

THE DESTRUCTION OF BLACK CIVILIZATION

GREAT ISSUES OF A RACE
FROM 4500 B.C. TO 2000 A.D.



BY CHANCELLOR WILLIAMS
Third World Press

"A Foundation and new approach to the history of our race. . . . It was pioneering research into unexplored areas. This book is not only urgently needed now, but it will be read by future generations.

—John Hendrick Clarke, President
African Heritage Association

"This book should be the basis for all the so-called Black Studies programs. This is the basic text, necessary for Afrikan mental development in the last part of the 20th century."

—Imamu Amiri Baraka, Chairman
The Congress of African People

"Williams' directness, forcefulness, and the partial warmth of an insider whose own destiny and that of his people is at stake has strong impact. . . . **The Destruction of Black Civilization** is a balanced appraisal of an ancient and contemporary African history. . . ."

—THE BLACK WORLD

"From a well documented chapter on Egyptian civilization, Chancellor Williams moves on through material that deals with the impact of Judaism and Christianity on the African migrations. . . . His claim that Islam helped the slavery of Black Africa is untrue because he used white text rather than accounts of non-whites academia and the truth."

—MUHAMMAD SPEAKS

"This book is a contribution to the understanding of Black civilization and the way of life of African people. For once here is documentation put forth by a Black scholar. More books of this kind are needed."

—Wiley Smith III, Associate Director
Institute of African-American
Affairs, Kent State University

". . . It is a comprehensive analysis of our past and a most perceptive and relevant analysis of our present condition as a people."

—Andrew J. Billingsley,
Vice President for Academic
Affairs, Howard University

"Chancellor Williams comes to us at a time when his message, if interpreted correctly, can help us to understand **Why We Lose**—why the Black African man rests firmly on the bottom of Africa and everywhere else the African and his descendants reside. His book needs little analysis. It needs to be read. His message is sharp and clear for everyone to see. . . . He says that the central problem of 30 million Black Americans in the United States is unity—that we must unite or perish."

—THE AFROCENTRIC WORLD REVIEW

THE
DESTRUCTION
OF
BLACK
CIVILIZATION

GREAT ISSUES OF A RACE
FROM 4500 B.C. TO 2000 A.D.

by Chancellor Williams

Illustrated by Murry N. DePillars

WTP

THIRD WORLD PRESS

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

First Edition
First Printing
Revised Edition

Copyright © 1974 by Chancellor Williams

All Rights Reserved

No material in this book can be copied, reproduced, or
used in any way without written permission from
Third World Press, 7524 South Cottage Grove, Chicago, Illinois 60619

Manufactured in the United States of America.

Dedication

To the Black youth of the Nineteen Sixties for Beginning the Second Great Emancipation—the Liberation of Our Minds and thus Changing the Course of History.

Preface

While this book is still a summary of more detailed research, it seemed necessary to amplify certain questions and the answers to them. The widespread interest in and study of the book is deeply appreciated and rewarding to the author, and the letters from the prisons have been most touching and revealing.

As noted elsewhere, I am keenly aware of many repetitions throughout the work, unavoidable because of comparative methods used, and others for emphasis—which may have turned out to seem overemphasis.

Contents

PREFACE

MAPS AND ILLUSTRATIONS	13
----------------------------------	----

PART I

THE PREVIEW	17
-----------------------	----

- Origin and Development of Study—18
- Origin and Steps in the Study—20
- Scope of the Study—21
- The White Arabs—23
- The European Journey—24
- The Field Studies—27
- The Theoretical Framework—35
- The Scholars' War on the Blacks—37
- The New Approach—41

CHAPTER I

THE OVERVIEW	46
------------------------	----

- Nature Joins the Attack—51
- Pre-Conditions for Progress—56
- The Conquest of the Blacks by Religion—58

CHAPTER II

ETHIOPIA'S OLDEST DAUGHTER: EGYPT 62

- The Great Deception—62
- The "External Influence" Myth—68
- The Mulatto Problem—76
- "Black Egypt Turning Brown and White"—83
- "The City of a Hundred Gates"—91
- Thebes and the Role of Religion—94

CHAPTER III

EGYPT: THE RISE
AND FALL OF BLACK CIVILIZATION 101

- The "Blackout" in Review—103
- Ethiopia South—109
- The Third Period of Great Rulers—112
- Ethiopia Recaptures Egypt—121

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST CATARACT:
THE BLACK WORLD'S NEW BORDERLINE 125

- The New Borderline of the Blacks—127
- Scraps from Pre-History—128
- The "Children of the Sun"—129
- The Development of Writing—134
- Christian Africa—143

CHAPTER V

THE TWO THAT CARRIED ON 144

- The Semitic Storm from Axum—147
- The Growth of States—148
- A "Decisive Battle of History"—150
- Black Makuria—156
- The Arab Hordes—159
- How Slavery Came to be
 Confined to Blacks Alone—160
- And Now—Alwa—164
- The Surprise Kingdom—165

CHAPTER VI

THE AFRICAN CONSTITUTION:
BIRTH OF DEMOCRACY 171

- Origin of African Democracy—172
- Early Education—176
- The Earliest Judicial System—178
- The Ancient African Constitution—181
- The Fundamental Rights of African People—181

CHAPTER VII

THE SCATTERING OF THE PEOPLE
ROUTES TO DEATH AND DESTRUCTION 187

- Migrations As Cultural Decline—187
- White Scholars As Authorities—190
- The Saharan Tragedy—195
- Ethnology and the Migrations—199
- The Imperialists with the Pen—201
- To the Caves, to the Swamps—203

CHAPTER VIII

THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE:
CASE STUDIES BY STATES 208

- They Called it "Ghana"—208
- Mali—214
- Songhay—217
- The Black Revival of Learning—219
- The Black Muslim Triumph and the End—223
- The Remarkable Mossi—235

CHAPTER IX

CENTRAL AFRICA:
EVIDENCE FROM A SMALL STATE 235

- The Kingdom of Kuba—235
- The Political Organization—241
- The Government of Kuba—242
- The Religion of Kuba—244
- History and Philosophy—247
- Shyaam the Great—248
- The King-General—251

CHAPTER X

WHITE DEVILS FROM THE WEST 259

The Kongo-Angola Story—261

Queen Nzinga: the Unconquerable—276

CHAPTER XI

THE LAST
OF THE BLACK EMPIRES 290

The Empire Builders—294

The Great Mutota—295

PART II

CHAPTER XII

A VIEW FROM THE BRIDGE 311

The Summing Up—311

A View From the Bridge—319

A View of the Motherland—326

CHAPTER XIII

THE BLACK WORLD AT THE CROSSROADS 329

The Motherland at the Crossroads—332

Wanted: Leaders and African Ideologies—334

The Black Unity Threat—337

CHAPTER XIV

ORGANIZING A RACE FOR ACTION 341

Wanted: All Prisoners to Enlist!—343

Black Separatists—Who Are They?—346

The Direction of Civilization—348

The Liberation of Our Minds—351

CHAPTER XV

THE SHAPE OF THINGS
TO COME: A MASTER PLAN 361

How to Begin—And by Whom?—367

Structure by Divisions—371

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES 383

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 387

INDEX 394

Maps and Illustrations

The Ethiopian Empire (Map)	63
Menes, Ethiopion King of Kings	65
The Arab Settlement at Fostat	70
The Pyramids of Giza	72
The Great Sphinx	74
Early North Africa (Map)	102
Queen Hatshepsut	114
War Council at Napata	122
Queen Candace	126
Meroe	133
Aspalta, King of Kush	135
The Queen of Ethiopia at Meroe	139
A "Decisive Battle of History"	151
"We Have Come . . ."	188
Empires of Mali and Songhay (Map)	209
Kingdom of Kuba (Map)	236
The Kingdom of Ndongo and Matamba in the 17th Century	260
Queen Nzinga of Matamba	277
Queen Nzinga of Angola	279

PART I

"What became of the Black People of Sumer?" the traveller asked the old man, "for ancient records show that the people of Sumer were Black. What happened to them?" "Ah," the old man sighed. "They lost their history, so they died. . . ."

—A SUMER LEGEND

The Preview

THIS WORK IS A SUMMARY OF THE 16 YEARS OF RESEARCH and field studies which were intended for a 2 volume history of the African people. The writing plan for the two volumes would have required at least another five years, even if the serious impairment of my vision had not occurred. In the meantime there had developed an urgent need for the results of my research which concentrated on crucial areas in the history of the Blacks that had been either unknown, known and misinterpreted, or known but deliberately ignored. My own history classes were only a part of the rebellion against the only kind of textbooks available. It was a general rebellion against the subtle message even from the most "liberal" white authors (and their negro disciples): "You belong to a race of *Nobodies*. You have no worthwhile history to point to with pride."

The Destruction of Black Civilization, therefore, could not wait another five years just to be more detailed, impressive, or massive in scope; for a reinterpretation of the history of the African race could be compressed into a smaller work for background reading, and so written that Black John Doe, cab driver or laborer, and Jane Doe, house maid or waitress, can read and understand the message from their forefathers and foremothers as well as college students and professors.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF STUDY

In a small town surrounded by cotton fields in South Carolina, a little black boy in the 5th grade began to harass teachers, preachers, parents and grandparents with questions which none seemed able to answer: How is it that white folks have *everything* and we have *nothing*? Slavery? How and why did we become their slaves in the first place? White children go to fine brick, stone and marble schools nine months a year while we go to a ranshackle old barn-like building only 5 1/2 months—and then to the cotton fields. Why?

In the sixth grade one of our teachers, Miss Alice Crossland, helped me to become a sales agent for the *Crisis* and the *Norfolk Journal and Guide*. This was like turning on the floodlights of Heaven; for the books on our race, listed on the back pages of the *Crisis*, started me off on this never ending search, but raised more questions as I progressed through school—raised more perplexing questions than were answered. For, having read everything about the African race that I could get my hands on, I knew even before leaving high school that (1) *The Land of The Blacks* was not only the "Cradle of Civilization" itself but that the Blacks were once the leading people on earth; (2) that Egypt was not only once all Black, but the very name "Egypt" was derived from the Blacks; (3) and that the Blacks were the pioneers in the sciences, medicine, architecture, writing, and were the first builders in stone, etc.

The big unanswered question, then, was *WHAT HAD HAPPENED?* How was this highly advanced Black Civilization so completely destroyed that its people in our times, and for some centuries past, have found themselves not only behind the other peoples of the world, but even the color of their skin a sign of inferiority, bad luck and the badge of the slave whether bond or freed? And, since I had learned that whites were once enslaved as generally as any other race, how did it come about that slavery was finally concentrated in Africa for Blacks only? In short, no books or other studies in high school and college answered or gave clues to answers to the problems that puzzled me most. For no matter what the factual data were, all the books written about the Blacks by their conquerors reflected the conquerors' viewpoints. Nothing

else should have been expected. And, considering how thoroughgoing was the capture of the minds of the Blacks also, it is really not surprising that so many Negro scholars still faithfully follow in the footsteps of their white masters.

I was convinced that what troubled me and what I wanted to know, was what troubled the Black masses and what they wanted to know. We wanted to know the whole truth, good and bad. For it would be a continuing degradation of the African people if we simply destroyed the present system of racial lies embedded in world literature only to replace it with glorified fiction based more on wishful thinking than the labors of historical research.

My inquiry, therefore, was concerned with Black civilization alone—what the Blacks themselves achieved independently of either Europe or Asia. This was an entirely new approach to the study of the history of the Blacks. It meant, first of all, segregating traditional African institutions from those later influenced by Islamic Asia and Christian Europe. In this way, and in no other, we can determine what our heritage really is and, instead of just talking about "identity," we shall know at last precisely what purely African body of principles, value systems or philosophy of life—slowly evolved by our own forefathers over countless ages—from which we can develop an African ideology to guide us onward. In other words, there can be no real identity with our heritage until we know what our heritage really is. It is all hidden in our history, but we are ignorant of that history. So we have been floating along, basking blissfully in the sunny heritage of other peoples!

My research was a quest for some specific answers to very specific questions. Some of these were: (1) How did All-Black Egypt become All-White Egypt? (Note at this point that mulattoes were classified as "White" in Egypt, all North Africa, and the Middle East—a fact that still confuses Blacks in the United States where the very opposite policy was adopted). (2) What were some of the specific details in the process of so completely blotting out the achievements of the African race from the annals of history—just how could this be done on such a universal scale? (3) How and under what circumstances did Africans, among the very first people to invent writing, lose this art almost completely? (4) Is there a single African race, *one African people*? (5) If one race or one people, how do you explain the numerous languages, cul-

tural varieties and tribal groupings? (6) Since, as it seemed to me there are far more disunity, self-hatred and mutual antagonisms among Blacks than any other people, is there a historical explanation for this? (7) And how, in puzzling contrast, is the undying love of Blacks for their European and Asian conquerors and enslavers explained?

These questions, along with those stated earlier, constituted the core problems for sixteen years of study. And while the outcome did not eventuate in the more detailed work as planned, I think I succeeded in summarizing the most significant highlights of my findings in the chapters which follow this *Preview*.

ORIGIN AND STEPS IN THE STUDY

1. Review of world history. Believing that the history of the race could not be understood if studied in isolation, I began a slow—and *deliberately unrushed*—review of European history, ancient and modern, and the history of the Arabs and Islam. I say "review" because by 1950 I had already studied and taught in the three fields of American, European and Arabic history—a most fortunate circumstance for the task ahead.

2. Began the formal study of Africa in Europe, not Africa. I did not know how very wise this was when the decision was made. For I did not then know that Europe and Asia had been hauling out of Africa over the centuries just about all of the historical materials I needed to see and study at the very outset, and which, of course, could not be found in Africa. Certainly, I knew from reading all about the "Rape of Africa," but to know the scale on which this was done one must see at least some of it in Europe with his own eyes—and be amazed. The museums in various cities of the European colonial powers are the repositories of much African history.

3. Documentary sources. These are available in both Europe and America. Reports of Colonial Administrators in Africa, Parliamentary debates, reports and letters from geographers, explorers, captains of slave ships, and—especially rewarding—the reports and letters from missionaries to their respective societies' home offices. For the earliest records on ancient Africa in Europe, Greek and Roman sources were the most useful (See *Bibliographical Note*)

4. Field Studies. The field studies covered two years of work in Africa. Armed with a rather solid background in written documents, the primary concern now turned to oral history and the developing methods of historical criticism applicable to it. (Several chapters will be required just to detail the methods and procedures in this relatively new and rewarding field of oral tradition). Every region of Black Africa was covered: 26 nations in East, West, Central and Southern Africa, and 105 language groups.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

We began in the lands bordering the Mediterranean on the North and extending southward on both sides of the Nile below the 10th parallel, thus including Axum and neighboring kingdoms. This vast territory was the ancient Ethiopian empire, a federation of autonomous and semi-autonomous kingdoms. The study began here, firstly, because this was the heartland of the African race where evidence of that first Black civilization is to be found there still, despite all the centuries of efforts to destroy it.

From the researcher's viewpoint the most important part of the investigation was the beginning of the task of singling out and clearly setting forth the precise nature of Africa's own independently developed civilization. A Continent-wide study of the traditional customary laws of the Blacks, for example, enabled us to learn for the first time that a single constitutional system prevailed throughout all Black Africa, just as though the whole race, regardless of the countless differences in language and other locally determined cultural patterns, lived under a single government. A similar continent-wide study of African social and economic systems through the milleniums reveal the same overall pattern of unity and sameness of all fundamental institutions. That there is a historical and fundamental basis for real brotherhood and unity of the Black race could not have escaped the notice of all of those Europeans who have been investigating and writing about Africa over the years. But they are shrewd. Massive Black unity would be massive Black power—which, of course, would reduce white power and its domination of the whole earth. So white "Africanist" writers always concentrate on the "ethnic differences" among Africans, tribal antagonisms, "hopeless" language barriers, the cultural varie-

ties etc. They even make a separate "ethnic" group of their own mulatto offsprings from Black women by classifying them as "white" in some areas and "Coloureds" in others. Hence, a system of thought and practices were developed and superimposed on an already divided race to keep them permanently divided. No one can deny that in this, too, the whites have been most successful.

We have presented in Chapter VI enough of the traditional *African Constitution* and the *Fundamental Rights of The African People* to be specific beginning points for the identity and the discovery of the heritage we talk about without any definite frame of reference.

Chapter VII views the long drawn-out migrations as continent-wide movements that help to explain many of the most important factors in the destruction of black civilization. For the migrations help to answer the question: What happened to the African people? Or, what caused them to descend from the highest place to the lowest among the peoples of the world?

Even though the work was radically abridged, an innovation in historical research was introduced by going beyond the mere documentation of sources in order to validate, beyond all questions of doubt, the principal viewpoints of the work. This was the case-study method by which a representative number of states from every region of the continent was studied—North, East, West, Central and Southern Africa.

In the "View from the Bridge" and the final chapters, I make a more definite break from the "old line" school of historians. To be objective and scientific, this school insists, the research scholar should do no more than present the comprehensive and fully documented results of his investigations. There should be no "subjective" commentaries, no editorializing. Just present the factual data and leave the work to the readers to interpret or evaluate as they choose.

This may not only be the correct viewpoint, but it is even beautiful for historians who represent the already arrived people who control the world. They can well afford the luxury of historical knowledge for knowledge's sake—the great satisfaction that comes from just knowing how things came to be.

But the Black historian, member of a race under perpetual seige and fighting an almost invisible war for survival, dare not follow in these footsteps of the master. Quite the contrary, after

faithfully researching and piecing together the fragmented record of the race's history, the task of critical analysis and interpretation should begin. What were our strengths in the past? In what respects were we most vulnerable? Where did we go wrong? And all this, like the study of history itself, must be for the express purpose of determining *WHAT TO DO NOW*. In short, the Black historian; if he is to serve his generation, must not hesitate to declare what he thinks the results of his studies mean. For even when our history shows us where we have been weak, it is also showing us how, through our own efforts, we can become strong again.

THE WHITE ARABS

The relentless searchlights of history were turned on the roles played by the use of both Islam and Christianity in the subjugation of the Blacks. This confused many and outraged those who do not pause to distinguish evil men who use religion to disguise their real aims from religion itself. So the unthinking Muslim or Christian is likely to think that his religion is being attacked rather than the conquerors and enslavers who disgrace it in covering their drive for wealth and world domination.

The Blacks in the United States seem to be more mixed up and confused over the search for racial identity than anywhere else. Hence, many are dropping their white Western slave masters' names and adopting—not African—but their white Arab and Berber slavemasters' names! For the Arabs themselves are a white people, the Semitic division of Caucasians and, therefore, blood brothers of the Jews against whom they are now arrayed for war. The confusion will continue, however, as long as the fact that millions of mulattoes in Arab countries are considered "White" is ignored along with the other fact that countless unmixed, sun-baked desert-dwelling Arabs are not only brown but some are very dark in color—all this darkening of the skin in spite of their age-old tradition of the thick cloth covering the face from the scorching sun. Indeed, not only do mulattoes consider themselves 100% Arab, but jet-black Africans, whose forebears were in Arabia for generations, speak Arabic and call themselves Arabs—just as Black Americans speak English and call themselves "Americans." In both

cases neither the Black Arab nor Black American¹ thinks he is "white." To repeat, then, the Blacks are in Arabia for precisely the same reasons Blacks are in the United States, South America, and the Caribbean Islands—capture and enslavement.

In studying the actual records in the history of the race, therefore, the role of White Arabs must not be obscured either by their Islamic religion or by the presence of the Africans and Afro-Arabs among them any more than we should permit white Europeans and white Americans to use Christianity to cover their drive for power and control over the lives of other peoples.

THE EUROPEAN JOURNEY

I arrived in England in the Fall of 1953 to begin formal studies at Oxford University, primarily through the Institute of Colonial Studies and at Rhodes House (which might be more properly called Africa House). In addition to the study of documentary sources on Africa, I had other objectives: (1) I wanted a more direct, close-up view of the European mind, its real attitude toward the Black world. (2) The extent to which European wealth and power were derived directly from Africa. (3) The nature and philosophy of the European education that was shaping and determining the mentality of Africans. For I was already fully aware of the disastrous effects of the white American education system on Black Americans who, not having any other frame of reference, had to adopt the ideologies and viewpoints of the whites to survive at all—even when these viewpoints are against themselves. This meant visiting various classrooms in elementary and secondary

1. The term "Black" was given a rebirth by the Black Youth Revolt. As reborn, it does not refer to the particular color of any particular person, but to the attitude of pride and devotion to the race whose homeland from times immemorial was called "The Land of the Blacks." Almost overnight our youngsters made "Black" Co-equal with "White" in respectability, and challenged the anti-black Negroes to decide on which side they stood. This was no problem for many who are light or even near-white in complexion, for they themselves were among the first to proclaim with pride, "call me Black!" Those who hate the term but hold the majority of leadership positions, feel compelled to use it to protect their leadership roles.

schools, teacher training institutes, and classrooms of lecturers and professors in a selected number of colleges in the universities. These were not "look-in-and-leave" visits, but all day studies at the schools visited, remaining throughout the period in the classrooms, and talking with students, teachers and principals thereafter. In such a study one learns very quickly that the textbooks and other works describing education do not tell the same story as the schools in action tell. (4) Finally I wanted to know—and again from direct study—exactly what made Oxford probably the greatest university in the world. What are the specific elements of that greatness? Was great teaching a factor, and, if so, who are the great teachers, nature of teaching or, in short, what made them great teachers?

From just the foregoing aims of the study it must be obvious that I was still examining various aspects of the probable reasons why the whites became the masters of the globe.

In both France and England I found that the system of education fostered a new kind of aristocracy—an aristocracy of the "educated." College graduates constituted the new upper classes. The son of a carpenter or railroad conductor became estranged from his family and former friends upon receiving his university degree. A case in point was J. L., a young Englishman in my College at Oxford (Lincoln), and who was one of my close friends there. He refused to go home during any of the long vacation breaks because, to quote him, "I can no longer associate with my family and old friends. Wouldn't know how to talk with them. We have nothing in common now, you know. . . ."

This British (an European) philosophy of education fitted in ideally with those Africans from the continent and elsewhere who, unlike J.L., came to Europe from the privileged class at home. Some of those studying in England became more British than the British, just as many from what was French West Africa became more "French" than the Frenchmen.

The first tragedy to note about the effects of this class education on Blacks is that it further reinforced colonialism's policy of perpetual disunity in Africa and elsewhere. The line dividing these Black "upper" and "middle" classes from the Black masses and their basic aspirations is more rigidly drawn. And this superior class mentality, becoming even more crystalized since independence,

is an almost certain guarantee of future uprisings on a scale never seen.

The second great tragedy is in the nature of what is called "education." It is mainly rote learning, the ability to memorize phrases, concepts and other required data. *Thinking* is neither required nor expected. Critical analysis and evaluation of subject matter are not required. But the ability to absorb and recall is required. The brilliant scholar, then, is one who can readily quote authorities and remember well his bibliographical sources. So we have a generation of Black scholars who continue to amaze students by mouthing the doctrines and viewpoints of their white teachers—like so many robots without minds of their own.

Yet study under white teachers and professors should be most rewarding, and it can be if you do not enter white institutions with a head like an empty pitcher going to a fountain to be filled. I was safe and richly rewarded during my studies in white universities only because I happened not to be so naive that I expected the viewpoints of the conquerors to be the same as those of the conquered on matters relating to our place in the world.

Elsewhere I have emphasized, by repetition, that some of the most fruitful sources for study came quite unintentionally from white scholars. A case in point was at Oxford. The course was "The History of Colonialism in Africa." The presence of two or three Blacks in the class, while obviously uncomfortable to some, was generally ignored. For African studies were of long standing as an integral part of the imperial system. They were not planned for Africans at all, but for the future administrators of the Empire in Africa. So Professor Madden was pointing out in his lecture how difficult—and even impossible—it was to rule Africans in view of their "wild and most primitive system of democracy." For just as fast as African kings or chiefs undertook to carry out British laws which displeased the people, "the people would remove them from office," therefore, this "primitive African democracy had to be destroyed" before the British system of Indirect Rule could be effective.

The point here is that these sneering remarks by an eminent British historian revealed to me an entirely new field of research. That lecture led me into the study of one of the most significant developments in the entire history of the Black race: an ancient

system of democracy (existing before Greece), evolved from a continent-wide constitution that governed the whole African people as a single race. This all-important finding was arrived at by comparative studies of African customary laws in every region of the continent. The Europeans were confronted with a real social democracy that existed long before the terms "socialism" and "democracy" were invented in the West. For Dr. Madden it was "savage" because the people were the real rulers in fact, and not merely in theory.

THE FIELD STUDIES

In so far as the study of African history is concerned, I regard direct investigation in the field—and in Africa—as of the highest importance. This field work should be undertaken only after thoroughgoing research in written and other documentary sources. The study of available written sources, their evaluation, and the mounting archaeological records are all the first major phase of African research and, I would say, a prerequisite for field-work.

The field work was mainly concerned with oral history. I had noted in my study of sources of noted historians that many who decried oral tradition as "unreliable" never failed to use it themselves to supplement or give added validity to their works. The fact is that neither written nor unwritten records should be accepted as true without verification.

Although two years were devoted to the field work, the ground covered was possible only because of careful advance planning and the scheduling of areas and groups in each country months ahead of my arrival. These had to be in the hinterland, or "Bush Country," generally far away from the Westernized urban centers. For our quest was not for the long standing tradition of either Islam or Christianity in Africa, but for the more ancient tradition of Africa itself. So vast and untapped is the real history of the African race that I myself only scratched the surface of what is yet to be done. Some of the areas to be explored by future historians are set forth in pages which follow in this chapter. A major research project should not be undertaken by a single individual. This was my mistake—hence, the 16 years of work that a research team of eight or ten persons might complete in three or four. The kind of well-

organized research teams required for in-depth studies may be difficult to promote because of our pitiful go-it-alone individualism. A research project such as mine should have had a team of highly trained experts from the fields of history, archaeology, anthropology, medicine, linguistics tropical agriculture, political science, etc.

The widely ranging scope of the study minus a team was possible only because of the interest and active support of certain African governments and the unforgettable help of the people in every region and country. For all kinds of help were needed. As indicated above, much had been pre-arranged. The United States Department of State had notified the American embassy in each country that I was coming, requesting our ambassadors to give any requested assistance. Excepting the Sudan, where embassy officials appeared to be under some kind of fear, the embassies everywhere went all-out to be helpful. The embassies had the very important work of making the advance arrangements for trips into the interior through the appropriate ministries in each country. These in turn had to contact the various provincial governors or district commissioners who had to make living and conference arrangements with village chiefs, elders, the keepers of oral traditions and other specified groups. The amount of time all this advance work saved for the study itself is obvious.

But volunteer work of our African brothers who accompanied me into the field was what I referred to above as "unforgettable." Some of these were teachers who, as in the case of my previous field work (1956-57), had secured leave for the purpose without any trouble at all. Indeed, even the people we call "illiterate" had that storehouse of wisdom which made it easy for them to understand that I was working, not for myself, but for them—for the whole Black race.

I am trying to make it clear here that, although I did not have the kind of research team referred to above, many people—128 in number—participated in this work and made the outcome possible. So, when at various places I say "we" it is not the editorial or royal "we," but reference is made to individuals and groups that actually worked on various parts of the study. However, I had to decline the services of many highly recommended Africans because of their "upper class" attitudes toward the common people. For I had learned quite early that the people in the interior can spot the arrogant

and "superior" African just as easily as they recognize the arrogant and "superior" white investigator. They will give answers to questions readily enough, but not the right answers. I therefore selected only those whose heartbeats seemed to be tuned to the heartbeats of the great common people from whom all of us came.

The interpreters were generally assistants who spoke two or three of the languages of the country. An entirely new kind of assistant was the verifying interpreter. (This is to double check the interpreters, for sometimes they do not convey your question precisely or give back the exact reply). There were training sessions before and during the field work. In those fortunate cases where we had four or five competent assistants, one of the interpreters remained with me, while the others worked on special assignments in different places in the area.

The documentary research preceding all this in the United States was not done entirely alone. Some of the most important areas of my study of ancient sources were rechecked in independent studies by a select group of graduate students in history. Their assistance in re-appraising such early sources as Manetho, Herodotus, Josephus, Strabo, Abu Salih, *et al* was invaluable. Foremost among these were Reverend Carleton J. Hayden and Mr. Donald W. Kiehefner.

In concluding my remarks on the field studies in Africa some comments on four of the countries visited are in order. In the Sudan the authorities did not want me to work in or even visit the all-black southern provinces. Their fifteen years of rebellion against the "Arab" North caused the whole vast area to be officially "sensitive," and, therefore, barred to outsiders. The suggestion was that I confine my studies to the Northern Sudan. This I refused because I had been previously assured that the rebellion had been "completely crushed," and that "peace and quiet" prevailed everywhere. Besides, I could only find Islamic institutions in the North—institutions of which I already had full knowledge by years of special study and teaching. As indicated above, the American embassy in Khartoum did none of the preparatory work about which I give the U.S. embassies throughout Africa so much praise, although it had six months' notice before my arrival. And they maintained a strictly hands-off policy after my arrival. I therefore, prepared to leave at once, but announced that I do not beg to study anywhere, and that the world would learn that this was the only

"African" state where an African scholar was barred. The Ministry of the Interior reacted swiftly. Not only was permission to do field work in the South quickly granted, but all the necessary arrangements were made with dispatch. This included establishing my southern headquarters at Malakal. The simple fact was that while they were quite familiar with European research people roaming freely all over the country, a *Black* doing field studies in the Sudan is a phenomenon indeed.

Ethiopia (the new name for Abyssinia), like the Republic of the Sudan, is also ruled by people of mixed blood who not only do not consider themselves African by race, but who maintain a privileged class society based upon color. To them all black skinned Africans are "Bantu." To these they feel superior by reason of "white blood," and their discriminatory practices are just as subtle and real as those of the whites. And although the enslavement of black skinned Africans continue in both countries even in our times, both the Sudan and the new Ethiopia have adopted the "Brotherhood Front" since the sudden rise of so many independent African states—the Sudan to serve as the "Bridge" between the Arab world and the new Black states, and thus control or influence their international policies through the U.N.; and Ethiopia to more directly control or influence Black Africa through Western backing in establishing the headquarters of the Organization of African Unity in Addis Ababa and pushing Haile Selassie into the key role of continent-wide leadership, thus blocking the "dangerous" influence of Kwame Nkrumah. (It is because of my steadfast refusal to either skip or gloss over these aspects of the historical record that I am criticized by many Negroes—and I know exactly when to use this term!).²

And now southward to the fully white ruled lands where hostility to a black face was fully expected: Rhodesia and South Africa. Long before reaching Southern Africa I was told that I might as well skip Rhodesia, and that even if admitted into South Africa I would not be permitted to work. But Rhodesia—to the surprise of just about everyone—pulled out all stops, as though it had resolved to outmatch all the Black states in amenities and various kinds of assistance beyond all expectations or needs. There was the usual press conference, followed by front page headline coverage of my mission. The other surprise was invitation for TV and radio broadcasts to the nation. Our Zimbabwe friends were somewhat suspicious

of the motives behind all this red carpet treatment of a Black American, especially when it continued after my uncompromising replies to questions on a TV broadcast panel session. The Ministry of the Interior had an interpreter flown 300 miles to join me when I visited his particular language group, the Ndebele. The only objectionable incidents were when, on two different occasions in different places, two District officers wanted to attend my meetings with Chiefs and the Council of Elders. I objected, and the matter was closed.

Finally, South Africa. The situation in this country is so ridiculous that, far from allowing myself to be incensed with rage, I found it amusing. The unremitting brutality of these whites against the Blacks leaves them in a state of permanent fear. They seem to consider every Black man, not a potential, but an actual threat. And what they are preoccupied with every hour is unbelievable until you are actually in South Africa. My passport was a "mistake made somewhere." I, of course, had no intention to do field work in South Africa, but had to pass through it to reach the surrounded countries then under British rule. No one at all was supposed to be barred from passage to and from these countries. But it required the action of the U.S. Ambassador at Pretoria and an angry American Consul General at Johannesburg to free me from the airport room where I was held and checked on every thirty minutes. Even when the Consul General arrived in person the authorities insisted that I must not enter the city, but be taken under guard to the train for Swaziland. Mr. Riley (the C. G.) then decided to defy South Africa by not only driving me leisurely through Johannesburg, but 200 miles around the country, stopping at different towns, and finally on to Switzerland. What I referred to above as amusing were incidents such as excited policemen rushing to flag

2. One of the fateful illusions among Blacks is that the white world does not know about the very weak areas in the race which are the basis for its power and control over them. When we reach the point where we begin to seek out and turn the searchlight on the things that divide and hold us back—at that point the white oppressors will have reason to tremble. The white man stays on the alert, keeping a sharp lookout for any signs of strength and developing among the Blacks. Exploring for real obstacles to unity would be a disturbing sign of growing strength.

down the big Cadillac because they could so quickly spot a black face before they saw the seal of the United States emblazoned on the sides of the car or the American flag flying from the hood.

An *African* is a member of the Black race, and from times immemorial he was known as such by all the peoples of the world. Throughout this work the term refers to Blacks only. It should be noted also that I write about the African *people*—not African *peoples*, as Western writers do. I am dealing here with essentially one people, one "race," if you please—the African race. In ancient times "African" and "Ethiopian" were used interchangeably because both meant the same thing: a Black. This, of course, was before the Caucasians began to reorder the earth to suit themselves and found it necessary to stake their birthright over the Land of the Blacks also. In line with this, some Western historians have recently wondered where the Africans came from!

The reasons given for beginning formal studies of Africa at Oxford implied much more than was stated. Reference was made to studying the "Caucasian mind," for therein may be found many clues that lead to a better understanding of the history of the Blacks and how the systematic blackout of significant portions of that history occurred.

This is why I urge those students who intend to accept the great challenge of basic research in this discipline to go into "enemy territory," linger there, study and critically analyze their lectures and their "scholarly" writings, for they are some of the most rewarding sources for African history—precisely because in shrewdly attempting to delete, disguise or belittle the role of the Blacks in world history, they often reveal the opposite of what was intended. They are fruitful sources of unconscious evidence—supplying the very evidence they thought to suppress or recording facts the significance of which they were totally ignorant. A fairly good example is the written account of a European explorer in East Africa. He was outraged because he and his party had to wait two weeks to present request to explore the country to the African king. The Black autocrat, the account went on, had the presumption to keep *white men* waiting (*italics mine*) in order to show his people how high and mighty he was. The whites were denied even a brief audience, while the king would quickly receive any old black that wandered in from the countryside. Now the explorer, without know-

ing it, was actually reporting how African democracy worked, and how it had been working before there was an Athens or Greece (where Westerners think democracy was born). The explorer would have been surprised to know (1) that "king" in Africa meant something entirely different from what it meant in Europe and Asia; (2) that this black king, far from "putting on airs," did not have the right to receive them even socially without the presence of at least three senior Elders; (3) that to consider a petition to conduct explorations in the country, the full Council of State had to be called, and that this could not be done by the king without the advice of the First Minister (who happened to be on tour when the explorers arrived in the capital); (4) and that the "old blacks" they saw "wandering in from the countryside" and being quickly received, were the councillors who had been summoned—some from distant provinces—to pass on their request to explore. They were the direct representatives of the people. The voice of the king was in fact the voice of the people, without which he could not act at all on any matter of importance, or even talk alone with strangers. It should be clear, therefore, that our guidelines for research must lead to a critical analysis of all sources, whether original, secondary or oral. In particular, we should seek out those works with the special mission to "prove" the superiority of whites by "proving" the inferiority of Blacks—all in language so subtle, scholarly and scientific that to the uncritical mind their "truths" seem self-evident. But it is also noteworthy that while the most hostile racist writers usually prove the very opposite of what they intended, their works inevitably contain useful, factual data that must be accepted. Indeed, it is doubtful whether anyone, even a devil, could write a book completely devoid of truth.

Research in African history is more tedious, laborious, and time-consuming than is true in other unsuppressed fields. For in developing the "underdeveloped" history of the Blacks, one has to explore the most unlikely sources for a fragment here and a fragment there, and in works in no way concerned with African history, and just as often no kind of history. Sometimes it is a paragraph or two in an explorer's account; at other times significant items may be found in the numerous missionary reports to the home office, explaining the mission's tasks, but also the native institutions to be overcome. All of these may be valuable and most valid

sources precisely because they were not intended to be such at all. The writers were detailing bigger European interests. Any references to Africans were merely incidental to larger purposes. Just piecing all these fragments together could be a research field by itself.

In my work in European and American history I ran into no such problems and the research tasks were easier. In Egyptian history, to give a final example of Caucasian roadblocks to be overcome, one has the extra time-consuming job of identifying the numerous black giants of history who have been classified and effectively disguised as Caucasians over the centuries. First of all, one must know the various names that referred to Blacks exclusively and by which they were known throughout the ancient world. For in addition to the more widely used "African" and "Ethiopian," they were also known as Thebans, Libyans, Thinites, Nubians, Cushites, Memphites, Numidians, etc. Even before white Asians gained the ascendancy in any of these areas, their very presence in relatively small numbers was sufficient to identify them as the leaders and achievers of whatever attracted the attention of the world.

Another trick—the very opposite of the American law and practice—was to classify Africans with "Caucasian blood" as Caucasians. If any of those so classified turned out to be notorious characters, pro-African or anti-white, they were loudly proclaimed and contemptuously called "half-breeds."

The millions of early Blacks who were forced either by circumstances or expediency to replace their own names with Asian and European names only added to the problems of historical identification.

Far from becoming baffled and discouraged by the more painstaking basic research required, the student of African history must accept the challenge as a twentieth-century mandate that is essential to the salvation of the race in the most literal sense. They will need the active support of Black governments and predominately Black institutions of learning. These should be actively sponsoring (1) comprehensive basic research programs; (2) research teams for field studies—especially in history and archaeology; (3) and a thorough-going teacher-training program for history and other related disciplines.

What, indeed, are Black institutions of learning waiting for?

The young people to show the way? The simple truth is that what is needed first is active pioneering initiatives. Financial assistance would then be forthcoming even from unexpected sources. Black inertia is the main problem. There is still too much dependence on white scholars to do our work for us. I have written elsewhere that as long as we rely on white historians to write Black history for us, we should keep silent about what they produce. They write from the Caucasian viewpoint, and we are naive indeed if we expect them to do otherwise—all the ballyhoo about their "scientific objectivity" to the contrary notwithstanding.

THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Over the years of studying African history certain propositions and theories evolved quite naturally as guiding headlights in the explorations. A few of them are set forth here, some previously stated or implied:

1. That Africa—all Africa—is the native homeland of the Blacks;³ and that the Asiatic peoples who occupy North and Eastern Africa, even though they may have been there for centuries, are no more native Africans than are the Dutch and British who likewise occupy and control the southern regions of the continent. The question of where the homelands are from which all of these invaders came is not debatable;
2. That the Blacks were among the very earliest builders of a great civilization on this planet, including the development of writing, sciences, engineering, medicine, architecture, religion and the fine arts;
3. That the story of how such an advanced civilization was lost is one of the greatest and most tragic in the history of mankind and should be the main focus of research studies in African history;
4. That Asian imperialism, though rarely ever mentioned, was, and still is even more devastating for the African people than that of either Europe or America; and that the Arabs' white

3. An important fact that should be well known is that *all un-mixed* Africans are not jet black. For while the great majority are black skinned, countless thousands who lived for centuries in cool areas have lighter complexion—and no "Caucasian blood" at all.

superiority complex is not one whit less than that of Europe or America, although their strategy of "brotherhood" deceives naive Blacks.

5. That the forces behind the continuous splintering of already small groups and even the breaking up of kingdoms and empires, followed by the equally endless migrations, included the steadily increasing death of the soil and the advance of the deserts; the drying up of lakes and rivers, along with the attending change of the climate and the always certain internal strife—all combined with invasions and famine to become a way of life;
6. That the strength and greatness of the African people can be measured by how, in the face of what at times seemed to be all the forces of hell, they fought through to survive it all and, rebuilt kingdoms and empires some of which endured a thousand years.
7. That within the framework of even the smallest surviving states they adhered to and kept alive the basic principles of the traditional African constitution and held on through all the passing centuries to the fundamental elements of its ancient democratic, social, political and economic systems all over the continent;
8. That Africa was the cradle of a religious civilization based on the conception of one Supreme God, Creator of the Universe; and that this belief in one Supreme Being ante-dated that of the Jews by several thousand years before Abraham, and that the role of the numerous sub-deities on whom Western writers dwell, was exactly the same as that of patron saints in the Christian world; I advance further the theory that the early wandering Hebrews, so numerous in Africa, received many of their religious ideas there, for there it was that Abraham sojourned, Moses was born, Joseph lived, and some of the early years of Jesus Christ were spent. There is no question either that even centuries after Mulattoes and Asians emerged as the only Egyptians, they still regarded Black Africa as the chief source of the spiritual—"The Land of the Gods" or "The Land of the Spirits";
9. That notwithstanding the remarkable civilization they did develop even milleniums before Christ, and the amazing rebuilding of empires in spite of the great dispersions—notwithstanding all this, African people fell far behind in the forward march of the rest of mankind because, in addition to the destructive

forces of nature on the continent and the hostile forces from without, they, the African people, further enshackled themselves with their own hands through certain aspects of their social institutions and beliefs that stood as roadblocks to progress even where conditions were favorable.

THE SCHOLARS' WAR ON THE BLACKS

This work begins where the history of the Blacks began, in Egypt (Northern Ethiopia) and the Sudan (Southern Ethiopia). Thus at the very outset, I clash head-on with the Caucasian version of African history. My focus, then, is on the *Great Issues* in the history of the blacks that emerge from this confrontation with white scholarship; for while I have covered much of the same ground explored by scholars before me, I generally reached different conclusions than theirs, and from the same body of facts.

Let us pause for a moment at this point. I have made a blanket indictment of white Western scholarship on Africa. If it cannot be sustained, it should never be made. They are brought under fire at various points throughout this work—the kind of work, as I also stated, should be absolutely needless in the closing years of the 20th century. The case against Western "Africanists" is rather fully set forth in the work itself, but may be outlined here as follows:

1. First of all, they are not ignorant of the true history of the Blacks, including their achievements as builders of one of the first great civilizations on this earth (ancient writers say it was the very first); and they, the Western scholars, know all about the authentic early and modern sources. They simply ignore and refuse to publish any facts of African history that upset or even tend to upset their racial philosophy that rests so solidly on premises sanctified by time that they no longer need to be openly proclaimed.

2. They are, unwittingly, promoting the steady march toward a world conflict between the races. Yet they are doing what they feel they must do, in faithful obedience to their Caucasian culture, the racial pattern of which emerged in the 17th century. The steady conquest and enslavement of a whole people made it imperative to create both a religious and a "scientific" doctrine to assuage the

white conscience. Their phenomenal success in the industrial world at once supports and justifies their philosophy, the supremacy of the fittest. The danger now arises from an entirely new and unexpected development: A sleeping and submissive non-white world, while all this white power was being amassed, is no longer either sleeping or submissive.

3. Even the African revolt against colonialism and the world-wide challenge to white domination of the entire earth—even these signals of change do not disturb these scholars of imperialism. They represent the Lords of the Earth, controlling all levels of education, science and research. They control the education of Blacks throughout the world. Therefore, they see no need, even in the 1970s, to take a new look at the history of the Blacks from its beginning and start the work of restoring the pages they deleted or ignored.

They are doing the very opposite. Their histories and other "scientific" studies of the Blacks are presented just as they have been for three hundred years. With the rise and spread of independent African states and the Black Revolution in the United States, these scholarly representatives of White Supremacy quickly reformed their techniques of mind control: They set up in Europe and America highly financed African studies associations, societies, institutes, history journals and "African" periodicals of various kinds—all under complete white control and direction. Their African studies programs were pushed in the colleges and universities far ahead of the general demand by Black youth for Black studies. As the latter demands developed, Black youth discovered that white professors not only had the field occupied, but were still teaching their traditional viewpoint on "race."

In the continuing crusade to control the minds of the blacks through the nature of their education, American and British scholars lead. They are as ruthless and aggressive in their scholarly pursuits on races as their co-partners in seizing and controlling the wealth and peoples of other lands. Having established strong national and international "African" associations and journals that even attempt to control research activities on Africa, they proceeded to flood the world with hastily thrown together African "histories," pamphlets, and publications on just about every subject that could stand a "black" title.

4. From their all-powerful "position of strength" they continue to arrange and rearrange the world as it pleases them, naming and classifying peoples, places and things as they will: In the United States whites known to have any amount of "Negro blood"—no matter how small—are classified as Negroes; in Africa, North Africa in particular, they do the very opposite. Blacks with any amount of "Caucasian blood" are classified as "White." This scheme was rigorously applied in the history of Egypt, for example, where even unmixed black pharaohs became "white" and the originally black population was never referred to as Egyptians at all! The black kings who founded and ruled from the First Dynasty are disguised as such, while the Saite kings (white) of the small areas of Lower Egypt are presented as the Pharaohs of all Egypt even when African pharaohs were on the throne of Upper Egypt.

Blotting the Blacks out of history included replacing African names of persons, places and things with Arabic and European names. One wave of the masters' magic wand, and black Hamites and even Cushites, like their early Egyptian brothers, are no longer Africans!

5. Their periodization of African history is carefully arranged in such a way that the history becomes the history of Arabs and Europeans in Africa, and *not* the history of Africans. In *African History*, a recent publication of the American Historical Association as a guide to teaching, their purpose becomes clear in the arrangement itself: First period is from the Fall of the Roman Empire to 700 (A.D.) (Arab invasions); the second period of African history is the period of "Islamic" civilization, 700 (A.D.) to the coming of the Europeans in 1500; the European Period from 1500 to 1960 is subdivided at 1880 to mark the period of colonialism. *There is no period of Black civilization* in Black Africa. Such is the Caucasian viewpoint—almost a religion. Their very first period eliminates 4,000 years of Black civilization and the very greatest periods of African achievements; their second period is devoted to the Arabs and Berbers in Africa; and in their third period the focus is on European civilization. And it is all done under the heading of *African* history.

Where it was impossible to deny Black achievements, equal and often above the whites, such achievements were attributed to some kind of Caucasian influence, even if imaginary. Yet, the AHA

Publication Number Fifty-six uses the same strategy that makes Western scholarship so very triumphant: The main thrusts of its racist presuppositions are, for the unwary, completely hidden by much highly welcomed factual materials. But what is certain to disarm almost everyone is racism's forthright attacks on racism throughout the publication. I suppose no one is expected to notice the implied incapacity of Black historians to deal with African history objectively. (They are not referred to as historians, of course,) They are "... some modern African intellectuals who have tried to show great civilizations in the past, grander than anything that ever existed."

As a direct result of this continued universal enslavement through education, Black youth are in revolt. That revolt will become increasingly dangerous as they increasingly realize how completely they are blocked from self-realization in the very institutions that should further it; how difficult it is to find suitable textbooks in Black history or even "Negro" teachers who do not limit themselves to the viewpoints of the white masters who trained them. The frustrations become more intolerable as the young find themselves between two fires: The white racists who determine the very nature of their education and Negro educators who also see the world through the blue eyes of the Saxons. In short, they are forced to turn to their own devices because they find so many of their own race, who should be working with them, in the camps of the "enemy."

Insofar as periodization is concerned, no one should be so naive as to expect a proper division of African history while the field is almost completely preempted by the enemies of that history. A proper division would tend to encourage a more all-inclusive research and a less biased interpretation of the results. Neither will happen until a new generation of Black research scholars and historians take to the field, becoming the foremost authorities in their own right—Black historians, not a single one of whom will fall in Professor Philip D. Curtin's category of Black intellectuals who try to "show great civilizations in the past, grander than anything that ever existed." The new research efforts call for Black experts not only in the field of history but also in the allied fields from which African history must heavily draw—archaeology, anthropology, linguistics, etc.

THE NEW APPROACH

The first period would begin with "prehistory", primarily because Nowe, one of the oldest cities on earth, was begun by the Blacks before recorded history. Another important reason is that the Canaanites and other white Asians had invaded the Nile Delta and established a stronghold in Lower Egypt (then Northeastern Ethiopia or Chem) in prehistoric times. This early concentration of whites along the seacoasts of the Land of the Blacks is a circumstance of crucial importance in Black history because it was exactly from this development that the achievements of the Blacks were overshadowed by later writers or blotted out entirely. The call is for Black specialists for *one period in one area*. What, for example, was the actual influence of the white Asians—rigidly held back for centuries in the lower one-fourth of the country—upon the Blacks who held the three-fourths that came to be known as Upper Egypt? Review and in-depth studies of this period are required. The general historian is out. The best general histories, region by region, can be written only after the work of the specialists is done.

The second period might well be from the conquest of Lower Egypt by the Ethiopian leader, Menes, in 3100 B.C.⁴ to the end of the Sixth Dynasty, 2181—also the end of the Old Kingdom. This was the period that gave birth to Egypt—and before which there was no Egypt. It was the period during which Black kings united the "Two Lands," started the dynastic (lineage) system, and began the building of the greatest civilization. The greatest in-depth review and concentration of research should be focused on this second period. It was, in fact, the Golden Age in the history of the Blacks, the age in which they reached the pinnacle of the glory so dazzling in achievements that Western and Arab writers felt compelled to erase it by the sheer power of their position and begin Black history over 3,000 years later, limiting such as they allowed to "Africa South of the Sahara."

The third period of Black history in Egypt should begin with the Seventh Dynasty, 2181 (B.C.) and be subdivided into the tragic

4. Earlier dates, such as 4500 B.C., are also given and accepted by many authorities; for conflicting dates do appear in ancient records. I do not debate the point.

periods of internal turmoil and white invasions. The first subdivision would be from 2181 B.C. to 2040 (B.C.)—the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, and Tenth Dynasties. Thereafter, strict chronology should be ignored in order to focus on a single issue: The role of invasions and conquests in the destruction of Black civilization, with the resulting ethnic transformation of Egypt from black to brown (Afro-Asian and Afro-European), to white.

This means that the second subdivision would bypass the Restoration period of the great Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties for the next period of invasion and conquest—the Hebrew (Hyksos) rule, 1645-1567 (B.C.). Again, bypassing the New Empire, the other subdivisions would study the periods of the Assyrian, Persian, Greek, Roman and Arab invasions and the impact of their conquests and rule on the Blacks.

The fourth major division would begin with the skipped-over Eleventh and Twelfth Dynasties, 1786-1233 (B.C.), the great Eighteenth, 1567-1320, and then continue from the Age of Ramses to the end of the Twenty-fourth Dynasty, 1330-730.

The fifth period should be from the last of the Black pharaohs to the destruction of the remaining southern division of the Ethiopian Empire below the First Cataract, 730- (B.C.) to the fifth century (A.D.).

The sixth period: From the reemergence of successor Black states in the fifth century (A.D.) to their final destruction by the Arabs in the thirteenth century.

The seventh period, like the second, should not be a time division of neat and largely irrelevant chronological sequences. It is a study of migrations of the Blacks that covered many centuries, but which became more widespread and desperate after the Arab conquest of the original center of Black civilization in the Sudan. The long periods of wandering all over the continent, often aimlessly, was the great historic race of the Blacks for survival—a race that tried to outdistance famine, disease, slavery and death. The period that should have an intense closer-up study and critical analysis extends from the thirteenth century to colonialism in the nineteenth.

Elsewhere I have posed the most perplexing question: If the Blacks were among the very first builders of civilization and their land, the birthplace of civilization, what has happened to them since that left them at the bottom of world society—precisely what hap-

pened? The Caucasian answer is simple and well-known: The Blacks were always at the bottom. This answer is clear even in the histories and other educational material they so busily prepare for the Blacks themselves. Almost all of the true answers will be found in the study of the causes of the migrations and the tragic results stemming directly from those seemingly endless movements of fragmented peoples.

How was the art of writing lost by one of the first peoples to invent it? . . . Study the migrations. How and why did a once great people with a common origin splinter off into countless little independent societies and chiefdoms from which 2,000 different languages and dialects developed? . . . Study the migrations. What caused the brother-against-brother internecine wars, hatreds, slavery and mutual suspicion among the various Black societies? . . . Again, study the migrations!

There would be several subdivisions of great importance. Slavery and the slave trade, for example, would include Africa, Asia and the Americas. This would be the background for later periods covering Black history in the United States, South America and the Caribbean areas.

The eighth division is the reemergence of African kingdoms and empires, by regions, between the tenth and nineteenth centuries. This was the period during which there were attempts in every region of Africa to restore the glory that was Ethiopia's. It is doubtful if any of these black states realized that they were being slowly but steadily surrounded and hemmed in from all directions by invaders from the seacoasts and across the Sahara. The ultimate fall of the Black states, first under Islamic and then under European Christian blows, closed this period with the triumph of colonialism.

The final period is the Black Revolution that ended *political* colonialism with the rise of *politically* independent states. This would take us from 1950 to the present, and should be subdivided for developments in Black America, South America and the "Islands of the Seas."

From the new approach and plan for research study and development of African history presented above "periodization," while recognized as highly important, is not allowed to so fragment a great movement or development covering many periods and milleniums that their real significance is lost. Examples are the ethnic trans-

formation of Egypt from black to brown to white, and the long centuries of the great migrations. These defied periodization in any meaningful sense.

I only made passing reference in the work to Blacks scattered outside of Africa over the world—not from the slave trade, but dispersions that began in prehistory. This fact alone indicates the great tasks of future scholarship on the real history of the race. We are actually just on the threshold, gathering up some important missing fragments. The biggest jobs are still ahead.

Ancient China and the Far East, for example, must be a special area of African research. How do we explain such a large population of Blacks in Southern China—powerful enough to form a kingdom of their own? Or the Black people of Formosa, Australia, the Malay peninsula, Indo-China, the Andaman's and numerous other islands? The heavy concentration of Africans in India, and the evidence that the earliest Aryan chiefs were black (which will make Hitler rise from his grave) open still another interesting field for investigation. Even the 'Negroid' finds in early Europe appear not to be as challenging as the black population centers in Asia. For, again, reference is not made to small groups which may have wandered anywhere over the earth; rather, our concern is with great and dominant populations. These are the Blacks who have so puzzled Western scholars that some theorize that Asia or Europe may be the homeland of Africans after all. The African populations in Palestine, Arabia and Mesopotamia are better known, although the many centuries of Black rule over Palestine, South Arabia, and in Mesopotamia should be studied and elaborated in more detail. All of this will call for a new kind of scholarship, a scholarship without any mission other than the discovery of truth, and one that will not tremble with fear when that truth is contrary to what one prefers to believe.

Nothing is clearer than the tragic fact that Africa, like the rest of the Black world, has only the illusion of being free and independent. It is only about one-third free. It is still as economically ensnared as it ever was—in some respects more so. The study of this period and the conditions it presents will confront the Blacks of the world with the final challenge. The response to that challenge will be the test of the genius of the race. The outcome and, indeed, the whole future of the race depends upon the extent to

which we have become intellectually emancipated and *decaucasianized* enough to pioneer in original thinking. Those who do become free in fact, will no longer readily grab the white man's ideologies and systems whether Capitalism, the Western version of democracy, or Communism—without a critical review and analysis to determine whether Africa's own traditional system, when updated, may not be truly superior and best fitted to meet the aspirations of the Black world. This last period, then, is the time of great decisions. It may well be the black race's last chance for a rebirth and salvation.

The division proposed above for a new approach in the research, teaching and study of African history will outrage most Western and Arab scholars—along with their subservient Negro followers—because I have shifted the main focus from the history of Arabs and Europeans in Africa to the Africans themselves—a history of the Blacks *that is a history of Blacks*. They will be coming back—center stage—into their own history at last. But to what end? Will it be just for the intellectual satisfaction of *knowing* our true history? Knowing it, yes—but *so what?* The answer is *nothing*—unless from history we learn what our strengths were and, especially, in what particular aspect we were weak and vulnerable. Our history can then become at once the foundation and guiding light for united efforts in serious planning what we should be about now.

CHAPTER I

The Overview

THE LAND OF THE BLACKS WAS A VAST LAND—A BIG world into itself covering 12,000,000 square miles. From its northernmost point in what is now Tunisia to Cape Agulhas is approximately 5,000 miles, and in its widest extent from east to west it is 4,600 miles. The whole of this second largest continent was once *Bilad as Sudan*, "The Land of the Blacks"—and not just the southern region to which they had been steadily pushed from the north. After Asian, Greek and Roman occupations the term 'Sudan' came to indicate the areas not yet taken from the Blacks and was co-extensive with the Ethiopian empire.

For the Ethiopian empire once extended from the Mediterranean north and southward to the source of the Nile in the country (Abyssinia) which recently reverted to the ancient name of the Ethiopian empire of which in earlier times it formed its southeastern provinces. Even as late as the times of Menes, 3,100 B.C., Ethiopia still included three-fourths of Egypt—or up to twenty-nine degrees North parallel. The Asians held the Delta region—hence "The Two Lands," well-known to all historians but never fully explained. (To explain the "Two Lands" of course would blast the myth about the builders of Egyptian Civilization).

It was pointed out that the study of the Blacks must begin in Egypt because more of their indestructible monuments are there; and, further, because many of the artifacts archaeologists have been uncovering during the past seventy-five years as "Egyptian" are in fact "African." Yet the very "Heartland of the Race" and the cradle

of civilization were actually further southward below the First Cataract, centered around the capital cities of Napata and Meroe. From there black civilization spread northward, reaching its most spectacular achievements in what became known as "Egyptian Civilization."

The general condition of vast stretches of land over the continent—uninhabited and uninhabitable, seemed to support the Western thesis that Africans never developed any worthwhile civilization, had no notable historic past and, the more charitable might add, that in the very nature of their situation it could not be otherwise. Samuel Baker went far in promoting the idea of African innate inferiority even if he had to use the most forbidding area in Africa to do it—the terrible swamplands of the Sudd, an area south of Khartoum that in its full extent is as big as England. No one would claim that any kind of society, civilized or savage, could exist in the Sudd Swamplands, probably the largest in the world. For it was neither all land nor water, but a seemingly endless mass of rotting vegetation, interwoven tree-like vines, steaming heat, swarming man-killing mosquitoes, crocodiles, hippos and other unknown forms of tropical life. The conclusion of Baker and others was that they were in a land where time had stood still since its beginning, where life never advanced and the human species has simply rotated in aimless cycles like the animal life in the Sudd.

As late as the 1840's and 50's these explorers, even the most ignorant, should have known that in the same vast continent of wastelands, tropical rain forests and swamplands, there were also areas of arable land and civilized states. But they wrote about what they saw the most of: vast stretches of wasteland and secluded groups of "strange" people.

But, as we shall see, some of the great kingdoms and empire-builders in Africa seem not to have known the meaning of failure or had any ideas about surrendering to fate. Ejected here, they led the people there—and began to build again.

Wherever the splintered-off refugee groups found a place where the soil seemed favorable for cultivation, and the land unoccupied by preceding migrants, they settled and began to build villages again. A sense of relative security was a necessary factor in deciding to begin a new settlement. A crucial question was, how many miles had they put between the slave hunters and themselves? For the kind of houses and community buildings they would erect depended

directly on the probability of permanent settlement or sudden flight again. In short, whether to build large, sturdy and attractive compound homes and temples of worship or easily demolished huts.

It was for reasons of security that so many of these groups—later called tribes or societies—sought the most hidden and isolated areas they could find. This permanent separation from their kinsmen in other groups was generally quite contrary to their hearts' desires. The original splintering off and parting was often in tears. But breaking up into smaller units seemed to be the only route to survival in a permanent crisis situation—apparently permanent, since the movement of people over the continent had been going on so far beyond the memory of each generation that migrations and temporary settlements were among the most significant facts in the oral tradition of each society.

Fragmentation and isolation had two momentous consequences. The first was that the isolation of various groups led to the development of over two thousand different dialects and languages. The second fateful outcome was that the rise of all these tongues widened the gulf between the blacks that territorial distances had already achieved. One should pause here for reflection if there is any serious attempt to really understand what happened to the African people and why. For even without the aid of Western writers in emphasizing the language differences and the cultural variations and attempting to show how unrelated the blacks are, they themselves came in time to consider themselves unique and each society not only independent of the other but its enemy, if only potentially. Disunity and mutual suspicion became an African way of life. Small chiefdoms sprang up everywhere, often no more than a single village of one of two hundred people. Africa, therefore, presented itself to Asia and Europe as the ideal land for exploitation, enslavement and conquest.

The history is complex and many-sided, and would be so if we were discussing just one nation and not an entire continent. This is why our focus must be on the main lines of development, the African-wide aspects, and the unmistakable common origin and continent-wide sameness of basic institutions which these universal aspects reflect.

There were, then, different outcomes for different societies. Some perished even to the last member from disease, starvation or

warfare. Others, despairing of ever again being able to have a fixed abode, became nomads. Some, although isolated so long that they had developed different languages and customs, had nevertheless decided that salvation required a union with other groups. These were the tribes that merged with other tribes, lost their separate identity and languages; and who evolved from this process a single common language, larger and large chiefdoms, kingdoms, and finally empires that began the rebirth of their long lost civilization.

The fiercest wars between the blacks occurred in the founding and expansion of new kingdoms and empires. For while the core groups were voluntary confederations, expansion of empire required the conquest of neighboring states, usually small, independent chiefdoms, that preferred to maintain their absolute sovereignty. The repercussions from this forced unity by conquests were to shake the continent from end to end centuries later when European political rule ended.

Modern Africans and students of Africa have tended to emphasize the destructive impact of European imperialism in Africa while ignoring the most damaging developments from the Arab impact *before* the general European take-over in the last quarter of the nineteenth century—a relatively recent period. This point is important. For one of the most remarkable chapters in the history of the Blacks is that dealing with those dauntless leaders and people who, having lost one state after another along with three-fourths of their kinsmen, nevertheless overrode all the forces of destruction and death and began to build—always once again—still another state. From the earliest times the elimination of these states as independent African sovereignties had been an Asian objective, stepped up by Muslim onslaughts after the Seventh century A.D. So the re-established black states were still being conquered and Islamized when Europeans began to arrive in greater numbers to impose their rule over both Asians and Africans. The big thing that happened here, to repeat, is generally glossed over, ignored or forgotten. The last being a pretension, since a historical development of this magnitude could hardly be forgotten by serious writers on Africa. For what happened very simply was that European imperialism in Africa checked and replaced Arab imperialism. The Arab screams against Western imperialism are the screams of outrage against Western Caucasians for checking and subduing Eastern

Caucasians in the very midst of the blacks they had conquered. There are still countless thousands of blacks who are naive enough to believe that the Arabs' bitter attack on Western colonialism show their common cause with Black Africa.

* * *

Insofar as those who were fortunate enough to find promising areas for settlement are concerned, the picture was generally one of state building and the revival of basic African institutions which, though not forgotten, could neither be maintained nor developed by any people forever on the move.

But what about the countless societies, fleeing before the conquering hordes and the enslavers, as well as famine and the deaths which were its daily companion, —what about those who found no Promised Land anywhere? For quite unlike the societies I mentioned that could settle down and had the opportunity to start and develop civilizations comparable to any elsewhere in the world at the time, these people could neither settle down nor, therefore, develop a civilization. What they suffered from year to year as they wandered over the continent is almost beyond both description and belief. In fact, while the story is well-known, few writers would want to go into its awful details. Suffice to say at this point that, here now were numerous societies of Africans that were virtually sentenced either to death from starvation or enslavement by Arabs (I am still in the pre-European period) or barbarism and savagery and, in many cases, even cannibalism.

Under such conditions I would defend not only the retrogression of these people to barbarism but to cannibalism itself. The defense of the latter is easy, since it has been well established that other supposedly highly civilized men will revert to savagery and cannibalism under prolonged conditions of extreme hunger and thirst, when survival itself is the only question that dominates the hunger-crazed mind. This phenomenon of reverting to a state of savagery and even cannibalism under extreme conditions of starvation is known to occur universally among various peoples—white, black, brown, red, or yellow.

The facts we have, then, show that after they lost Egypt and the Eastern Sudan, some Africans, overriding all adverse conditions,

grouped themselves to form nations and developed a high order of civilization independent of any external influences. Others never settled anywhere long enough to develop anything notable, but seemed to remain in a state of lethargy or suspended animation. They had surrendered to fate and became too weak to fight back. They descended to a state of semi-barbarism. "Descended," because most of these societies had known better times and a higher order of life. Some in more favorable circumstances, nevertheless, failed to advance. Still others were in the class discussed in connection with cannibalism—hunger-crazed people who had sunk to the lowest levels of dog-eat-dog existence. These last are the people about whom European and American authors delight to write. No cartoons are better known than those showing a sweating white man (usually an explorer or missionary) being cooked in a huge black pot, while black savages dance around with human bones decorating their heads or stuck through pierced noses. The idea these "experts" on Africa have been planting in the minds of the peoples of the world—and are still actively planting—is that "This is Africa, and these are the savages who are now clamoring for independence!"

NATURE JOINS THE ATTACK

The question of physiography, vegetation, climate, water and soil are all more crucial in the history of the Blacks than they are in the case of any other people. (For here a whole continent is involved, and on that continent a people who in one period of time were among the foremost people on earth, and in a later period the farthest behind.) Nature itself set an environmental stage in a manner and under conditions which appear to have been designed to test to the utmost (one race's moral, intellectual and physical powers to override all obstacles to survival.)

The slow but relentlessly steady withdrawal of inhabitable land over the centuries eventually left Africa a land of desolation, a wasteland, the greater part of which was desert and treeless grassland with only a fractional part, about ten percent, with the much needed forests and thickets. Even the continental land configuration was against its native inhabitants. Like a vast inclined plane, the highlands, beginning in Central Africa at 3,000 feet above sea

level, rose southward to higher and higher levels, reaching the highest level of 15,000 feet in the Southeastern provinces of the ancient Ethiopian empire. This caused Africa to slope northward and its principal rivers—the Nile in particular—to flow in the same directions. This single circumstance caused the blacks to lose the very earliest centers of their civilization and the Heartland of the race—Egypt and the southern area that was later called the Sudan (or Land of the Blacks, just as though Egypt itself was not also formerly the "Land of the Blacks"). For the greatest of their rivers, the Nile, played still another tragic joke on its people. This river, the longest in the world, flows 4,127 miles across Africa from Lake Nyanza to the Mediterranean. Yet not until it reaches Assuan (Aswan) and begins its last stretch of 750 miles to the sea does it overflow to further enrich 13,500 square miles of already fertile soil in Egypt! For its 3,377 miles through the heart of Black Africa, the Nile sank as it cut deep canyons in its soft limestone floor, leaving cliffs at places from a few hundred to a thousand feet high. What this means is that for over 3,000 miles through the eastern side of the continent the Nile was collecting the rich soil carried to it by the heavy rains and a thousand tributary streams. These flow into the "Mother of Rivers" and add to the enrichment of its waters flowing northward, "guarded" all the way by her deep channels until it reaches the hard sandstone bottom above Assuan and then begins its periodic overflow the rest of the way to the sea! Here a natural phenomenon cheated the Africans in a big way that was to have dire consequences. There could be no black "Daughter of the Nile," observed Parsons in his *Streams of History*. For the Nile, in making Upper Ethiopia (Egypt) so rich in food production that it became world famous not only as the "Bread Basket of the World" but also for its highly advanced civilization, stirred the envy of Asia and Europe—from which continents migrants began to settle.

(Even in this, the physical geography of Africa was favorable to the "peaceful" settlers who later were to become its conquerors and rulers; for the seacoast is lowland everywhere, not more than 500 feet above sea level, and remains lowland 500 miles inland. Asian and European occupation of the sea coasts of North Africa and East Africa was, therefore, relatively easy, and probably even welcomed at first by the Blacks as co-partners in world trade. But the

poor and hungry nomads from the vast desert areas of the Middle East poured into the most fertile and easily accessible areas of this other land of deserts that is North Africa.

There were several consequences of the greatest historical importance which are generally not sufficiently stressed. The first was that both the Saharan transformation and the steady incursion of Asians pressured more and more Blacks back into the interior to concentrate in the already limited survival areas where just to subsist was a daily struggle. The second important result was the widespread amalgamation of the races. For the weaker, more submissive blacks remained in Asian-occupied territory to become slave laborers and slave soldiers, and to witness a ruthless sexual traffic in Black women that gave rise to a new breed of Afro-Asians. These were classed as Caucasians or Asians. They themselves bitterly objected to being identified with the race of their mothers—African. When these later became known as Egyptians in Egypt, Moors in Morocco and Mauretanians or Carthaginians in Carthage (Tunis) great care was taken to distinguish them from Africans in daily intercourse, in paintings and in documentary literature. This "New Breed," half-African, was to join with their Asian fathers and forefathers in the wars and enslaving raids against the blacks that went on century after century until all North Africa was eventually taken.

Still another fateful geographical factor that favored the invaders has been implied or partly stated in the foregoing observations. Aside from the easy occupation of the lowlands of the seacoast and the gradual taking over of the rich lands of the Nile valley and its ancient civilization, both Asians and Europeans found the highlands of southern and eastern Africa "more pleasant and healthy for Caucasian settlement." This meant that even after nature had damned three-fourths of the continent's land mass as impossible to support human life, the Asians and Europeans came in to seize and hold the best of the one-fourth that was left. The Blacks found themselves cut off from all seacoasts that then mattered, hemmed in from all directions, and confined within narrower and narrower limits. Thus they became a wandering people, forever migrating in their own vast homeland, fragmenting from great united nations into countless little splinter societies, becoming so isolated from each other that each formed a new language of its own, considered itself quite different from its original brothers—

now regarded as strangers and enemies in the endless tribal wars that ensued over the inhabitable land. The land over which these struggles went on varied in different regions. So did the climate that so greatly affected it; the people and even some of their institutions varied under environmental influences. The land mass in the eastern regions, for example, has been undergoing a vertical movement of elevation and sinking along with a leveling process occasioned by the atmosphere and weathering since Miocene times. Geologists trace the elevation of the mountains in the area—even Kilimanjaro—and the faulting and fracturing that created the Great Rift, to early volcanic activity.

In the arid and semi-arid regions there are vast stretches of desolate land which were not made so by nature alone. For, like the Sahara itself, much of it was once woodland where animal life flourished and streams flowed. Man played the leading role in its destruction by fire in his shifting farm methods. Animals helped in the process. The relation of green grass and forest to climate and climate to rainfall seems not to have been known or fully appreciated. In treeless and grassless areas the periodic rains evaporate into non-water-holding earth. One may travel hundreds of miles over regions of this kind without finding a single stream. All rivers and streams have disappeared like the rain-drops in the sand. Because of the same physical characteristics of the land previously discussed, irrigation was extremely difficult, and in most places impossible, outside of Egypt.

We have spoken so much about African deserts of sand and rocks that one might be misled by thinking that it was this kind of land alone that could not support a population. But there were vast non-desert areas of hard red and red-brown soil that had been leached by heavy rainfall, robbed of its essential elements for vegetation (such as calcium and phosphorus), and, of course, its once rich humus of top-soil. This continuous weathering was obviously destructive. The soil problem was further aggravated by having underneath floors of hard laterite elements—just as though there was a master plan to guarantee that this soil would not hold any water. Therefore the problem involved far more than restoring top-soil and a land conservation program to prevent erosion, because this hard floor underneath drains away the rainfall as fast as it reached that level. "No corner or scrap of land in Africa has

escaped hunger," says Josue de Castro in his *Geography of Hunger*. "This is a continent of the starving, all of it. And in hunger and chronic malnutrition may be found one of the most decisive reasons for the backwardness of Africa, for the relative stagnation and lassitude of the greater part of its people."

But the "Garden of Eden" areas must not be overlooked when we are considering the general, overall conditions. These are areas which, while not comparable to the rich flood plains of the Nile valley and Delta, have unfertilized soil that nevertheless produce a surprisingly rapid growth of abundant vegetation and a heavy concentration of animal and bird life. These are the areas where fruits and nuts of many varieties grow in abundance without the aid of man. Without these areas of salvation here and there over the continent, along with pastoral grazing land, the Blacks as a race would have doubtlessly perished from the earth.

They almost did. The trend once seemed to be definitely in the direction of extinction. Even if we dismiss accounts of planned mass extermination by their enemies as "unreliable," too many other threats to survival remained to darken every ray of hope. Disease was everywhere the offspring of distress, privation, hunger and malnutrition. It spread over the land as advance scouts for death. Over half of Africa's babies were either born dead or died soon after birth. Old age was between forty and fifty years. Three-fourths of the people—even today in our own time—are still weakened by malnutrition and malarial water, and a number of diseases that are largely traceable to these two causes—beriberi, pellagra, scurvy and even leprosy. The scourge of childhood is Kwaskiokor, or malignant malnutrition.

This accelerated depopulation of the black man's countries resulting from the nature of soil and climate, mass enslavement, deaths in resisting slavery, wars of conquest, intertribal conflicts, exhaustions from endless flights and migrations and ever-present disease—all this reduced the black population by three fourths! Under reasonable, favorable conditions, the African population today would be four times its present number. And when it is pointed out that three-fourths of the people today are still weakened by malaria and malnutrition, reference is made to the one-fourth of the people who survived in spite of it all.

How, then, were the Blacks able to battle invading enemies

from one end of the continent to the other for several thousand years? True, they were overcome in the end, but what sustained them through all those centuries of struggle on so many different fronts and against so many different kinds of enemies? Weakened so generally by both disease and what became perpetual hunger, whence came their strength and courage to carry on? It may well be that the answers lie in the death-defying pyramids they built in Egypt when the land was theirs. There must be a number of pre-conditions without which the genius of any people for thinking, inventing, discovering and building will be inhibited and may even die under extreme circumstances.

PRE-CONDITIONS FOR PROGRESS

A few of these pre-conditions for progress are: (1) The people must become famine-free, and be able to end their perennial roaming from place to place in search of food and water, and settle down. (2) Having found suitable territory, the leaders must proceed, through negotiations with other neighboring societies and fragmented groups, to *nation-building*. (3) There must be developed—and this is a crucial pre-condition—a sense of national community among the various language groups that make up the country. This is so important that it cannot be left to wishful thinking or chance. It must be *programmed* in such a way that a sense of loyalty and of being an important part of a great united brotherhood, which is the nation itself, will develop naturally. (4) A strong army for defense. (5) The reign of law and justice, applying equally to all classes in the society. The people must feel absolutely secure as individuals, and that in *their* country there is equal justice for all.

In short, certain conditions in a country can bring about that internal peace, stability, and confidence which unshackle the mind. There is now *time to think*. No more trekking with bleeding feet for hundreds of miles across rocky deserts. No more seeing your kinsmen fall out and welcome death along the way. A home at last, better farms, plenty of food. And now . . . *time to think*.

There is nothing mystical about the reasons why one group of people can easily become physically and mentally strong while another becomes physically weak and less mentally alert. An abun-

dance of nutritious food and pure drinking water may spell the difference between advance and decay. The number of death-dealing diseases developing from malnutrition alone is alarming. But what should be stressed above everything else is that millions of babies may become both physically and mentally retarded by disease while in their mother's wombs—which is another way of saying that a people wholly ignorant or indifferent to basic health can themselves become inferior in fact. But even this central fact, when fully realized, will still remain in the field of mere discussion until Blacks everywhere begin mass organization for mass education of the masses. The system is so structured—world-wide—that Blacks are forced into conditions that can lead to inferiority even genetically. There must be a breakthrough or gradual extinction. This is the final pre-condition for survival and advancement.

Your attention is called again to the map of Africa, for it is very significant where the earliest invaders entered and permanently settled. They took over the areas of trade and easy contacts with their homeland and the other nations of the world—a point that simply cannot be overstressed in considering the plight of the African people. In the north they settled around the Mediterranean, thereby maintaining contact with Europe and Asia. In the north-east, east, and south, they settled along the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, thereby keeping in touch with their homeland and the trade with countries farther away. Black Africa was thus hemmed in and effectively cut off commercially and otherwise from the rest of the world.

The techniques of penetration and dominance were varied. Some came as peaceful traders and, doubtless, trade was all that was intended by many. Africans were always eager traders. The main attraction of foreign traders was that they brought in many new kinds of commodities. These traders had little or no trouble in gaining coastal footholds as trading posts. The land was not sold, but leased. However, the Blacks had what the world wanted most: Gold, diamonds, ivory, copper, iron ore and, themselves.

The "trading posts" soon became strong fortifications around which villages and towns sprang up as settlers from Asia poured in and armed forces became organized. The Africans watched these developments with increasing apprehension, for the "traders" were often armed with superior and different types of weapons of war

and spent much time in training recruits, including Africans. Indeed, in some areas a definite pattern emerged: an all-African army under Asian officers (a pattern to be followed later by the Europeans).

This was easy enough for the Arabs. They owned the captured Africans who made up their fighting forces. The Africans could blame only themselves for this. Here, as in certain other things, they were still engaged in practices which, while once universal, had long since been dying out or generally abandoned by the rest of the world. This one was the enslavement of captured prisoners of war. When African chiefs and kings began to sell these to slave-hungry Arabs, they set in motion a chain of events that was to undermine the civilizations of the most advanced societies on the continent, further checking their progress and degrading their whole race for another two thousand years. When the sale of their fellows became the chief source of wealth, African leaders became increasingly estranged from the finest thing in African life, the sense of community and of kinship with all who would be friends. When greed severed the traditional ties of brotherhood, gradual movement of the invaders from the coastal areas inland became relatively easy. Blacks against blacks with increasing suspicion and hatred may be traced to the Africans' own slave raids. The inland raids for slaves were resisted by some chiefs and the raiders were attacked. But this opposition was not always due to any opposition to slavery, but to this kind of direct action which by-passed the chiefs and thereby eliminated their profits.¹

THE CONQUEST OF THE BLACKS BY RELIGION

Other invaders found penetration easy under the banners of religion. Full advantage was taken of the fact that Africans are a very religious people.² First came the Crescent flag of the Prophet.

1. There were, however, numerous chiefs who not only opposed slavery, but fought against it to the death—literally. Some were encircled and with their whole people died fighting the enslaver to the end.

2. The Christian churches of 4th century Africa were independent of Western imperialism. They therefore could not be used as bases.

The Islamic advance was three-pronged: proselytizing missions claiming one brotherhood; widespread intermarriages and concubinage with African women, due to Muslim system of polygamy; and forceful conversions at sword point. The Cross of Jesus Christ followed the Muslim Crescent. The cloak of Christianity was a most convenient hiding place for those who had other designs. Hence the drive to convert. Conversion here meant far more than conversion to Christianity. As in the case of Islam, it meant change into the white man's image, his ideas and value system. The real object of worship turned out to be neither Jesus Christ nor his Father, God, but Western man and Western civilization. Christian brotherhood? Well, eh, yes! *In principle*. Or, to be practical, you blacks can have all the Christian brotherhood you desire—among yourselves. *Apartheid* was Africa-wide under colonialism, and not a peculiarity of the South African system as so many are led to think.³

But what happened in the process of converting the blacks to Islam and Christianity was the supreme triumph of the white world over the black. Millions of Africans became non-Africans. Africans who were neither Muslims nor Christians were classed as "pagans" and therefore required to disavow their whole culture and to regard practically all African institutions as "backward" or savage. The blacks in their own right became non-persons—members of a race of nobodies, and so hopeless that self-realization as personalities, even in a subordinate status, could only be achieved by becoming Muslims or Christians. Indeed, in order to destroy completely not only their African heritage but also their very African identity psychologically, they were forced to change their names to Arabic and Christian names. Henceforth, if these black Emils, Johns, Muhammads, Samuels, and Abdullaahs happened to achieve greatness in some field, the assumption would be that it was Caucasian achievement, unless a special effort was made to identify the race of the persons in question. Blacks at home in Africa and blacks scattered over the world bore the names of their enslavers and oppressors—the ultimate in self-effacement that promoted a self-hatred which made pride in race difficult. That these

3. The pattern of continent-wide segregated communities can be seen even today in independent African states.

psychological shackles still handicap not only the rebirth of modern African states but also blacks everywhere should be obvious to all.

Finally, there were the invaders who apparently disdained the cloak of deception and came in fighting. They had no problems. They knew in advance that they would find the Africans almost everywhere unprepared to defend themselves against a well-organized, well-trained body of men, no matter how small. This situation developed as splinter, independent little states became more and more numerous. The use of secret agents seems to be as old as organized states; for the practice of sending spies as goodwill ambassadors, traders, etc., well in advance into a country to be invaded goes far back into antiquity. Those sent into Africa from various lands could report back that:

1. The Africans were largely a peaceful people engaged in agriculture, mining trade, fishing, the arts, crafts of various kinds and manufacturing such things as pottery, furniture, building materials, boats, weapons of war, etc.

2. That these settled states and their generally highly developed social and political systems indicate their advanced civilization.

3. But that they are ill-prepared for war, except against their neighbors, who also use the kind of spears, bows and arrows which we abandoned long since.

4. In general, they have no swiftly moving mounted soldiers. One hundred of our dashing calvarymen with fire-power could put 10,000 of them to flight.

5. They are a secretive people. For while they are fully aware of the great mineral wealth of the continent, they use it in a very limited way, mainly for personal adornment, and have no desire to open up to foreigners for world commerce that would greatly benefit them. They accordingly rigidly limit their trading activities, but mainly because Asians hold all of their seacoasts and have them cut off from the world and its trade.

6. Finally, the whole of Africa could, with a few exceptions, be progressively taken over simply by picking off one small state after another. For the over-all pattern of the continent is one of countless small independent groups, each for itself and itself alone. There is no unity among them, even for a common defense. Since it is the first duty of each chief to protect his people, all seem to

be too proud to seek unity with other chiefs, thinking this might indicate a sign of weakness and itself invite attack. . . .

Therefore it could have been truthfully reported to either Asia or Europe any time during the last thousand years that the widespread segmentation and attending disunity among the Africans made them easy to conquer and dominate.

(Some of these six hypothetical items would be valid as conclusions regarding a general situation only after the widespread collapse of strong African states, when small splinter states spread over the continent like an epidemic. But, as we shall see, the united resistance of the Blacks to white Asian invasions had been going on before recorded history began; and, despite all the segmentations and endless invasions from the North, South, East and West, there were black nations that kept up the resistance of five thousand years right down into the 20th century. We shall review some of these in chapters which follow.