

VULINDLELA

7

BBB

4-(4) 1976

WOBOGO

20-29, 72

Diop's Two Cradle Theor
and the
Origin of White Racism

409 241-8666

Did white racism originate with capitalism as a rationale for African enslavement in the sixteenth century? If so, it leaves many situations in history waiting for explanation. How does it explain, for example, the presence of racism in East India, in pre-capitalist Arabia and in situations in general where Black and white races clashed with whites gaining dominance? Or how does it explain the anti-Black character of European languages, especially the terror that is associated with the terms "Black" and its many manifestations? 1 If linguistics prove that this terror is older than 1500 B.C. explanation must be sought in an ancient antagonistic Black-white interaction, prior to 1500 B.C. And though there have been attempts to explain white racism as originating in pre-historic times, our frame of reference is the period during which documented evidence exists concerning European nomadic culture. 2

A more plausible explanation for the origin of white racism may be constructed with the help of Cheikh Anta Diop's two cradle theory, one cradle being the Southern (African) cradle and the other being the Northern (European) cradle. Dr. Diop who was born in Senegal in 1923, earned his Ph.D. at the Sorbonne in Paris and is presently the Director of the Radiocarbon Laboratory in Senegal. His theory implies clearly that white racism was a result of early European nomadism and the ethnocentric-

xenophobic mentality which resulted from it. Ethnocentrism is a lack of tolerance for other races and xenophobia is a fear of strangers. Diop himself does not explicitly make this connection but his theory clearly implies it if interpreted correctly.

Diop's two cradle theory is based on three premises. His first premise is that:

There existed in the beginning, before the successive contact of peoples and of nations, before the age of reciprocal influences, certain non-essential relative differences among peoples. These differences had to do with the climate and the specific conditions of life. The people who lived for a lengthy period of time in their place of origin were moulded in a durable fashion.... 3

This implies that a people's collective personality (political-economic-social structure) is determined in their formative years i.e., their first intense experience as a people, much as a child's personality is determined in its first 4-6 years. These basic traits persist even under changes in social organization and in geographical location.

Diop's second premise concerns the opposite character of civilization in the two cradles. Chart A, though not comprehensive, presents some of the qualities which were characteristic of each of the cradles.

Chart A

Quality	Southern Cradle (African)	Northern Cradle (European)
Descent	Patrilineal	Matrilineal
Gods	Familial Gods	One Universal God
Social Philosophy	Individualistic, Xenophobic	Collective, Xenophilic
Ancestor Worship	Cremation	Burial
Mode of Existence	Nomadic	Agrarian, Settled

Northern = left
(European) column

Southern = right
(African) column

Diop's second premise states this opposite character explicitly:

In passing from South to North all cultural values are overthrown and became opposite as the poles. To sum up, ancient Africa was opposed to Europe in its conceptions of domestic life, state craft, philosophy, etc. The stratification of the two sociological realities can be discerned there at every level, in every epoch and in all fields.⁴

To explain this opposite character Diop formulated his third and fundamental premise:

The requirements of *nomadic life* and those of *settled life* provide all the elements of an explanation which makes it possible to clarify the subject.⁵

Diop's theory was formulated largely to disprove that of Bachofen, a European writer, who proposed a universal transition from promiscuity to matriarchy to patriarchy in all societies. Diop's two cradle theory instead links a matrilineal descent system (not matriarchy in the "domination by women" sense) to African agrarian life, and a patrilineal descent system (which for Europe was equal to "domination by men") to European nomadic life. A matrilineal system resulted from the balance economic input from men and women in agricultural society. Additionally, the African wife was entrusted with inheritance rights because she remained at home and was therefore more stable than the man who was, even in agrarian society, more nomadic than the female and more exposed to physical and social risks, thus men and women had complementary equivalent roles in African agrarian society.

A patrilineal descent system resulted historically from the lesser role of European women in nomadic life. The upkeep of the home as a role was non-existent because, the home was non-existent, i.e., home was the wagon. Since she was also useless on the hunt, the European women's only real role was procreation, hence she was devalued in European society. The origins of European homosexuality (rampant in Ancient Greece) and prostitution can perhaps be traced to this devaluation.

The other qualities in Chart A follow logically from Diop's theory. Burial for example is logical for those whose sustenance came from the soil whereas cremation allowed nomads to also worship their ancestors by carrying the ashes with

them. Diop's work can be consulted for further information.⁶ But our concern here is the xenophobic-ethnocentric social philosophy which became white racism, the problem of the 20th century.

Racism, A Mass Based Social Philosophy (Mass Philosophy)

Before continuing, we would like to distinguish between what we will call a mass philosophy⁷ and a theory. A theory is produced and understood by a smaller number of people. The masses seldom know or understand it. Contrarily, a mass philosophy is a set of ideas and values possessed by everyday people. It has become part of the behavioral pattern of all of the people. White racism has the latter character and is therefore primarily a mass philosophy, and secondarily a theory. A mass philosophy is the result of a common experience shared by all and that is why we must seek white racism's origins in an experience common to whites in ancient times, not in a theory the masses neither saw nor understood.

From Nomadism to Racism

White racism originated in pre-capitalist European nomadism. It is from this specific condition that the ethnocentric-xenophobic mentality of Europeans developed. This social philosophy or value system became a mass philosophy after thousands of years of nomadic existence and in turn became white racism when the white race came in contact with Black and other races of color (red and yellow) and dominated them. Prior to the actual domination of white over Blacks, i.e., during the period of Black world dominance, the mentality could only be expressed as an extreme individualism, a lack of tolerance for other cultures (ethnocentrism) and races (ethnocentrism) and an actual fear of other races. (Xenophobia).

The progression from nomadism to individualism and xenophobia is logical just as is the progression from agriculture to collectivism and xenophilia (love of strangers). According to Diop:

The sedentary life and the nomadic life not only gave way to two types of family but equally to two forms of the state. Collectivism is the logical consequence of agricultural sedentaryism...⁸

Agriculture demands cooperation on a large scale for planting, harvesting, irrigation, distribution etc. Eventually this

racism from a perspective who saw the minority to secure themselves

white was a mass philosophy

white theory

mass philosophy

economic balance

No household - because of nomadism role of white female-devalued

origins of European homosexuality

nomadic

communal activity must transcend even extended family boundaries, as it did in Egypt.

It is known that the form of the Nile Valley demanded from the population from the time they installed themselves there, a general communal activity on the part of the nomes and all of the towns to cope with natural phenomena such as the floods of the river. The obligation to break the too-narrow isolating limits of the primitive family, that is the clan; the necessity of having a strong central power transcending the individual and co-ordinating the work, administrative and cultural unification, all this was implicit in the material conditions of existence. Thus, the primitive clans soon merged to become no more than administrative divisions (the nomes). The state appeared with its apparatus of government perfected to the smallest details, without our being able to trace, except through legend, an anterior existence of a period of nomadic life, and this is valid for Egypt, Ethiopia and the remainder of Black Africa. 9

Diop further contrasts this African development with that in Europe:

In Europe, among the Aryans, the nomadic style of life makes each family, an absolute entity, and autonomous cell, independent in all its purposes, self sufficient from an economic or other point of view. In addition, the head of the family does not have to account for anybody, there is no authority higher than his own, no religion above his, no morality outside domestic morality. This situation, born during the nomadic life, perpetuated itself for a long time after sedentarisation. Fustel de Coulanges showed that individual rights among the Aryans was anterior to the foundation of cities, and that this is the reason why, for a long time, the state had no power to interfere in the private life of families, that is to say that in Rome and Greece during whole centuries a man could kill his son, his wife or his slaves or sell them, without committing a crime against the state, which was then the city. Public authority stopped at the door of a man's house. 10

Individualism obviously took root early in Europe and predestined Europeans to develop highly individualistic competitive institutions and philosophies such as

capitalism and Darwinism. The practice of assigning such development and qualities to all peoples based on purely speculative arguments is unscientific and therefore inexcusable.

European Individualism prevented the unifications of its first body of civilized people from forming a nation.

The very nature of the institutions was opposed to the unification of the territories to form a nation... While the domestic institutions of the Aryans belonged to them in their own right, their political institutions seem to have been borrowed from the outside. This particularism of institutions, which did not provide for the case of the foreigner, and the xenophobia which was a consequence of it, explains the frenzied patriotism of the Greco-latins... the idea of a stranger being free and enjoying a juridical individuality never occurred to the Greco-latins. To kill a stranger was not a crime; the laws making no provision for his case, he was unable to lay a complaint against anyone and could not be tried by any tribunal. A man was a man only at home.

This xenophobia survives today even in colonial and neo-colonial Africa. Hospitality is an example at this, which even colonization was not able to destroy. Here is the reason for the basically open door policy of African society which was the great historian Chancellor Williams felt was a fatal flaw, but whose origin he was not able to fully explain.

Individual right and xenophobia was basic values in the European cradle, even in settled white society. Nomads must have possessed these traits in even cruder form. Such people would be embryonic racists whose reaction to a Black race would be paranoic, such as it was in East India, however, we must keep in mind that the contact of the barbaric whites or even partially civilized ones like the early Greeks with cosmopolitan sophisticated Blacks such as Cushites, Nubians, and Egyptians would not produce racism. It would produce instead a powerful feeling of cultural and technical inferiority in the whites. The ethnocentric-xenophobic mass philosophy would remain suppressed by the objective reality but reinforced by the domestic institutions that persisted in concrete form (religious rites, legend, traditions, etc.). If whites came to power (such as in East India) these attitudes would flower into racism. Institutions

borrowed from the Blacks would have racism super imposed on them, thus, the African skill-determined caste system in pre-Aryan East India became a racist institution. This type of racism didn't occur in Africa or in areas conquered by Africans due to the social structure of African society which prohibited the development of racism and of capitalism even when conditions favorable for their evolution were present.

The Capitalist Origin/Socialist Destruction Myth

Most Marxist, socialist, and many non-Marxian social scientists claim that racism originated after and as a result of Capitalism and therefore will disappear when capitalism disappears. Five criticisms can be directed at this premise. The first is that racism preceded capitalism (the subject of this paper). Even exponents of the capitalist origin theory usually show that slavery begat racism before capitalism existed. The second is that the capitalism origin premise does not explain the mass character of racism in several European countries which speak different languages and have different cultures. Gobineau's theory never reached the essentially illiterate white masses in his time. ¹⁴ So his and other theories cannot account for it. ¹⁵ The third criticism has been stated, i.e., European languages are anti-Black. There has not been enough time since capitalism began for all these different languages to have acquired this same character. ¹⁶ Fourth, if the reason for racism was conquest then all conquered people should have been judged equally inferior. They were not. Orientals were considered strange, exotic, and even barbaric but not unintelligent (except, ironically, by Karl Marx and a few others). Yellow people were considered to be less inferior than Blacks because they were less Black, not simply because they weren't conquered or were conquered to a lesser degree.

¹⁷ The fifth criticism deals with the contention that the elimination of capitalism will eliminate racism. As others have noted, even if capitalism were racism's mother, elimination of capitalism would not necessarily mean elimination of racism. All living things are capable of reproduction, but the children survive after the parent dies, often changing their nature in doing so. Today racism is firmly rooted in the white masses. contrarily, capitalism is not. The average white does not understand what

capitalism is nor can they practice it, but they can practice racism which is reinforced by their whole culture. A change to another political system (dictatorship of the white proletariat for example) will not alter the collective mentality of a given people in any reasonable period of time.

There are considerations. White workers, whom socialists claim are not really racists, do not perceive it to be in their interest to eliminate racism. As the U.S.A. declines, whites will reason that a minority Black population is expendable. A genocidal war against Blacks would appear to be an easy solution for an already armed, organized white population. ¹⁸ Under white-dominated socialism protest in any form about racism will be outlawed as against the revolution (as in Cuba). Meetings among Blacks for any reason will be illegal. Many of the superstructures of capitalism can be placed on a socialist base without serious modification of the former, just as can be done with a house. In any event, we are doomed if we place our survival in the hands of any white body. People struggle in their own interests. We must struggle in ours.

We have established a theoretical explanation for the origin of racism. We will now discuss a concrete example of a pre-capitalist racist system established by whites, i.e. East India, complete with a racist theory for good measure.

East India— Racism not Caste

the structure of East Indian society today is a powerful argument for a pre-capitalist origin of white racism. The oppression of the Sundras, the Blackest East Indians and the lowest caste in that society is identical to that of Blacks in colonial society and it demonstrates clearly that the creation of color heirarcies is one of the oldest political and social institutions of European origin. East India, is not the only strong evidence however. The racial interactions in Acient Egypt, so well analyzed by Chancellor Williams, the writings of Al Jahiz in the ninth century A.D. (before capitalism) concerning racist white Arabs, the racist remarks of persons such as Ibn Khaldoun, the great deception about the theft of Africa civilization by the "Greeks," and the structure of Arab countries today demonstrate our main thesis. But East India is the clearest modern example of an evolved ancient racist system, even though the original Aryan invaders are no longer strictly white in color because they are a

- Env factors
- Philosophy
- Economics
- Biology-social Darwinism

slavery begat racism before Capitalism

numerical minority in a Black land.

Our main source of information is a work by two East Indian writers, G.P. Malalaskera and K.N. Jayatilleke entitled "*Buddhism and the Race Question*." The rationale for the study is given in the preface.

"The reason why Mr. Malalaskera and Mr. Jayatilleke have confined themselves to this particular aspect of the subject is that like many historians and sociologists, they attribute the origin of the caste system, at least in large measure, to the Indo-European invaders of India. the authors of this booklet rightly stress the close analogy existing, in various countries, between different racial groups. The resemblance is particularly striking when it comes to the behavior of those who claim superiority on the strength of membership of a privilege caste, the color of their skin, or even the type of their hair. 17

CASTE system
in India results
of Indo-European
Invasion is
synonymous with
racism

The authors then review two studies done on castes, one on blood type and one on nasal indexes, and they state:

The blood types of these two groups are quite different and differences like these were also found in six other gene-determined characters. They are in fact at least as different in these traits as American whites and American Negroes.....18

This is important. In most cases, the upper caste is no longer a true European type, but the gap in blood type between castes has remained. So on a relative basis (which is all that matters) the two castes, and others as well, function as though they represent two races.

The authors then refer to a study by another historian.

It is interesting to note that Risely, who argued for a racial origin of caste, observed after comparing the nasal indexes of some of the caste of Hindustan that the order of graduation established by means of the nasal index is substantially the same as that of social precedence.19

The nasal index per se does not mark a person as Black or white, but we are trying to point out that an original discernable difference in blood type and nasal index has been maintained and is related to the social hierarchy (racism) in that society.

The preceding has established that race

and caste are functionally equivalent. We would therefore expect a theory of racism to be present to compliment the practice of racism. In fact there was such a theory.

* The East Indian Racism Theory

East India's theory of racism was due to two ancient teachers, Purana Kassapa and Makkhali Gosala. Their racist theory was blatant.

There is however, a philosophical theory of racism held by some of the religious teachers in the Buddhas time which is mentioned and criticized in the Buddhas texts. It is associated with two teachers both of whom denied free will to man. One was Purana Kasapa who denied man's capacity for moral action in virtue of the fact that he had no free will. The other was Makkhali Gosala, who denied both free will and causation and argued that beings were miraculously saved (ahetu appaccuya Satta Visujjhanity) or doomed. They argued that human beings belonged to one or another of six species (abhijati) or specific types; in virtue of which they had certain genetic constitutions, physical traits and habits and psychological natures which they were incapable of altering by their own will and effort. The six types were designated by six colors. They were the black species Kana-habhijati), the blue species, the red species, the yellow species, the white species, and the pure white species. Whether these colors denoted differences in their physical complexion is not clear, but that they were genetically different in physical and psychological types is what is implied by the classification. To the black species belonged the butchers, towlers, hunters, fisherman, dacoit and executioners and all those who adopt a cruel mode of living. They were incidentally, among the lower castes and their complexions was on the whole the darkest. The other five types differed in virtue by their degree of wickedness or saintliness, which was not in their power to alter. The pure white species were considered to be the perfect saints, though their saintliness was considered to be natural to them as much as their physical constitutions and was in no way achieved by any effort or will on their part.20

This theory makes that of Gobineau appear mild by comparison and demonstrates clearly that Gobineau's theory was not the first of its kind in history. The opposition of Buddhism to such ideas was natural being that Buddha was apparently a Black, Egypto-Nubian priest who would automatically oppose an anti-Black doctrine.²¹ The racist theory even clearly accounts for the intermediate position of red and yellow persons who were probably the result of miscegenation. Recent colonial and neo-colonial society exhibit this same characteristic. In Portuguese colonies it is the mulattoes, in East Africa and parts of the Caribbean it is East Indians who are migrants from the lighter skinned upper classes of East India.

We have established that the caste system is functionally equivalent to a racial system and that a theory of racism existed but the essence of racism is the reduction of the despised race to subhuman status. East Indian culture demonstrates this quality. A particularly revealing passage describing the official view of the Sundras (relative niggers) in East India points this out:

The members of the lower castes were considered to be physically ugly, loathsome, and deformed; the chandalas....are described as-black, ill featured, hunched back, a prey to many diseases, purblind or with a crooked hand, lame or paralyzed, while the higher castes the Ksatriyas (rulers)....are described as handsome, fair looking and charming. But much more reprehensible is the fact that the Sundras (lowest castes, out-castes) were in the opinion of the high castes, by birth and nature intellectually and morally deficient as well. As Ghurye observes; Manu declares roundly that a Sundra cannot commit an offense causing loss of his caste so degraded was he.²²

We come to a key phrase:

The Sathpatha goes so far as to say that a Sudra (outcaste) is untruth itself. (emphasis mine)²³

We should like to stop and compare this phrase, and those preceding it, with a passage from a book which describes colonial African society as constructed by the white settler:

...as if to know the totalitarian character of colonial exploitation the settler paints the native as a sort of quintessence of evil...He represents

not only the absence of values, but also the negation of values. He is, let us dare to admit the enemy of values, and in this sense he is the absolute evil.

The similarity of these statements is significant. In both cases the identification of the Black element with evil (as opposed to being product of evil influence) is total and complete. Here we witness an exact identity of two systems separated by several thousand years and miles but linked to a common creator, white nomads from the northern cradle, the most recent one possessing technology and the ancient one a barbarian.

In the area of politics, severe restrictions were placed on the Sundras:

It was unthinkable, in the opinion of higher castes, that the members of the lower castes should be considered fit to govern and administer (the duty of the Ksatriyas) or to render the rulers advice (the duty of the Brahmins). Even if a Sundra mentions the name and class of the twice born arrogantly, an iron nail ten fingers long shall be thrust red hot into his mouth. If he proudly teaches Brahmins (priests) their duty the King shall cause hot oil to be poured into his mouth and into his ears.²⁵

There is a close parallel here with the contention that the continental African or the African born in the U.S.A. cannot govern himself. Here also it is indicated that the Sundra at times did these very things for which punishment had to be prescribed, just as colonial Blacks often "got out of their place."

In the area of economics, the laws (actually taken from the Laws of Manu) were equally harsh:

In ancient India especially in those regions where Brahminism most strongly prevailed, the Sundra was not only considered the servant of another, but also regarded as one who could be expelled to do servile work. For he was created by the self existent to the slave of a Brahmin....A sundra though emancipated by his master is not released from servitude, since that is innate in him, who can set him free from it? ²⁶

The parallel with attitudes of whites in Africa and America toward enslaved Blacks is clear. A slave in America could

also be killed by another white without punishment because a slave was below property and considered a slave by nature, yet, this system we are now describing preceded that in the dispora by nearly three thousand years and is actually more severe since a free slave was free in fact in America. This system obviously is not unique to capitalism but is unique to a given people, i.e., Europeans, whites.

It might be argued by some that these severe attitudes developed only after attitudes had hardened in ancient India from long periods of conflict. This is not true. The caste restrictions were simply a more advanced state of fundamental quality. We return to the authors:

The strength of the racial hypothesis lies in the fact that it can explain so many factors of castes prejudice; the Rigveda sometimes gives vivid accounts of what the Aryan felt among the Aborigines among whom he had to settle down. One hymn says: "We are surrounded on all sides by Daysu tribes. They do not perform sacrifices; they do not believe in anything. They are not men! Kill them. Destroy the Dasa race." We find here the usual pre-conditions of racial prejudice.²⁷

I would agree with all but one term pre-conditions! Here we find not even something as mild as racial prejudice, but racial hatred in fact. The basis of this hatred (or fear and an ethnocentric-xenophobic mentality to be accurate) was racial and cultural:

The migrant invaders have encountered a tribe of people who are considered to be racially and culturally different. The physical differences are striking. The Aborigines are dark skinned and noseless (anasa). They have a different language and a different religion, in short a different culture...they were devoid of Vedic rituals (ahar-man), not worshipping Vedic gods (adeva-yo), non-sacrificing (ayajvan), phallus worshippers (sisna-devah), lawless (avrata)...²⁸

Obviously, the attitudes came with the Aryan and only became codified into law after conquest was complete. Clearly the invading Aryan brought the same attitudes, set up the same system and used the same methods of oppression whether in India, colonial Africa or the dispora.

Some are of the opinion that the East Indian caste system was formed long before the Aryan arrival. Diop himself maintains that in essence the East Indian caste system was an African system which was based on the four basic divisions, i.e., the agrarians, the skilled persons, and the priests, and the King but, we should distinguish between Diop's contention of a caste system based on function as a African system with an agalitarian structure, and the obvious racial and other determinants and modifications imposed perhaps on that caste system by the invading Aryans. In fact he states the case correctly when he asserts:

Thus, this caste system seems to result from a recent transformation of Indian Society with the decline of Dravidian supremacy.²⁹

This is true, the decline of Dravidian supremacy began with the conquest by the Aryans, and therefore we agree with Diop concerning absolute origins, but we contend that the East Indian caste system we are familiar with was based on race, as is obvious from the word used to designate caste in East India: "Varna," which literally means "skin color":

If there is a basic similarity between the nature of caste prejudice and discrimination and of racial prejudices and discrimination, and if it is likely that it was these racial prejudices which became concealed in the caste prejudices of a later day— to which the word for caste or "varna" which means "skin color" still appears to bear witness— then in the combating these latter prejudices we are dealing with the problem of racism in another form, and objections against either caste or racism would be ipso facto objections against the other.³⁰

The indications at this time are that the word "varna" or at least its skin color interpretation by the Aryans of ancient India was not used by the indigenous population to designate caste. If, the caste system preceded the invasion by the Aryan, then knowledge of the word for caste prior to the use of "varna" would enable us to determine exactly when and why "varna" replaced this word. (It is unlikely that Africans used "varna" to designate caste in skin color sense). Reference to African settlement of early East India will clear up this confusion. Our opinion at this time is that the present hard caste lines in East

India were result of the effects of Aryan racism on an African caste system which was skilled determined. The caste system even today, is identical with a racial system and this identity with racist systems outside East India is due to a common origin; the European, who's attitudes were forced in nomadism, their first experiences as a people.

The Origin of Capitalism

Since it has been postulated by many (if not most) that capitalism is racism's mother, a brief explanation of the origins of capitalism would be instructive. Diop's two cradle theory indicated clearly that capitalism had its origins in early European extreme individualism. Europe, never went through communal period (as Marx erroneously contended). The moment they settled down to the land, it was on an individualistic basis. Feudalism differs little from capitalism in this respect. The principal of slavery and private ownership of the "means of production" was peculiar to Greece just as it was to feudal and capitalist Europe.

Diop explained the significance of the commonly known European traits, the tendency toward glorification of robbery and intrigue (present today on T.V.) which are closely related to the gangster like mentality of a capitalist:

Crime violence, war and a taste for risk, so many sentiments born of the climate and the early conditions of existence all predisposed the Aryan world, extraordinary as this may appear, to a great historical destiny. 31 (emphasis mine)

This historical destiny was imperialism and capitalism, imperialism being simply a world wide manifestation of European nomadism and capitalism and manifestation of European individualism. The qualities relating to crime, war, and risk fit perfectly the gangster mentality of a capitalist. Coupled with the aversion to tilling the soil and the early establishment of individual right before the establishment of cities, it would seem logical that capitalism and imperialism would result from this collection of qualities especially when coupled with the excess capital created by slavery.

Africans did not develop capitalism because of the structure of African Society. Both Chancellor Williams and Diop have stated that elements of capitalism existed

in ancient Africa. Diop commented on this in ancient Egypt:

The labor force was therefore free and contractual in urban or rural communities, comparable in that respect to workers in capitalist countries. In this second form capitalism could appear and as a matter of fact there was a marginal capitalism with the appearance of a business class who rented land in the countryside and hired hands to cultivate it. Like the farmers of Europe, their sole aim was to amass huge profits, the same business practices were carried on in the cities.... Apparently, the only safeguard to prevent these practices from developing into a strong capitalism was the practically inalienable rights of the Egyptian citizen. This was a special feature of the juridical organization and the Egyptian ethical code. 32

So, the agrarian development in Africa prevented the growth of capitalism even when conditions existed for its development. Remember that slavery was necessary for true capitalist development, and that is why Marx and Engels stated it so unequivocally. Africans never developed slave based economies such as Grecian, European, and American ones, so they never developed capitalism. Much more work is needed in this area. Suffice it to say that European nomadism appears to be the fundamental determinant in the development of European imperialism and capitalism.

Footnotes on page 72.

Vullndlela Wobogo has been involved in the Black Struggle since the sit-in days. He was an integral part of the BSU movement and has worked with various groups in the last ten years. He is also a physical Chemist, Musician, and Historian. His only other publication to date is "Fanon's 4-Stage Path of Decolonization" in Kitabu Cha Juá Summer edition, 1974. He resides with his wife Nozipo and daughter Enitianwa in California. He attended the sixth Pan African Congress as a science delegate in 1974.

Capitalism
is racism's
MOTHER

Capitalism a
manifestation
of individualism
Imperialism a
manifestation
of European
nomadism

The history of Russian and Chinese involvement in Africa is a complex one. To fully grasp the complexities of this involvement would, indeed, require travel and much study of original documents. However, from the sources available, the Sino-Soviet policy in Africa seems to be of a triangular nature, that is, the USSR, China and the USA are bouncing from policy to policy, stalled by outdated ideology yet continuing to play catch with each other hoping to win the biggest prize in the world— Africa. Most foreign policy is profit motive whether it be capitalist or communist. That is to say that nothing is put in without expectations of a greater return. However, on the surface what is different between the three super powers in Africa is *style* and performance. It is true that of the three powers the Chinese are more "people" oriented and are in greater empathy with the complex problems facing the new nations. The USA, as well as USSR, are considered advanced technological nations and come to Africa and in doing so, miss the opportunity to really be of aid in a meaningful way. The great Uhuru Railway is an example of this.

After all of the rhetoric, after the exchanges of paper and pencil, after the smiles, lies and countless handshakes, after the internationalism, one worldism and human beingism, what remains are the children who must go beyond the limitations of the adults, what remains is the people. What remains "is the responsibility of every government to look after the interests of their country as they see them." This too has been the case with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the People's Republic of China.

Footnotes on inside back cover.

It is impossible to do complete justice to this subject in so few pages. In that light I would like to suggest two other books of immense value, *Pan-Africanism or Communism* by George Padmore and *China's Policy in Africa 1958-1971* by Alaba Ogunsanwo. Soviet-Sino influences in Africa: Altruistic or Business as Usual? It is excerpted from a longer work which will appear in *Enemies: The Clash of Races* by Haki R. Madhubuti to be published by Third World Press in Feb. 1977.

Footnotes from Wobogo's article.

1. The term "white", even though it is the color of death masks in Africa, is not a terrifying term in African culture.
2. The color-confrontation theory of Dr. Francis Welsing, for example, is an attempt to explain white racism as originating in pre-historic times.
3. Cheikh Anta Diop "The Cultural Unity of Negro Africa," Presence Africaine, Paris 1959 pg. 9.
4. C.A. Diop "African Cultural Unity" Soulbook 9, p. 24.
5. *Ibid.*, pg. 18.
6. See Cheikh Anta Diop "The Cultural Unity of Negro Africa," Presence Africaine, Paris 1959.
7. The term "value system" is probably equivalent to the term "mass philosophy." We are using the latter to emphasize the term "mass," i.e. possessed by all the people in a given culture or society.
8. *Ibid.*, pg. 143-45.
9. Cheikh Anta Diop, "The Cultural Unity of Black Africa," 1959 Presence Africaine, pg. 143-45.
10. *Ibid.*, pg. 144.
11. *Ibid.*, pg. 146.
12. *Ibid.*, pg. 147.
13. For a discussion at this see Cheikh Anta Diop "The African Origin of Civilization" chpt. on political and social evolution of Ancient Egypt pp. 210-11, 225, Laurence-Hill Pub.
14. Mass literacy is a relatively recent phenomena. Many countries in Europe today have relatively illiterate masses (Portugal for example, according to many, has an illiteracy rate of over seventy per cent (70%).
15. Don Blackman in "Race vs Class," takes this view. Carlos Moore in "Cuba, the Untold story" Soulbook 7, 8 & 9 also takes a similar view.
16. There are over 90 million registered handguns in the U.S.A. (1976). The number of rifles owned is at least twice that. This does not include unregistered guns. There are in effect more guns than people. Keep in mind also that many seemingly harmless organizations, such as they Boy Scouts, are military in nature.
17. G.P. Malalaskera and K.N. Jayatilaka "Buddhism and the Race Question," Preface, UNESCO, 1958.
18. *Ibid.*
19. *Ibid.*, pg. 25.
20. *Ibid.*, pg. 27.
21. All manifestations of the Buddha in Asia are Black with woolley hair. They all appear to be Egypto-Nubian priests who fled Egypt when she fell in approximately 600 B.C. The priests carried their spiritual knowledge but lost much of the scientific knowledge for obvious reasons. The well known aspects of Buddhism and its companion Yoga are all simply Egypto-Nubian priesthood practices, i.e. fasting, meditation, and above all the belief that one could attain a God-like state if soul was liberated from the body through knowledge and self denial.
22. *Ibid.*, pg. 26.
23. *Ibid.*, pg. 26.
24. Frank Fazon "The Wretched of the Earth," Evergreen, 1966, pg. 34.
25. *Buddhism and the Race Question*, pg. 30.
26. *Ibid.*, pg. 27.
27. *Ibid.*, pg. 27.
28. *Ibid.*, pg. 30.
29. Cheikh Anta Diop *The African Origin of Civilization*, Lawrence Hill Co. 1974, pg. 287, Footnote 39.
30. *Buddhism and the Race Question*, pp. 30-31.
31. Cheikh Anta Diop, "The Cultural Unity of Negro Africa," pg. 163.
32. Cheikh Anta Diop, "The African Origin of Civilization," pg. 211.