

# PAN AFRICANISM AND PAX AFRICANA IN THE NEW WORLD ORDER: ISSUES

**Emimeke Henry Dienye PhD**

Faculty of Humanities, Department of History and Diplomatic Studies, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

**Sam A. Dede PhD**

Faculty of Humanities, Dept. of films and Theatre Arts, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

## Abstract

The paper did set out to examine nexus between Pax Africana, Pan Africanism and the new world order (NWO). The new world order is causing great social, economic and political dislocation amongst weaker states of the “global south” without any visible remedies or resolutions in sight. What had remained worrisome is that the continued reliance on the leading states / powers by states of the “global south” for solutions to these dislocations, even in the phase of “cold shoulders” and rebuffing of the states of the global south. The protagonists of the “new order” claim that new world order is impacting the conduct of states and individuals in the current global system positively; whether rightly or wrongly is a matter of the side of the divide where one finds itself. The claim of a new world order is still resonating across the global system with a fraction of states holding a contrary view. The intensity of the debate had thrown up several issues bordering on the survival states in the global system. It is in this light that the paper did deem it fit to examine the nexus between the survivals of African states, “Pax Africana” and “Pan Africanism” within the context of a new world order. The examination leads to several conclusions that include the “inferiorization” of African values and culture. The consequence of the “inferiorization” of the African continent is her relegation to the “back waters” of global politics and economics, thus, the recommendations canvass herein.

**Keywords:** The New World Order, Globalization, Pan-Africanism, Pax Africana. Colonialism, Neo – Colonialism.

## I. Introduction

While the paper did set out to establish the nexus between the three concepts (PAX AFRICANA, PAN AFRICANISM AND NEW WORLD ORDER) and their impact on the “progressing unification” of the black race. By all intent and purposes, the caveat whether their impacts had been positive or negative did inadvertently set the tone and thrust of the paper. The term “new world order” is highly contentious, in the sense that, over time and space, it has acquired several connotations and meanings, thus, the division noticed in the current global system over the subject of the new world order. The phrase “new world order” became noticeable and visible in the 19th century due to the innovations in science and technology in impacting and transforming the world and global system, into a new social structures or global cooperation. The idea took a more concrete and specific meaning with the US President Woodrow Wilsons espousing his vision for the “League of Nations” that aimed at creating international relations that would make future conflicts less attractive. That vision died with the dawn of the Second World War, yet, the “term” took to centre stage after the Second World War, with establishment of the United Nations and the Bretton wood institutions – international monetary fund and World Bank - that are considered an integral part of the new global order. These global economic institutions were meant to guarantee economic wellbeing of states/nations, thus, by extension peace in the global system. But in the immediate aftermath of the Post world war 11 settlement, saw the emergence of the ideological war that is commonly referred to as the “cold war” take the centred stage which inadvertently took the “shine off” the term (new world Order) in mainstream academic discourses, but where it found mention, it was deemed to have been deployed by conspiracy theorist that sees it as a covert plan by global elites to establish a totalitarian world government. In the new millennium, the “term” was prominently associated with George H

Bush in his description of the new epoch in international cooperation, collective security and the spread of democracy and free market, thus, the concept being closely linked to globalization.

By all intent and purposes, the new world order (NWO), going by the structural division of the current global system - developing and developed states and with benefit of hindsight, its manifestation (NWO) in the "global south" had been brutish, nasty, and unforgiving. The states of the global south are drained politically, economically and socially. The dictates/ rules of the new world order is the primary reason for the political, economic and social dislocations in the third world states including those of Africa. In advancing this line of reasoning further, Ake (1992) noted, thus, while citing Brzezinski noted thus, that the "new world order" is seen very much in "terms" of the leadership of the United States of America in the current global system. However, his concerns/ fears are much broader, as these concerns were underlined by the great deal of attention giving to the strategic issues that defines the role of the United States of America in the new world order. The issues that underlined the fear of both scholars include the collapse and disintegration of the Soviet Union and the ascendancy of western concepts of democracy and the free market. In the course of the hegemonic and ideological struggles, a broad western coalition extending from Europe to Japan was forged as a "functionally pragmatic transnationalism", with shared interest in collective security and free trade. What this potent for the rest of the world in the new world order is that international politics amongst (the coalition members) leading states in the current international system has made the organic distinctions between domestic and external realm to be blurred. Since the members of the western coalition (leading states) are too interdependent and too well armed to fight each other, global politics is becoming in some ways, similar to America's urban centres, where violence is concentrated in the poorer segment of society, thus, today, on a global scale, war has become a luxury that only poor nations can afford, while morally unpalatable, this reality nonetheless does somewhat enhance global security. If that be the case, the new world order has framed a new geostrategic agenda and it is on the resolution of this strategic agenda that the prospect of peace and stability depend, thus, the geostrategic agenda can be thought as a triangle drawn from Brussels to Tokyo, Tokyo to Cairo to Brussels. The "Brussels axis" is a representation of the European project of economic and political unification that would lead to a more stable world by terminating intra-European powers conflicts. The "Tokyo axis" is the Far East regional security project. The concern here is that in the interest of peace and security, Japan, China South Korea and Taiwan could be brought into some structure of regional cooperation with the help and leverage provided by the "paramountcy" of United States of America's power in the region. The "Cairo Axis" is the Middle East Project where the end of the Gulf War and the end of the cold war have created unprecedented opportunities for a settlement not only to bring peace but to check the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Here, as in the other two axis, the willingness of the United States to use its leverage becomes decisive, thus, both Krauthammer and Brzezinski (1992), see the immediate danger to peace and security to global peace lying in the south. This view point and position was further amplified and supported by Brzezinski (1991), while citing President Jacques Delors in his address to the international institute for strategic studies in March 1991 when he noted inter alia "all around us naked ambition lust for power, national uprisings and underdevelopment are combining to create potentially dangerous situations containing the seeds of destabilization and conflict aggravated by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction". While the salient fact that needs noting is the pre-eminence position of the United States of America in the "functionality" of the "new world order", thus, the question of how best to managing all the threats therein the system. On how best to managed the conflicts foster by The new world order on the global system, Ake (1992) argue inter alia that as far as the more remote and clandestine geostrategic threats exit and attached to the following four kinds of initiative - The first is to deepen the political and military unity of Europe as partners of the United States. The second is the progressive

strengthening of the political and economic power of the various soviet national republics that is advancing the decaying of the Soviet Union while, the third is to engage the United States, Japan and china in a regional security arrangement in the Far East. Lastly (fourth), to push through with the peace settlement in the Middle East. All these geostrategic objectives depend on the United States for the simple reason that no other power currently possesses the attributes needed for the effective global leverage, military reach, political clout, and economic impact as well as social and cultural appeal, the threat to global peace and security would remain. Thus, the immediate danger and threats emanating, specifically, from nations in the “global south”, can only be mitigated by (response) - direct police action – that are not generally discussed or brought to front burner of international discussions, but rather, taken for granted, thus, the question - what are the expected objections to imperialist violations of the sovereignty of the weaker nations? In determining when and how to address such problems that may arise in the international system may need to be guided less by the traditional notion of sovereignty (i.e. one state violating the sovereignty of another) and more by the scope of the threat itself. In other words, there may develop situations in which external intervention is required in what is seemingly internal/ domestic affairs of the state as the case in Yugoslavia yesterday and perhaps elsewhere tomorrow – may be necessary and Justified by the potential consequences of activities that are otherwise of internal character.

By all intent and purposes, the notion of conspiracy theorist concerning the new world order been pushed out into the global system had left the global system divided as exemplified by the views of William Pfaff. Pfaff hold a contrary view to the dominant conception of the “new world order”, especially, as it concerns the unipolarity thesis. He argues that the very category of sole superpower vanished with cold war rivalry. It vanished because it was constituted by the possession of a nuclear arsenal and competition over a model of the collective humanity (mankind’s future). Because the United States is no longer the sole superpower, it has been left in a situation of having to consider what it must do and even to define what it is. While there is no denial that United States remains phenomenally powerful and easily the world’s most formidable military power, however, it must be noted that power in itself has become in the context of world politics an immensely complicated fact with the growing need to make differentiation between proliferating categories of significant power, political, military, and economic and technology. The United States excels in military power, it is heavily indebted and its military power is partly redundant, relative to its security needs. Moreover its ability to mobilise consensus for public policy is less than adequate and it is beset with social tension. Despite the power of the United States the international prospect today is not so much a world dominated by a single superpower as it is one lacking even great powers that meet the traditional definition of invulnerability. Thus, the idea of collective security in the “new world order” is premised on the triumph of western ideology; therefore, it is not uncommon to find the widespread of the democracy and the triumph of democratic governance in the current global system. To this end one can confidently argue that in all of these conceptions or across the entire spectrum of debate over the “new world order” lay the role of the United States of America, especially, with her underwriting the idea of collective security. Whether the United states and her allies are celebrating the unipolar, articulating a geostrategic agenda(s) or arguing on the vulnerabilities that had banish all hope of domination by the United states of America, what is central in recent discussions is most often than not is the fulcrum or the role of the USA in the changing new world order and its efforts at collective security.

Be that as it may, in all the conceptions of the new world order – old and new – they are about the grand northern coalition against eastern socialism. In all the conceptions of the strategic agendas that underlies the new world order is the focus on peace and security and the penetration into the affairs of weaker states for the effective exploitation of these states for the benefit of leading states.

The contention that sees “new world order” (NWO) has been a positive development, stem from the fact that geostrategic agenda that is dipping the political and

military alliances between Europe and the United States of America had place huge burden on African states as the alliance had continued to define their relationship with continent on the premise laid by colonialism. Colonialism laid the foundation for the continued exploitation of weaker states (nations of the global south) politically, economically, and socially, thus, the “new world order” following in this footsteps. It is in this light that the paper is forced to ask whether at the operational level of society in the global system there is indeed a “new world order” or what is really meant by a “new world order”. Several scholars have contended that there is a new world order especially with the emergence of America as the biggest economic, political and economic boiling pot of the world. The emergence of the USA translated into her wearing the toga of a superpower that place huge moral and political, economic and social responsibilities on her. In the same vein, these burdens demanded new form, ways and approaches to global issues. It is these “new ways” that had been transfigured into the “new world order”. The question again is whether the new ways and approaches to global issues translate into having a “new world order”. The logic of a “new world order” potent that there was an “old order” that needs replacing and what are features of the “old order” that had necessitated its replacement. In the old order, colonialism and imperialism was at its foundation. It supported the subjugation of weaker states – politically, economically and socially. By all intent and purposes, in the old order everything non – European was “inferiorised” to the extent that efforts of these non-European cultures towards the progress and development of humankind were deliberately written off or attributed to other cultures. Colonialism and imperialism caused political economic and social dislocations in all non-European cultures (states) for the singular reason of exploitation. It is the attraction therein colonialism and imperialism (exploitation) that lead to the fall of the old order, as some European nations that felt aggrieved with the rules governing the old order, thus, the need for them to challenging it, consequently, it’s fall. It is from the ashes of the old order that the new world order sprout out. Is there any difference between the old order and the new order? For a “new world order” that increased the pace of dichotomization of global system without any international mores, it was not different from the “old order”. The dichotomy of the global system primarily constituted the basic structures of the new world order, an order of two extremes. The two extremes here referred to the radical/ structural division of the world into - rich and poor nations, which by aggregations had amounted in geo political terms as “South” and “North”. The “North” houses the powerhouse of the current global system- political social and economic – while the “South” on the other hand, houses “the poor of the poorest”. Statistically too, it is common knowledge that the population of the global “North” that constitute or make 20% of the world population controls 80% of the wealth of the world, no wonder the “South” with about 80% of the world population controls only a paltry 20% of the world’s wealth, no wonder it is haven of poverty, diseases, unemployment, etc. For the purpose of clarity, the term “new world order” is construed to be a new period or dawn in global history evidencing the dramatic changes/ approaches in world political thought and the balance of power in international relations. Notwithstanding the varied interpretations of this term, it is commonly associated with the notion of world governance, thus, in furtherance of this logic, Kissinger noted inter alia;

No truly global world order has ever existed. What pass for order in our time was devised in Western Europe nearly four centuries ago at a peace conference in German region of Westphalia conducted without the involvement or even the awareness of most other continents and civilizations? A century of sectarian conflicts and political upheavals across central Europe had culminated in the thirty years War of 1618 – 48- a conflagration in which political and religious disputes commingled, combatants resorted to total war against population centres and nearly a quarter of the population of central Europe died from combat, diseases and starvation.

The kernel of Kissinger thoughts is that the Westphalia peace accord reflected practical accommodation to reality, not a unique moral insight. It relied on a system of independent states refraining from interference in each other’s domestic affairs and checking



each other's ambition through a general equilibrium of power. To this extent, when one stretches the idea further, especially, into the 21st century, there will be discovery that the idea of a "new world order" by the states of the global north is centred around relatively small issues that includes the following - the changing nature and structure of power in the world system, (2) the changing nature and magnitude of threat to international security (3) the role of the United states in the world and the increasing pace of social 'political and economic dynamics. From the claims of Kissinger, one salient and visible fallout is the holding on to the logic of the centrality of the concept of "Unipolarity" in the entire debate over a "new world order" in the current global system. The fallout caused scholars like Ake and Krauthammer that both question the latent misconception that underlines the entire debate over new world order, especially, as it concerns the failure in acknowledging the gradual emergence of other power poles in the system. To this end both scholars posited that though "Multipolarity" will come in the nearest future, but in the main time (20th century) "Unipolarity" remains the revolving door to understanding the "new world order". The boundary of this logic was further extended with the declaration of Krauthammer that noted *inter alia*;

There is but one rated power and no prospect in the immediate future of any power to rival it... American pre-eminence is based on the fact that it is the only country with military, diplomatic political and economic assets to be a decisive player in any conflict in whatever part of the world it chooses to be involved itself.

The crux of the matter is that the concept of the "new world order" has several indexes underlining it, thus, the failure of acknowledging them and the inability in not been able to establish the connectivity between these indexes to the new world order leaves one viewpoint greatly limited. But for the purpose of this paper the "new world order" is considered to be the period of history evidencing a dramatic shift in world political thought and the balance of power. The new world order gained prominence after the two world wars, particularly after WW11 when the global powers aimed at creating structures to prevent conflicts and promote international cooperation. These primary motives had extended into the 21st century. Though, the 21st century had uniquely presented humankind with its own problems like those of Corona virus, increasing perversity of poverty across the globe and incidences of armed conflicts. The interplay of these known problems confronting humankind had caused several states / nations and cultures to develop what can be consider their own unique approaches to these issues and problems. For the African continent their approach is encapsulated in the concept of "Pax Africana" and "Pan Africanism".

### **Pax Africana in the New World Order**

While, it is difficult to extricate concept Pax Africana" from "Pan Africanism" for the simple reason that both concepts are rooted in the black race (Africa) and ultimately desiring the same goal - emancipation of the black race and Africa. It is the pathway to this "ultimate goal" that has created the trajectories and subject of discussions for different scholars, thus, the question what is "Pax Africana" especially in the context of the "new world order". Pax Africana, or "African peace" was a concept that found relevance in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as the European powers colonised and pauperised much of the African continent. The idea behind or the intent behind the concept of "Pax Africana" was the desire to creating a period of peace, tranquillity and stability in Africa under the supervision of European colonial rule. The term was first used by a British writer Mary Kinsley in her book "west African studies" in 1899. It was later popularized by French historian Theodore Monod in his book *L'Afrique Occidentale* in 1937. During the colonial period, European powers imposed their own systems of government, borders and infrastructure on African societies that most often than not lead regularly to political instabilities and conflicts. Despite the intentions of colonial powers to bring peace to Africa, the reality was often far from the ideal of "Pax Africana"<sup>9</sup>. The concept and the idea, by all intent purposes, "Pax Africana" as envisioned by African leaders and scholars was predicated on notion that Africans/ African states should be responsible for maintaining peace and order on the continent, reducing

reliance on external powers. The idea and concept is rooted in the post-colonial aspirations for self-determination, sovereignty and unity among African nations, as Africa's aspirations/dreams became a mirage during the colonial period. The question is how is the idea different from Pan Africanism? The attempt at proffering answers to question and situating the answers within the context of the new world order caused the paper to examining the thoughts of Ali Mazurui in his seminal work of 1967 title in search of "Pax Africana" where he postulated, thus, the peace of Africa is to be assured by the exertions of Africans themselves, thus, "Pax Africana" is the specifically military aspect of the principles of continental jurisdiction" Mazurui further noted that there are four crises endangering the planet – (1) depletion of resources(2) the population and other dangers to the ecology (3) large scale violence among human beings. The first three dangers to our planet need institutions of global supervision and control. But the worst danger concerns large scale human violence including the danger of a nuclear war. From the answers proffers to the dangers by Mazrui found the relevance of "Pax Africana". The answers of Mazrui took into cognisance of the hostile international environment Africa found itself, thus, his declaration that this is where "Pax Africana" looms relevance. Is Africa affected by this nuclear cloud hanging over the world's political system? How does Africa suffer from it and in what ways can the continent contribute towards saving the world from nuclear holocaust? At the heart of the matter is the paradox of Africa's location. It is the most centrally located of all continents but politically it is perhaps the most marginal. This anomaly has the implications for Pax Africana.

While kernel or the central theme of Mazurui thoughts is that the African continent can help coagulate global peace by looking inwards for what is uniquely "African approach" to the resolutions of her conflicts without necessarily relying on external forces that had albinio help creating and fuelling these conflicts in the first place. The core of Mazurui thesis and postulation was put to the test almost immediately in the African continent. Simply put, Africa must think Africa, dream Africa, and breathe Africa. statistically revelations noted that between 1948 – 2013, over 40 percent (28 out 68) of the UN's peace keeping and observer missions were deployed in Africa; and almost half (27) of the world body's 55 missions launched in the post-cold war era had been in the continent . However, one salient fact that needs noting is the fact that the world body's founding charter made no specific provision for "peace keeping". It was originally envisaged that military actions by the UN would be authorised by the Security Council and implemented with the assistance of a military staff committee as provided for in chapter VII of the charter (which deals with peace enforcement). Armed peacekeeping as a tool was first employed by the UN during the 1956 crisis over the control of Egypt's Suez Canal when Britain, France and Israel launched a military intervention to seize the canal. Following the 1950 uniting for Peace resolution which granted the Un general assembly the power to step in whenever peace and security was threatened by the inability of a divided security council to take appropriate action , the world body established a. Emergency force (UNEF) to prevent a renewal of hostilities along the Suez canal. Another test to the thesis of Mazurui was in the Congo where the intervention lasted for 4 years (1960 – 1964) where the debts incurred during the intervention became controversial and unpleasant to the custodians of the global system. The bottom line of the series of intervention of the global body in Africa caused most African states losing faith in the global institution. The Congo issues did rake up several issues that include Africa's vulnerabilities in the complex old world order in the global system that needed replacement.

The "new world order" required the new "modus operandi" that is intricately woven around globalization, free market economy, and the domino supervision of the United States of America. The call for a new "Modus oparandi" did inadvertently accentuate the need for Pax Africana. From the period 1967 till date when Mazurui extended the boundaries of Pax Africana, what had become visible is that in the new world order the asymmetrical gap between Africa and the rest of the globe is becoming wider. Africa is reduced to be the

partaker of history and not a maker of history thanks to European interventions in several multiple guises. These guises and intricacies had kept Africa at the back waters of global politics and economics. For example, no African states had made it to the security council on a permanent basis ( the highest decision making organ of the United Nations). African states had continued to wobble and vulnerable in the new world order. To scholars like Ojo (1999), whose claims was quiet revealing and troubling as he posited that if Africa gets its economic performances right every other thing right, especially in the purview of the expanding notion of security in the current global system that have handed powerful countries in the system that amble advantage of intervening in the affairs of weaker states of current system that includes Africa states. To this end Ojo argued that the current scramble for Africa by the three spiders of global politics – USA, China and the EU as they are recently tagged and described. What is worrisome in this “new scramble” for Africa is that it is been leverage and intricately woven around the dictates of the new world order that hinges on globalization, free market economy and domino supervision of America. The lessons therein in Ojo’s analysis especially as it concerns this paper is that Africans and the African continent would remain vulnerable and helpless in phase of the increasing conflicts that is ravaging the continent due to the woeful economic performances, interference of leading states in the affairs of African states and the subdued reasoning of Pax Africana amongst Africans and their political leaders.

The issue of the subdued reasoning of “Pax Africana” amongst African leaders had been traced to the Congo crisis of the 1960s, when the UN secretary was seen as taking the lead in managing security issues. Some leading states frowned at been saddle with the expenses of the intervention, thus the clandestine move for role reversal. The role reversal became manifest soonest, especially with demand of the USA and the pushing for a new world order. The five (5) permanent members of the Security Council now largely control decision making on peacekeeping. The end of the cold war by 1990 also resulted in the increased corporation between Russia and USA which facilitated the deployment of UN peacekeepers in Namibia, Angola, Mozambique and Somalia. Again these interventions was to give the leading states the opportunities to increase their strangle hold on African economies. In furtherance of this line of reasoning and logic, Ojo, again, in his is analysis raked up a new trajectory with the declaration that Africa’s biggest problem in the “new world order” and within the purview of expanding notion of security is economics, coupled, with the underlining debate over assertiveness as demanded by “Pax Africana” would remain a mirage. From the stance of the erudite scholar, one is tempted into believing that Ojo had never heard of the Organization of Africa’s Unity (O.A.U) now the African Union. The O.A.U. was an initiative/ effort towards the assertiveness as demanded by “Pax Africana”. The OAU was a representation of the continent taking the bold initiative of seeking Africa’s solution to her conflicts. By all intent and purposes, African conflicts had left most African states helpless and in dire need especially in the phase of incidences of conflicts in Africa. While kudos must be given to the efforts of OAU/AU in being at the fore front of conflict resolutions in Africa so far, Ojo was never far away from calling for the need for Africans to think “Pax Africana,” especially, where primacy is given to economic determinants of African states. The woeful economic performances of African states had left the continent in search of new approaches to braking the shackles of neo colonialism all over again and this came about as a result of the system the that needed to replaced especially in the context of the United states of America emerging as a superpower after the second world war and pushing for the emancipation of colonial people from the shackles of colonialism.

### **Pan Africanism in the New World Order**

“Pan Africanism” as a concept is a broader ideological, spiritual and political movement that even envelopes the “Pax Africana”. Though, the concepts of “Pan Africanism” And “Pax Africana” share similarities, both were borne out of peculiarities of the Africa and the black race as a whole. “Pan Africanism” advocates for the solidarity and unity amongst the people of Africa, African descent (black race) worldwide. It has helped in

the shaping of the political, economic and social landscapes of Africa and Africans in the diaspora since its emergence in the 19th and early 20th centuries. With emergence of the “new world order” characterised by the shifting power dynamics, globalization and increasing interdependence, “Pan Africanism” found footing in a global environment that is brutish nasty and unforgiving of weakness, as those seen in their world states, especially, those in Africa faces both limited opportunities and intense political, social and economic challenges. It shares the same antiracial background with African personality and negritude. It was not until 1919 when Henry Sylvester – Williams of Trinidad and W.E.B. Du Bois of the USA both of African descent, used it as motto of the first Pan African congress held in Paris that it became a political credo. Following through on the Paris conference Sylvester Williams and Du Bois quickly organized four other conferences of which the fifth was very significant as Pan Africanism and African nationalism really took concrete expression. For the first time the necessity for well-organized firmly - knit movement as a primary condition for the success of the national liberation struggle was recognized observes Nkrumah, who had served as one of the joint secretaries of the conference’s organizational committee. To this end Legum notes;

Deep as its quivering, sensitive centre, Pan Africanism rests on colour consciousness. Recognition of the unique historical position of black peoples as the universal bottom dog led a revolt against passive submission to this situation. The emotions associated with blackness were intellectualised; and people to regain their pride, their strength and their independence. But, although, black skins were made into the shield for the battle. “Pan Africanism” became a race conscious movement, not a racist one (Legum; 60).

What did not go unnoticed was the referencing done by Legum that claimed that “Pan Africanism” was the “movement for the total liberation and unity of Africa” in his analysis thus caused Okadigbo extending the boundaries of Legum analysis by adding that “it is not the strategy for the procurement of freedom and unity that really matters; it is the Geist”. It is in the light of the movement or growth of the Geist towards its manifestation as Pan Africanism that caused Nkrumah to talk about the “African personality” and “conciencism” in the understanding of the concept of Pan Africanism. While not trying to distance his views on Africa’s personality from those of Nkrumah, Diop cited in Okadigbo helped extend the boundaries of thoughts of Nkrumah on African personality by noting thus;

The African personality which is the basis and foundation of our humanism aspires... to being freed from western grip. It requires that our people should speak through us... our peoples only mean to give expression to what they alone can show forth; how they identify themselves in the context of the world situation and of the great problems of mankind.

Summing up this line of reasoning Okadigbo posited that it can be said that African personality is the anti – thesis of the ideological territorial and paternalistic subjugation of Africans with the systems of direct religious and colonial domination and represents that aspiration of contemporary Africans to speak and act like Africans with dignity. Okadigbo went further to declare’;

Only within the setting of some specific cultures do events of significance take place. Within this culture, too such events derive their significance. It happens that the same events, occurring as it were between the frontiers of two different cultures elicit totally different responses from the differing cultures. It is in this area that the questions of cultural bias and distortion arise. For in terms of objectivity where the evaluation of facts and events are of paramount necessity, the cultural alien only offers alternative set of prejudices instead of genuine understanding (Okadigbo; ix)

It is against this backdrop that this paper explores the historical evolution of Pan “Africanism” its relevance in contemporary global politics and its role in the new world order. Historical traditions trace the root of Pan Africanism back to the 19th century and it gained impetus from the shared experiences of colonization, slavery and racial discrimination. Early advocates like WEB Du Bois, Marcus Garvey and Kwame Nkrumah emphasised the need



for Africa unity and self-determination. The movement gained momentum in the mid-20th century leading to the establishment of the organization of African unity OAU in 1963 that aimed to promote political and economic cooperation among African states and to eradicate colonialism. Pan Africanism in the 21st century had continued to evolve influenced by the factors of globalization technological advancement and the rise of geo politics actors. Key institutions like the African Union (AU) which succeeded the OAU in 2002 strive to address modern challenges through initiatives aimed at economic integration, peacekeeping and sustainable development. The AU's Agenda 2023 outlines a strategic framework for transforming Africa into a global powerhouse, emphasizing unity prosperity and peace.

Within the context of the new world order that is characterised by the multipolarity and the accelerating pace of globalization had presented Pan Africanism with series of challenges that are inhibiting Africa's growth, prosperity and development, especially in the 21st century. These challenges had elicited responses from the African Union in order to usher in growth and development. One of such responses is in the areas of economic integration and development where the continent responded with the Africa continental free trade area (AFCFTA) launched in 2021. The AFCFTA was aimed to create a single market for goods and services across Africa, boosting intra African trade and economic growth. It was to represent a significant step towards economic unity and collective bargaining power on the global stage. Foreign investment and partnership was another area the African continent explored. Africa's increasing engagement with emerging powers like china and India that offers fresh opportunities for infrastructure development and economic diversification. However, the new engagement with emerging powers of china and India had also necessitated the development of new strategic management tactics in order to avoid new forms of dependency. Conflict Resolution and peace keeping is another aspect of where the AU is making in road at resolving African conflicts – the Congo versus Rwanda, Sudan crisis all bear testament to the efforts of the AU . All of these attempts of the AU's at peace keeping mission and conflict resolution are crucial for the maintenance of stability, thus, strengthening all efforts at fostering a cohesive Pan African identity. In the realm of democratic governance, the AU is promoting democratic principles and good governance across African states in order to enhance sustainable growth, unity and development.

In conclusion, in a "new world order" that is brutish nasty and unforgiving to weaker states due to the increasing pace of globalization that is causing great inequalities in the global system. While globalization is making richer states richer, it is making weaker and poorer states poorer for the simple reason of "best global standards" in the global system. It is in this hostile environment that "Pax Africana" and "Pan Africanism" gained tremendous success. It has gripped the African people and continent. It has an exciting and romantic hold over militant African nationalist, particularly those whose countries are still being bulge down heavily by neo – colonialism and its dictates. It has been the uniting theme at several African conferences culminating in establishment of the organization of Africa states (the loose union of the sovereign African states) the current agitations for black power, blackism black pride and afro America solidarity in the United States and elsewhere find their roots here. No matter the method or approach employed by its varied advocates all over the world, as must necessarily be the case, the ideal is the same with its African counterpart and stem.

## References

- ..... (1992). Order, Disorder and U.S. Leadership. The Washington quarterly Vol.15, No 2. Spring.
- ....."Order, Disorder and U.S. Leadership" in the Washington Quarterly 1992, Vol.15, No 2. Spring 5 – 13.
- Adedeji, Adebayo (1991). Africa in the Nineteenth nineties; A decade for the Socio economic Recovery and Transformation or Another lost Decade. Nigerain Institute of international affairs.

- Adekeye Adebajo (2010). "Prophets of Pax Africana; Africa's Security Architecture" in Adekeye Adebajo the Curse of Berlin Africa After the Cold war( New York; Columbia University press 52.2.
- Ahlman, Jeffrey S. (2010). The Algerian question in Nkrumah's Ghana 1958-1960: Debating "Violence" and "Nonviolence" African Decolonization. *Africa Today* 57: 66-84.
- Ahlman, Jeffrey S. (2011). Road to Ghana: Nkrumah, Southern African and the eclipse of a decolonizing Africa. *Kronos* 37: 23-40.
- Ajulu, Rok. (2001). Thabo Mbeki's African Renaissance in a Globalising World Economy: The struggle for the soul of the Continent. *Review of African Political Economy* 28: 27-42.
- Ake, Claude. (1992). The New World Order; A View from the South. (Port – Harcourt; Malthouse for CASS. 7-13.
- Asante, Molefi Kete. (2010). "Afrocentricity and the argument for civic commitment: Ideology and citizenship in a United States of Africa" in the *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 63(2):121-31.
- Ayttay, George B. N. (2010). The United States of Africa: A Revisit. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 632: 86-102.
- Azikwe, Nnamdi. (1970). *My Odyssey*. New York: Praeger.
- Bessis, Sophie. (2003). *Western Supremacy; the Triumph of an Idea?* Zed Books; New York.
- Blyden Edward W. (1966). "The call of Providence to the descendants of Africa in America" in (eds) Wilson J Moses. *Classical Black Nationalism; from the American Revolution to Marcus Garvy*. New York; New York University Press.
- Blyden Edward W. (1967). *Chritainity, Islam and the Negro race*. Edinburgh; University of Ediburgh Press.
- Brzezinski Zbigniew (1991). "Selective Global Commitment" *Foreign Affairs* Vol.70 ,No 4 Fall 1-20.
- Brzezinski, Zbigniew. "Selective Global Commitment" in (*Foreign Affairs*1991 Vol.70 ,No 4) Fall 1-20.
- Cordesmann, H.A. *Weapons of Mass Destruction in the Middle East* ( Oxford; Fergsmon Press. 1991) PP224-228.
- Du Bois William B. (1992). *The Gift of Black folk; the Negroes in the Making of America*. Millwood; Kraus – Thomson Organization.
- Eze, Micheal O. (2013). Pan AFricanism; A Brief Intellectual History in *History Compass* Journal of September (9-11).
- David, M. (2013). Pan – Africanism of the 21st century- Challenges and Prospects in the journal of Helen Sueman Foundation. (71) (34 -39).
- Gebrekidan, F. (2012). From Adwa to OAU; Ethopia and Politics of Pan Africanism 1896 – 1963 in the international journal of Ethiopian studies (6) 71 – 86).
- Geiss, imanuel. (1967). "Notes on the Development of Pan Africanism" in the *Journal of Historical society of Nigeria*. 3;719 -740.
- Imbua, D.L, Onor, S. O. Odey, P.O. (2017). *A Companion to African History In the Nineteenth and Twentieth century*. Makurdi; Aboki Publishers.
- Irvine, Judith. (1978). When is Genealogy history/ Wolof genealogies in comparative perspective in *America Ethnologist* 5; pp 651 – 74.

- Keith Gottshalk (2022). Re-Thinking Pan Africanism and African Integration in the African Journal of Political Science (AJPS) 10(1).
- Kissinger, Henry. World Order (New York; Penguim Book.2014) PP3-15.
- Krauthammer, C. "The Unipolar Moment" in Foreign Affairs.1991, Vol 70 No1 America and the world) PP22- 23.
- Legume Colin Pan Africanism. (New York; Frederick A Praeger.1957) PP13 – 23.
- Mark, M. & Phillippa Nhengeze (2018). Pan Africanism; A Quest for Liberation and the Pursuit of a United Africa in the Journal of Genealogy 2 (28)
- Mazrui Ali. Towards a Pax Africa; A study of Ideology and Ambition (Chicago; university of Chicago Press. 1967) PP201- 210.
- Mbeki Thambo (1999). The African Renaissance; the new struggle. Johannesburg; Tafelberg Publishers.
- Mulemfo, M. M. (2000). Thabo Mbeki and The African Renaissance; the emergence of new of new African Leadership. London; Actual Press.
- Nkrumah, K. (1964). Conciencism. London; Heinmann.
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). Towards colonial Freedom.London; Panal Books.(59)
- Nkrumah, K. (1965). Africa Must Unite. London; Panal Books(Pp132)
- Nwoko, M. (1988). Basic world Political Theories. Claretian Institute of Philosophy press.
- Ojo, O.J.B. (1998) Economic Underpinnings to International Security (Port –Harcourt; Malthouse 13 -28. 10.
- Okadigbo, C. (1985) Consciencism in African Philosophy. Fourth Dimension.
- Okadigbo, Chuba (1985). Consciencism in African Political Philosophy. (Enugu; fourth dimension.
- Taye Thomas A. (2019). "A critical Reappraisal of Pan Africanism; A Quest for Supra state formation and Authentic Development in Africa" in International Journal of Innovative Research in Electronic and Communication (IJIREC) Volume 6 Issue 4 (pp34 -45).