PAN-AFRICANISM AND ZIONISM
The Delusion of Comparability

MICHAEL W. WILLIAMS
Simmons College

Between Pan-Africanism and Zionism there are both similarities and differences. However, a careful examination of these two movements would clearly reveal that the differences between them significantly exceed the similarities. More importantly, such an examination would demonstrate that the differences are far more decisive, fundamental, and consequential than the similarities.

Despite this reality, one of the greatest misconceptions that has consistently characterized the perceptions of many academicians and activists has been the notion that Pan-Africanism and Zionism are essentially the same. Several well-known Pan-Africanists of the 19th and 20th centuries were victimized by this delusion. For this reason, they often perceived the Zionist idea and movement in very favorable terms. Furthermore, many scholars have gone as far as to suggest that Pan-Africanism owes its very existence to Zionism. It is the purpose of this study to critically review these misconceptions in light of the stark reality that has actually shaped these two movements.

MOVEMENTS IN POLARITY

Before reviewing the literature on this subject, it is necessary to delineate, with the use of hard facts and historical reflection, the exact nature of the fundamental differences between Pan-Africanism and Zionism. Below is a brief summary.

JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, Vol. 21 No. 3, March 1991 348-371

1. The ancestral relationship Africans in the diaspora have shared with Africa has been and remains quite strong. There is no debate on this question, because it is a scientific and historical fact that the overwhelming majority of Africans in the diaspora today are the descendants of those Africans who were forcibly removed from Africa as early as the 15th century during the European slave trade. While the struggle for Pan-Africanism cannot be reduced to just this simple biological truth, it is a significant factor that continues to provide fuel for the movement.

On the other hand, the main advocates of Zionism, the Jewish bourgeoisie and their followers of European origin, are not, in any significant way, biologically related to those Jews who left Palestine many centuries ago (Comas, 1965, pp. 21-22; Herskovits, 1960, pp. 1489-1509; Lilienthal, 1953, pp. 213-228; Montagu, 1974, pp. 353-377). Moreover, while much of the Zionist ideological apparatus rests on this myth of a Jewish race, the fact of the matter is that Jews were, from their original religious conversion, a "mixed multitude" whose members, from the earliest of times, could be found among different racial and ethnic groups.

2. On the question of resettlement, the two movements part ways considerably. With Pan-Africanism, a return to Africa has always been an important part of the movement, but it was never a goal that had to be achieved before Pan-Africanism itself could be realized. Perhaps because there were always hundreds of millions of Africans still living on the mainland, emigration plans were never as indispensable to the success of Pan-Africanism as they were to the development of the Zionist movement. In the case of Zionism, its primary objective—the creation of an exclusive Jewish state—could have never been achieved without the few million Jews who eventually emigrated to Palestine.

Relatedly, the manner in which the emigres relate to the indigenous population is another critical area of contrast between Pan-Africanism and Zionism. For instance, one of the most consistent advocates of resettlement for the cause of Pan-Africanism, Marcus Garvey (1967) made this very important statement on how Africans

in the diaspora were to relate to the African mainland community upon rejoining them:

> When the time comes for American and West Indian Negroes to settle Africa . . . (it) will not be to go to Africa for the purpose of exercising an overlordship over the native, but . . . to have established in Africa that brotherly co-operation which will make the interests of the African native and the American and West Indian Negro one and the same. (p. 52)

This sentiment is consistent with the cooperative and egalitarian spirit that has characterized Pan-Africanism over the years, especially with its strong socialist current during much of the 20th century.

In contrast, the Zionist movement has evicted the Palestinians from their homeland, expropriated their homes, land, and personal belongings, demolished thousands of Arab villages, and made the remaining Palestinians second-class citizens within the state of Israel (Jiryyis, 1976). This expropriation scheme was clearly part of the colonial plans of the founder of modern Zionism, Theodore Herzl (1960). Before the creation of Israel, Herzl had this to say about what to do with the indigenous Arab population: "We shall try to spirit the penniless population across the border by procuring employment for it in the transient countries, while denying it any employment in our own country" (p. 60).

Perhaps the only phenomenon in the history of Pan-Africanism sharing any degree of semblance with the Zionist abuse of Palestinian Arabs is the re-settlement experiences of Liberia and Sierra Leone in West Africa. It is a fact that Africans from North America, the Caribbean, and Europe, upon returning to West Africa, were successful in obtaining the more privileged positions in these two countries, and in some temporary instances, particularly in Liberia, forced the indigenous population to work under harsh conditions (Clapham, 1976). However, expulsion or legalized discrimination, as in the case of Israeli society, was never sustained. Furthermore, because the creation and evolution of these two states were, primarily, the product of private and public European initiative in Great

Britain and North America, conditioned by pecuniary interests and political maneuvering (Padmore, 1972, pp. 1-53), it is somewhat difficult to consider such an anomalous experience as an integral part of the struggle for Pan-Africanism. Along these lines, Liberia's traitorous denunciation and rejection of Garvey's honest and prodigious plans to help industrialize Liberia, at the prodding of the U.S. government, should not be forgotten (A. J. Garvey, 1970, pp. 147-158; M. Garvey, 1967, pp. 362-394). In sum, there has been no Pan-Africanist notion advanced by any of its practitioners that has made a claim to land outside or inside Africa that required the eventual expulsion or political and economic subjugation of its indigenous inhabitants.

3. Pan-Africanism has always been intrinsically anti-imperialist. Throughout the different phases of modern imperialism, Pan-Africanists have sought to end the international tyranny of the capitalist powers in their disruption, depopulation, division, and continued domination of African society and its scattered and suffering people. The imperialist powers seem to have understood this reality for quite some time, which explains their consistent opposition to the Pan-Africanist movement. For example, during the first quarter of the 20th century, W.E.B. Du Bois's efforts to hold a Fifth Pan-African Congress in Tunisia and Garvey's efforts at Pan-African cooperation with Liberia were both undermined by the French and the United States governments respectively (Du Bois, 1965, p. 243; A. J. Garvey, 1970, pp. 147-158; M. Garvey, 1967, pp. 362-394). More recently, Kwame Nkrumah's Pan-African design for Africa and the African world was dismantled with the critical aid of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), a tool of American imperialist intrigue throughout the world (Stockwell, 1978, p. 160). The countless denunciations of imperialism by the major advocates of Pan-Africanism merely reinforce the fact that Pan-Africanism and imperialism are opposed to each other.

Once again, in contrast, the goals of the Zionist movement have been, and continue to be, inextricably connected to the objective of imperialism. Indeed, it is a well-known fact that the creation of Israel would not have been possible without the critical support of

imperialist sponsorship (Al-Kayyali, 1979, pp. 9-26). How otherwise could Palestine be colonized by European Jews if the European imperialist powers who ruled the Middle East in general, and Palestine in particular, did not approve of such a scheme? This is why the Zionists courted the Turks, the British, and the United States, the three successive rulers of the Middle East. Arab nationalism could not have been defeated and world opinion harnessed toward the Zionist cause without the financial, military, and political assistance of Great Britain and the United States. Even the United Nations resolution in 1948 to partition Palestine in order to create the Jewish nation could not have passed without U.S. "arm twisting" of three allies and U.N. members, Liberia, Haiti, and the Philippines (Al-Abid, 1969, pp. 33-35). The sober recognition of this reality by the Zionists was so profound that it led to the infamous alliances with the rulers of Nazi Germany before and during World War II (Brenner, 1983; Yahya, 1978). Given this historical relationship between Zionism and imperialism, it is not surprising that shortly after the creation of Israel, in the lead article of its leading Hebrew daily, *Ha-Aretz*, the editor-in-chief (cited in Davis, 1977) was bold enough to write:

> Israel has been given a role not unlike that of a watch-dog. One need not fear that it will exercise an aggressive policy towards the Arab States if this will contradict the interests of the USA and Britain. But should the West prefer for one reason or another to close its eyes one can rely on Israel to punish severely those of the neighboring States whose lack of manners towards the West has exceeded the proper limits. (pp. 105-106)

More recently, the Israeli role as U.S. proxy in Latin America has been clearly established (Lusane, 1984, pp. 34-37).

4. After many years of historical development, Pan-Africanism has evolved into a movement that aims at the achievement of socialism within the political context of continental unity. A legion of Pan-Africanist leaders of the 20th century have contributed to this development (Williams, 1984). Such a development has meant a growing appreciation of the nature of class conflict within capi-

talist society. For this reason, it would be fair to argue that Pan-Africanism is a socialist movement, without being subjected to the political maneuvering of the Soviet Union or the ideological trappings of Marxist orthodoxy.

During the early years of its existence, Israel was partially successful in portraying itself to the world as a noncapitalist society. Many persons and countries (especially in Africa) honestly believed that Israel, through its system of kibbutzim, was struggling to build the classless society, albeit on a religious basis. However, its policy of aggression and expansion against neighboring Arab countries was instrumental in uncovering the truth behind the Zionist myth of Israeli-styled socialism (Davis, 1977, pp. 27-30). Not only was there always a very small percentage of the population working on the kibbutz, more importantly, the kibbutz farms were far more critical in occupying and protecting land appropriated from the Arab community than in building a socialist Israel. In fact, these farms were quickly transformed into military camps for the defense of Jewish settlements.

Today, life on a kibbutz is far removed from the collectivized farming and communal living which the first Jewish emigrants from Russia had practiced. Socioeconomic cleavages have been developing for some time, with the means of production being controlled by capitalist bankers and creditors, hence opening the kibbutz up to collective exploitation (Ataov, 1979, p. 155). Furthermore, despite the role that the external Arab conflict and internal racial antipathy have played and continue to play in retarding and obscuring class contradictions in Israel, it is an undeniable fact that if there were no labor in Israel to exploit for private profit, the millions of dollars in American private capital would not continue to find their way into the Israeli economy so easily. With only a minority of dissenters, Zionism has always been an effort to create an exclusive, Jewish bourgeois state (Elmessiri, 1977, pp. 1-17).

5. These two movements not only have fundamental differences, but, more importantly, their goals and objectives are diametrically opposed to each other. In fact, in its efforts to realize its goals, Zionism has served to impede the impending realization of the goals

of Pan-Africanism. For instance, settler colonialism in southern Africa is a major obstacle in the struggle to liberate and unify Africa. Yet Israel has equipped South Africa's armed forces with sophisticated military equipment; Israeli officers have helped to develop South Africa's military strategy; and South Africa's counterinsurgency tactics have evolved, essentially, from the concrete experience of the Zionist efforts against the Palestine Liberation Organization (Adams, 1984, pp. 29-37). This military assistance, of course, is in conjunction with the very strong economic ties Israel has established with South Africa (Adams, 1984, pp. 19, 27).

Throughout the rest of Africa, Israel has been very busy in its attempt to destroy the Pan-African effort to build unity between the Arab population of the north and the darker African population below the Sahara (Sono, 1984, p. 259; V. Thompson, 1969, pp. 289-290). Additionally, in that the objectives of Zionism have almost completely coincided with the objectives of imperialism, the state of Israel has played, and continues to play, a major role in the consolidation of the neocolonialist phase of imperialist control throughout Africa (Sono, 1984; Stetler, 1972, pp. 95-106).

PAN-AFRICANIST MISCONSTRUCTIONS

Ironically, despite the reality described above, many Pan-Africanists of great distinction have conceived of, and reacted to, the Zionist movement in a way almost totally unsuspecting. Martin R. Delaney, during the middle of the 19th century, championed the cause of Africans in the United States returning to Africa. Delaney (1966) traveled to Africa to negotiate resettlement agreements with African leaders, and he was one of the first to advance the notion that "Our policy must be . . . Africa for the African race and black men to rule them" (p. 110). However, as so many have done before and after him, Delaney mistakenly conceived of the multiethnic and multiracial followers of Judaism as a single people with common "national" characteristics and thus rightfully deserving a government of their own. In a discussion on what he considered to be the histori-

cal tendency and nationalist zeal of all "nations within nations" to struggle for freedom, Delaney (1968, pp. 11-12) felt that Jews throughout the world were, as should scattered Africans, justifiably seeking self-government in a land of their own. In his famous treatise entitled "The Condition, Elevation, Emigration and Destiny of the Colored People of the United States," Delaney (1968) makes some of these points:

> And such also are the Jews, scattered throughout not only the length and breadth of Europe, but almost the habitable globe, maintaining their national characteristics, and looking forward in high hopes of seeing the day when they may return to their former national position of self-government and independence, let that be in whatever part of the habitable world it may. (p. 12)

Another 19th century Pan-Africanist, who generally followed the path laid by Delaney, was Edward W. Blyden. By the end of the 19th century, Blyden had become one of the leading proponents for Africans scattered abroad to return home (Lynch, 1967). Although born in the Virgin Islands, he lived and worked most of his life in Liberia, where he distinguished himself as an outstanding public servant and a brilliant scholar. While most of his writings dealt with issues directly related to Africa and its scattered people, Blyden, whose interest and expertise in religion were quite substantial, also spent a significant amount of time in examining the Jewish question. In *From West Africa to Palestine*, Blyden (1873, pp. 192-193, 199) criticized the Jews for living outside of the Holy Land and not "returning" to Palestine. Characterized by some as being "much more of a Zionist than most Jews" (Weisbord & Kazarian, 1985, p. 8), Blyden referred to Zionism as "that marvellous movement" and, in his *The Jewish Question*, Blyden (1898, pp. 7-8) compared his Pan-African efforts to those of Theodore Herzl. In perfect consistency with the Zionist argument, Blyden (1898) once declared with great assuredness that "There is hardly a man in the civilized world—Christian, Mohammedan, or Jew—who does not recognize the claim and right of the Jew to the Holy Land" (p. 8).

Considered the Father of Pan-Africanism by many, W.E.B. Du Bois, although active in the late 19th century, made most of his monumental contributions to this movement over the first six decades of the 20th century. As an amazingly gifted and indefatigable scholar, journalist, writer, and activist, Du Bois made efforts toward the liberation and unification of Africa and Africans everywhere which are a cherished part of this historical struggle. He felt this struggle was analogous to the burgeoning Zionist movement of his day, a movement that received his deepest sympathies (Du Bois, 1944). In a 1919 editorial in the *Crisis* magazine, in which his Pan-African aspirations are as clear as ever, Du Bois wrote that "The African movement means to us what the Zionist movement must mean to Jews, the centralization of race effort and the recognition of a racial front" (p. 166). In addition to erroneously implying that the Jews are a race, Du Bois's pro-Zionist views were often characterized by less than favorable perceptions of the native Arab inhabitants of Palestine and their level of development. As almost any of his Zionist contemporaries would have argued, Du Bois (1985) felt that Zionism was a case of "Young and forward thinking Jews, bringing a new civilization into an old land and building up that land out of the ignorance, disease and poverty into which it had fallen, and by democratic methods to build a new and peculiarly fateful modern state". It is worth noting that these comments were made by Du Bois during the height of the conflict between the Palestinians and Zionists, exactly one week before the birth of Israel in May of 1948.

Unquestionably, the greatest and most successful organizer for the Pan-Africanist cause was Jamaica-born Marcus Garvey. For at least a decade after World War I, Garvey and the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) were the unchallenged recipients of the nationalist loyalties of millions of oppressed Africans in different parts of the African world. However, in regards to the Zionist movement, which earned Garvey's most laudatory approval, he, like so many others, held many fallacious ideas. For instance, while extolling the Jews for recognizing that "the only safe thing to do is to go after and establish racial autonomy" (1936a,

p. 3), Garvey believed that Pan-Africanism and Zionism shared a common motive: "Our obsession is like that of the Jews. They are working for Palestine. We are working for Africa" (1938, p. 10). Garvey went so far as to wish those European Jews who were clamoring for a partitioning of Palestine good luck, with the belief that such an arrangement would actually contribute to what he felt were similar efforts on the part of his followers (1936b, p. 3; 1937, p. 2; 1939, p. 3). In fact, Garvey's ideological support for the Zionist movement was so strong that it sometimes occasioned a reciprocal appreciation of his movement from grateful Zionists. At a UNIA rally in 1920, Garvey read a telegram from a Zionist Jew, which read in part: "I join heartily and unflinchingly in your historical movement for the reclamation of Africa. There is no justice and no peace in the world until the Jew and the Negro both control side by side Palestine and Africa" (cited in Weisbord and Kazarian, 1985, p. 17).

The writer-historian George Padmore, the ideological mentor of Kwame Nkrumah and many others, was a Pan-Africanist par excellence, and one of the leading forerunners of the movement toward African unity and socialism that culminated in the national liberation movements in Africa after World War II. Although a devout Marxist briefly during the early years of his political activity, Padmore (1972), from Trinidad, became a leading socialist organizer within the Pan-African movement and was critical of Marxism when he felt it did not take into account the particularity of the African condition. While his writings do not address, specifically, the Zionist question in a way typified by many of his Pan-African predecessors, his very disparaging assessment of Garvey's contributions to Pan-Africanism (pp. 65-82) show he is a victim of the Pan-Africanism-equals-Zionism delusion. In reducing Garvey's Pan-Africanist program to simply a "back to Africa movement," Padmore went as far as identifying Garveyism as "Black Zionism," which he felt "collapsed even before the Negro Moses set foot in the Promised Land of Africa" (p. 120). Like Garvey himself, Padmore could not seem to discern the fundamental differences between the Pan-African efforts of Garvey and his followers and

the Zionist efforts of those Jews of European origin who were bent on forcibly displacing Palestinian Arabs to create the modern state of Israel.

Ironically, according to James Hooker, who has carefully studied Padmore's life and political evolution, there is strong evidence that Padmore favored Israel in the Arab-Israeli conflict; admired the support that American Zionists gave to Israel; and hampered Egypt's efforts to wield greater influence in sub-Saharan Africa when he served as Kwame Nkrumah's African affairs adviser (Hooker, 1967, pp. 79, 135, 151). Furthermore, Golda Meir (1975), former prime minister of Israel, wrote in her autobiography that Padmore "was extremely interested in Israel" (p. 325). According to her account (pp. 325-326), Padmore, whom she considered "the most important ideologist of the forces of 'progressive' Pan-Africanism," was the one who "insisted" on arranging her meeting with approximately 60 delegates of the All-African People's Conference in Accra, Ghana, in December, 1958.

A lesser known Pan-Africanist, who worked actively alongside Padmore, Nkrumah, and other important figures in the United States, Europe, and Africa, was Ras Makonnen from Guyana. In addition to his organizational and propaganda work, Makonnen's successful business ventures were instrumental in financing all sorts of Pan-African activity, not the least of which included the organization of the Fifth Pan-African Congress in Manchester, England, and the Pan-African Federation Press (Makonnen, 1973, pp. x, 163-164). Perhaps one of his greatest contributions can be found in his semiautobiographical narrative of the Pan-African activity of his contemporaries before and after World War II. Entitled *Pan-Africanism From Within*, this book is replete with very important details of, and insight into, the Pan-Africanist movement. In it, Makonnen has quite a bit to say about how he and his associates viewed the Zionist movement vis-à-vis their own efforts in trying to build Pan-African cooperation among peoples of African descent.

In fact, according to Makonnen, the Zionist movement provided an important experience for the Pan-African community in Great

Britain, which was organizing the Fifth Pan-African Congress. This was due, primarily, to the similarity between Pan-Africanism and Zionism as (at least) Makonnen (1973) perceived the two.

> A number of influences impinged on our thinking at this time. Undoubtedly what was going on in Palestine with the Jews was an important experience for us members of this other diaspora. For here was another people who had lived for so long and in such large numbers away from Palestine, and yet they had been able to register their claim. The spirit of Pan-Africanism was the same kind of awakening, awareness of origins, the certainty about the link back to Africa . . . So the Jewish experience was formidable. We felt the particularity of the Africans, our Africanness, just like Jewishness. And later we wondered when we saw a handful of Jews in the Haganah movement gaining independence militarily for Palestine, whether we could do the same. (pp. 165-166)

As a result of his strong affinity to Zionism, like Garvey earlier, Makonnen (1973, p. 75) admonished the African diaspora in the United States for not manifesting the spirit of "fervent black Zionism," as successful Zionist Jews had in the United States in their effort to relate to Africa and Palestine respectively. After discussing the failure of Garvey to establish alliances with Haile Selassie of Ethiopia and President C.D.B. King of Liberia, Makonnen concluded that "what makes both of these affairs more tragic is comparing them with the Jewish enterprise over Palestine at the same time" (p. 74). If Makonnen had been able to recognize what were even then the strong imperialist underpinnings of the Zionist movement, it is unlikely that, given his strong anti-imperialist stance, he would have been satisfied with the African diaspora "copying the outreach of the Jewish groups," as he so adamantly encouraged (p. 75). In fact, if he could have appreciated the very real difference between the cordial relationship European imperialism shared with Zionism compared to its antagonistic relationship with Pan-Africanism, he would likely have been far more understanding of the obstacles that Garvey and so many others had to face in their effort to realize the goals of Pan-Africanism.

Although too little is written about it, Paul Robeson's legacy as a Pan-Africanist is outstanding. Despite being born and raised in the United States, Robeson (1971) adhered to one of the basic tenets of Pan-Africanism by considering himself an African (p. 33); relatedly, he did everything in his power to further the cause of Pan-Africanism through culture (Robeson, 1969; Stuckey, 1985). In conjunction with his amazing career as one of the world's most gifted cultural artists, Robeson worked consistently with Du Bois and other Pan-Africanists to achieve the liberation of Africa from imperialist domination. His work with the Council on African Affairs, which he cofounded in 1939, was an example of such efforts (Geiss, 1974, pp. 366-368). As a person who so strongly empathized with those who suffered from oppression and tyranny throughout the world, it is not surprising that Robeson would be willing to assist in efforts to liberate Jews, who were experiencing intense levels of persecution during his time. However, his empathy for persecuted European Jews, as in the case of his colleague Du Bois, was ironically accompanied by an apparent absence of any similar feeling for the victims of Zionist aggression, the Arab refugees. Robeson's confusion on the basic contradictions between Judaism and Zionism was revealed when he declared in 1934 that the Jews, "like a vast proportion of Negroes, are a race without a nation" and when he traveled to Palestine in 1948 to sing for the Jewish troops in their fight against the Arabs (1978, pp. 90, 183).

Perhaps no one of African origin in the 20th century has embodied the ideological development and programmatic thrust of the Pan-Africanist movement as much as Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana (James, 1977, pp. 77-78; Williams, 1984). Being raised in Africa under colonial rule, and also having spent, collectively, over 12 years in the United States and Great Britain, provided Nkrumah with a kaleidoscopic experience within the political context of the African world. With his sharp acumen, eagerness to learn, and commitment to serve his people, Nkrumah became the prime candidate for the historical role he performed so well. In addition to leading the first successful sub-Saharan nationalist struggle in Africa, resulting in Ghanaian independence from British colonial rule, Nkrumah transformed Ghana into what Malcolm X (1965) so

aptly called "the fountainhead of Pan-Africanism" (p. 62). Furthermore, like two of the men who heavily influenced his ideological development, Padmore and Du Bois, Nkrumah was a very productive scholar whose many analytical writings helped to shape his and later generations of activists and scholars involved in the African revolution.

Interestingly, despite his very piercing attacks on international finance capital and imperialism, Nkrumah's (1973) writings and speeches indicate a curious avoidance of any substantive discussion of the collaboration between the Zionist state of Israel and modern world imperialism. It appears that Nkrumah's earliest perception of Israel was heavily influenced by the unwavering admiration that his closest ideologues had for the Zionist state (Botsio, personal communication, February 15, 1988; W. Thompson, 1969, p. 14). Garvey, Du Bois, Makonnen, and Padmore were clearly the most important figures in this regard. Consequently, immediately after independence in 1957, Ghana established very close, primarily economic, ties with Israel (Rivkin, 1962, pp. 72-77; W. Thompson, 1969, pp. 46-51). The Black Star Shipping Line and the Ghana National Construction Company were two companies that benefited immensely from Israeli investment capital and managerial expertise. And as could be expected, Ghana-Israeli relations set a pattern that other independent countries in sub-Saharan Africa soon followed.

However, as Nkrumah's understanding of imperialism developed, he began to loosen the ties between Ghana and Israel, culminating to a certain degree in his signing of the accords at the Casablanca Conference in 1961 which condemned "Israel as an instrument in the service of imperialism and neo-colonialism not only in the Middle East but also in Africa and in Asia" (Watt, 1961, pp. 660-661). Given the ideological framework that he inherited, this move and subsequent statements that Nkrumah (1964, pp. 15, 25) made favoring the Palestinian side in the Middle East crisis indicate a clear break with his Pan-African predecessors on this question.

At the risk of sounding apologetic, it should be understood that the views of Nkrumah's Pan-African predecessors on the Zionist

question were shaped by historical forces that were in the process of disintegration during his term in office. In short, the harmony of interests between Zionism and world imperialism did not become apparent until the era of decolonization, the period in which Nkrumah was so intimately involved.

ACADEMIC EUROCENTRICISM

Many academicians, no less sympathetic to the goals of Zionism, have been even more prone to equate the Pan-Africanist movement with the Zionist movement. Relatedly, emanating from some among this group is the dubious notion that Pan-Africanism owes much of its development to the Zionist movement. Howard Brotz (1970), in his study of the Black Jews of Harlem, argues that "Garvey's political ideas (were) essentially an adaption of the key ideas of the Jewish thinkers Pinsker and Herzl" (p. 101). In demonstrating his almost complete ignorance of the historical development of Black nationalist thought since slavery, Brotz attempts to defend this assertion by feebly reasoning that:

> There seems to be almost no continuity between the colonization programs of such pre-civil war Negro Leaders as John Russwurm and Edward Blyden and the twentieth-century developments. When Garvey arrived on the scene, Jewish Zionism, of course, was very much in the atmosphere. (p. 138)

That his conclusions are far removed from the historical reality is indubitable, as has been amply demonstrated by many credible historians of this phenomenon (Carlisle, 1975; Clarke, 1974; Draper, 1970; Stuckey, 1972; V. Thompson, 1969). The eminent historian (and Edward Blyden's greatest biographer) Hollis R. Lynch provides a telling rebuttal of Brotz's argument. For whereas Brotz could seem to find "no continuity between . . . Edward Blyden and the twentieth-century developments," Lynch furnishes ample evidence to substantiate his assertion that "Blyden's pan-Negro ideology was undoubtedly the most important historical progenitor of

Pan-Africanism" (1967, pp. 250, 248-252; 1971, pp. xxxiv-xxxv). He establishes the fact that Du Bois, Padmore, Garvey, and many others were all familiar with, and immensely inspired by, Blyden's work.

Tony Martin (1982), another distinguished historian (and Marcus Garvey's greatest biographer) has also documented the Blyden-Garvey relationship. After noting that Blyden was "one of (Garvey's) great heroes in terms of historical writings," (p. 248), Martin provides a quite revealing quote made by Garvey in Jamaica in 1915, prior to his first trip to the United States:

> You who do not know anything of your ancestry will do well to read the works of Blyden, one of our historians and chroniclers, who has done so much to retrieve the lost prestige of the race, and to undo the selfishness of alien historians and their history which has said so little and painted us so unfairly. (p. 248)

The fact of the matter is that these types of relationships between Pan-Africanists of different lands and time periods have occurred and been documented on numerous occasions. In his excellent essay on this subject, W. Ofuatey-Kodjoe (1977) explains why:

> The ideological influence under discussion here has been accomplished by the communication of ideas through a variety of contacts among Africans, Afro-Americans, and West Indians, and through the dissemination of the written word. Since the mid-nineteenth century there has been increasing *contact* among Afro-Americans, West Indians and Africans principally through emigration, migration, and sojourns of varying lengths of time. In addition, a growing body of literature — scholarly, polemical and journalistic — has been carried across the expanse of the Atlantic between Africa and the Americas. Of course, this process of communication and the influence through contact and literature has been one continuous and inseparable process involving a large number of people who have made significant contributions; emigres, missionaries, educators, publicists, literati, reformers, and revolutionaries. (pp. 1-2)

Nevertheless, there are still those historians who miraculously insist that Pan-Africanism, because it is, in their view, devoid of

any roots in the African world experience, is simply a product of the Zionist movement and its European-based experience. Dan V. Segre (1980) submits that "Africanism, like Zionism, is essentially a movement of ideas and emotions and was directly influenced by the efforts of the Jews to combine Redemption with Return" (p. 24). According to Segre, France and England are the two specific countries from which Pan-Africanism, like Zionism, emerged: "both Zionism and Pan-Africanism were the outcomes of the process of emancipation started by the Enlightenment and by the moral, religious and romantic reactions produced by the French Revolution in the cultural climate of Europe and England" (p. 24).

While Robert G. Weisbord (1973) avoids the Eurocentric convenience of tracing the origin of Pan-Africanism to a European-based experience, his views echo the conclusions of others who fail to see the fundamental differences between Pan-Africanism and Zionism. In his very useful, and in some ways seminal, work that deals with the historical linkages between peoples of African descent throughout the world, Weisbord submits that Pan-Africanism "has resembled modern political Zionism," and he is not reluctant to refer to Pan-Africanists as "black Zionists" (pp. 7, 138). His perspective is due, in part, to the fact that he fails to see the significant differences between the ancestral relationship Africans in the diaspora and Jews living in Europe have shared with Africa and Palestine respectively. Yet because of this omission, Weisbord surmises that "Black Americans were not unique in the 1890's and early 1900's in seeking an asylum in the land of their fathers. East European Jewry was in a comparable situation" (p. 36).

The most common human target used by those academicians who equate Pan-Africanism with Zionism is Marcus Garvey. Much of this is a result of Garvey's acclaim and his emphasis on a portion of Africans in the diaspora returning to Africa to resettle, despite the very real differences between Garvey's resettlement plans and the expropriation scheme of the Zionist movement. Consequently, with a quite superficial understanding of genuine Garveyism, Weisbord and Richard Kazarian (1985) state that "Garveyite rhetoric virtually duplicates that of the Zionists" (pp. 16-17). Arnold

Rose (1949) adds to the confusion by arguing that Garvey and the duly recognized father of Zionism, Theodore Herzl, had essentially the same aim. According to Rose (p. 43), as a solution to prejudicial mistreatment and abuse, they both embraced escapism abroad over assimilation at "home."

Henry F. Jackson is among those scholars inclined to measure how well Africans in the United States are assisting in the development of Africa by comparing them to their Jewish counterparts in regards to Israel. The analogy is aborted, however, by his failure to consider the critical role Israel plays in the geopolitical strategy of U.S. imperialism. Without this understanding, for instance, the Jewish impact on U.S. foreign policy may seem staggering when compared to the more modest influence wielded by Africans. Hence Jackson (1982) writes:

> Although they comprised only 3 percent of the American population, or 5.7 million people, Jews usually pressured the United States to take a pro-Israeli posture . . . Blacks, on the other hand, with 15 percent of the population, had failed to significantly influence American policy toward Africa until [Andrew] Young's short-lived and inconclusive tenure [as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations under the Carter administration]. (pp. 162-163)

Despite the shallowness of his argument, he attempts to buttress it with impressive empirical data:

> U.S. economic and military assistance to Israel and African states can be taken as a measure of the relative interest-group influence of American Jews and Blacks. Israel, a quasi-industrial nation with a population of 3 million, received $790 million U.S. economic assistance in fiscal 1979, whereas Nigeria, a developing nation of 90 million people, received nothing. Israel alone received nearly two thirds of total U.S. military assistance (or $4 billion out of $6.6 billion) to all countries in the world. The Nixon Administration closed the AID office in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1975, offering a graphic gesture of U.S. denial of assistance to African states. Such evidence indicates clearly that the pro-Africa interests have not gained significant impact on the policy process. (p. 163).

However, the essential problem for Jackson remains: the absence of any investigation into the nature of the quid pro quo relationship that Israel shares with the United States, relative to the latter's relationship with the underdeveloped dependencies of Africa, many of which, because of their ideological persuasion or political volatility, are far less dependable or capable in serving the objectives of U.S. foreign policy. Needless to say, Jackson is not alone in this uneven attempt to gauge the progress of Pan-African efforts with the use of a Zionist yardstick (Weil, 1974, pp. 109-130).

CONCLUSIONS

It would be remiss to conclude this review without noting that not all persons today, or in the past, who have in some way been associated with either or both of these movements, have shared this delusion of comparability. There are a few notable exceptions. For example, Pan-Africanist Malcolm X (1961) viewed Zionism with utter disgust, albeit through an Islamic prism:

> The Jews, with the help of Christians in America and Europe, drove our Muslim brothers (i.e. the Arabs) out of their homeland, where they had been settled for centuries, and took over the land for themselves. This every Muslim resents. In America, the Jews sap the very life-blood of the so-called Negroes to maintain the State of Israel, its armies and its continued aggression against our brothers in the East. This every Black man resents. (p. 166).

Furthermore, in the midst of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Malcolm (1965, pp. 123-127) was not disinclined to publicly express his support for the Egyptian government and its President, Gamal Abdel Nasser—especially in the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal.

One of the leading Pan-Africanists today, Kwame Toure (formerly Stokely Carmichael) is without question the most avowed, consistent, and knowledgeable anti-Zionist in the history of Pan-Africanist struggle. Ever since the Student Non-Violent Coordinat-

ing Committee, the organization he once chaired, denounced Israel in the 1967 Arab-Israeli conflict (Sellers, 1973, pp. 201-203), Toure's ideological trek toward Pan-Africanism has been deeply imbued with a growing understanding of, and abhorrence for, the Zionist movement. To a group of Arab students approximately 20 years ago, he pledged that

> We will work more closely with the Arab students wherever we can. Our eyes are now open: We have begun to see this trickery of Zionism; we have begun to see the evil of Zionism, and we will fight to wipe it out wherever it exists, in the Middle East or in the ghetto of the United States (Carmichael, 1971, p. 142).

Today, Toure lives in Guinea and propagates the ideals of Pan-Africanism throughout the United States and in different parts of the world during his periodic tours of university and college campuses. His speeches are hardly ever devoid of some reference to the racist and imperialist nature of the Zionist movement.

Historian and social critic Harold Cruse (1967, pp. 476-497), in his classic work entitled *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, had quite a bit to say about these two movements. And despite an occasional slip into ambiguity, Cruse remains one of the few Black intellectual mavericks on this subject. In short, Cruse argued that Pan-Africanism and Zionism are "totally dissimilar in most respects," and, in contradistinction to the Eurocentric view, that "both Zionism and Black nationalism have undergone historical conditionings peculiar to themselves" (p. 490). One of his greatest and most courageous contributions was his willingness to discuss the manner in which he felt Zionist organizations in the United States were using African-American organizations and leaders to advance the Zionist cause. According to Cruse, one of the interesting consequences of this strategy was a sordid type of hypocrisy, involving "pro-Zionist influences within Negro civil rights organizations . . . strategically aiding and abetting Negro integration (assimilation), albeit Zionists, themselves, do not believe in integration (assimilation) for Jews" (p. 484).

Finally, another historian and Pan-Africanist of great distinction, John Henrik Clarke, has demonstrated his awareness of, and opposition to, the Zionist movement on many occasions. Considering Zionist practices in Israel as a form of apartheid, he once wrote that "both Israel and White South Africa are artificial settler states created by the political backwash of Europe," adding that they were both "stubbornly trying to establish a nationality in nations that never belonged to them" (1977, p. 7). As for Israel's extensive involvement in Africa, Clarke was quite candid in his view that "the Israelis were no different from other whites who wanted to control the resources of this vast continent by any means necessary" (1977, p. 9). Furthermore, his support for the struggle of the Palestinian people remains unwavering, a struggle that he has argued is similar to the plight of Africans. According to Clarke (1987), "Palestinian Arabs exist under the domination of a form of settler colonialism similar to that experienced by Africans in pre-independence East Africa and present-day South Africa" (p. 91).

As this review has tried to demonstrate, these challenging and critical analyses, although sorely needed within the academic debate on this subject, are barely even awarded peripheral status by many of the leading scholars in this field. However, if Pan-Africanism, or any other experience within the history of African people, is going to be properly treated as a particular human experience with its own historical integrity, it will be necessary for social scientists of African descent to take notice of Tony Martin's (1982) observation made at the First African Diaspora Studies Institute less than 10 years ago.

> There are parallels between black history and white history, of course, but it is unfortunate that blacks do not see our history primarily in its own right. We always seem to be looking for parallels in the experience of other peoples to shape our history. In the old days, other peoples told us we had no history at all; now they acknowledge that we have a history, but only in terms of other peoples' history. (p. 243)

For to ignore this criticism is to simply continue to cloud our understanding of the nature of the African world experience.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. (1984). *The unnatural alliance.* New York: Quartet.

Al-Abid, I. (1969). *A handbook to the Palestine question: Questions and answers.* Beirut: Institute for Palestine Studies.

Al-Kayyali, A. (1979). The historical roots of the imperialist-Zionist alliance. In A. Al-Kayyali (Ed.), *Zionism, imperialism and racism* (pp. 9-26). London: Croom Helm.

Ataov, T. (1979). The role of Israel in the service of imperialism. In The International Organization for the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ed.), *Zionism and racism* (pp. 153-161). New Brunswick, NJ: North American.

Blyden, E. (1873). *From West Africa to Palestine.* Freetown, Manchester and London.

Blyden, E. (1898). *The Jewish question.* Liverpool.

Brenner, L. (1983). *Zionism in the age of dictators.* Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill.

Brotz, H. (1970). *The Black Jews of Harlem: Negro nationalism and the dilemmas of Negro leadership.* New York: Schocken.

Carlisle, R. (1975). *The roots of Black nationalism.* London: Kennikat.

Carmichael, S. (1971). *Stokely speaks: Black power back to Pan-Africanism.* New York: Vintage.

Clapham, C. (1976). *Liberia and Sierra Leone: An essay in comparative politics.* London: Cambridge.

Clarke, J. (Ed.). (1974). *Marcus Garvey and the vision of Africa.* New York: Vintage.

Clarke, J. (1977). Foreword. In R. P. Stevens & A.-W. M. Elmessiri (Eds.), *Israel and South Africa: The progression of a relationship* (p.7). New Brunswick, NJ: North American.

Clarke, J. (1987). A book review of The Palestine Problem in International Law and World Order, (W. Thomas Mallison and Sally V. Mallison). In *Without Prejudice, The EAFORD International Review of Racial Discrimination, 1*(1), 91.

Comas, J. (1965). The myth of the Jewish race. *Issues, 19* (4), 21-22.

Cruse, H. (1967). *The crisis of the Negro intellectual.* New York: William Morrow.

Davis, U. (1977). *Israel, utopia incorporated: A study of class, state and corporate kin control.* London: Zed.

Delaney, M. (1966). Official report of the Niger valley exploring party. In H. Brotz (Ed.), *Negro social and political thought 1850-1920: Representative texts* (pp. 101-111). New York: Basic Books.

Delaney, M. (1968). *The condition, elevation, emigration, and destiny of the colored people of the United States.* New York: Arno.

Draper, T. (1970). *The rediscovery of Black nationalism.* New York: Viking.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1919). Editorial. *Crisis, 17*(4), 166.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1944). Jews and Arabs. *Phylon, 5*(1), 86.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1965). *The world in Africa: An inquiry into the part which Africa has played in world history.* New York: International Publishers.

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1985). A case for the Jews. In R. Weisbord & R. Kazarian (Eds.), *Israel in the Black American perspective* (p. 22). Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Elmessiri, A. (1977). *The land of promise: A critique of political Zionism.* New Brunswick, NJ: North American.

Garvey, A. (1970). Garvey and Garveyism. New York: Collier-MacMillan.

Garvey, M. (1936a). Editorial. *The Black Man, 1*(12), 3.

Garvey, M. (1936b). Editorial. *The Black Man, 2*(2), 3.

Garvey, M. (1937). Editorial. *The Black Man, 7*(August), 2.
Garvey, M. (1938). Editorial. *The Black Man, 3*(10), 10.
Garvey, M. (1939). Editorial. *The Black Man, 4*(1), 3.
Garvey, M. (1967). *The philosophy and opinions of Marcus Garvey on Africa for the Africans*. London: Frank Cass.
Geiss, I. (1974). *The Pan-African movement: A history of Pan-Africanism in America, Europe and Africa*. New York: Africana.
Herskovits, M. (1960). Who are the Jews? In L. Finkelstein (Ed.), *The Jews: Their history, culture and religion* (Vol. 2, pp. 1489-1509).
Herzl, T. (1960). *The complete diaries of Theodore Herzl, Vol. I*. New York: Thomas Yoseloff.
Hooker, J. (1967). *Black revolutionary: George Padmore's path from communism to Pan-Africanism*. New York: Praeger.
Jackson, H. (1982). *From the Congo to Soweto: U.S. foreign policy toward Africa since 1960*. New York: William Morrow.
James, C. (1977). *Nkrumah and the Ghana revolution*. Westport, CN: Lawrence Hill.
Jiryyis, S. (1976). *The Arabs in Israel*. New York: Monthly Review.
Lilienthal, A. (1953). *What price Israel?* Chicago: Henry Regnery.
Lusane, C. (1984). Washington's proxy: Israeli arms in Central America. *Covert Action, 20* (Winter), 34-37.
Lynch, H. (1967). *Edward Wilmot Blyden: Pan-Negro patriot 1832-1912*. New York: Oxford.
Lynch, H. (Ed.). (1971). *Black spokesman: Selected published writings of Edward Wilmot Blyden*. London: Frank Cass.
Makonnen, R. (1973). *Pan-Africanism from within*. London: Oxford University Press.
Malcolm X. (1961). Excerpts from an interview with C. Eric Lincoln. In C. Lincoln, *The Black Muslims in America*. Boston: Beacon.
Malcolm X. (1965). *Malcolm X speaks*. New York: Grove.
Martin, T. (1982). Garvey and scattered Africa. In J. Harris (Ed.), *Global dimensions of the African diaspora* (pp. 243-249). Washington, DC: Howard University.
Meir, G. (1975). *My story*. New York: Putnam's.
Montagu, A. (1974). *Man's most dangerous myth: The fallacy of race*. New York: Oxford.
Nkrumah, K. (1964). *The quest for a united Africa*. Accra: Government Printing Department.
Nkrumah, K. (1973). *Revolutionary path*. New York: International.
Ofuatey-Kodjoe, W. (1977). The ideological triangle: Reciprocal ideological influences among Afro-West Indians, Afro-Americans and Africans. *Studia Africana, 1* (Spring), 1-16.
Padmore, G. (1972). *Pan-Africanism or Communism?* New York: Doubleday.
Rivkin, A. (1962). *Africa and the West: Elements of free-world policy*. New York: Praeger.
Robeson, P. (1969). African culture. In A. Hill & M. Kilson (Eds.), *Apropos of Africa: Sentiments of Negro American leaders on Africa from the 1800s to the 1900s* (pp. 133-135). London: Frank Cass. (Original work published in 1935)
Robeson, P. (1971). *Here I stand*. Boston: Beacon.
Robeson, P. (1978). *Paul Robeson speaks—writings, speeches, interviews 1918-1974*. New York: Bruner/Mazel.
Rose, A. (1949). *The Negro's morale: Group identification and protest*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
Segre, D. (1980). Colonization and decolonization: The case of Zionist and African elites. *Comparative Studies in Society and History, 22*(1), 23-41.

Sellers, C. (1973). *The river of no return: The autobiography of a Black militant and the life and death of SNCC*. New York: William Morrow.

Sono, T. (1984). Israel repenetrates Africa: Zionism and Afro-Arab solidarity. *The International Journal of World Studies, 1*(3), 257-287.

Stetler, R. (Ed.). (1972). *Palestine: The Arab-Israeli conflict*. San Francisco: Ramparts.

Stockwell, J. (1978). *In search of enemies: A CIA story*. New York: Horton.

Stuckey, S. (1972). *Ideological origins of Black Nationalism*. Boston: Beacon.

Stuckey, S. (1985). The cultural philosophy of Paul Robeson. In FREEDOMWAYS (Ed.), *Paul Robeson: The great forerunner*. (pp. 50-64). New York: Dodd, Mean.

Thompson, V. (1969). *Africa and unity: The evolution of Pan-Africanism*. London: Longman.

Thompson, W. (1969). *Ghana's foreign policy 1957-1966: Diplomacy, ideology and the new state*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Watt, D. (Ed.). (1961). *Survey of international affairs*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Weil, M. (1974). Can the Blacks do for Africa what the Jews did for Israel? *Foreign Policy, 15*, 109-130.

Weisbord, R. (1973). *Ebony kinship: Africa, Africans, and the Afro-American*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Weisbord, R., & Kazarian, R. (1985). *Israel in the Black American perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Williams, M. (1984). Nkrumahism as an ideological embodiment of leftist thought within the African world. *Journal of Black Studies, 15*(1), 117-134.

Yahya, F. (1978). Zionist relations with Nazi Germany. Beirut: Palestine Research Center.

Michael W. Williams is Associate Professor of Sociology at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts. He is also Director of the African American Studies Program at Simmons College.