects should endeavour to be self-employed, especially the educated ones, instead of depending on the meagre salaries which the colonial civil service had to offer.\(^\text{35}\) For, if they are economically independent, then they would be able to think independently and constructively without fear of losing their jobs. It is only then that they can work tirelessly to emancipate themselves from

\(^{35}\text{Azikiwe, My Odyssey, op. cit., p. 44}\)
political thereadom, and thereafter continue their national economic emancipation.

Thus, we can understand Azikiwe as holding that the enlightened colonial subjects would have to first emancipate themselves from relative mental and economic servitude before joining hands to emancipate totally their societies economically and politically. It is usually such enlightened colonial subjects that form the core of the anti-colonialist movements.

Another feature which recommends Azikiwe's philosophy for decolonization, especially to pacifists, is its disavowal of violence as a means of attaining liberation. Azikiwe's favour of the constitutional (reformist) means of emancipation persisted even though he occasionally had to doubt its efficacy in the face of the unyielding attitudes of many colonial masters. The fact that many colonial masters were not willing to relinquish power though peaceful negotiations made him to recommend whatever means that promises to be efficacious in eradicating imperialism. This implies the possibility of using force to attain emancipation from the imperialists. In this, we can see Azikiwe's pragmatic and eclectic bent. For, though he favours peaceful means, he recognizes that some cases of colonial emancipation defy any peaceful solution. In such cases, Azikiwe seems to acquiesce in whatever means that would lead to the desired end should be employed. This is a banal recognition that different circumstances dictate different tunes.
Azikiwe's stand on the question of whether colonial emancipation must be attained through violence or through peaceful means is vindicated by history. For while some colonial territories in Africa gained their political freedom through constitutional/peaceful negotiation, (they include Nigeria, Ghana, Senegal to mention but a few), others gained their political independence through the force of arms (among them are Algeria, the former Portuguese colonies of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea Bissau). Azikiwe's position on the issue of the most appropriate means to colonial emancipation is not a dogmatic one. He realizes that no one means can be absolutely valid and efficacious in all situations.

On the whole, Azikiwe's ideology for colonial emancipation, despite its defects, is commendable as a realistic and pragmatic one. His recognition that liberation effort must come from within the colonial territories rather than from outside and his encouragement of colonial subjects to take up the responsibility of emancipating themselves shows the thinking of a patriot who has keen eyes of realism. It sets him far ahead of his contemporaries in thought. He remarks in this regard that

Where my concept of the New Africa differs from the concept of others is that I believe that only from within the African must the New Africa become a reality and not through other efforts, however noble and philanthropic, from without.36

Again, Azikiwe's philosophy of a New Africa bears the stamp of a realistic appraisal of the colonial situation and the forces which made imperialism possible. His recommendation of how to eradicate imperialism anywhere it

---

occurs is intellectual rather than sentimental. Hence, his recommendation of a humanistic approach to the problems created by imperialism rather than emotional recourse to blind force which, even if it accomplishes the desired end, does so at a great and regrettable cost.

Again, Azikiwe might have recognized that armed confrontation with the imperialists would amount to taking an incalculable risk, the outcome of which was uncertain. For the imperialists, though smaller in number within the colonies, still had superior weapons which guaranteed their imperialist venture in the first instance. Hence, engaging them in physical combat would amount to fool-hardiness on the part of colonial subjects who would expose themselves to the possibility of losing too many lives. Thus, he tactfully recommends a peaceful means to emancipation though it is gradual. He was convinced that "Modern industrial society and the educational policy of European powers in Africa and Asia make any direct attack on the imperialists, at present, suicidal." This is why the moral and gradual approach should be adopted. This involves appeals to the conscience of the imperialists on the evils of imperialism, exposing its contradictions and double standards.

Azikiwe appeals to us as expounding a more mature ideology for decolonization than his exuberant contemporaries who claim to be radicals (such as Nkrumah, Frantz Fanon).
His cold analysis of the forces at work in the colonial era made him to articulate the "philosophy of a New Africa" on the bases of the actual and the possible. Many colonial territories, especially in Africa, which gained their independence through negotiations rather than open confrontation vindicate Azikiwe that colonized societies could secure emancipation through constitutional means. But the fact that some peaceful efforts at liberation often proved inefficacious shows that certain situations required the employment of force to secure colonial emancipation.

(b) **Merits of Neo-welfarism:**

Let us now focus our attention on Azikiwe's ideology for post-colonial emancipation. We have observed that the Neo-welfarist ideology was formulated in response to the perceived need for post-colonial emancipation. It is an ideology which sought comprehensiveness by trying to harmonize the valuable elements of the major ideologies through the eclectic - pragmatic method.

One of the merits of Neo-welfarism is that it constitutes
to suffer from the parochialism which bedevils the two major contemporary economic doctrines.

Neo-welfarism is, thus, a realistic cognition of the multi-faceted nature of reality which it conceived to be ever-emerging and ever unfolding to reason and the senses through which it is apprehended. Neo-welfarism is a dynamic philosophy which is anti-dogmatism and anti-absolutism. This is why it rejects the dogmatism and one-sidedness of both the capitalist and socialist conceptions of man and his ideal life. Both capitalism and socialism tend to promote the selfish and altruistic tendencies in man, respectively. In either case, the multi-dimensional character of man is neglected. This short-coming in both capitalism and socialism is avoided by the Neo-welfarist ideology by recognizing the multi-dimensional character of man and expounding ends and means which reflect the dominant characteristics of man. For Neo-welfarism, unlike other contending ideologies, recognizes man to be both selfish and altruistic - at least, he has the tendency towards both. Thus, as a realistic socio-political ideology, Neo-welfarism envisages a socio-political arrangement under which man's selfish and altruistic nature are to be harmonized to achieve a better end.
Another merit of Azikiwe's Neo-welfarism is its emphasis on the practicable and the useful. Its adoption of these pragmatic criteria shows it as a living philosophy articulated in response to concrete socio-political problems which it is designed to tackle. In particular, Neo-welfarism is formulated to tackle the problems of lack of appreciable development and the ideological confusion which beset the new states. Neo-welfarism, thus, shuns useless speculations about socio-political matters. It rather emphasizes the real, practicable and useful.

Furthermore, Neo-welfarism is a humanistic ideology — although other ideologies may claim to be humanistic too. For it aspires to lead to the establishment of a humane society where there can be abundance and where the state would guarantee for every citizen a reasonable minimum standard of living. The Neo-welfarist State, it is envisaged, would ensure that man's exploitation and dehumanization by his kind is brought to a minimum if not totally eradicated.

Equally, Neo-welfarism is an integrative philosophy. It aims at integrating the world communities into a harmonious economic and political whole. Its demands for the adoption of the principle of abundance as the basis of economic organization and democracy as the political principle of society invariably entails local and
international co-operation and peaceful co-existence. Since no nation can exist in isolation, the mode of economic and political organization of one definitely influences, or is influenced by the other(s). Hence, Neo-welfarism offers itself not just as a suitable developmental ideology for post-colonial societies, it aspires to become a global ideology so as to engender an abundant world community where as Azikiwe put it, everybody would help to produce enough, get enough, share enough and care enough.

Thus Neo-welfarism is offered as an ideology which would enable the world to overcome her present alienation which results from a situation whereby a small section of humanity lives in superlative affluence while the rest live in abject poverty and want. By seeking to replace "affluence" for the few with "abundance" for the many, Neo-welfarism is blazing the trail as a responsive ideology to the nagging demand for a "New International Economic Order." This is a call for a new economic relation among world communities in view of the fact that a few industrially and technologically advanced countries of the world are exploiting the economic resources of the less advanced countries of the world for the enjoyment of the few and to the detriment of the many. It is a call to redress the

preponderous imbalance in the distribution of wealth between the few advanced societies and the many less-developed countries of the world whose inhabitants are increasingly "becoming aware of, and are dissatisfied with, the disparity between their standard of living and those of developed neo-colonialist states." 38

Neo-welfarism is expected to pull the world out of her present alienating situation by proposing the establishment of a world economic community organized on the principle of the economics of abundance as opposed to the present arrangement in which the world economy is operated on the economic principle of scarcity. Neo-welfarism is an ideology which promises to integrate and reconcile the erstwhile colonial peoples with their former masters to produce a harmonious and healthy relationship between them. Such a relationship would ensure peace, fellow-feeling and care for one another.

Furthermore, the eclectic - pragmatic method of Neo-welfarism has much to commend it. First, it is the best approach to the cognition of the multi-dimensional nature of both human and non-human reality. As an integrative procedure, the eclectic pragmatic method seeks to harmonize the various truths which reason and experience yield in

different areas of human inquiry. In this way, it seeks to sift and harmonize whatever truth there is from diverse sources and in various systems of thought. It is thus an open methodology which does not ignore the possibility of finding something of value in various systems of thought. It is also a methodology which promises to enable man to attain a more comprehensive understanding of reality in its manifold nature. Second, the eclectic - pragmatic approach has a flexibility that easily enables a thinker or researcher not only to borrow what is of value in the various opposing systems, but to accommodate new truths that are always being unfolded through reason and experience. In this way, the eclectic and pragmatic method of cognizing reality is ever-widening the scope of human knowledge. Thirdly, as a method which approaches all systems of thought with tolerant skepticism, the eclectic and pragmatic approach can lead man to a higher understanding of the nature of reality and the meaning and goal of life for man.

On a more restrictive note, the eclectic - pragmatic method of Neo-welfarism, especially for its emphasis on tolerant skepticism, offers the erstwhile colonial peoples the best way of escaping from their intellectual and social confusion as a result of the subtle superimposition of the imperialist culture on their indigenous cultures. The colonialists not only occupied the colonial territories physically, they also tried very hard, with various degrees
of success in various areas, to mentally occupy the minds of colonial subjects by imposing their values, systems of thought and conception of reality on them. They pursued this more vigorously through a special educational system designed to achieve their purpose in the colonies.

Colonial education, apart from producing "yes, sir" colonial civil servants, was made a vehicle for inculcating the value-systems and cultural attitudes of the imperialists in colonial societies. Thus the products of the colonial educational system (majority of them, though) still retained the colour and physic of their people, ... their minds have been white-washed. They developed foreign taste and imitated the manners of their colonial mentors while deriding the natives for lacking what they have, that is, the imperialist idiocyncracies. Such educated colonial subjects invariably became unwitty accomplishehers of the mental colonization of their societies. Because such educated colonial subjects were highly regarded by their people, and because this same had been infected by the virus of mental colonization, they became a model for their people to follow. They followed them to mental, cultural, economic and political servitude. The political servitude was later terminated (only apparently) by the perceptive colonial subjects who spear-headed nationalist struggles. However, mental and cultural servitude and still persists and needs to be redressed.

However, when colonial societies gained their political
independence, they had drunk so deep in "the imperialists' fountain" that they could no more extricate themselves totally from its intoxicating power — economically, culturally, mentally and institutionally. On the other hand, they still retained much of their traditional beliefs and idiosyncrasies most of which were often antithetical to one another. The struggle between the imperialist values and belief systems and the indigenous ones for the unflinching loyalty of the minds of erstwhile colonial societies created profound confusions and perplexities for them. Ever since independence, they have been battling with the embarrassing situation of not being able to return to their pristine ways of life nor totally freeing themselves from their spell. They have since been living with this debilitating complex which we can term "an unbalanced patchment of imperialist and indigenous idiosyncracies."

The unbalanced indigenous and foreign values which colonial societies have come to share tend to pull them in opposite directions, so much that progress becomes difficult. In the midst of such cultural and attitudinal cross-road, the eclectic and pragmatic approach of Neo-welfarism promises to help colonial societies overcome their confusion by first freeing their minds from rigidity and the adoption of tolerant skepticism which would enable
them to blend the best in the two cultures and achieve a harmony which would lead to a higher attainment of the ideals envisaged.

As a realistic philosophical method, the eclectic pragmatic approach to the situations in post-colonial societies is the best option in view of the fact that the erstwhile colonial subjects cannot effectively jettison or fully erase the cultural values which they have imbibed from the imperialist nations. Besides, their minds cannot be completely wiped clean of certain indigenous values and beliefs even though they may conflict with the alien ones which they have come to accept. Thus the sifting of the best elements in apparently opposing cultures and harmonizing them on the pragmatic criteria, would enable post-colonial subjects to overcome the split-personality complex which has inhibited their desired development in the various spheres of human endeavour.

Also, Azikiwe himself recommends the eclectic pragmatic approach to the formulation of a more adequate ideology for development on the ground that it has a flexibility which would enable the person intent on formulating a workable ideology for the attainment of a better human society, to incorporate that which is distinctly indigenous to the people for whom the ideology is being formulated or recommended. For instance, in its applicability
to the African situation, the eclectic - pragmatic approach would take cognizance of the indigenous extended family system. Thus the harmonization of opposites would be "atop of our 'extended family system' to further the frontiers of State responsibility for the welfare of all its citizens." Hence, the eclectic - pragmatic method takes care of both the universal and the particular structure of social life among various human communities.

Another merit of Neo-welfarism is that it is formulated on the basis of experience and reason. The analysis of the theoretical principles and the actual functioning of capitalism, socialism and welfarism reveals that none is quite suited for the establishment of the desired humane and abundant society which would guarantee happiness for all. Yet, the actual functioning of each shows that they all have something of value to contribute towards the establishment of a better society which none can singularly lead to. Hence, empirical evidence of the working of those systems exposes both the strength and the weakness of each and, thus, suggests the eclectic and pragmatic approach. The borrowing from each of the systems has to be dictated by the extent to which any element to be borrowed has actually worked. In this, we find that eclecticism has pragmatism to guide it away from irrelevant combination of ideas.

39 Azikiwe, Ideology for Nigeria, op.cit., p. 125
APPENDIX

AZIKIWE: LIFE AND BACKGROUND TO HIS PHILOSOPHY

Benjamin Nnamdi Azikiwe fondly called Zik, was born on November 16, 1904 in Zungeru (in the present Niger State of Northern Nigeria). He is the first son (indeed he was the first child) of Mr. Chukwuemeke Azikiwe and Mrs. Chinwe Chukwuemeka, both of whom hailed from Onitsha in the present Anambra State of Eastern Nigeria.

At the time of his birth, his father was a civil servant assigned to work in the section of the Military department known as the Nigerian Regiment which was a unit of the West African Frontier Force located at Zungeru in the Wushishi District of Niger Province. On account of his parents' residence in Northern Nigeria, Zik lived there for eight years (1904 - 1912) and could speak the Hausa Language "very fluently."

In fact, Azikiwe speaks the three major languages of Igbo, Hausa and Yoruba very fluently as a result of his peripatetic early life. This is often the reason why many commentators on Nigerian leaders usually stressed the "national character" of Zik who they also described as the embodiment of the Nigerian psyche. He is Igbo by tribe; he was born in the North and was domiciled in Yorubaland for several years as a student, a journalist, a nationalist and a politician.
Azikiwe began his educational career at the age of eight (1922) when he enrolled at the Holy Trinity School at Onitsha as a Form One Pupil till 1932 when his formal education terminated in the University of Pennsylvania in the United States of America. Indeed, Zik's educational career is epical to narrate, peripatetic in character and unqualifiedly formative and nourishing in content as well as full of pathos and bathos.

His primary, secondary and university education took him to different parts of Nigeria (from Onitsha to Lagos, from Lagos to Calabar and back to Lagos) and was eventually rounded off in the United States of America. On account of the many schools he attended which were owned by different Christian denominations, Azikiwe belonged to different Christian denomination at different times — he was once a Catholic, then an Anglican, then a Methodist, then a Presbyterian, then a Jehovah's Witness and finally back to the Presbyterian fold.  

His contact with the various denominations that profess the Christian Faith must have put him in a good position to appreciate the fact that each denomination has something of value to teach, and learn from the others. It made him less fanatical and more tolerant of other religious viewpoints. This helped to mould his eclectic-pragmatic

---

1 Azikiwe, My Odyssey, op.cit., p. 67
character which, in all departments of life, shuns absolutism, dogmatism, inflexibility and fanaticism. Thus, he was predisposed to consider each system of thought in every sphere of life as part of the conscious effort by man to arrive at some truth about life, the universe and the destiny of man (if there be any such thing).

Azikiwe's early contact with many Christian denominations and the broad-mindedness which he imbibed from that contact was complemented, on the secular plane, by the numerous playmates and friends he kept. Anywhere he went, he made friends with people both as a child and as an adult. His ability to make, enduring friends on the basis of sharing similar interest, and tolerate others of differing inclinations, greatly explains his usual readiness, later in life, to join hands with people like-minded — no matter their ethnic, cultural and religious diversity — in the pursuit of common interests. This important leadership trait in Azikiwe made the nationalist struggle for self-rule, which he spearheaded, cohesive and formidable.

The seed of nationalism was sown in the fertile mind of Azikiwe in 1920 when he stayed briefly at the Hope Waddell Training Institute, Calabar. Here he was enrolled in standard six — a class, he told us, he had passed in 1919. He would have been enrolled in the Teaching Department if he had showed any interest. It was this fact, that he should be in school rather than be idle at home that must have influenced his
father's decision to enrol him in Standard Six again.

However, the few months he spent at Hope Waddell provided one of the greatest inspiration for his messianic vision for Africa and his later purposeful nationalist activities. Indeed Azikiwe's stay at Hope Waddell witnessed "THE BIRTH OF A DREAM" as he entitled the third Chapter of My Odyssey. This "dream" was the urge to liberate the entire people of Africa from the yoke of colonialism.

This inspiration first came through the stories he heard from his school-mates concerning the need of the entire people of Africa to be free from colonial rule. The first of such stories came from a Liberian student in Hope Waddell. He used to tell Azikiwe the fascinating story about his country whose governors, judges and heads of department were blackmen. But, perhaps, more inspiring was the story by a Yoruba friend who told him and other boys "about a great Negro who was coming with a great army to liberate Africa." 2 The boy was obviously referring to Marcus Garvey.

Azikiwe confessed that prior to the story by the Yoruba boy, he was "not aware of the fact that Africa needed liberation." 3 He attributed this ignorance to the fact that he came from a family that could be said to be "living well" and as such suffered less material wants than other children.

---

2 Ibid, p. 32
3 Ibid, p. 33
from poverty-striken homes. On account of his relative comfort, Azikiwe "never thought of any problems" except those arising from his school work. Consequently, he "spoofed the idea of a Negro coming from America to redeem Africa" and told the Yoruba boy that they (himself inclusive) were being trained to take the place of their fathers in the various departments created by the colonial administrators.

Azikiwe must have been surprised, if not embarrassed, by the reaction of the boy who, as it were, had lost his father early in life and whose mother was a petty trader. Azikiwe narrated that the boy laughed at his ignorance of the conditions of the masses and proceeded to lecture him on the social conditions of his fellow country men and women. When the Yoruba boy finished talking, an Ibibio colleague held Azikiwe by his right ear and called him "daunce" which was equivalent to calling him "helpless worthless idiot." This was the boys' caricature of the abbreviation, H.W.I., which as "Hope Waddell Institute" is a shortened form of the "Hope Waddell Training Institute." This attracted the laughter of other boys at Azikiwe's expense. He felt insulted.

However, on Saturday after that incident, Azikiwe went home and during a discussion his father confirmed that some Africans were "hopeless, worthless idiots" which was why they tolerated alien rule without organized resistance.
This jolted Azikiwe to the truth in what the Yoruba boy said and made him want more information about the man from America to redeem Africa.

When he returned to school, he apologized to the other boys and requested his Yoruba friend to provide him with more information about the man he had talked about. The boy went to his wooden box and brought an old issue of *The Negro World* on the front page of which was one of the weekly letters of Marcus Aurelius Garvey who was popularly known as the "provisional President of Africa." The boy read some portions of the letter to Azikiwe. But the part which struck Azikiwe most forcefully read:

> God almighty created each and every one of us for a place in the world; and for the least of us to think that we were created only to be what we are and not what we can make ourselves, is to impute an improper motive to the Creator for creating us.  

Azikiwe was so deeply touched that he copied it neatly into his notebook.

Also, the motto of the Garvey Organization, the Universal Negro Improvement Association, which says "One God, One Aim, One Destiny" greatly appealed to the young, sensitive and impressionistic Azikiwe so much so that he tells us:

I resolved to formulate my philosophy of life so far as was practicable, towards the evangelization of universal fatherhood, universal brotherhood and

---

5 Quoted by Azikiwe, in *My Odyssey*, p. 34
and universal happiness.\textsuperscript{6}

Later that year, 1920, he left the Hope Waddell Training Institute, Calabar, for Wesleyan Boys High School (WBHS), Lagos, to continue his education. The reason for this change of school was due to the fact that there was no secondary department in Hope Waddell and Azikiwe was not interested in pursuing the teaching programme being run at HWTI.

Back at WBHS, then headed by Reverend Harold Stacey, Azikiwe worked hard, academically. At this time, he began to attend the Methodist Church at Tinubu Square. This had to be the case because, as we observed earlier on, the attendance of any particular missionary school entailed the attendance of its church.

Thus it was at the Tinubu Methodist Church that he came into contact with Dr. (Rev.) James Emmanuel Kwegyir Aggrey who turned out to be one of his greatest inspirers in life. On the day he first met Aggrey, Aggrey was in the church preaching on the book of Isaiah Chapter 6:1-10 where Isaiah gives testimony of his vision of God whom he heard saying "whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" to which Isaiah answered, "Here am I; send me" (verse 3). The effect of this sermon on young Azikiwe was tremendous and he tells us that "from that day, I became a new man, my ideas of life changed so much that I lived in day-dreams, hoping against hope for the time when it would be possible

\textsuperscript{6} Ibid, p.35
for me to be like Aggrey." 7

Aggrey's sermon, he further informs us, had spiritually electrified and inspired him with a sense of mission. According to him, "it then dawned upon me that life had a meaning and I had a mission to fulfil; thus it was my task to make life worth while for my fellow men and to be a friend to the struggling humanity." 8 This lofty resolution by a boy who was barely sixteen years old sounds idealistic and might be expected from any other sensitive boy of that age-grade. In this regard many would be willing to credit young Azikiwe with a keen mind and nothing more. But the profoundly interesting thing is that the matured Azikiwe strove to live up to the resolution made by the young and idealistic Azikiwe. This goes to show how far ideals guide practice.

Reverend Aggrey's sermon was not only inspiring to young Azikiwe, he felt its direct challenge. For while sermonizing, Aggrey had told the congregation about his personal life which revealed his sacrifice for Africa and mankind. He had also declared that he had brought the good tidings that "Nothing but the best is good enough for Africa." 9

7 Ibid., p. 38
8 Ibid., p. 36
9 Ibid., p. 37
The effect of these words on Azikiwe was miraculously transforming and he recounts — in the familiar Biblical account of the conversion of Saul (Paul) — that "As he uttered these words, the scales fell from my eyes and I began to see a glorious future." But what Azikiwe saw as the greatest challenge to him came at the end of the sermon when Aggrey said something like "If I, one of you, could go to the new world, and made a man of myself, then you can too. May God help you. Amen." This challenge precipitated his own iron resolution to attain success in life and to lead a life that would be instrumental to the happiness of a larger humanity.

In fact, he was so fascinated by the assertion that "Nothing but the best is good enough for Africa" that he began to ruminate over it after the service. Then he became critical of the professionals and intellectuals in West Africa at that time. He observed, to his utter disappointment, that only a very few of the Africans "measured up with the best in their calling in the world as a whole." He blames this disappointing situation on the fact that most Africans in various callings never tried hard enough, nor aspired high.

10 Ibid., p. 37
11 Ibid., p. 37
12 Ibid., p. 38
enough.

These considerations made Azikiwe to vow that if he could not be the best in his chosen field, he would try to be numbered among the very best "because 'Only the best was good enough for Africa.'"\textsuperscript{13}

The following day, after that inspiring and soul-nourishing service, Reverend Aggrey visited WAMSS. This afforded Azikiwe another opportunity to meet Aggrey and it proved to be a great blessing for him (Azikiwe). This was because it was on that occasion that Azikiwe received a gift of a book entitled \textit{Negro Education: A Study of the Private and Higher Schools for Coloured People In the United States}, from Aggrey. This book turned out to be so valuable for his higher education that he sincerely acknowledges,

\begin{quote}
I owe my higher education to this book, for it was through the information I gleaned from it that I was enabled to make necessary contact for my education in America.\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

These encounters with Aggrey and what he had stirred up in him made Azikiwe very desirous to know more about him. Consequently, he decided to delve into his biography with the hope of getting more inspirations and strength. These he got, and they made him resolve that

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p. 39
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid. p. 33
if Garvey could dream of 'One God, One aim, and One Destiny' in America, and influence his contemporaries, and if Aigrey could also dream that nothing but best was good enough for Africa, then not even death would stop me from reaching America in order to make my dreams come true.  

It was in this inspired frame of mind that he wrote to his father and pleaded with him to assist him to go to America to pursue his higher education.

Meanwhile, he worked hard at his studies. As a reward for this, he won the boarder's prize at WBHS in December, when he was a little over sixteen-years old. This prize was a book entitled From Log Cabin to the White House. Its author was W.M. Thayer and it was the biography of a former President of the United States of America, James A Garfield. Azikiwe read this book very thoroughly and was thrilled by the almost larger-than-life story of Garfield, a man of low birth who lost his father at the age of 18 months and was brought up in a log cabin.

Such was Azikiwe's great capacity to draw deep inspiration from any source that could offer it, both from direct human intercourse, books and situations. As for books, they have played various roles in enabling him to resolve to climb the ladder of success. They have guided

---

15 Ibid, p. 40
16 Ibid, p. 40
him like a good shepherd. He strongly acknowledges this fact in the following lines:

Books have steered me on my journey through life.
The 1917 prize brought me closer with the
greatest hymnologists of Christendom, and
henceforth I began to dabble in the writing of
poetry. Then came what I regard as the prize of
prizes, the biography of Garfield. This book
revealed the possibilities of will-power in the
face of abject poverty, and the rewards of the
frontier spirit.\footnote{Ibid, p. 42}

He was equally greatly encouraged when he received a
catalogue containing information about the American colleges
and universities catering exclusively for the education of
persons of African descent. This further raised his hopes.

Under the above animated passion, one would no doubt
pity young Azikiwe for the severe blow which his intellectual
quest and aspiration suffered at his father's negative reply
to his letter requesting his assistance to enable him go to
America to pursue his higher education. His father had
emphasized in his letter that as a civil servant on a meagre
salary, he had done his best to give him some sort of secondary
education. He rather advised him to take the next Civil
Service Examination in order to join the civil service.
Frustrated, Azikiwe had little choice than to sit for
the examination as his father had advised. This was in July,
1921. When the result was released, he was successful. Thus,
on October 17, 1921, he was employed by the Treasury, first
as an unpaid Learner till the end of the year; then as a
paid Learner, and on April 1, 1922, he was appointed a Third
Class Clerk with a salary of four pounds a month. 18

However, the life of a Third Class Clerk in a colonial
Civil Service was not satisfying to young Azikiwe whose
restless spirit and aspirations had crossed the shores of
Africa and mentally found abode in the United States of
America — the America of Garvey, Aggrey, Garfield and
Lincoln. He thus became more restless and more determined to
go to America for further studies, especially as he daily
came face to face with the exploitative nature of colonialism.
In consequence, he began an intensive correspondence campaign
with certain universities in America.

Azikiwe's burning desire to attain higher education in
the United States of America later drew his father's
appreciation, and support, especially after his abortive
attempt to be stowed away on a ship to America. 19 Thus, in
spite of some obvious problems, especially lack of fund, he
sailed to the United States to start his higher education in
Storer College in 1925.

18 Ibid, p. 42
19 Ibid, pp. 54 - 68.
While leaving the shores of Africa, Azikiwe thought of a course of study which would enable him "not only to earn an honest living but to serve humanity." He thought that journalism was his best bet. However, although he did not major in mass-communication so as to qualify as a professional journalist, his interest in the profession and the enlightening ends to which he put his journalistic activities later made him one of the most famous names in African journalism.

His experiences in Storer College for the two years he spent there and his contact with MacDonald, the President (Principal) of the institution were most enlightening. The lesson which Azikiwe learnt from MacDonald's engagement in manual work on their first meeting remained indelible in his mind and greatly prepared him for the strenuous struggles for survival in the heady days ahead. Most importantly, Azikiwe learnt not to treat manual work as something mean and unworthy of the educated people. In fact, it was Azikiwe's preparedness to undertake any type of job that saw him through his educational career in America.

While at Storer College, Azikiwe was able to develop his athletic abilities. He participated in many sporting activities including football, athletics, boxing and cross-country. Some of these games earned him some laurels.

20 Ibid, p. 76
Azikiwe maintains that sports taught him big and unforgettable lessons. Among them was the need to prepare before embarking on important ventures, to be tactful in dealing with human beings and most importantly, that life is a race in which a would-be winner needs to plan every stage. 21

In 1927, Azikiwe graduated from the Storer College and gained admission into Howard University. But he needed money for enrolment. Thus he decided to go to Pittsburg where he hoped to find some job which would enable him pay his fees.

Things proved to be very difficult for Azikiwe at Pittsburg. He frequently lost jobs and at a certain time he could not find anything to do. He began to starve. Things got so bad that he decided to commit suicide. It was only the miracle of God that saved him when He sent Rev. Father Lamb to rescue him where he lay on a rail track for the approaching train to crush him to death.

After this incident, Azikiwe began to pick up gradually, though he still had the nightmare of gaining employment and being out of it at short intervals. Thus within a few months, he worked variously as a dish-washer, a miner, a road-worker, a lift-operator, a load-carrier, and in other capacities. 22 Through these jobs, especially the mine job which fetched him 497 dollars 45 cents, he was able to make reasonable

21 Ibid., pp. 94 - 95.
22 Ibid., pp. 103 - 111
savings which enabled him to enrol at Howard University for a degree in political science in February 1928.

Scholarship at Howard University greatly equipped Azikiwe for his nationalistic and philosophical thinking. Both his lecturers and the various disciplines had immense influences on him. He acknowledged that his anti-colonial stance was greatly influenced by Professor Tunnell, a Negro and his political science lecturer. During their lectures, Tunnell had always emphasized the need for organized resistance against colonial rule as well as the need to arouse the masses into action through enlightenment.

From the various courses he took at Howard University, Azikiwe learnt unforgettable lessons which he later utilized for his life's works. In fact, he sees his experiences and learning at Howard University in more broad terms as a case of "How an African student came into contact with intellectuals of African descent and was influenced to battle against wrong."\(^{23}\)

By the summer of 1929, financial difficulties forced Azikiwe to withdraw from Howard University. Consequently, he had to apply for admission and financial help at Lincoln University. He was admitted and financially assisted. He supplemented the financial assistance of the University with some earnings from part-time jobs to pay his fees through to the final completion of his programme in June, 1930 when he

\(^{23}\) Ibid, p. 120
bagged the "BA Cum Laude" in political science.\textsuperscript{24}

In the course of his programme at Lincoln University, he participated actively in sports and literary activities. He contributed immensely to the development of these areas. His poetic ingenuity was exemplified by the appearance of his poem "To Lincoln" in The Lincolnian Year Book of 1930 and it was selected for inclusion in the centenary publication under the title, Lincoln Poets, published in 1954.

However, Azikiwe's thirst for mental improvement was not quenched by his hard-earned "BA cum Laude" in political Science. Hence, in the summer of 1930, through a scholarship from Phelps - Stokes Fund, he enrolled at Columbia University and began "theoretical Studies in journalism."\textsuperscript{25} In this course, he studied international law, labour problems and principles of journalism. It was during this period that he was selected to be the associate editor of the Summer Session Times which was the Columbia University newspaper.

By the end of that summer (1930) non-availability of fund forced him to abandon his course at Columbia University. He then applied to Lincoln University for graduate-assistantship. Luckily, he was given the award and this enabled him to pursue his graduate studies at Lincoln University and the University of Pennsylvania simultaneously. At the latter university, he

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid, p. 120
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, p. 154
enrolled for a Master of Science (MSc) degree with anthropology and political science as his major and minor courses respectively. At the Theological Seminary of Lincoln University he enrolled for a Master of Arts (M.A.) degree with religion and philosophy as his major and minor respectively.

At the Lincoln University, after an excellent performance in all his papers, he was awarded the M.A. degree in June 1932; while the University of Pennsylvania awarded him the M.Sc degree in February 1933. Meanwhile, he had also enrolled for a doctoral degree programme in political science at Columbia University in 1931. He had even "satisfied some of the preliminary requirements" and was placed under the supervision of Professor Parker T. Moon. The title he chose for his doctoral dissertation was "Liberian Diplomacy, 1847 - 1932." 26

By the fall of 1933, Azikiwe worked as a full-time instructor (Lecturer) in political science. In this capacity, he worked hard to entrench the study of African History in the University's curriculum.

In the meantime, he began to feel homesick. He also began to feel that Africa was beckoning him to serve her. He therefore, decided to abandon his doctoral degree programme so as to return to Africa in order to do for her "what that continent need for a renaissance of thought and action." 27

26 Ibid, pp. 155 - 56
27 Ibid, p. 160
To achieve this he was quite prepared to suffer any personal inconvenience if need be.

It was on the basis of this resolution that he sought and finally, got employment from a Gold Coasta (Ghananian) businessman, A.J. Ocansey who had agreed to Azikiwe's proposal that the establishment of a daily newspaper would be profitable. Thus in 1934, he returned to Africa (Ghana to be specific) to achieve a brilliant career in journalism and to become a foremost African nationalist and politician of his time.

Under Ocansey's employment, Azikiwe founded The African Morning Post of which he was the first editor-in-chief. Azikiwe's editorial policy was geared towards reawakening of self-consciousness among Africans so as to enable them launch an onslaught against colonialism and colonial domination. Indeed, Azikiwe states that his main objective in returning to Africa was to infuse in the indigenous African a spirit of constitutional resistance to foreign rule and to inculcate in him certain psychological disciplines to facilitate the organization of such resistance and the realization of political freedom.29

Really, Azikiwe's attraction to journalism, apart from offering him gainful employment, can only be fully appreciated against the back-drop of his nationalist thinking. For, he saw journalism mainly as the most efficacious means to prepare

Ibid, p. 252
the minds of Africans for the inevitable struggle against colonial rule. Thus he saw in journalism a veritable instrument for the realization of his nationalist ideals. It is little surprising that his journalism was dominated by nationalist themes of total eradication of colonialism and the amelioration of the poor conditions of the colonial societies. Hence, The African Morning Post and later, The West African Pilot which he owned and edited, became the appropriate platforms for the launching of his well-articulated "philosophy of a New Africa" which expounded the necessary conditions for the liberation of Africa from colonialism as well as the path to Africa's development. 29

Through the pages of The African Morning Post, Azikiwe launched his crusade against colonialism and colonial domination in the Gold Coast (Ghana) and the entire continent of Africa with such radical audacity that the colonial authorities marked him as a dangerous enemy. He occasionally had brushes with the colonial authorities but his tact and astuteness usually kept him out of prison bars.

Sometime in 1937, Azikiwe resigned his appointment as the Editor-in-chief of Ocansey's African Morning Post due to some editorial and financial misunderstanding between them.

29 Ibid, pp. 53 - 54 (This has been discussed in some details in our Third Chapter).
However, he still has high regards for Ocransey whom he calls his benefactor and the man who enabled him to embark on his avowed task to precipitate African liberation.

When Azikiwe left Gold Coast (Ghana), he returned to Nigeria, his country, and with some second-hand printing equipment he bought while in Gold Coast and some capital he was able to raise, he inaugurated 'The Zik's Press Limited' in the middle of 1937. "The Zik's Press Limited" was incorporated on August 5, 1937 with the initial capital of £5,000 and, on November 22, 1937, it rolled out the first copies of the West African Pilot whose motto was "Show the light and the people will find the way."

The West African Pilot continued the crusade for colonial emancipation which Azikiwe had envisaged for The African Morning Post with a great determination: during the colonial authorities, exposing their hypocrisy, inhumanity and exploitation as well as urging the colonial societies to brace up and free themselves from colonial rule. The name, West African Pilot, is significant as it depicts the nationalist role which Azikiwe envisaged for his newspaper. Thus, the newspaper was expected to pilot the people of Africa to achieve independence from foreign rule and domination.

The regional expression "West Africa" which appears in the name of the newspaper should not mislead anyone into thinking that Azikiwe's concern for liberation was becoming
narrowed down to West Africa; he was still genuinely committed to the crusade of total emancipation of Africa as his "philosophy of a New Africa" which the West African Pilot propagated exemplifies. However, it has to be admitted that the main area of the newspaper's practical operations was West Africa. Nevertheless, its liberating messages were addressed to the entire African continent.

The universalistic nature of Azikiwe's message of liberation is evident in his highly prized motto: "that man's inhumanity to man must cease." In propagating this gospel which would establish a social relation among men throughout the world, Coleman observes,

Azikiwe was just at home in Accra as in Lagos or Onitsha. Lynching in America, pass laws in South Africa, pass laws in South Africa, or boycotts in the Gold Coast (now Ghana) received just as much emphasis in his newspaper as did the problem of creating an independent Nigerian nation-state.

Coleman further observes that Azikiwe made "racial inequalities and injustices and the need to right historic wrongs" the central theme of his combative and provocative journalism. It was the content and brand of his journalism that accounted for his fame and power, and proved to be the most crucial single precipitant of Nigerian and, to a

30 Ibid., p. 222
31 J. S. Coleman, Nigeria: Background to Nationalism (California California University Press, 1960) p. 223.
On the whole, the West African Pilot grew to be a huge success both financially and nationally. Its financial success led to the formation of the Zik’s Group of Newspapers which published daily papers in the major centers of Nigeria. Some of those daily papers were still published until the Nigerian Civil War which began in 1967. On the nationalist front, the West African Pilot and other associated dailies succeeded in no small measure in spreading socio-political consciousness among the African people as the prerequisite for the overthrow of colonialism in Africa.

Later, as the nationalist movements gathered more momentum and political independence began to appear on the horizon, nationalist activities became translated into political activities as nationalist movements metamorphosed into political parties. Most nationalists, ipso facto, became politicians. It is against this background that we can view Azikiwe’s long and eventful political career which began formally in 1947. Since then Azikiwe has remained the most spectacular Nigerian politician for over four decades. He is easily the most experienced, the most celebrated, the most successful, the most misunderstood, and the most maligned of all known politicians, dead and alive.

The NCNC of which he was the first General Secretary from its inception in 1914 to 1946 and the President from
1946 - 1959, provided the spring-board that launched him into active political life. Since winning the Lagos municipal election, in 1947, Azikiwe continued to climb higher on the political ladder. Thus he was elected into the Western House of Assembly in 1951, was inducted into the Premiership of Eastern Region in 1954, elected into the Federal House of Representative in 1959 and in January, 1960, he was elected into the Senate (Upper House). Later in 1960, he became the first indigenous Governor-General and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces.

In 1963, when Nigeria became a Republic, he was made the first Nigerian President albeit-ceremonial. He held this office till shortly before the first military coup in Nigeria in January 15, 1966.

The military interregnum for the next thirteen years put Azikiwe into political abeyance as was equally the case with his other political colleagues. Within this period, Nigeria fought a bitter Civil War which ended in 1970. During the war, Azikiwe was in the Biafran domain and his position in the war, is still as controversial as his many political actions.

By 1979 when the Military under the headship of Lt. General Olusegun Obasanjo decided to hand-over power to elected civilian government, Azikiwe was very much in the race for the Presidency. He contested under the umbrella of the Nigerian People's Party (NPP) and lost in an
election whose results remained among the most controversial in Nigerian history. The civilian administration headed by Shehu Shagari was terminated by the military coup of Iddigbon and Buhari in 1983.

Buhari and Iddigbon were toppled by a kind of palace coup which brought Ibrahim Babangida to the headship of Nigeria. Babangida's team promised to return Nigeria to a democratically-elected leadership in 1990 but they later changed their mind — as if their promise had been a slip of the tongue — and postponed the assumption of power by the civilians till 1992.

Shortly after the military take-over in 1983 coup, Azikiwe announced his final retirement from active partisan politics. However, he still remains the political monument of Nigeria. Indeed, his life's story is almost synonymous with the history of Nigeria as a nation.

On the whole, we have tried to know more about Azikiwe (Zik of Africa, as he is fondly called), by delving into his background and the numerous cross-currents which helped to fashion his thought. We would appreciate from the variegated background of this many-sided personality that great minds are often produced by the circumstances of their epoch which they react to, either positively or negatively. Azikiwe grew up to be anti-colonialist and anti-colonialist because of his experiences of the colonial situation and his reactions
against it.

The unjust economic and political relations in the colonial set-up were mainly responsible for his rebellion against the status quo and his determined efforts towards eradicating colonialism. It is equally his concern for social and political justice as the proper foundation of a united and prosperous nation that led him into socio-political philosophy and into active political life.

Indeed, the life and thought of Azikiwe would no doubt remain a source of inspiration to the dejected and the despondent, to those who groan under bondage imposed by their fellowmen, to those who are opposed to oppression in all forms and shapes, as well as to those who wish to evolve a better society where man would be a brother to his fellow man — caring enough, having enough and giving enough.
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