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Abstract

The road forward is to finish the liberation of African peoples, in Africa and in Diaspora, based on the common Pan-African goals of self-determination, right to development and access to their natural resources (land). The struggle to achieve these goals must be rooted in the context of our concrete conditions. Part of this condition is the historical harm of slavery, which the issues of monetary compensation, reconciliation and atonement can not be approximated with. This paper, therefore, x-ray the various perspectives of intellectual debate on reparations - integrationists versus nationalists, the affirmative action; political autonomy arguments and reparation as a re-distribution of resources and power. These arguments were examined vis-à-vis the goals of Pan-Africanism as envisioned by Marcus Garvey’s – Back-to-Africa and W. E.B. Du Bois’s – Oneness of Africa. We inferred that reparations presents a legion of technical problems, such as how much to be paid and what formula to calculate the cost; determining who represent African Americans and the legitimacy of such group; whether the payment should be limited to only African Americans etc., that payment of monetary compensation may not adequately address the African concrete conditions, neither can it be an adequate value of the decimated African pride and value systems. Reparation is a process; demand should focus on extracting apologies from American and European governments, and while the campaign for programmes that will address the needs of Africans and our brothers in Diaspora follows.
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INTRODUCTION

Reparation is like a red hot iron pulled out from blacksmith’s furnace. Metaphorically, it is both hot and controversial. Emotion or anger, or both, takes the greater part of the reparationists and anti-reparationists debate. Besides emotion and/or anger associated with the intellectual discourse, there are basic principles that are immutable. First, there was a time, between 1445 to 1870 a group of people (Africans) were forcefully taken away from their geographical location to another location (far away from their kith and kin) as slaves. Second, these slaves were grossly exploited as unpaid plantation and factory workers for several years. Third, at the end of these slavery activities, the ex-slaves and their descendant have been continually subjugated and subjected to unjust racial discriminations.

Although, the interest and support for African American reparation is relatively a recent history of the 1990s, with the hosting of the International Conference on Reparation in Nigeria, and United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and related intolerance in 2001, Durban, South Africa. These struggles have been raging since 1890s of the ex-slave pension movement, and early 20th century repeated petitions to United States Congress for a monthly Federal Allowance as compensation (Berry, 2005). There are several leading organization in the movement – Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA); the National Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension, Association; the National Black United Front (NBUF); the Global Afrikan Congress (GAC); the African-African Descendants Caucus (AADC); the National Coalition of Blacks for Reparation in America (N’COBRA) etc (Obuah, 2007; Winbush, 2003; Wikipedia, the free Encyclopedia).
It is of interest to note that an ex-slave woman, Callie House led the Pension Association as their spokeswoman. According to Berry (2005), the association sued the U.S. in federal court in 1915, demanding some $68 million collected in federal taxes on cotton between 1862 and 1868, and it was the first class-action lawsuit for African American reparations. There are, also, congressional efforts that are outstanding, the first congressional Reparations Bill of 1867 (Winbush, 2003), and the Democratic Congressman, John Conyers effort to get a bill passed to appoint a commission to go into the feasibility of reparations (The New York Times, July 1, 1994, Section B, p. 10). The struggle is not limited to associations and congressional bills, books have also been written in pursuit of this noble objective, among them are: Martin Luther King (Jr) (1964) Why We Can’t Wait, that there be Reparations; Bolner, James (1968) Towards a Theory of Racial Reparation; Bittker, Boris I. (1973) The Case for Black Reparations; Richard America (1993) Pay the Social Debt: What White America Owes Black America; Ali A. Mazrui (1994) Global Africa: From Abolitionists to Reparationists; Berry, Mary Frances (2005) My Face is Black is True: Callie House and the Struggle for Ex-Slaves Reparations; Martha Biondi (2003), The Rise of the Reparations Movement; Randall Robinson (2000) The Debt: What America Owes to Blacks etc.

The reparations tempo and discourse increased aftermath of the Holocausts and Japanese American Settlement, prompting some scholars to argue that African Americans demand for reparations was derivative of the above. The discrimination the Jews suffered at the hands of Hitler parallels in all significant respect to the discrimination African Americans have faced in the history of slavery and thereafter in United States. The Jews were disenfranchised, discriminated against in education and employment. They
were excluded from beaches, playgrounds and parks, and were limited to recreational facilities designed for them. Jim Crowism humiliated Negroes in a similar fashion. Both Jews and Negroes were treated with severe cruelty. Therefore, if reparations in a variety of forms were paid to Japanese Americans and the Jews, not only as a “hand-out” but as a compensatory measure for violence against these groups, then it raises a more fundamental question why African Americans are denied of such benefit. Winbush (2003) argues that it is the “entrenchment of white Supremacy in world politics” that renders this basic legal and moral tenet controversial when applied to the transatlantic slave trade.

The Pan-Africanist Movements was to challenge the activities of imperialist domination: the slave trade, racial segregation and colonization of Africa. The Pan-Africanist struggles were at their peak in the late 19th century. From the outset of the activities of the slave trade, resistance and protest against the inhuman degradation of Africans and its people took various forms. The idea of Pan-Africanism was conceptualized by African intellectuals such as Henry Sylvester-Williams, Joseph Casely-Hayford, William Edward Burghardt Du Bois, George PadMore, Marcus Garvey and others who witnessed the brutalization and dehumanization against Africans, during and after abolition of slave trade. The Pan-Africanist thought and practice shows that the meaning and content of the concept was shaped mainly by historical events that confronted the people of African origin and Diaspora. This means the fight against imperialism and racism remain the propelling forces in the development of the Pan-African movement.

It is on this note; therefore, we examine the struggle and the challenges for reparations by African Americans and Africans. To know how this contemporary movement furthers or contradicts the founding
fathers ideas on Pan-Africanism. Reparations struggle has increased, so is also, the academic debate in favour or against, we examines these intellectual positions. This paper is partitioned into three: part one is the introduction, and expositions on the concepts of nationalism and Pan-Africanism, based on this ground we examine the various perspectives. In part two, we looked into the whole gamut of the reparations struggle and debate, and the issue of “goal dichotomy”. The final part forms the conclusion of the paper.

NATIONALISM VS PAN AFRICANISM

“Nation”, “Nationality”, and “Nationalism” are buzzwords that are easily used to express a multitude of situations, human conditions, and states of mind. The variation in their usage and application need not detain us here. The issue of whether “nation” existed in Africa before their contact with Europe and Arab also need not take our time, but should be left for the appropriate forum. The common and generally understanding of nation is a common cultural, linguistic, religious and political system. Nationality is the state or quality of belonging to a nation. The emergency of nationalism is usually when there is a threat, man-made or natural – to the nation, either on their natural resources or the people. Nationalism, therefore, is an ideology or principles of resistance, development, and platform used by a set of people of a particular nation.

In pre-nineteenth century Western Europe, the growth of Monarchial power, and the consequent establishment of centralized states brought people of different nationality under the Monarchial powers. The Monarchial quest for power had involved the bourgeoisie as well as the dynastic aristocracy. They had, largely in order to satisfy the designs of their own statecraft, subordinated feudal, ecclesiastical, communal, and numerous
other centers of control to the overriding needs of what came to be called a “national design” (Robert, 1968). Widespread discontentment and consciousness among the literate, and sometimes among the masses, that the nation was a common enterprise that deserved to be run by all national or their middle class representatives ignited national struggles. Thus, nationalism provided an ideology to which people (usually the middle class) seeking an escape from the old oppressions of church or Monarch, or even from foreign rule, could devote their efforts in the hope of obtaining liberty. It was the feeling of which revolutions were made.

The 1885 partitioning of Africa became the immediate cause for the growth of nationalism in Africa. The colonial powers created the present nations of independent states of Africa, by arbitrarily dividing the continent into administrative entities and imposing thereupon imported legal, linguistic, and cultural concepts. To Africans, nationalism remained an answer to their oppression and arbitrary demarcation, because it incorporate the idea of liberty.

AFRICAN NATIONALISM: THE EXTERNAL FORCES

We have stated earlier, that all nationalism is a product of reaction against forces beyond an individual or group capability, and that forces, may be man-made, natural, internal or external. To explain the forces of African Nationalism, we have to rely heavily on George Shepperson’s (1960) book *Historians in Tropical Africa*. Shepperson, stated five external factors which contributed to the growth of African nationalism.

First, is the West Indian factor, these are people or persons who are originally alien to the African society, who comes into it from outside, identifies themselves enthusiastically with it and then, plays a leading role in the development of its consciousness. Edward Blyden, is an outstanding
example, whose writings and speeches did so much to lay the theoretical foundations for the concepts of “African personality” and “negritude”. George Padmore contribution is no less significant to African consciousness.

The second factor is the activities of residence overseas. Most of the African leaders at the time of their independence have spent their formative part of their lives in Europe or America, and they experienced racial discrimination at first hand, and this has strengthened their feeling of national consciousness. A striking example is Orishatukeh Faduma, who was baptized in Sierra Leone as William Davis; adopted a Yoruba name in 1887, when “Africanizing” influence of Edward Blyden was growing. Faduma went to America and associated with Negro America Movements and returned to Africa in late 1914 as a leader of a “back-to-Africa” movement of African Americans. Faduma denounced the Europe thus:

The two gods of Europe are the idolatry of Domination and Money before which great nations bow and crush weaker ones in name of religion.

He was read by early African nationalists particularly Nigerians – Zik, Awo, Macaulay, J. K. Randle etc.

Third, is an African political movement of resident Africans in Africa states not of their own origin. This was due to labour movement and the spreading of gospel of Christianity. Notable examples among them were Casely Hayford of the then Gold Coast a wondering preacher; the Nyasa migrants into South Africa in 1920s – Clements Kadalie and his Industrial and Commercial Workers’ Union of Africa, the famous I. C. U.; and Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe (Zik of Africa) on returning home with a strings of degree in political science and Anthropology, became editor of Gold Coast daily newspaper, The Morning Post, which gave him full scope to criticize the bigotry of racial intolerance under which he had suffered as a student and
which prevented him from gaining suitable employment in his own country Nigeria. As Dudley (1978) described it, the militant journalism of Zik played a part in awakening in the reading populace a radical political consciousness, in fact a new nationalism.

The fourth, is the character of the World Wars, which Bismark predicted during the West African Conference of Berlin in 1885 that;

The evils of war would assume a specially fatal character if the natives were led to take sides in disputes between the civilized powers (Shepperson, 1960).

The wars which Africans know nothing of brought about a deep and fundamental change in the relation of African people. It had both economic and political consequences on Africans who participated in the war (ex-servicemen) and those at home. Quoting Sir Philip Mitchell’s testimony of the impression of the wars on Kikuyu people of Kenya:

A large member died on service, a large number than that service justified, for, though there were exceptions, the feeding and care of the porters and protection against excessive loads were seldom of an adequate standard (Shepperson, 1960).

Beside the pains of loss and grievance, the wars helped to deflate white man’s respect. Mr. F. S. Joelson Wrote in 1920:

It cannot be pretended that it will ever be as high as it was before the war taught blacks to butcher the ruling whites (Shepperson, 1960).

It did not take long before the Mau Mau in Kenya took up arms to “butcher” the whites, and militant liberation groups formed in Southern and Eastern Africa and pockets of picketing by the Zikist Movement took place in Lagos, Nigeria.

The fifth external force is foreign ideological influences. These are ideologies that have entered African soil relatively independent of
Christianity culture and European administrative patterns. Among these foreign ideologies are Marxism – Leninism, and most importantly Pan-Africanism. The contribution of Marxism for the growth of nationalism in African was relatively late, after the Second World War. This is unlike Pan-Africanism Movement, which has been organizing since 1900, All-African People’s Conference, which served to mark as a new epoch in African nationalism.

Nationalism, in African, then means a patriotic fervour that made real the possibilities of nation self-determination, a self determination on a national basis.

**PAN-AFRICANISM**

The idea of Pan-Africanism came out of the Africans in Diaspora, amongst the great names associated with its development are Edward W. Blyden; Henry Sylvester – Williams; Marcus Garvey, W. F. B. Du Bois; Orishatukeh Faduma; George Padmore. Esedebe (1978:89) included James Africanus Beale Horton and Reverend James Johnson as the foremost precursors to the Pan-Africanist movement, who sought “to Africanise Christianity and tended toward the formation of independent African churches”.

Pan-Africanism have been described as “a movement of ideas and emotions” (Legum, 1978:443); and “Pan-Africanism as an idea, and Pan-Africanism as a movement” (Esedebe, 1978:75). These definitions are complimentary, they stem from the same ideas and feelings, that is, *a desire to be free from alien rule, to create a new role for the African in Africa and for Africa in the world*. Unlike nationalism which is primarily concerned with the political unification of different ethnic groups within a single state, Pan-Africanism is concerned with achieving large political
units, a commonwealth of African states, or a supra-state political unification. It is of interest to note that Pan-African movement does not have a bureaucratic structure to synthesis her aims and objectives, and development strategies toward achievement of her aims. Her aims can be inferred from the speeches and writings of the foremost Pan-Africanist, which at best are discordant. W. E. B. Du Bois explains that Pan-Africanism aims at an “intellectual understanding and cooperation among all groups of Negro descent in order to bring about, at the earliest possible time, the industrial and spiritual emancipation of the Negro people” (Esedebe, 1978:75); Marcus Garvey, sees it as “Back to Africa” movement, Africa for Africans, and a battle to link the destiny of the Diaspora and continent forever together” (Legum, 1978:449; Omowale, 2003) Alioune Diop, describe its aim in line with the concepts of “African personality” or “Negritude” (Esedebe, 1978:75); Julius Nyerere said, it is an association that “must express itself in the struggle of the common man throughout the world for equality and justice” (Legum, 1978:445); Nkrumah called it unification of the whole of Africa – “Africa Must Unit”, while Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, proclaim its aim as “an African Leviathan in the form of a political organization or association of states… a miniature United Nations”.

The strategies to achieve her series of objectives were no less different, Marcus Garvey’s Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) served as the first Pan-African mass organization, and mobilized people for an All-African People’s Conference. Garvey’s UNIA had branches wherever Africans were to be found, dispersed around the world, including Africa. Between 1919 and 1927, Dubois and Garvey have organized four Pan-African Congresses, the fifth Pan-African Congress was held in African, Accra Ghana, which out of experiences came some of the
ideas and attitudes which the father of Pan-Africanism handed on to the movement, irregular halting and often confused, but still a movement, that led to the 1958 conference in Accra.

Besides the confusion and conflict of interest between Du Bios and Garvey over Pan-African aims and strategies, the organization made three fundamental impacts on Africans. First, it injected the nationality consciousness among Africans; second, the Pan-Africanism call for cultural restoration was a confidence-building strategy that made African to belief in themselves; and third, Pan-African belief in “Oneness of Africa” (as preached of Du Bios) and support of “Back-to-African’ (Marcus Garvey), remains the ideological creed for Reparations Movement. At present, unification or oneness as advocated by Nkrumah is no more feasible, what is feasible is the idea of working towards closer unity through functional cooperation - seeking to coordinate African social, educational, economic and political polices, without necessarily abrogating their separate sovereignties.

REPARATION: THE DEBATE AND THE STRUGGLE.

One of the uncertainties concerns the basic question of how many Africans were imported. This has long been an object of speculation, with estimates ranging from a few millions to over one hundred million. A recent study has suggested a figure of about ten million African landed alive in the Americas, the Atlantic Islands and European …Nevertheless, if the low figure of ten million was accepted as a basis for evaluating the impact of slaving on Africa as a whole, the conclusions that could legitimately be drawn would confound those who attempt to make light of the experience of the rape of Africans from 1445 to 1870. (Walter Rodney; 1972:109).

This issue of reparations has once again become the focus of intense and serious debate. There is no dearth of scholarship on the broad issue of reparations, it has been described variously by scholars as ‘a culture war’
(Alfred L. Brophy, 2004); ‘as a movement to reconceptualize politics and society” Manning Marable, 1998); ‘as a larger part of the black freedom movement” (Robert Westley, 1998); while Cook sees reparations as part of “a new paradigm that arrives as reconciliation through atonement”. Opinions are sharply divided or varied, it is a conflict of race - group identity and group liability.

Art Hall (2000) theoretical discourse on the internal dispute between integrationists and nationalists bring to the forefront different positions, the integrationist argues that ending the old de jure discrimination was sufficient, and that African American should be able to work and cooperate within the system, while the nationalists is of the opinion that America has a duty to atone for the past and maintain measures to equalize a society that is more racially divided. The major point of their difference is the dominance of the individual versus that of the group.

Integrationists focuses on the individual, the European-American individualist world view as the dominant perspective as an obstacle to reparations programme. For integrationists, the war was seen, in essence, as a war between individuals with differing attributes, of which race is only one. Equality exists or existed as long as the rules of the game (were) fairly and even applied to everyone, without regard to race. The integration theory embodied the outcome of African American assimilation to white culture and norm, and it have widespread acceptance among the white because it is less threatening and complimentary in nature to the dominant ethos of materialism, competition, and individualism. Because the value placed on individualism in European-American culture is so much entrenched in the dominant perspective that it could not yield to concepts such as group wrongs or group entitlements.
One the other hand, nationalists focus on the group and collective conditions and experiences - racism, discrimination and oppression – faced by African Americans. Nationalism is the theory of the submissive entity, and the proponents reject notion of “Black pathology and white supremacy”, that is often the basis of integration theory. Despite integration’s popularity, it has been criticized to be ineffective, since the abolition of slavery and participation of Blacks in American politics, integration-based politics has not so much improved the quality of life experience of African American. This failure, in the alternative, has encouraged the re-emergency of Nationalism and reparations as a legitimate solution to the racial issues existing within the United States.

The integrationists have also posited that African Americans can be found on many different socio-economic professional and influential levels. Whereas, before the outlaw on racial discrimination, African Americans could be homogenously categorized because their experiences and backgrounds were similar, such categorization is much more difficult today, as many barriers are broken. Added to this, is the rise in the number of African American representatives in the republican party, most notably Clarence Thomas, Colin Powell, J.C. Walts, and Alan Keyes.

Another perspective of the debate is the Affirmative Action and Reparations. Kim Forde - Mazrui (2004) looked into this school of thought extensively. The basic issue is about the extent to which American society is liable to the present effects of past discrimination. Two principles underlie this debate, to which the liberals and conservatives agree to. The first principle is the unjustification of racial discrimination. The second is that one who wrongfully harms another is duty-bound to make amends. Therefore, slavery and discrimination against Black American were wrong,
and they should not happen again. The basis of intense disagreement, as pointed out is “the extent to which the effects of past discrimination persist and the collective responsibility of society.

The opponents of affirmative action argues that America as a whole is not responsible for discrimination practiced by only some states and private actors, that it is unfair to hold current society responsible for discrimination by past society, and that blacks today ought not be viewed as victims of past discrimination, given the passage of time. They attribute exclusively responsibility for the social and economic disadvantages disproportionately experienced by blacks to blacks themselves for eschewing opportunity in favour of crime and government dependence. The moral angel of the opponents of affirmative action contend that the victims of racial preferences should be made whole, irrespective of whether you are black or white, and the state or corporation responsible should provide the relief. Therefore, they absorb the whole America of any culpability, in fact, there is no continuing culpability.

Towards the other extreme are those who beliefs that America’s nation should shoulder responsibility for consequences of her discriminatory history. America as a nation was responsible for protecting slavery and discrimination, a responsibility that continues over time despite change over in the American citizenry. There argument is that the effects of past discrimination are pervasive and manifest in social and economic deprivation, institutional racism, and present discrimination. Such effects exert an oppressive and debilitating force on black people that it will be unfair for society to blame those blacks who engage in unproductive, irresponsible or criminal conduct.
Rotan Lee (2004) argues that, fortunes were made from the cotton economy, encompassing the projects from cotton, rice, tobacco, and sugarcane. Slavery configured the unique calculus of the South American commercial and economic binds to the North in the midst of industrialization even as the slave trade became a black-market business. In fact, slavery inherently equates to unjust enrichment even if the practice was legal at the time. In the wake of constitutional proscriptions against slavery, former slaves and their ancestry remain uncompensated for the reasonable value of their services: *quantum meruit* (as much as deserved) therefore, on the basis of unjust enrichment by the labours of another, American government are culpable for human right violations, and all thirty-six million black African residing in America today are entitled to full reparations.

Affirmative action is a special arrangement or policy, which recognize the needs and rights of the disadvantage people to enjoy the social and economic facilitates provided by government. This group of people is given special preference in employment and provision of social amenities through what is known as quota, set aside etc. The opponents of reparations are of the opinion that this affirmative policy action is tantamount to reparations, that the African Americans should take advantage of such policies and better their lot. And some people are simply tired-tired of constant reminder of a history that predated their birth, tired of being accused of shameful acts they never personally participated in.

This argument is valid as it may appear, but reparations is a moral and justifiable issue, which passage of time is immaterial to it, as long as no atonement and payment has been made. Affirmative action is a palliative measure that addresses issues of social inequality and discrimination in general, not only against the African Americans, but also applicable to
whites and blacks. This cannot in any rationality, be substituted for payment as a result of economic harm caused on Africans during the period of forced labour (slave).

Also, opponents of reparations insinuate that African Americans have the culture of violence, opposition, crime and dependent on government hand-out instead of being innovative and cashing in on several opportunities in American society. This argument is an extension of McClelland n-achievement and Hoselitz sociological theory of status withdrawal, which explains the under-development of third world. According to McClelland, Third World problem is as result of attitudinal and personality variables which do not motivate people toward innovation, entrepreneurial behaviour and ingenuity, while Hoselitz asserts that Third World nations are particularistic, ascriptive-oriented and collective-oriented which contributes to the conditions of their under-development. These are imperialistic theorizations, its explanatory power is valid only to the extent it maintains the status quo - social and economic discrimination and inequality. To change social roles and behaviours, you have to change social structure which sustains those conditions. The effects of slavery are pervasive and manifest in social and economic deprivation, institutionalized racism, and discrimination. The effect of such discrimination exerts on African Americans are weakening and oppressive, that compensation is necessary for confidence-building mechanism.

Harris (2001) on his part advanced the theory of Political Autonomy option as a form of separations. He established three basic principles supporting political autonomy argument. First, it is an effort to stamp out racism against African Americans, since slavery, segregation, and underclass status of Africans are race-based, remedy must target racism. Second,
reparative remedy should be backward looking, that is, should assign blame to the perpetrator of the act. Third, reparative remedy to African Americans should be group-based, since the real victims of slavery are long dead, reparations must be extended to African Americans as member of a group. Harris criticized affirmative action, that both monetary and non-monetary transfers have a limited impact in relations to eradicating institutional racism, or improving the debilitating conditions of African-Americans. Other programmes can also be ineffective, and probably resort to ‘reverse discrimination’ against the whites. Also, affirmative actions have been dragging on for years, and yet it has not bettered the lives of blacks. Thus, the support of political autonomy remedy.

On the basis of these, Harris advocates the creation of a separate state for the black to grant them a political autonomy. He calls for separate nation, and, of course, completely new institutions. New institutions would not be handicapped by a legacy of racism, like the present institutions in America. The new institutions would be placed on the hands of African Americans, and therefore, could hardly operate to entrench white wealth. African American state with African American institutions will not experience institutional racism that is by-product of history of slavery. The institutions will not subject them to any underclass status, every citizenry have the equal opportunity to start on clean slates.

The political autonomy remedy provides for a ‘once-and-for-all’ solution. It will bring to an end programmes like affirmative action, set asides, and quotas that many Americans disagrees with. Harris argues that the perception of the white public on reparative action as a ‘reversed discrimination”, is at the expense of the whites, but political autonomy does not suggest that whites should compete against African Americans who
might have an advantage based on race. On the other hand, it suggests that whites should compete against whites, while African Americans compete among themselves. Finally, separate state for the blacks would alter the victim status of African Americans that other policies perpetuate. The outcome of political autonomy is Black Nationalism and black autarky. Black Nationalism will to a reasonable extent counter some negative images of African Americans.

Lee Harris’s advocacy of separate states and Black Nationalism perspective is a radical proposal that will require a constitutional amendment, in a rigid constitutional state like United States of America. Harris missed the point, that America is a class-based, and private property capitalism system is the material base of oppression, as well as race, and a separate black state is likely to contain the same elements of oppression. Also, African Americans in charge of new institutions may distribute social amenities and contracts as unevenly among themselves as observed in America. Therefore, there is no valid-time basis to believe that an African American state would not manifest discriminatory practices very similar to those found in United State more especially when African Countries are black dominated, yet discriminatory practices are evidence. Lastly, separate state for the African American would entrench racism the more in economic, political and social sphere. The whites are in control of American economy, and they may manufacture sub-standard products either to injure the blacks or have undue profit, the whites are also in control of American central government and may be discriminatory in resources allocation to the black state. Socially, black state may be reminiscence of the “for white” and “for black” recreational parks and bus segregation that are responsible to present black conditions.
Kyle Logue’s (2004) *Distributive Justice* argument, attacked and debunked the proponents of affirmative action, that the call for either cash or in-kind transfers from the whites to blacks in unusual and illogical.

Kyle established a broad-based programme, upon which he rest his argument. African Americans are on the average significantly less well off than whites. The inequality extends to almost every conceivable measure of well-being - income, wealth, education, employment, health, housing, even life expectancy. Given this facts and the country’s history of slavery and segregation, then it is natural and normal that the government ought to spend some resources to reduce that inequality. Though Kyle admitted that the thesis is not entirely new, but such design must be informed by the basic lessons of public finance economic. He argued that race is a good tool for implementing an egalitarian vision of distributive justice for three reasons: (a) race is one of the best predictors, or proxies for, overall social and economic well being, (b) redistribution on the basis of race will not cause labour-market distortion that accompany income or wealth distribution, because race is relatively immutable and (c) race is relatively observable.

Finally, Kyle do not endorse any particular racially re-distributive programme, he included direct cash transfer from whites to blacks, perhaps administered through federal tax system, though may be unconstitutional but provides an interesting policy. Also, it may include a range of in-kind re-distributive programmes, from race-based affirmative-action programmes to federal funding of urban housing and educational programmes to certain types of anti-discrimination law, all of which may be constitutional, depending on their particular design details. He concludes that redistributive programme can be justified on the basis of a modest version of egalitarian distributive justice.
The theoretical arguments-integrationist, nationalism; affirmative action; political autonomy and redistributive programmes- as examined have their merits and demerits as far as reparations and realizing the aims of Pan-Africanism is concerned. It will be of interest to note that, the redistributive programmes, approximate more to the concrete conditions of African Americans and Africans in Africa. Firstly, all the theoretical positions, including redistributive programmes ignore an important segment of the beneficiary of reparations. All the actions and solutions of African Americans are canvassed, without recourse to Africans in African continent, who are the progenitors of slave descendant and who suffered (or still suffering) the consequences of de-populated society, due to forceful exportation of Africans to work in American and European plantations. Though, redistributive action did not include Africans in Africa, but if its principles of redistribution of wealth, land, and power, through a specially designed programme should apply globally, Africans in Africa will be liberated from the shackles of neo-imperialism.

The argument can be further extended, that redistributive programmes shall include land, because land and space is much about ownership, control and distribution of resources therein. The Latin Maxim: *guid guid plantato solo so credit*, that is, he who owns land owns what is on, under and above it, speak much about the value placed on land in Africa (Omenma, 2002:5). The wealth of Africa is in the land; all our gold, diamonds, precious metals, and oil are in the ground. So he who controls the land exercises wealth, economic and political power. Therefore, to breakdown white privileges-power and wealth, a land redistribution programme should be an important aspect of reparations in the Northern and Southern states where the African slaves lived and worked.
In African continent, particularly Kenya and Southern African countries - South Africa, Namibia, Angola, Zimbabwe etc where the whites (ex-colonial masters) have dominance over arable land, such lands should be re-allocated to the indigenous African landowners, who are rendered landless and poor. Land redistribution according to Omowale (2003) will significantly alter the relationship of the African peasants to the European and American landlord, their African lackeys and the multinational corporations and financial institutions. Such re-alignment of economic forces will lay the basis for the next stage of expropriating the mineral and industrial resources of the continent. When the Zimbabwe governments takes back the land and re-allocate it to the Zimbabwean peasants, that are reparations. When the land resources of Niger Delta people of Nigeria, are entrusted on them, that is reparations. Once this process begins, one cannot tell where it will lead to.

It is the entrenchment of white supremacy in world politics that readers African leaders non-responsive. Once there is a breakdown of American and European dominance over African economy, politics, and natural resources, African continent will re-claim their place of pride, as the cradle of world civilizations, then and then Marcus Garvey’s BACK-TO-AFRICA philosophy will be a fiat accompli. Africans in diaspora, will be more than enthusiastic to trace their root back to African soil - *The Land Of Pride; The Land Of Culture And The Land Of Brotherhood.*

Finally, and most importantly, is extraction of apologies from the American and European government, individuals and corporations who benefited from the slave labour and caused the inhuman treatment. The validity of such apology are, first, it will mean admittance of wrongful action against humanity, thereby initiating programmes to bridge the power
and wealth disparities between the white and black. Secondly, apology will assuage Africans, and re-position African, wherever they are, in restoring our lost pride and rich culture. In 1998, President William (Bill) J. Clinton flirted with an apology for slavery when he visited Goree Island, the place of embarkation for many slavery taken to the Americans. Also, President George W. Bush (Jnr) recent statement regarding the crimes of slavery suggests the power of reparations arguments (Alfred Biophy 2004). Though both stopped short of direct apology, it is a good beginning towards redistribution programmes.

It is instructive to note that the struggle for reparations that started way back in 1890 ex-slave Pension Allowance agitation, culminated to John Conyers bill to appoint a reparation commission in America in the late 20th century, that the Africans in Africa have been passive in this struggle. It was only in 1992, that late Chief M.K.O.Abiola and eleven others Africans, including Prof. Ali A. Mazrui, were sworn in before the Presidents of Africans in Dakar, Senegal. These Groups of Eminent Persons were mandated to pursue and to explore the modalities and logistics of campaigning for reparations. According to Mazrui,

Unfortunately, Abiola too was suddenly taken ill and died unexpectedly on the eve of his being released from prison. The reparations movement received a severe blow (emphasis mine) because Abiola had been a man of means committed to the cause (Mazrui, n.d)

The fundamental questions are: are African leaders committed to the reparations struggle since the death of Abiola? What are African leaders contributions to the struggle? Do African leaders realize that African Americans are descendants of Africans in African? Can a child have more legitimate claim than the father over their ancestry land?
THE GOAL DICHOTOMY: Related to the issue of theoretical argument is the varied goal of reparationists. Most African American movements are requesting for financial compensation; some are writing about reparations should begin with truth commissions that acknowledge the scope of the problems along with an apology; among the African Americas, is which particular group of blacks are entitled to reparations claim etc. Before the talk about payment of colossal amounts of money, there is the need to know what is to be accomplished. In essence, why reparations? We considered some of these dichotomies of goals amongst the reparationists.

AGE DICHOTOMY: Slave trade and slavery was a distance history, not all young people of African descendants have a strong knowledge of history, neither did they experience the unlimited exploitation of labour, that their parents, grand parents and other forbearers faced. Though the young people are experiencing racial segregation today, it is just a tip of the iceberg of horrific slave era. A major factor of reparations claim is the closeness of the request for reparations to the actual injury. This results to the diminished understanding, commitment, and importance young people places on issues of race disparity. The issues of age gap plays an important role in the feeling of lack of ownership for reparations among Africans and those in Diaspora, and the requisite support, mobilization, and endorsement needed. That is a feeling of sense of Apathy and Indifference.

WHO BENEFITS: The issue of age gap and lack of ownership leads to the practical problem of defining the parameters of race. Reparations is compensation for a group injury, it is a problem defining who is a member of this injured group. Who are the descendants of slaves and who are not? Is it the African Americans community only, what if the native Africans,
Caribbeans, other foreign members of the Black Diaspora, and those who have recently naturalized as American citizens? These factors reduce the ability to identify an injured group or group worthy of reparation claims. This must be addressed in the reparations process.

**GOAL INCONSISTENCE:** The existing dichotomy of age and how to administer reparations claim, leads to inconsistent goal, unidentified goal and ensuring tensions or conflicts. The interest have been ranging from truth and reconciliation commission, apology, monetary payment, trust fund, in-kind payment, at the other extreme are those who campaign for debt forgiveness as a form of reparations. Thus, lack of a clear-cut idea of reparations goal have led different, often conflicting efforts, thereby creating tension.

**CONCLUSION**

The paper has addressed, to a reasonable - extent, the issue of nationalism, Pan-Africanism and the external forces that help in molding. African thought and ideology. We are of the opinion that it was the influence of Negro Americans, West Indians and Africans who lived outside Africa for economic reasons, that stimulated and provided the intellectual foundation upon which African nationalism and Pan-Africanism was born and nurtured. The underlining principles, was and still is (I hope so) African self determination, de-colorization, African unity, and restoration of African pride and value system. It is on this note, that we examined the intellectual debates or argument in favour of or against the reparations struggle, by African Americans and Africans in African continent. We concluded that despite all the intellectual debates and civil right movements whether in support of affirmative action, political autonomy or redistribution action, the greatest challenge to the black man is lack of UNITY OF GOAL.
That as long as there are plethoras of goals or goal dichotomy, reparations claim my not be realistic in this century.
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Pan-Africanism has always been about the unity of African people. When Henry Sylvester Williams organized the Pan-African Conference in 1900, the purpose of the conferences was to bring African people together. Williams didn’t even have a particularly progressive or revolutionary vision at the time because he wasn’t demanding an end to colonialism. The conference was simply about unity among African people. The problem is that the critics of Pan-Africanism don’t seem to understand the importance of unity, which leads me to the ADOS movement since that movement has been very critical of Pan-Africanism, The Akan, and the Debate Over Kwame Nkrumah’s Ghana w Dr. Kwasi Konadu. 0 325. Real Black News and the #MOBP! The overarching desire to maintain some form of Black nationalist piety to the traditions of the reparations struggle continue to garner us NOTHING material other than the symbolic satisfaction of maintaining that cultural nationalist dogma. 47 minute mark: The reason that two YouTubers were able to generate a functional strategy that have political function? Both Carnell and Moore recognized that modern social media was an effective medium and they also realize that the American citizen focus is a more politically salient when attempting to making a case in U.S. legislatures and courts. The question of reparations appears to be the new thematic focus on contemporary Pan-Africanism and Beckles in this Paper contributed to the discourse: a discourse I find very controversial and complex and that has many questionable dimensions to it. What is significant though is the choice of title which is deeply impregnated with meaning. According to Conrad Worill (2019) The Pan African component of the Reparations Movement launched its first international conference on Reparations in Lagos, in 1990. After that conference, the OAU (then) set up a Group of Eminent Persons to work out the different ways in which to proceed and secure technical advisors, who would help solve some of the difficulties associated with the claim for reparations. What is pan-Africanism? Can a white, Asian, non-black or non-African person be a pan-African? Is globalization still relevant in the contemporary scenario of global politics? What is its introduction, objectives, and conclusion? Why did Pan-Arabism fail? What are the aims of Pan Africanism? Which philosophies are the most relevant? Which are the most irrelevant? Related Questions. What is the main difference between Afropolitanism and Panafricanism? What is economic regionalism in the East African community? What is the ideal role of Pan-africanism in today’s Africa? What is pan-Africanism? Can a white, Asian, non-black or non-African person be a pan-African?