What does Pan-Africanism mean to Europe? Pan-Africanism is rarely conceptualized as part of European histories and realities. Although the first Pan-African conferences took place in Europe, were led by African descendants residing in Europe and focused on combating European colonialism and racism. This chapter outlines the philosophy of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 and situates Pan-Africanism in a European context. It presents Pan-Africanism as part of European history and realities and as a conceptual framework for the African diaspora in Europe. It calls for reframing European histories and realities in ways that are neither racially exclusive nor nationalistic. In a context of a growing presence of people of African and other non-European descent, contestations over nationhood and widespread denials of the relevance of race as well as the histories and lasting consequences of European colonialism—the philosophy and history of Pan-Africanism in Europe is all the more relevant.

This chapter begins with a reflection on the meanings and definitions of Pan-Africanism as a term, philosophy and movement. The second section outlines the defining philosophy of the early Pan-African conferences in Europe 1900–1945. The third section elaborates on the defining features of Pan-Africanism as expressed by the activities of these conferences and points to ways in which they are a part of European history. Whereas the fourth and final section reflects on the relevance of Pan-Africanism to conceptualizing a racially inclusive history and the African diaspora in Europe.

On the meaning of Pan-Africanism

What is the meaning of “Pan-Africanism”? There have been many proposals for what should and should not be labelled Pan-Africanism and why.² For example, in British political scientist William B. Ackah’s self-professed crude definition, it is a movement by Africans for Africans—including continental Africans and people of African descent in the diaspora—in response to European ideas of superiority and acts of imperialism.³ Whatever definition one may use, as British historian Hakim Adi points out, most writers would agree that Pan-Africanism is a phenomenon that emerged in the modern period and is concerned with the social, economic, cultural and political emancipation of “African peoples, including those of
the African diaspora.” Underlying its manifold expressions is a belief in the unity, common history and purpose of Africans and people of African descent and the notion that their destinies are interconnected. This includes the early European conferences in London, Paris, Brussels, Lisbon and Manchester 1900, 1919, 1921, 1923 and 1945. It also includes, for instance, the British abolitionist organization Sons of Africa—founded in London in the 1780s by Olaudah Equiano (1745–1797) and Ottobah Cugoano (1757–1791)—as well as the Haitian Revolution of 1791, the creation of an independent Haiti in 1804 and its Constitution—which established the country as a safe-haven for all people of African descent.

While not aspiring to give a universal definition of Pan-Africanism—this chapter seeks to sift out the core, defining features of the Pan-Africanism of the European conferences 1900–1945. This is mainly done by examining the avowed objectives, themes, statements, resolutions, petitions and other activities of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945. As canonical as these conferences may be, the Pan-Africanism that typifies them should not—contrary to what British historian George Shepperson has argued—be seen as capital “P” Pan-Africanism in contrast to other allegedly small “p” pan-Africanism of e.g. Marcus (1887–1940) and Amy Ashwood Garvey’s (1897–1969) Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA). Rather, the characteristic Pan-Africanism of the early European conferences is merely a possible version among others. As a broad working definition, it indeed seems fair, as Hakim Adi does, to describe Pan-Africanism as a phenomenon that emerged in the modern period; concerned with the social, economic, cultural and political emancipation of Africans and people of African descent; with underlying beliefs in their unity, common history, purpose and interconnected destiny. However, it remains to be fleshed out what the nature is of this unity, common history, purpose and interconnected destiny; and why Africans and people of African descent have a shared interest in emancipation. Answering these questions will help us spell out a philosophy of Pan-Africanism—what it is or may be; how to understand it; why and how it is justified; as well as why and how it is socially, culturally, economically and politically relevant. It will also push us to grapple with such philosophically loaded questions as whether Pan-Africanism presumes that Africans and people of African descent by nature share a common character, culture, history and destiny or if and how it, at all, is founded on “race.”

On the philosophy of Pan-Africanism

This chapter argues that the Pan-Africanism of the early European conferences may be summed-up by six core tenets, premises or features:

1. **Pan-Africanism as racial affinity**—Africans and people of African descent around the world share common origins in Africa and similar physical features. This fact is the first foundation of the Pan-Africanism of the European conferences 1900–1945. However, this foundational recognition of “race” and mutual affinity of continental origins and similar physical features did not depend on “racialist” presumptions of shared innate mental or cultural characteristics. Of course, there was a recognition that Africans and people of African descent were subject to such assumptions—which came with the package of white supremacy, anti-African/Black racism and oppression. Still, it seems clear from the activities of the early conferences that the meanings they ascribed to shared physical appearances and continental origins had more to do with shared circumstances than innate qualities. Even when the ascribed meanings included a sense of cultural unity—say, a sense of cultural loss of the African diaspora as well as survival of its cultural ties
to the African continent—more often than not these meanings were expressed in circumstantial terms. It was the sort of “racial” affinity that one of the principal architects of the early conferences, W.E.B. DuBois (1868–1963), expressed in an oft-cited passage from his autobiography, *Dusk of Dawn: An Essay Toward an Autobiography of a Race Concept* (1940). The concept of race had at this time undergone so much change and contradiction that as he faced Africa he asked himself:

what is it between us that constitutes a tie which I can feel better than I can explain? Africa is, of course, my fatherland. Yet neither my father nor my father’s father ever saw Africa or knew its meaning or cared overmuch for it. My mother’s folk were closer and yet their direct connection, in culture and race, became tenuous; still, my tie to Africa is strong. On this vast continent were born and lived a large portion of my direct ancestors going back a thousand years or more. The mark of their heritage is upon me in color and hair. These are obvious things, but of little meaning in themselves; only important as they stand for real and more subtle differences from other men. Whether they do or not, I do not know nor does science know today.  

However,

the physical bond is least and the badge of color relatively unimportant save as a badge; the real essence of this kinship is its social heritage of slavery; the discrimination and insult; and this heritage binds together not simply the children of Africa, but extends through yellow Asia and into the South Seas. It is this unity that draws me to Africa.

2. Pan-Africanism as shared conditions—Africans and people of African descent around the world share similar conditions or circumstances as “Black”/Africans/people of African descent. It was elemental to the sense of unity, common history, purpose, interconnected destiny and interest in emancipation of the early conferences that Africans and people of African descent find themselves in a world where their similar physical features and continental origins are racialized, take on similar meanings and result in similar positions of subordination and disempowerment. Although this was not the only basis of Pan-African unity, it was an essential one.

3. Pan-Africanism as collective interests—Africans and people of African descent around the world have shared interests as a group in being liberated from joint or overlapping conditions of discrimination and subordination and thus to work together towards collective empowerment and emancipation. The Pan-Africanism of the early conferences centred on the collective liberation and flourishing of Africans and people of African descent. This focus on a broad collective rather than individual, ethnic or narrowly nationalistic liberation and flourishing—was primarily, albeit not exclusively, due to an understanding of having largely shared or overlapping conditions as a group. The similar positions of subordination and disempowerment of Africans and people of African descent around the world as a collective meant that they had shared interests to work together, become empowered and emancipated as a collective.

4. Pan-Africanism as a structural view—The racism, discrimination and oppression facing Africans and people of African descent around the world as a collective are primarily “structural” and have international as well as national dimensions. The Pan-Africanism of the early conferences 1900–1945 was based on an understanding of the racism, discrimination and oppression facing Africans and people of African descent as due to a racially stratified
world ordering of political, legal, economic, social and cultural affairs—which placed them in similar positions of subordination and disempowerment. For example, politically, Africans and people of African descent lacked self-determination and equal rights; legally, they were unequal before the law with a segregated and inferior standing compared to white Europeans; economically, their labour and natural resources were exploited to the benefit of white Europeans; socially, Africans and people of African descent were accorded lower statuses than whites; culturally, indigenous African cultures were being suppressed while notions of the superiority of white Europeans and the inferiority of Africans and people of African descent permeated European cultures. This racialized ordering had both national and international dimensions. At the international level, there were fundamental political, economic and other inequities between, for instance, European colonial states and colonized African countries or African descendant majority countries in the Caribbean. This sort of multidimensional “structural” or “systemic” understanding of white supremacy and the subordination of Africans and people of African descent was elemental to the Pan-Africanism of the early European conferences. Hence, one will find in their records and activities a wide range of subjects across political, legal, economic, social, cultural, national and international spheres—be it, for instance, unequal rights, racial segregation, colonization or economic exploitation.

5. **Pan-Africanism as decolonial**—The practices, relations of power, institutions and worldviews of European colonialism (and imperialism) is the primary culprit of the “structural racism” facing Africans and people of African descent around the world. Hence, it is elemental to Pan-Africanism to promote processes of decolonization and liberation from colonialism (and imperialism). The Pan-Africanism of the European conferences was based on an understanding that it above all was the histories, practices, worldviews, national and international organization of European colonialism (and imperialism) that established white supremacy as a rule—including, the discrimination against, enslavement, exploitation and other suppression of Africans and people of African descent. Hence, anti-colonialism and decolonization was at the heart of the Pan-Africanism of these conferences.

6. **Pan-Africanism as political**—The conditions of Africans and people of African descent of “structural racism,” colonial (and imperial) practices, embedded relations of power, institutions, views and their consequences are largely political problems. That is, they fall within the ambit of political concepts, responsibilities and decision-making. Therefore, the framework and objectives of Pan-Africanism need to be largely political. Characteristically, the objectives of the early conferences were framed in such political terms as justice, equality, rights, self-determination and sovereignty. The resolutions, manifestos and declarations of the conferences were framed in such political terms and addressed states, international communities of states, the League of Nations and the budding United Nations. They mostly concerned issues that belonged to the responsibility of states, policy- and law-making—such as racial segregation, colonization and economic exploitation. For example, George Padmore (1903–1959)—who coorganized the Fifth Congress in Manchester 1945—described Pan-Africanism in such terms as seeking to attain “the government of Africans by Africans for Africans, with respect for racial and religious minorities who desire to live in Africa on a basis of equality with the black majority”; and that it “subscribes to the fundamental objectives of Democratic Socialism (...), stands for the liberty of the subject within the law and endorses the [Universal] Declaration of Human Rights, with emphasis upon the Four Freedoms.”
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These six core features of Pan-Africanism—as racial affinity, shared conditions, collective interests, a structural view, decolonial and political—will help us describe and understand the nature, rationale and activities of the early Pan-African conferences and their relevance to Europe.

The Pan-African conferences in Europe

Where these six core features were not explicitly expressed in the activities of the early conferences, generally they were implicitly presumed by them. All the six core features are expressed already in the first Pan-African Conference in Westminster Town Hall in London 22–24 July 1900. It was called by the Trinidadian-born London-resident and law student Henry Sylvester Williams (1869–1911) to be attended “by those of African descent from all parts of the British Empire, the United States of America, Abyssinia, Liberia, Hayti, etc.” to “protest stealing of lands in the colonies, racial discrimination and other issues of interest to Blacks.” Here we find alluded to a recognition of the racial affinity, shared conditions, collective interests, structural view and decolonial aspirations of Pan-Africanism as outlined earlier. It should be noted that the Pan-African collectivism called on here (as elsewhere) need not—and as a general call did not—hinge on a meaning or understanding of “Africans,” “African descendants” or “Blacks” as having innate psychological or cultural qualities in common.

Likewise, the thematic program of the conference, “Programme of Subjects for Discussion,” is premised on the six core features. For example, the first item on the program asks what conditions of home environment, education, labour, leadership and espirit de corps would favour the development of a high standard of African humanity. Here we find assumed, a racial affinity and collective interests of Africans and people of African descent. All the other items on the program also presume this. In addition, they presume a recognition of shared conditions, structural racism and the impact of European colonialism on Africans and people of African descent. For instance, the second item speaks of the “cruelty of civilized Paganism of which the Race are the victims”—“Entailed by Slavery,” “Perpetuated under freedom” and “Supported by social, political and professional exclusiveness.” The fourth item addresses unsolved problems and impediments of “Africa, the Sphinx of history”—including, “The selfish and sordid ends to which it is prostituted,” “A policy exclusively commercial unfavourable to the development of character in every race” and “[t]he consequent treatment of natives as tools instead of men, in the West Indies and America equally as in Africa.” Similarly, the sixth and final item states that, “Organized plunder versus human progress has made our race its battlefield” and that “Europeans and others [have] enriched [themselves] at the cost of Africa.” It also calls out the absence of endowments “to benefit the natives of Africa a crying shame”—whereas the previous fifth item declares that, “Europe’s Atonement for wrongs is the loud demand of Africa.”

Perhaps nowhere else in the first conference in London were the framing six features of its Pan-Africanism more vividly expressed than in its keynote speech, “Address to the Nations of the World.” Its opening lines have since become canonical:

In the metropolis of the modern world, in this the closing year of the nineteenth century, there has been assembled a congress of men and women of African blood, to deliberate solemnly upon the present situation and outlook of the darker races of mankind. The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line, the question as to how far differences of race—which show themselves chiefly in the color of the skin and the texture of the hair—will hereafter be made the basis of denying to
over half the world the right of sharing to utmost ability the opportunities and privileges of modern civilization.\textsuperscript{19}

Here and in the rest of the speech we find a sweeping panoramic view of a racial affinity and collectivism chiefly based on “the color of the skin and texture of the hair,” shared or overlapping circumstances, structural racism and disenfranchisement facing Africans and people of African descent around the world. The speech had been prepared by a conference organizing sub-committee—chaired by W.E.B. DuBois—in which it also was decided that the address be sent to “the sovereigns in whose realms are subjects of African descent.”\textsuperscript{20}

What stands out in this speech and the early European conferences is a structural view of the racial stratification and exploitation as primarily due to the national and international orderings of colonialism and that these circumstances need to be framed and addressed politically. This structural, decolonial and political view became successively accentuated from the 1900 conference in London until the 1945 conference in Manchester.\textsuperscript{21} “[I]f by reason of carelessness, prejudice, greed and injustice, the black world is to be exploited and ravished and degraded,” Address to the Nations of the World admonishes, “the results must be deplorable, if not fatal—not simply to them, but to the high ideals of justice, freedom and culture which a thousand years of Christian civilization have held before Europe.”\textsuperscript{22} The address encouraged that “the black subjects of all nations take courage, strive ceaselessly, and fight bravely, that they may prove to the world their incontestable right to be counted among the great brotherhood of mankind;” and ended with an appeal to “the Great Powers of the civilized world, trusting in the wide spirit of humanity, and the deep sense of justice of our age, for a generous recognition of the righteousness of our cause.”\textsuperscript{23}

Although it would take another 18 years until a second conference—the so-called First Pan-African Congress—took place in Paris 1919, the Pan-African Conference in London 1900 set the ideological tenor for subsequent conferences.\textsuperscript{24} A succession of Pan-African Congresses were held in Paris, London, Brussels and Lisbon in 1919, 1921 and 1923. A fourth one was held in New York City in 1927. They were all organized by W.E.B. DuBois in collaboration with Paris-based African American Ida Gibbs-Hunt (1862–1957), Senegalese deputy to the French Assembly Blaise Diagne (1875–1935) and others.\textsuperscript{25}

The First Pan-African Congress took place in Paris during the 1919 Paris Peace Conference and the closing of World War I. The allied and associated forces met in Paris during the spring to draft a “peace of justice” for the peoples of Europe to live together in friendship and equality. The result was the Treaty of Versailles—signed 28 June 1919—in which the victorious allies held Germany responsible for the war and sought justice by demanding reparations.\textsuperscript{26} On the agenda of the Peace Conference was what to do with Germany’s African colonies. Two years earlier, as France had conquered Germany’s central and east African colonies with the help of African troops, DuBois wrote in the political magazine \textit{The Survey}:

\begin{quotation}
It would be the least that Europe could do in return and some faint reparation for the terrible world history between 1441 and 1861 to see that a great free central African state is erected out of German East Africa and the Belgian Congo.\textsuperscript{27}
\end{quotation}

The reappoartment of Germany’s African colonies after the war sparked a new Pan-African movement.\textsuperscript{28} DuBois was appointed by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to attend the Peace Conference to collect information on the contributions to the war of Black troops. As native Africans had no voice at the Conference, he was determined to use the opportunity to assemble a Pan-African Congress to
serve the interests of Africans and people of African descent.\textsuperscript{29} France being under martial law, the Congress needed the consent of the French Government. Despite opposition from the US and England, it was consented by the French Prime Minster, Georges Clemenceau (1841–1929). Mostly, thanks to the advocacy of Senegalese Deputy to the French Assembly and Commissioner-General of Colonial Affairs in the French cabinet, Blaise Diagne, in addition to some acknowledgement of the hundreds of thousands of Senegalese men who had fought for France during the war.\textsuperscript{30} After having arrived in Paris on 11 December 1918, in little more than two months DuBois—together with Ida Gibbs-Hunt, Diagne and others—managed to organize a First Pan-African Congress of 57 delegates from across Africa and its diaspora at the Grand Hôtel, Boulevard des Capucines, 19–21 February 1919. France was represented by the Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs of the French Chamber, Belgium by a member of the Belgian Peace Commission and Portugal by a former Minister of Foreign Affairs.\textsuperscript{31}

To understand the rationale of the First Pan-African Congress in Paris, we need to bear in mind its philosophy of racial affinity, shared conditions, interests, etc. DuBois and his co-organizers treated the Paris Peace Conference as an opportunity to assemble a Pan-African Congress and raise Pan-African issues more generally beyond the reapportionment of Germany’s colonies in Africa. In line with its Pan-African philosophy, this issue of the reapportionment of the German colonies was understood as an instantiation of broader structural problems of colonialism, exploitation, racial discrimination and subordination of Africans, people of African descent and other people of color. It was from this perspective that DuBois, in a memorandum to Blaise Diagne and others on January 1 1919, declared that among the chief objectives of the Congress would be to obtain statements on the conditions of, and make policy recommendations for, Africans and people of African descent throughout the world. Moreover, the Congress would make strong representations of the 250 million Africans and people of African descent around the world without a voice at the Peace Conference and the newly established League of Nations in Geneva. Additionally, it would lay before these assemblies principles for the future development of the race. Including, equal political rights, universal education, native rights to the land and natural resources, industrial development primarily for the benefit of the natives and the development of autonomous native governments towards “an Africa for the Africans.”\textsuperscript{32} Still, given that the concrete issue at hand at the Peace Conference was the future of Germany’s African colonies and Africa more generally—it was only natural that the Congress primarily focus on Africa.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, as DuBois put it, Africa was central to Pan-Africanism as “a racial fount” and since an amelioration of the lot of Africa likely would ameliorate the conditions of people of African descent throughout the world.\textsuperscript{34}

Regarding the relationship of European states to Africa, Africans and people of African descent, DuBois was clear. What Europe wanted in Africa was “not a field for the spread of European civilization, but a field for exploitation.”\textsuperscript{35} It was the raw materials of Africa—ivory, diamonds, copper, rubber, etc.—and cheap native labor to mine and produce these things that Europe coveted (for its own wealth and power).\textsuperscript{36} In the Manifesto of the Second Pan-African Congress, “To the World,” DuBois called this exploitative relationship “the crux of the matter.”\textsuperscript{37} Meaning that it was out of the racially divided economic exploitation of European colonialism that a vast racial ordering/structuring of social and international relations had developed. This genealogical understanding of the relationship between economic exploitation and structural racism anticipated later conceptualizations of “racial capitalism.”\textsuperscript{38} The Manifesto assessed the basic maladjustment of the great modern problem as “the outrageously unjust distribution of world income between the dominant
and suppressed peoples (...) the rape of land and raw material, and monopoly of technique and culture.  

It was against this background of a basic maladjustment and systemic/structural racial discrimination established by European colonialism, that the Pan-African Congresses put forth their resolutions. In the resolutions passed by the First Congress and presented to the Paris Peace Conference, we find most of the themes of the resolutions of later Congresses.  

- Equal rights irrespective of race or color and economic and social justice according to ability and desert;  
- The establishment of labor laws for the international protection of Africans (and that the League of Nations establish a permanent Bureau to oversee this);  
- That native land and natural resources be under the ownership of the natives;  
- That the investment of capital and granting of concessions be so regulated as to prevent the exploitation of natives and the exhaustion of the natural wealth of their countries;  
- That every native child shall have the right to education in their own language;  
- That no particular religion or culture be imposed on the natives and that they shall have freedom of conscience;  
- That Africans must have the right to participate in government in conformity with the principle that the government exists for the natives (and not the natives for the government).  

The resolutions of the early conferences 1900–1945 on self-determination over land and other natural resources, a globally equal division and protection of labor and a new international economic order with an equitable distribution of resources—as the Fourth Pan-African Congress put it, a “reorganization of commerce and industry so as to make the main object of capital and labor the welfare of the many rather than the enriching of the few”—anticipated later international decolonial movements and interventions that in many ways remain relevant still today (including the resolutions of the 6th Pan-African Congress in Dar–es–Salaam 1974).  

For instance, state and peoples’ sovereignty and self-determination over their natural resources was essential to the UN Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO)—that newly independent states pushed through the General Assembly in 1974. This Declaration asserted, among other things, the full “permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources” and the right of the developing countries and the peoples of territories under colonial and racial domination and foreign occupation to achieve their liberation and to regain effective control over their natural resources and economic activities.  

By the 1980s the NIEO had been displaced by the interests of the “First World.” Nonetheless, this theme of sovereignty and self-determination was picked up again by the Organization of African Unity—a predecessor to the African Union, founded on Pan-Africanism—in its African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights (1981): “All peoples shall freely dispose of their wealth and natural resources,” this right “shall be exercised in the exclusive interest of the people” and State Parties to the Charter “shall undertake to eliminate all forms of foreign economic exploitation (...) so as to enable their peoples to fully benefit from the advantages derived from their national resources.”  

Overall, the calls and resolutions of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 were meaningful in a political context and grammar of equality, rights, non-discrimination, self-
determination, sovereignty and justice. The emphasis of the conferences on equality and non-discrimination preceded later elaborations by the United Nations of universal human rights. Ultimately, the moral-political force and justification of the conferences laid in their explicit and implicit appeals to concepts of human, moral and political equality. In the words of the opening sentence of the Manifesto of the Second Pan-African Congress, “The absolute equality of races—physical, political and social—is the founding stone of world peace and human advancement.” The rise of all human beings the Manifesto describes as “the highest human ideal.” In our world, our likenesses as humans far outweigh our differences, we “mutually need each other in labor and thought and dream,” can “successfully have each other on terms of equality, justice and mutual respect”—whereas those are “the real and only peacemakers who work sincerely and peacefully to this end.”

Naturally, the Pan-African conferences were political in their address as well as their objectives. The structural racial discrimination, injustices and inequities facing Africans and people of African descent throughout the world mostly concerned the social and international organization of societies—including, societal institutions, laws, regulations and so on—which fell within the ambit of political responsibilities and decision-making.

As a matter of political strategy and relevance, the Pan-African Congresses 1919–1923 especially sought out the League of Nations—which was established during the Peace Conference 1919. In an editorial for the Crisis in May 1919, DuBois wrote that the League was necessary to the salvation of the race. Unless Africans and people of African descent had some “super-national power” to curb anti-Black policies at the national levels, they were doomed to fight for their rights internationally and the League held great promise in this regard.

The Fifth Pan-African Congress in Manchester 15–21 October 1945—a month after the end of WWII and a few days before the establishment of the UN—marked a culmination of the philosophy of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945. The core-philosophy of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 was clearly expressed in the statutes of the Pan-African Federation (PAF) behind the Fifth Congress. That is, to promote the well-being and unity of Africans and people of African descent throughout the world; demand self-determination and independence of African peoples and other subject races; secure equal rights and the abolition of all forms of racial discrimination and seek cooperation among African peoples and others who shared their aspirations. However, the resolutions that were passed by the Fifth Congress exclusively focused on Africa. These included, “the complete and absolute independence for the Peoples of West Africa,” “the removal of British forces from Egypt” and “the withdrawal of the British Military Administration from Ethiopian soil.”

Although the Fifth Pan-African Congress became a starting-point for several independence movements in Africa and the founding of international African organizations such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU)—which in 2002 was replaced by the African Union (AU)—after 1945 the core-philosophy of the Pan-African Congresses 1900–1945 lost its political force. Pan-Africanism took a “continental turn” and went from being race-based and broadly internationalist to mostly an internal African affair. The previous decolonial focus was perhaps less relevant or at least not as obvious once African states had become formally independent. Less pronounced was the need for (universal) equality, non-discrimination, freedom, self-determination and justice. More pronounced the interests and politics of the nation-state. Furthermore, the earlier focus on race was complicated by a situation where the ruling political and economic elites of (formally) independent African states were suppressing the interests of their own people; often while serving foreign interests. The Sixth Pan-African Conference in Dar-es-Salaam 1974 became a struggle between
those who favored a strictly class-based analysis of Africa’s problems and those who favored a race-based analysis. It also struggled with trying to come to terms with how the diaspora was relevant to the new Africa.²⁵

**In conclusion—history and the African diaspora in Europe**

The philosophy and history of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 may act as a corrective to Eurocentric and nationalist historiographies as well as help situate the African diaspora in Europe. The world of the early Pan-African conferences was one of European colonialism. Either directly or indirectly by being derivatives of it—such as the USA, Brazil or South Africa. The Europe of the early conferences is one of which Africans, people of African descent and other people of color have long been a part. Albeit as exploited, discarded and discriminated. As subjects, residents and citizens—albeit never full and equal citizens—of European nation-states and extended colonial states. Intertwined with the political, legal, economic, social and cultural formations of European nation-states and empires.

For a Europe that aspires to racial inclusion, equality and justice—the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 may hold a mirror to its history of racial distinctions, discrimination, exploitation and evasion. They may help us shift away from European histories told from the exclusive perspective of folk-nationalisms and white people to ones that include the lives, narratives, subject-positions and dignity of Africans and people of African descent. They may at once place people of color as subjects and actors of European history and Europe in a more equitable and fair global history.²⁸

In African Diaspora and African/Black European Studies, the core-philosophy of the conferences may help situate the African diaspora in Europe. What does it mean to be African/Black European? Do people of African descent in Italy, the Netherlands and Sweden have anything in common? How do we conceptualize “Afro-” or “African Swedes” when they tend to have a first- or second-generation immigrant background in Africa—mostly the Horn of Africa—without a joint ethnic, cultural or historical identity? Here we may draw from the philosophy of the Pan-African conferences 1900–1945 that put an emphasis on joint or overlapping racialized circumstances and positions as Black rather than any presumed racial or cultural identity.²⁹ Such Pan-African philosophy may act as a general conceptual and analytical framework for what it means to be Black in Europe and how being Black here is interconnected with being Black elsewhere. It may also point to ways in which the positionalities of Black people in Europe and elsewhere are inherently political. Here it will be critical that we apply a framework that is at once Pan-African and intersectional and includes e.g. gender, sexuality, class, migration, residency, nationality, ethnicity, culture and religion to the positionalities and politics of being Black in Europe.³⁰

Such a framework may act as an alternative to the current culturalist and identity-centered paradigm of African Diaspora and Black Studies.³¹ It could help decentralize—albeit not exclude—the relevance of culture and identity to situating people of African descent in Europe and elsewhere in the diaspora.³² It could contribute to situating the African diaspora in Europe by:

i. Pointing out what its common denominators are;

ii. Providing an analytical framework for…

a. Locating its joint or overlapping circumstances and conditions in Europe;
b. Indicating why and how these need to be understood as “structural” with national and international dimensions;
c. Why and how these are inherently political;
d. How it is relevant and justified to speak of people of African descent in Europe—or at the national levels, say, African/Afro-/Black Swedes, French or Dutch—as a collective, with shared interests, in need of political recognition, with joint or overlapping collective histories, situations and destinies;
e. How—in the broadest and most inclusive manner—the African diaspora in Europe is interconnected with Africans and people of African descent elsewhere.

When identity and culture enters back into this picture—as they sometimes should—it will not be as an analytical framework or common denominator for outlining, establishing or contextualizing the African diaspora in Europe as a cohesive category. Rather the racial and cultural identifications of people of African descent in Europe as people of African descent/Black/African—where and to the extent that such identifications are relevant—will be understood within an analytical framework as embedded in shared racial affinities, conditions, collective interests, national and international structures, histories and legacies of European colonialism. Moreover, within a framework that conceptualizes them politically as matters of human dignity, equality, liberation, justice and so forth. For instance, as DuBois put it in an editorial in the *Crisis* February 1919, cultures that are indigenous to a people must have free scope if there is to be such a thing as freedom for the world. For who shall say that any civilization in itself is so superior that it must be superimposed upon other people without their free consent.\(^{63}\) Or in the words of the Manifesto of the Second Pan-African Congress 1921, Africans and people of African descent should have freedom of religion and culture “with the right to be different and non-conformist.”\(^{64}\)

Notes

1 I would like to thank Teju Adisa-Farrar for her helpful comments on an earlier draft of this chapter. Thanks also to the audiences for the stimulating discussions following presentations of earlier versions of the chapter at the *Advanced Study Group Moves towards an Anticolonial Academy: Exploring Post- and Decolonial Epistemic Options* at Lund University, Sweden, 18 February 2019, as well the *Afroeuropen Studies Conference 2019: 7th Biennial Network Conference: “Afro Europeans: Black In/Visibilities Contested,”* ISCTE—University Institute of Lisbon, Portugal, 4–6 July 2019.
10 In a similar fashion, Anthony Bogues speaks of three core political ideas that dominate Pan-Africanist political discourse:

(a) The objective fact of the colonial and imperialist exploitation and domination of Africa and that this domination must end; (b) the idea that Africans and people of African descent share a common destiny; and (c) the political freedom of the African continent. (Anthony Bogues, “C.L.R. James, Pan-Africanism and the Black Radical Tradition,” *Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*, Vol 25, No 4 (2011): 486)

Although Bogues nails three core ideas of Pan-Africanism, they are too narrow, inconclusive and, at least in the case of (b), undefined. Although (a) is true, it is not merely in Africa that colonial and imperialist domination must end and where, as in (c), political freedom be achieved—but, for example, in the Caribbean too. And, it is not merely colonial and imperial domination that must end, but racial oppression and discrimination against Africans and people of African descent more generally. It is true that, as in (b), according to Pan-Africanism, Africans and people of African descent share a common destiny. However, in what sense?


12 (DuBois, 2007, p. 59)

13 Ibid.


18 Ibid.


22 DuBois, Walters, Brown and Williams.

23 Ibid. The decolonial and political objectives of the first Pan-African conference were already part of the African Association, founded by Henry Sylvester Williams in London 1897. The Nigerian newspaper the *Lagos Standard* reported on the founding of the African Association in 1897 that it was thought that “the time had come when the voice of Black men should be heard independently in their own affairs and that this could best be achieved by an organization of this kind, having its headquarters in London, the seat of Government.” This since “the Imperial Parliament is supreme in the Empire” and “by sufficient legislation the eyesores of the Empire can be remedied.” Therefore, “the Association thinks British public opinion is a prime force in this matter, and solicits its power, whereby Members of Parliament could be instructed that the better treatment of Native Races should command greater attention in Parliament” (Sherwood, *Origins of Pan-Africanism*, 38–39). In its “Aims and Objectives,” printed in the *Anti-slavery Reporter* the following year, the Association expressed itself as “deeply sensible of the absence of any body of Africans in England representing Native opinion in national matters affecting the destiny of the African Race...” (Sherwood, *Origins of Pan-Africanism*, 38–39). Its objectives were clearly premised on a Pan-African sense of racial affinity, shared conditions, collective, decolonial and political interests, “To encourage a feeling of unity to facilitate friendly intercourse among Africans in general,” and also to promote and protect the interests of all subjects claiming African descent, wholly or in part, in British Colonies and other places, especially in Africa, by circulating accurate information on all subjects affecting their rights and privileges as subjects of the British Empire, by direct appeals to the Imperial and Local Governments. (Sherwood, *Origins of Pan-Africanism*, 40)
During the 1900 Conference, the African Association was transformed into the Pan-African Association with headquarters at 61–62 Chancery Lane in London. Henry Sylvester Williams was its General Secretary and among its Executive Committee members were the African American intellectual-activist Anna J Cooper (1858–1964) and African English composer Samuel Coleridge-Taylor (1875–1912) (W.E.B. DuBois papers (MS 312), “Pan-African Association: Report of the Pan-Africa Congress, August, 1900”; Sherwood, Origins of Pan-Africanism, 98). Plans were made to open branches in Abyssinia, South Africa, Haiti, the US and other places. As Williams explained the purpose of founding the Pan-African Association:

“It was time some effort was made to have us [Africans and people of African descent] recognized as a people, and to enable us to take our position in the world. We were being legislated for without our sanction, and without a voice in the laws that were made to govern us. My idea in bringing about some alteration in this respect was confined in the first place to the British colonies, but the scheme developed into a Pan-African one. Our objects now is to secure throughout the world the same facilities and privileges for the black as the white man enjoys … (Sherwood, The origins of Pan-Africanism, 92.)

Accordingly, the main objectives of the Pan-African Association were to, “Secure civil and political rights for Africans and their descendants throughout the world,” “Approach Governments and influence legislation in the interests of the black races” and “Ameliorate the condition of the oppressed negro in all parts of the world” (Sherwood, The origins of Pan-Africanism, 91–92).

36 Ibid.

It is the shame of the world that today the relation between the main groups of mankind and their mutual estimate and respect is determined chiefly by the degree in which one can subject the other to its service, enslaving labor, making ignorance compulsory, uprooting ruthlessly religion and customs, and destroying government, so that the favored Few may luxuriate in the toil of the tortured Many.

In his autobiography from 1940, Dusk of Dawn, DuBois writes similarly that he at the Paris Peace Conference 1919 was “thrown into direct touch with what I came later to know was the real crux of the problems of my time; and that is the widespread effort of white Europe to use the labor and material of the colored world for its own wealth and power” (130–131).

38 Where “racial exploitation” is its own analytical category and arguably more central, pervasive and clearly delineated in the organization of the global economy than “class exploitation.” Cf. e.g. Mills, “Racial Exploitation,” 113–135; Cedric J. Robinson, Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition (Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 2000/1983). In the same Manifesto, DuBois writes that the great industrial problem of labor exploitation which had hitherto been regarded as a domestic problem of the global north must be viewed far more broadly if it is ever to be resolved.
Labor and capital in England, France and America can never solve their problem as long as a similar and vastly greater problem of poverty and injustice marks the relations of the whiter and darker peoples. (DuBois, “To the World,” 6)

39 DuBois, “To the World,” 7. In this crime “white labor,” he wrote, “is particeps criminis with white capital” and “the vast power of the white labor vote in modern democracies has been cajoled and flattered into imperialistic schemes to enslave and debauch black, brown and yellow labor.” Whereas, [T]he educated and cultured of the world, the well-born and well-bred, and even the deeply pious and philanthropic, receive their training and comfort and luxury, the ministrations of the delicate beauty and sensibility, on condition that they neither inquire into the real source of their income and the methods of distribution or interfere with the legal props which rest on a pitiful human foundation of writhing white and yellow and brown and black bodies. (Ibid)


45 UNGA, Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, A/RES/3201(S-VI), 1974, Article 4(e) and (h), www.refworld.org/docid/3b00f1e048.html (accessed July 29, 2019).

46 Getachew, 171–175. Still, the human right of peoples to self-determination, including, “their inalienable right to full sovereignty over all their natural wealth and resources,” was reiterated in the UN Declaration on the Right to Development (1986) [UNGA, Declaration on the Right to Development, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 41/128 of 4 December 1986, www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/RightToDevelopment.aspx (accessed 29 July 2019)].


48 Cf. Articles 1 and 2 of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).


50 Ibid.

51 DuBois, “To the World,” 6. On the basis of universal human equality, the Manifesto indict[s] European states of injustice and hypocrisy:

England, with her Pax Britannica, her courts of justice, established commerce and a certain apparent recognition of native law and customs, has nevertheless systematically fostered ignorance among the natives, has enslaved them and is still enslaveing some of them, has usually declined even to try to train black and brown men in real self-governance, to recognize civilized black folks as civilized, or to grant to colored colonies those rights of self-government which it freely gives to white men. (DuBois, “To the World,” 7)

52 DuBois, “My Mission,” 10–11. The final resolution of the First Pan–African Congress called on the League of Nations to, among other things, ensure that international labor law covered natives as well as whites, that they have equitable representation in the League of Nations and that,
Whenever it is proven that African Natives are not receiving just treatment at the hands of any State or that any State deliberately excludes its civilized citizens or subjects of Negro descent from its body politic (…) it shall be the duty of the League of Nations to bring the matters to the attention of the civilized world. (DuBois, “The Pan-African Congress,” 274)

Similarly, the Second Pan-African Congress which met in London, Brussels and Paris 28–31 August and 2–6 September 1921 directed its executive officers to approach the League of Nations, “believing that the greatest international body in the world must sooner or later turn its attention to the great racial problem as it today affects persons of [African] descent” (DuBois, “Manifesto to the League of Nations,” 18). As Jesse Fauset (1882–1961) reported in an essay in The Crisis, she and DuBois met with several lead representatives of the League on September 13 1921—among them its Secretary to which they presented copies in French and English of the outcome documents and resolutions of the Congress (Jesse Fauset, “Impressions of the Second Pan-African Congress,” The Crisis, Vol 23, No 1 (1921): 17).

53 The impetus leading up to the Congress was Italy’s 1935 invasion of Ethiopia (Adi, 107). Ethiopia and Liberia were the only countries in Africa at the time that were not colonized by European states. In the League of Nations, European and other members had absolved themselves from any past or present practices of enslavement, explicitly prohibited it in its Covenant and disconnected it from colonial labor—while castigating, scrutinizing and inferiorizing Ethiopia and Liberia for practicing it domestically (Getachew, 53–56). Prior to its invasion, Italy made the case before the League of Nations that Ethiopia was a failed state, in a chronic state of disorder, incapable of fulfilling its obligations as a member of the League, abolishing enslavement or otherwise protecting the rights of its subjects, could not be afforded equality with other members and needed help with being reorganized. Italy used this, including its intention to abolish enslavement in Ethiopia, as a pretext for its invasion (Getachew, 65–66). To C.L.R. James (1901–1989), Italy’s invasion and the League’s failure to act illustrated “the real motives which move imperialism in its contact with Africa [and] show[ed] the incredible savagery and duplicity of European imperialism in its quest for markets and raw materials” (quoted in Getachew, 68–69). Together with pioneering Pan-African activist Amy Ashwood Garvey, George Padmore (1903–1959), Jomo Kenyatta (1897–1978), who later became Kenya’s first President in 1964, and others—James founded the International African Friends of Abyssinia (IAFA) in London in 1935 (Adi, 108–110). Its headquarters was Amy Ashwood Garvey’s restaurant on Oxford Street (Adi, 110). In 1944 towards the end of the war, roughly the same group formed the Pan-African Federation (PAF). Kwame Nkrumah (1909–1972), who later would lead Ghana to become the first independent African nation after the war, was appointed Secretary of the Federation. W.E.B. DuBois was made its honorary International President and Amy Ashwood Garvey its Co-President (Padmore, 127–129, 132; Esedbe, 127–128; Sherwood, “Pan-African Conferences, 1900–1953,” 108–109; George Shepperson and St Clare Drake, “The Fifth Pan-African Conference, 1945 and the All African Peoples Congress, 1958,” Contributions in Black Studies: A Journal of African and Afro-American Studies, Vol 8 No 5 (2008): 56).


55 Sherwood, “Pan-African Conferences, 1900–1953,” 109. Of the nine resolutions that were passed only the final one mentioned any region outside of Africa: “the independence or at least self-government for all British, French and Italian colonies in Africa and the West Indies” (Ibid).

56 In St Clare Drake’s terms, “Racial Pan-Africanism” was replaced by “Continental Pan-Africanism” (e.g. Shepperson and Drake, 59).
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