

ENTANGLING ALLIANCE : BLACK AMERICANS, AFRICA AND CAPITALISM

By

Maghan KEITA *

Any analysis of African-American relations with Africa must consider the historical framework in which those relations occur. An understanding that the historical record is dominated by capitalism gives clarity to the activities that have existed between African-Americans and Africa from 1776 to the present.

Capitalism has fashioned and sustained an environment that promoted a psychology based on class relations. For the American black the unique environment that capitalism constructed was the institution of slavery and with it a psychology that influenced black political economic behaviour far past the destruction of the institution itself.

The importance of understanding capitalism as the historical framework of this discussion bears on the crucial role that class plays in the development of interaction between oppressed peoples, internally and internationally. For sometime the dominant theme has been that class and its attendant functions did not exist among Africans and African-Americans. This theme dealt with oppression as an external dynamic that did not have internal counterparts among the oppressed. It determined that racism was the oppressing force rather than a mechanism of that force and concluded that the eradication of racism was synonymous with the destruction of oppression.

The view of racism as the source of oppression obscured the real source, capitalism, and hid the fact that people of the same racial ancestry were just as prone to oppress one another as they were to oppress someone of a different color. The emphasis placed on racism distorts the real nature of capitalism and the class relations that are the essence of the system. This emphasis fosters the false belief that racism can be destroyed without touching capitalism.

For the African-American the environment compelled a type of schizophrenia or duality that DUBOIS spoke of as the attempt to be both African and American at the same time.

This schizophrenia was the product of a mentality promoted by the slave experience in America. This mentality illustrated the dialectic of oppression that found the slave, and later the freedman, desiring to trade places with their oppressor rather than destroy the system that oppressed them. The mentality of oppression fostered a profound identification with the oppressor among the oppressed and provided the oppressed with a standard by which they could gauge themselves : the oppressor (Freire, 1968 ; Ofari, *Black Scholar*, September, 1972 : 37 ; DUBOIS, 1946 : 334 ; Wright, 1974 :

* See page 105.

With slavery as the basis for a distinctive psychology whose objective and material circumstance was rooted in capitalism, the structure for black support of things American including foreign policy was developed. It developed out four centuries of blacks aspiring to the American dream. Even where this aspiration rejected American dominance, it accepted the capitalist model ; for good reason given that no other choice emerged until 1917.

Frazier has argued that the origins of the African-American petite bourgeoisie are in the small number of free blacks that existed prior to the civil war.

This is illustrated in the numerous efforts that blacks made to extricate themselves from American exploitation, economically, and at times physically.

Several things become quite interesting about these attempts on the part of some African-Americans to remove themselves from white domination : one was their desire to return to Africa ; two, was that they were free and people of property, no matter how limited ; and three, there was to some degree, white backing for such schemes as safe guards to the maintenance and the expansion of white interests. Right up to the start of the civil war blacks were attempting to convince whites of the practical and profitable nature of their repatriation schemes. Nor did these first «back to Africa» adherents miss the probability of advancing their own economic interests on the continent (1).

From the inception of the African Union Society of Providence, Rhode Island in 1797 to the various undertakings of the present, there has been a «civilizing and proseletyzing» attitude among African-Americans that is characterized by their need «to do something for Africa». However that «something» they proposed showed their inability to totally identify with Africa. That inability may be that African-Americans are ethnically American as Tilden LeMelle states (2). A certainty, however, is the fact that they are products of their economic and educational context, and this economic and educational context has given rise to their class situation and a certain African-American petit bourgeois chauvanism.

Being American and then black activated this civilizing mission. In 1901, the «civility» of the United States' citizen of color elevated the African-American to a status that set him apart from the South African black and it was a separation that African-Americans of the period attempted to maintain. The anxiety that African-American status provoked among South African blacks caused many of them to seek American citizenship in order to enjoy the same priviledges as African-Americans *in* South Africa. (3)

The African-American petite bourgeoisie mission either displaced or sought to compliment emerging 19th and 20th century African petite bourgeoisie that were developing under European colonialism. The activities of the America-Liberians, the implications and

the regalia of the Garvey UNIA propositions, the resolutions of the Lynchburg African Development Society (4), and even Dubois' proposals concerning the League of Nations' Mandate for the conquered German territories in Africa smacked of African-American petits bourgeois sentiments concerning the development of Africa along the lines of a «Christian and capitalist civilization». In any case, the African-American petite bourgeoisie advanced capitalism either through collusion with the Euro-American bourgeoisie or through fear of Euro-American expansion. As James Gilbert wrote in the early 20th century, the expansion of capitalism on the African continent was an African-American prerogative (5).

The powers of the capitalist world began to see the benefits of African-American petit bourgeois missionary zeal in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In the attempt to render the «uncivilized» African masses more pliable it was suggested that they be educated, at least in part. The educational policy, dictated by Europeans to meet European interests was aided to a large degree by African-American educators. The European belief was that education for Africans and African-Americans was one and the same problem. However, there were varying opinions as to how this should be carried out and as to what the end result was to be. General S.C. Armstrong, the first Principal of Hampton Institute, felt that the key to the problem was the «creation of rurally-based African leadership, *made content* through education and gradual advancement» (6). (*Italics added*).

The General was obviously advancing the idea of developing a black petite bourgeoisie.. His South African counterparts hardly saw education in the same light. It was their contention that any education was only useful in as much as it helped to create and maintain «a race of peasants living by and on the land» (7). Their fear was that if Africans were allowed to «obtain the degree of civilization of blacks in the United States, it would lead to serious consequences for whites» (8).

Given colonial reluctance, America's black petite bourgeoisie was still able to deliver an acceptable educational model. Black America's foremost educator of the time, Booker T. Washington developed an educational prototype that became the standard for education among two oppressed peoples. It was so acceptable in fact that it could be found in the most blatantly oppressive situations on the African continent: German Togoland and British South Africa. Washington's declaration that the Tuskegee model was the «peculiarly appropriate» and «correct» type of education for the Negro race won him international fame when he hosted the International Conference on the Negro. The conference was to aid educators and missionaries in devising a systematic means of expanding industrial training in Africa based on the Tuskegee and Hampton models.

The Washington model was so impressive that there were numerous attempts to enlist his aid or to emulate his accomplishments. John Dube of South Africa was so impressed with Washington, and so successful in copying his model that he was dubbed the «Booker T. Washington of the Zulus» (9).

Within the framework of capitalism, it was obvious that missionary work and education presented problems for both Africans and Europeans. European anxieties were alleviated through the African-American advocacy of an educational model that would immunize blacks against politics. For the African there seemed to be no solution, only the growing awareness that the Christianity, commerce and education that was being distributed among them by a group of European backed African-Americans in the name of «civilization» was creating a class of Africans in virtually the same mold as the process had created a similar class of African-Americans (10).

History shows that there is a contemporary conflict here. Where one might have argued the absence of alternative systems of political economics limited the directions that African-Americans might have pursued prior to 1917, the post-Bolshevik period and especially the period of national liberation in Africa pose a very uncomfortable dilemma. The historical adherence to capitalism and the tendency to promote it have placed the African-American petite bourgeoisie at odds with the very forces that will liberate Southern Africa.

The refusal to accept a class analysis of the African-American situation as well as the Southern African situation poses grave problems as far as African-American participation in the liberation of Southern Africa is concerned, (i.e. the Southern African situation is beginning to crystalize emerging and long existant petits bourgeois interests. Witness the promotion of the internal settlement government and the black petits bourgeois that represent its interests and their own recent, rapid and phenomenal acquisition of capital and land in a country that has severe shortages of both items as far as blacks are concerned. The Namibia exercise, the manœuverings of Swapo and black collusion with the DTA in order to insure continued South African dominance of the territory are illustrations of class interests, not race. The South African direction and supplying of UNITA forces not only in the attempt to disrupt the state of Angola but also to suppress the people of Namibia is another case of the petite bourgeoisie acting on behalf of bourgeois interests. In South Africa itself the same voice, in blackface, can be heard. Their message is investment is good for South African blacks; it will help alter apartheid peacefully. On the American side, the African-American petite bourgeoisie also has spokesmen who individually or institutionally support the expansion of capitalist interests in Southern Africa).

The anti-Marxist sentiment that is prevalent in the United States obscures a number of fundamental questions and often leads to tangential, and sometimes irrelevant discussions of peaceful change, idyllic democracy and civil rights analogies à la Andy Young in the attempt to project solutions for the Southern African situation that are both palatable to American mythology and capitalist interests.

Any question of African-American petite bourgeois interests must address itself to three issues:

- 1) The relationship of the African-American petite bourgeois to the national American petite bourgeoisie;
- 2) The relationship of the African-American petite bourgeoisie to the American black under-class; and
- 3) The relation of the African-American petite bourgeoisie to the international petite bourgeoisie, (in this case the petite bourgeoisies of Southern Africa).

(1) Most recently the basic defense of African-American petite bourgeois interest has rested on the concept that the African-American middle class has nothing in common with its American counterpart and tends to identify almost wholeheartedly with the black American working class. This assumption has been asserted in renewed criticism of E. Franklin Frazier's *Black Bourgeoisie* and in attacks on William J. Wilson's new work, *The Declining Significance of Race*. (11)

While strong racial identification seems highly visible in the black community and its source is oppression, i.e. racism, this identification does not preclude converging class interests among black and white petite bourgeois. The competition, and in some cases the antagonism, that exists between the African-American and the American petite bourgeoisie is based on their relative lack of power and the fact that their *specific* interests are not the same; both compete to control the same *general* interests for the same reasons because those interests and reasons are dictated by capitalism and the interests of class and not race.

African-American petite bourgeois competition with their white counterparts is overshadowed by the cooperation with both the American and International bourgeoisie. Questions concerning the delicate relations of black petite bourgeois who are the assumed, media-, or self-appointed guardians of all black class interests and their dealings with various multi-national corporations as board members or recipients of corporate monies or «expertise», only begin to illustrate the precarious position in which overall black interest might be placed.

In June 1978, the *Washington Post* reported that the «New Black Vanguard», i.e. black petite bourgeoisie, was voicing «corporate conservatism», that in effect, old line institutions that had styled themselves as protectors of black interests were now taking the side of corporations under the same rubric. The new position taken by organizations such as the NAACP and the Urban League have been justified as a re-thinking of «old assumptions about economic self interests». As Congressman John Conyers put it:

«We have just crossed into a new era. Before, we never had to argue economic theory with a black on the other end of the issue. We have always been the workers, the poor, the proletarians. «They» were always the managers, the wealthy, the bankers, the owners. Great. Very simple. «Us» versus «Them». Now it ain't so simple. Because some them is now us» (12).

Clarence Mitchell, lobbyist for the NAACP seconded Conyers view and showed his perceptiveness in this way:

«This really reflects progress in a wry sort of way. These corporations have hired blacks at the managerial level and they think like management I'm glad to see those black people in there, but I recognize they are promoting management's views and, usually, management's views are not good for the underdog» (13)

Interestingly enough the NAACP has reflected some of the management level views as financial crisis and lack of «expertise» have forced it into a far more compromising relation with the multinational corporate structure that has clarified its petits bourgeois nature.

In a recent fund raising appeal the NAACP was embraced by Mobil Oil on one hand and ITT on the other. The configuration may not impress many people until the point is made concerning the two multinational corporations activities: it is Mobil Oil that has been implicated in numerous reports, including the recently published Bingham Report, commissioned by the British Government, as a participant in the violation of sanctions against Rhodesia. It is Mobil Oil that has provided, in part, the life blood for Ian Smith's intransigence and Abel Muzorewa's folly. Its activities have helped to prolong the conflict and contribute to the rising death toll.

ITT, as sinister as Mobil in protecting bourgeois interests, participated in the overthrow of the Allende government in Chile without regard for the fact that it had been democratically elected.

With these answers the question becomes: what will be the role of the NAACP given the tremendous amount of power multinational corporations can bring to bear? A key to the discussion, again, is the relative lack of power of the petits bourgeois institutions, particularly black petits bourgeois institutions.

While Margaret Bush Wilson, chairperson of the NAACP board sits on the board of directors of the Monsanto, Corporation, her counterpart at the National Urban League does the same thing in a much more visible fashion. Vernon Jordan's corporate and foundation activities are prolific to say the least. Mr. Jordan sits on the boards of at least seven different corporations, including two with investments in South Africa. True to the interests he represents, Mr. Jordan has come to the defense of corporate involvement in South Africa:

I could not eat three times a day and go to Xerox and vote those people out of jobs just to placate my morality, especially when I felt it would not help end apartheid. (14)

With the divestment movement and the bank campaign growing on the campuses across the United States Mr. Jordan is not the only black spokesman for US corporate involvement in Southern Africa. Black academicians and administrators have joined the ranks of those opposed to divestiture.

Some black University administrators have (Rudolph W. Bromery Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst Campus and member of the board of Exxon) publically lamented the position taken by their institutions in urging divestiture (15). They have spoken favorably of corporate involvement in South Africa, and severely criticized decisions to disinvest:

Now some US activists would have us protest the truly horrible plight of most South African blacks by wiping out the few gains they have made through the progressive influence of US firms. (Lansing, Michigan State Journal,, December 29, 1978).

This position is echoed by a number of the African-American petite bourgeoisie including a former Black official in the Kennedy White House, who until recently handled the very prosperous South African public relations contract for Sydney Barron and Associates. A noted black sociologist of civil rights fame has done consulting for at least one multinational seeking to broaden its base in South Africa. And the Reverend Leon Sullivan, head of the Opportunities Industrialization Center, member of the board of directors of the General Motors Corporation, and author of the much touted Sullivan principles, has expressed serious reservations concerning divestment.

(2) The African-American academy offers an interesting transition here for a discussion of the African-American petite bourgeoisie's relation to the rest of black America. They have been among the most prominent critics of William Wilson's thesis that class has superseded race on issues of interest among blacks. A number of prominent black Americans have argued that blacks still identify with one another on

the basic issues of survival in American society and that across the class barrier there is a great deal of *individual* interaction. In fact, Charles Hamilton states that the consensus is so great that the only issue that the black middle class and working class disagree on is housing (16). What has been presented is an interesting yet superficial case. It would seem that a disagreement over housing is a great one indeed given the dispute that public and low income housing have caused in this country. The implications that are associated with the idea of one socio-politico-economic group's lack of concern for and desire not to associate with another group, (with which it has ties that are supposed to transcend class), on an issue as fundamental and crucial as housing in 1979 are extremely serious; far more serious in the immediate sense than who will be President of the United States in 1980.

The argument of interaction on the individual level between singular members of one class and another is historically grounded. However, the point that proponents have failed to realize is that the activities of individuals *per se* have never threatened class interests; it's only a class and the interaction between classes that have the power to disrupt class activity.

As far as the transcending nature of race is concerned there is a blatant exception in the example of the individual, or individuals, who lend themselves to activities that are damaging to the race as a whole. The interests that they represent in working for South Africa can not reflect a racial or ethnic cultural interest, so they must reflect class. Those interests are hardly the interests shared by the majority of the black community concerning the support for and participation in an exercise that oppresses and exploits an entire region of black people--Southern Africa.

(3) There seems to be some basis to the concept that aside from attempting to make the investment climate a bit better for US corporations in South Africa, the Sullivan Principles are a part of the foundation for the development of a South African black petite bourgeoisie. South Africa seems to have realized that it is in need of blacks who fit into the mold described by Hampton Institute's founder, S.C. Armstrong: blacks who are «made content through education and gradual advancement». The Sullivan Principles call for those exact provisions as safeguards to US corporate interests and the key to the advancement of a South African black petite bourgeoisie.

The Sullivan Principles reflect the hopes of a number of aspiring South African and Southern African petits bourgeois. As Chief Gatsha Buthelezi said:

I wish to appeal to South African industry to ward off a bloody revolution by making our people «blacks» feel that they have something to lose if anything went wrong in South Africa (17).

The South African black petite bourgeoisie has made similar pleas to the American corporate structure and they have been supported by influential members of the African-American petite bourgeoisie.

The Appeals made by Buthelezi and his colleagues, Chief Lucas Mangope of Bophuthatswana, Chief Kaiser Mantanzima of the Transkei and others, have been seen as aids to the maintenance of the system of apartheid. On February 4, 1978, the International Economist reported that

Even while vehemently fighting the Nationalists' '«separate development'» policy, Chief Buthelezi has helped to make it possible by working within the '«Bantustan» framework.

As Bernard Magubane has said, the homeland chiefs represent the first line of petit bourgeois interests in black South Africa. (18) For this reason they must support investment in apartheid.

The Soweto uprisings impressed the South African government of the need to placate the black population and the urgency for developing a black petite bourgeoisie with a broad base. The government received considerable pressure to accept this position from South African corporate executives who frankly admitted:

we became involved because we were scared. There was concern for the country, of course, but there was also a selfish concern for our assets. (19)

The executives referred to above had just set up the Urban Foundation under the auspices of South African industrialist Harry Oppenheimer. Mr. Oppenheimer has operated for the past twenty years or so as a liberal industrialist on the premise that investment in South Africa would ease the strains and oppression of apartheid. For the past twenty years or so, Mr. Oppenheimer has been proven wrong. As the South African economy continued to expand the system of apartheid increased in its efficiency and brutality.

With the doldrums of the post-Sharpesville and more recently the post-Soweto periods, the South African economy needed an almost life-saving external boost and American corporations along with other multi-nationals have been providing that fix even though the growth rate seems to be slowing.

At this point in the economic history of South Africa another facet of American Yankee ingenuity became apparent. One way to ward off economic disaster is to create a relatively stable, consumer-conscious, broad-based black middle class. Already South African Business is attempting to tap the growing «black market» through the use of «expert» advice from South African black petite bourgeois market analyst who admit that their white bosses expect a little too much of them:

«They imagine that, because you are black you know it all, straight off the cuff— how blacks will respond...» (20)

The South African government and South African business are spending a lot of time, money and energy in order to find out how blacks will respond, and the business sector has made its expectations well known. One member of the board of the South African Urban foundation put it this way:

«We are single-mindedly committed to improving the quality of life among blacks. Of course our work may have a spin off effect of promoting support for a free-market economy, but if it does, it will be entirely coincidental.» (21)

Of course, also coincidental is the report of the Wiehahn Commission, which favors reforms in labour legislation to make the plight of the black worker more palatable on the surface, while the government still exercises a great amount of control. While the complete impact of the Wiehahn Commission can't yet be assessed, it seems safe to assume that its recommendations will be another step in the direction of molding a class of people «made content through education and gradual advancement».

There are some very important international relations that become visible as an international black petite bourgeoisie comes into being. As mentioned above all petite bourgeoisies are relatively powerless. This position of powerlessness forces them to sell their services to the highest bidder; obviously the capitalist class. The purchase of those services allow the bourgeois to do phenomenal things through the words and actions of the petite bourgeoisie. On demand, Andy Young, Vernon Jordan, Gatsha Buthelezi or Lucy Mvubelo can recite the virtues of investment in South Africa and the debilitating effects that sanctions would have on the African working class, (in this case the fear is the loss of positions in the petits bourgeois sector). There are numerous others who will defend the system no matter how distasteful.

What has essentially happened over the space of 400 years is the development of a very specific model based on the exploitation of blacks and other peoples of color. For those exploited within that model the «escape route» was elevation at the expense of ones fellow travellers. Because the process began earlier in America and America experienced such dynamic growth, the model came to maturity and was ready for export to other places like South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya (22).

The similarities in the development of the African-American and the South African black petite bourgeoisie fit quite well into the framework Frazier described. Frazier spoke of the African-American

petite bourgeois emerging out of relative isolation in an era of legal segregation with some similarity to the system of apartheid. The Plessy V. Ferguson decision of 1896, and the doctrine of «separate but equal» that was established with it speaks as a general model for the South African concept of separate development.

Out of similar conceptual frameworks, at different times, in somewhat of an evolutionary manner, the development of two black petite bourgeoisies was encouraged. They were encouraged to help maintain and advance the interests of capitalism. They came into being out of necessity as important mechanisms of internal economic growth and to serve as buffers and managers of an antagonistic working class that could be appealed to on the basis of color.

Now, as a world class they find themselves in a precarious situation. If they honor their class commitments they will be perceived as enemies of the race and the working class; if they honor the concept of race they have failed to understand the full significance of that position.

The African-American, Kenyan, Nigerian, and South African black have emerged at the foremost among an international black petite bourgeois strata. As an international black petite bourgeoisie their role is the management of Africa and the diaspora on behalf of world capitalism. The extent to which they discharge their class interests is the extent to which they become enemies of the liberation of Southern Africa.

The psychology that accompanies the black petite bourgeois phenomenon is laced with tenacity. Being the last to attain status they are reluctant to give it up, even when it might be in their interest. For them the system of world capitalism is like the proverbial apple cart where the apples are rotting. Refusing to accept this, the black petite bourgeoisie, being the last to arrive means to be the last to let go as the struggle for liberation begins to upset the apple cart.

Most analyses of the Africa-American situation *vis a vis* Southern Africa have failed to go beyond the point of liberation. There has been no systematic consideration of the fact that African-American capitalist interests will conflict with the socialist interests of those Africans who have *struggled for liberation* and gained it. When this is done it should become quite clear that the bond that is referred to so often as being transcending will have to reflect more than the interests of color.

FOOTNOTES

1. Floyd J. Miller, *The Search for a Black Nationality*, pp. 5,18,250-274; «Lynchburg African Development Society», in Adelaide C.Hill and Martin Kilson, *Apropos of Africa*, pp. 167-168; James H. Robinson, «What Africa Asks of Us», in Hill and Kilson, p. 137 ; John W. Smyth, «The African in Africa and the African in America», in Hill and Kilson, p. 52.
2. Tilden J. LeMelle, «American Black Constituencies and Africa: a Rejoinder» in Rene Lemarchand, ed. *American policy in Southern Africa*, p. 334.
3. W.E.B.Dubois, in Julius Lester, *The Seventh Son*, II, p. 421; William Jane Pease, *The Negro Convention Movement* in Nathan Huggines, etal. eds., *Key Issues in the Afro-American Experience*, pp 194,196.
4. «Lynchburg African Development Society», *ibid.*
5. James W. Gilbert, «The Southern Negro's Debt and Responsibility to Africa», in Kilson and Hill, p.121.
6. Kenneth J. King, *Pan Africanism and Education*, p. 7.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
8. Clement T. Keto, «American Involvement in South Africa, 1870-1915: the Role of Americans in the Creation of Modern South Africa», unpublished dissertation, p.201.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 202.
10. King, pp.19,258.
11. Hollie West, «Is Race Lex Important for Blacks Now? *Washington Post*, May 13/77, Earl Caldwell, «The Rising Status of Commitment», *Black Enterprise*, December, 1978, pp. 38-42.
12. William Greiden and Harold Logan, «New Black Vanguard», *Washington Post*, July 25, 1978.
13. *Ibid.*
14. Nathaniel Sheppard Jr., «Rights Leaders at Odds on Whether Corporate Seats Pose a Conflict», *New York Times*, July 1, 1978.

FOOTNOTES, (con't.)

15. Rudolph W. Bromery, discussion at a «Face to Face» Symposium October 11, 1978.
16. Caldwell, *ibid.*
17. Jennifer Davis, «A New Face for Apartheid», reprint in *Southern Africa Perspectives*, 1974 (?), p.3.
18. Bernard Magubane, Discussion, Institute for Policy Studies seminar, 5/16/79.
19. John Burns, «Soweto Triangle: Foundation Woos Ghettos, Government», *New York Times*, June 6, 1977.
20. *Financial Mail*, «Black Spending in Focus», November 24, 1978, p. 14.
21. Burns, *ibid.*
22. See Colin Leye, on Kenya, in *Underdevelopment in Kenya* Gavin Williams on Nigeria, «Class Relations in a neo-colony: the Case of Nigeria», in Gutkind and Waterman, *African Social Studies*, pp.284-294.

RESUME

En 1974, quand J. E. Carter a été élu Président des Etats Unis, la Communauté noire qui l'a aidé à réaliser son rêve commença une longue attente pour le paiement des services rendus.

Le premier versement leur fut fait par la nomination de deux Noirs au Cabinet du Président. La nomination d'Andrew Young au poste d'Ambassadeur des Etats Unis aux Nations Unies commença à chauffer les esprits des Américains Noirs, particulièrement ceux des «Petits-Bourgeois» qui y ont vu une contribution significative des Noirs dans la politique étrangère américaine.

Le départ récent de Mr. Young du poste d'Ambassadeur des Etats Unis aux Nations Unies au milieu de cris de «Au racisme et à la double échelle des valeurs» a de nouveau soulevé le problème du rôle des Noirs Américains dans la formation de la politique étrangère des Etats Unis.

Pendant qu'aussi bien individuellement qu'en groupe les Américains Noirs avancent pour «rattraper le temps» pour ainsi dire il devient nécessaire d'essayer une évaluation de l'impact, si l'impact il y a, qu'ils auraient pu avoir sur la politique étrangère américaine particulièrement quand il s'agit de l'Afrique.



* *Maghan KEITA is former Associate Director of the Washington Office on Africa and Instructor of History and Politics at Bowie State College. Currently Mr. KEITA is conducting research on his Doctoral dissertation in African Studies from Howard University Washington D.C., and is attached to the African Institute for Economic Development and Planning as a visiting lecturer and researcher in Dakar, Senegal.*