

**THE RHETORIC OF KWAME NKRUMAH: AN ANALYSIS OF
HIS POLITICAL SPEECHES.**

By

Eric Opoku Mensah

MPhil (English Language), UCC

B.A. Hons (English Language), UCC

Thesis Presented for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Centre for Rhetoric Studies,

Faculty of Humanities

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

February 2014

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to use this opportunity to express my utmost gratitude to the many special individuals whose advice, support and love helped me to complete this thesis. My warmest appreciation goes to Distinguished Professor Philippe-Joseph Salazar, my doctoral supervisor. My encounter with Professor Salazar opened a new page in my research life. Whilst I initially anticipated a close-knit supervision relation, I came to experience a rather physically distant but close relationship. Professor Salazar strategically allowed me to ‘wonder in the woods’ for months. I was later to acknowledge that that difficult and lonely period was to allow me to form clearly and gain a deeper understanding of my research problem. Prof’s style has ultimately helped in shaping my own independent thinking and has helped me to find my academic voice, a voice which is a quintessential too in this whole academic journey. It has become an invaluable asset in my future academic life and work. I am also grateful to the team of examiners: Professor Erik Doxtader, (University of South Carolina), Professor Cheryl Glenn (The Pennsylvania State University) and Dr. Sergio Alloggio (University of Witwatersrand). Not only did these three astute scholars throw more light on my thesis, they each pointed clearly several scholarly paths for my future research work. I cannot forget the contribution of Professor Ian Glenn (Acting Director for the Centre for Film and Media Studies) for encouraging me and working diligently on the last minute paper work on the thesis.

I would like to acknowledge staff of Ghana Broadcasting Corporation (GBC) radio who gave me the opportunity to access the archives of audio recordings of Kwame Nkrumah. Although these recordings were found to be in a poor state of storage, the staff was of immense help. With their positive attitude towards my research, they helped me salvage key speeches that were central to my understanding of the

rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah. Again, I if I were to give a debt of gratitude to a group of Librarians that were passionate and committed to their work; these the staff of the Jagger Library at the University of Cape Town. They came to know me by name and in their minds I became synonymous with Nkrumah. I am grateful to the staff for their support during my long hours of search for the political history of the Gold Coast and the beginning of nationalist movements prior to Ghana's independence. I could not have done this without, in particular, Busi Kangala, for all her help in locating historical Ghanaian Literature; Dianne Steele, for her immense help in my referencing style; Alex D'Angelo, for taking me through how to rummage through the vast electronic resources. I also would like to express my gratitude to two outstanding women whose friendship and love I cannot forget: Sharon Eaton-Barnes of IAPO and Merle Jordaan of Third Tier Residence.

I also appreciate the members of the Brackendale Growth Group, especially Pastor Joshua, Toyin, Naomi, Chris and Bishop for providing me the needed religious and social support during my stay in Cape Town. Likewise, I mention my friends at UCT, namely, Prof Akokpari (Political Science Department) and his family, Eric, Nana Amoako, Jude, Saviour (Efo), Naa and Nana Yaa. I wish you Godspeed in your research. I also thank my friend and colleague, Kwame Amoako-Sakyi, for his immense interest and constant support for my work in rhetoric studies.

How could my doctoral studies have been possible without the financial support of the University of Cape Coast? I am eternally grateful to Professor Nana Jane Opoku-Agyemang, immediate past Vice - Chancellor of the University of Cape Coast and currently the Minister of Education, the Republic of Ghana for her support. I am also indebted to these senior faculty members at the University of Cape Coast: Professor Lawrence K. Owusu-Ansah, the Dean of School of Graduate Studies and Research;

Prof. Dora Edu-Buandoh, Dean, Faculty of Arts; Dr. Philip A. Gborsong, Head, Department of Communication Studies; and all my colleagues and the staff of the Department of Communication Studies. Dr. Joseph B.A. Afful, Head, Department of English; for straightening the initial concept and for painstakingly reading through the final draft of my thesis. I can never show the depth of my heartfelt appreciation.

I am especially grateful for the support I received from my family, especially my father, Opanyin Kwabena Poku, who challenged me to have more than he never had academically. I thank my sisters, Diana and Rosemond; your support has brought me this far. I earn a doctoral degree, never forgetting your individual sacrifices and love during my many years in school. I also would like to show my gratitude to my in-laws, especially Mrs Dorothy Awuah-Peasah for her support for my family, not forgetting Jay and Jerry.

DEDICATION

To Akua Serwaah, the woman whose love and strength provided the firm ground and atmosphere upon which this thesis was completed. Also, to Michelle and Michael, your constant questions sped me on to hurry and come home; to Manuel, your arrival coincided with the end. You made it complete. I love you all.

ABSTRACT

The study focuses on an examination of the political speeches of Kwame Nkrumah. The primary data of the study comprises audio-recorded and five volumes of selected published speeches of Nkrumah. Beyond these sources, the study explores the historical, political, and diplomatic circumstances which gave birth to Nkrumah's rhetorical inventions. In terms of the theoretical framework, the study applied three main correlative approaches: Aristotle (2007) on Levels of Proofs and Rhetorical Regimes, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) on Argument and Lloyd Bitzer on Situation (1968). Six major speeches were chosen for the study. They were selected chronologically ranging from 1950 to 1964. They were analyzed, applying the vertical and horizontal rhetorical structures. The study sought to find out the rhetorical strategies and tools, which Nkrumah employed in his political speeches. The study revealed that as part of his logical strategy, Nkrumah regularly employed logical association. With this tool, Nkrumah associates two entities either positively or negatively for the purpose of achieving good or bad publicity for a giving entity. The finding demonstrates that Nkrumah employed negative association in his political speeches to tag his Ghanaian and Western political adversaries to engender negative image for them whilst he used positive association to enhance his ethos. The study also showed that Nkrumah employed the argument of inclusion of the part in the whole. This argument becomes central to the subject of Africa's unity as Nkrumah argues for continental unity in Addis Ababa. In this argument, the importance of Africa is brought to the fore whilst minimizing the focus on individual states. Thus, through his argumentation, Nkrumah deepens the continental discussion which seeks to project the debate on Africa's freedom. The study also demonstrated that Nkrumah repeatedly applies symbolism as a strategic means of establishing his

ethos as well as creating solidarity with his audience. The study further established that Nkrumah employs the collective memory of his audience to create pathos in his address. Lastly, the study showed that Nkrumah repeatedly used his messages to address composite audiences both immediate and remote.

KEY WORDS

Rhetoric, persuasion, identification, colonialism, Nkrumah, independence

DECLARATION

I declare that **The Rhetoric of Kwame: An Examination of His Political Speeches** is my own work and that it has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university, and that all sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged as complete references.

Eric Opoku Mensah

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------------|--|
| AAPC | All African Peoples' Conference |
| ANC | African National Congress |
| AWAM | Association of West African Merchants |
| CYO | Committee on Youth Organization |
| CPP | Convention People's Party |
| EAF | East African Federation |
| NLM | National Liberation Movement |
| NPP | Northern People's Party |
| OAU | Organization of African Unity |
| PAF | Pan African Federation |
| PDA | Prevention Detention Act |
| UNAM | Afrique et Malgache |
| UAC | United African Company |
| UGCC | United Gold Coast Convention |
| WASU | West African Students' Union |

PREFACE

Kwame Nkrumah, as an African liberation fighter, has been a focus of intense academic interest both in the past and present. With respect to his life and work as a politician, he appealed and continues to appeal to various academic persuasions, especially within the social sciences. However, one fundamental strength of Nkrumah, which arguably, made him become a subject of interest both in the Gold Coast, Africa and the rest of the world was his oratory. Nkrumah's rhetorical skill was what attracted me to pursue this research. The thesis is based upon analysis of his landmark speeches which characterized the key moments which shaped the political discourse of the Gold Coast (later Ghana) and Africa as a whole. These will focus on pre-independence, independence and post-independence rhetorical inventions.

Because the central argument of the thesis is woven from individual/particular situations, the thesis will provide readers the rare opportunity in situating Nkrumah's rhetoric within political activities as they unfolded within the history of the Gold Coast and later Ghana. In this direction, I tried to provide the readers with numerous excerpts from speeches and newspapers in order to enrich the quality of the discussions. In doing this, I did not attempt to correct any errors as they may have appeared in these original speeches or newspapers. I, however, accept responsibility for any other errors as may be found in the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| TITLE PAGE | I |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | II |
| DEDICATION | V |
| ABSTRACT | VI |
| KEY WORDS | VIII |
| DECLARATION | IX |
| LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS | X |
| PREFACE | XI |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | XII |
| CHAPTER ONE | |
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| Background of the Study | 1 |
| Research Questions | 6 |
| Significance of the Study | 7 |
| Limitations of the Study | 8 |
| Literature Survey | 9 |
| Methodology | 11 |
| Theoretical Framework | 13 |
| Thesis Outline | 14 |

CHAPTER TWO

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S

DECLARATION OF 'POSITIVE ACTION' IN THE GOLD

COAST ON 8TH JANUARY 1950 IN ACCRA 17

Introduction 17

Merging the Enemies 20

Positive Action: Defending and Praising whilst Accusing
and Blaming Detractors 27

Coercive Rhetorical Strategy 33

Rhetorical Consistency of Words and Place 46

Conclusion 49

CHAPTER THREE

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S

MOTION OF INDEPENDENCE ON 10TH JULY 1953 IN

ACCRA 51

Introduction 51

The Travel of a Nation 54

Freedom: A God-given Right 61

The Different Audiences and Reception 70

An Invitation for Redemption 72

Conclusion 75

CHAPTER FOUR

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S

INDEPENDENCE DECLARATION ADDRESS OF 6TH

MARCH 1957 IN ACCRA 77

| | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| Introduction | 77 |
| The Birth of a Nation | 81 |
| Creating Solidarity and Unity | 84 |
| The Pan African Agenda | 93 |
| Civil Religion | 98 |
| Impact of the Address | 103 |
| Conclusion | 106 |

CHAPTER FIVE

| | |
|---|------------|
| RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S ADDRESS AT THE ALL AFRICAN PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE ON 8TH DECEMBER 1958 IN ACCRA | 109 |
| Introduction | 109 |
| Establishing Ethos | 111 |
| The Different Rhetorical Journeys | 117 |
| The Celebration of Africa | 128 |
| Effects of the Speech | 131 |
| Conclusion | 135 |

CHAPTER SIX

| | |
|--|------------|
| RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S OAU ADDRESS ON 24TH MAY 1963 IN ADDIS ABABA | 139 |
| Introduction | 139 |
| The Sense of Urgency and Creation of Fear | 143 |
| African Unity: Inclusion of the Parts within the Whole | 149 |
| Addressing the Composite Audience | 155 |
| Limitations of the Address | 164 |

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Conclusion | 171 |
|------------|-----|

CHAPTER SEVEN

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S

ADDRESS TOTHE PEOPLE OF GHANA ON 3RD

FEBRUARY 1964 IN ACCRA **173**

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Introduction | 173 |
|--------------|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Replacing Reality: Factual versus Rational Interpretation | 175 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Framing Subversion as Neo-Colonial influence | 182 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|--|-----|
| Equalizing the Party with the Republic | 192 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| Effects of Nkrumah's Address | 197 |
|------------------------------|-----|

| | |
|------------|-----|
| Conclusion | 200 |
|------------|-----|

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION **203**

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Introduction | 203 |
|--------------|-----|

| | |
|----------|-----|
| Findings | 203 |
|----------|-----|

| | |
|----------------------------------|-----|
| Recommendations for Future Study | 208 |
|----------------------------------|-----|

REFERENCES **209**

APPENDICES

Appendix (PA)

Kwame Nkrumah's Declaration of 'Positive Action' in the Gold Coast on the 8th January 1950 in Accra

Appendix (MOD)

Kwame Nkrumah's Motion of Independence on the 10th July 1953 in Accra

Appendix (ID)

Kwame Nkrumah's Independence Declaration Address of 6th March 1957 in Accra

Appendix (AAPC)

Kwame Nkrumah's Address at the All African People's Conference on the 8th December 1958 in Accra

Appendix (OAU)

Kwame Nkrumah's OAU Address on the 24th May 1963 in Addis Ababa

Appendix (OPS)

Kwame Nkrumah's Address to the People of Ghana on the 3rd February 1964 in Accra

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

The twentieth century witnessed the emergence of great speakers who through their oratory injected the feeling of nationalism and awakened the political consciousness of the people of Africa which sparked off the fight for independence in different parts of the Africa. Mention can be made of such great liberation speakers as Nelson Mandela, who through words and deeds, turned South Africa from apartheid into a modern democratic state (Salazar, 2002). Julius Nyerere also led the fight for independence from the British in Tanzania. Mention can be made of the youthful Patrice Lumumba, who, in the words of Salazar (2011), “performs the role of a prosecutor and judge [of the Belgians] on behalf of the silenced Congolese” (p. 41). Some of these liberators secured their places in African and the world’s political history partly because of their rhetorical inventions. Mention can be made of Haile Selassie’s famous “Appeal to the League of Nations,” Mohammed V “The Tangiers Speech,” Eduardo Mondlane’s “Dissent on Mozambique” and last but not least “the Beira Speech” by Samora Machel (Salazar, 2011).

In fact, these 20th century liberation fighters through rhetoric worked tirelessly to free Africa from colonial domination and every part of Africa is dotted with the rhetorical monuments of these liberation fighters. These men and others, largely through their oratory, affected the consciousness of their respective peoples

and Africa as a whole. Particularly, they awakened in their people a new sense of nationalism. This study focuses on one such liberation fighter - Kwame Nkrumah. This study, therefore, focuses on the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah, an African who through his oratory, led the Gold Coast into independence from the British and further garnered support from every corner of Africa to ensure the final emancipation of all African countries from the clutches of imperialism and colonialism.

Now, we turn our attention to Kwame Nkrumah and his political rhetoric. Nkrumah's youthful education and most influential period at the time began as a student at Achimota College (then known as Government College), which he joined in 1926. At the College, he met Dr. Kwegyir Aggrey, a Gold Coaster who became the first black assistant headmaster of this British established College. Dr. Aggrey introduced Nkrumah to his early ideas of Pan-Africanism by introducing Nkrumah to W.E.B. du Bois and Marcus Garvey (Rooney, 2007). Nkrumah recounts later that his first lessons on oratory and nationalism came from his mentor, Dr. Aggrey (Biney, 2011). At Achimota, he joined the Amateur Dramatic Society where he played leading roles (Rooney, 2007) and helped to establish the Aggrey Students' Society in honour of his mentor, Dr. Aggrey. The society became a debate group at Achimota College. Biney (2011) reports that "the society was an important training ground through which Nkrumah and his colleagues acquired oratorical skills" (p. 12).

Aside Nkrumah's development in oratory at Achimota, he also gained some political awareness at the time. At Achimota, he attended a lecture by Nnamdi Azikiwe, a Nigerian journalist who had studied at Lincoln in the United States of America (USA) and would later become the first president of independent Nigeria. This encounter had a lasting effect on Nkrumah and this will increase in time

through his reading of Azikiwe's articles in the *African Morning Post* (Rooney, 2007).

In October 1935, Nkrumah began a journey to the USA via the United Kingdom. Whilst he was in London waiting and trying to secure a visa to the USA, Nkrumah heard of the news of the Italian invasion of Ethiopia; this news really troubled him and increased his nationalism zeal (Nkrumah, 1957).

In the USA, Nkrumah pursued his undergraduate degree at Lincoln from 1935 to 1939. At Lincoln, he further engaged in rhetoric activities. In 1936, he was second in the "Kappa Alpha Psi oratory contest, speaking on 'Africa, the burden of the Negro'" (Biney, 2011, p. 14). In 1938, he won the Robert Fleming Labaree Memorial Prize in Social Sciences with an essay "Imperialism: Its Politics, Social and Economic Aspects" (Biney, 2011, 14). By 1939, Nkrumah graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Economics and Sociology.

It is on record that at Lincoln, Nkrumah became interested in the great philosophers. He came into contact with the work of scholars such as Kant, Marx, Hegel, Descartes, Freud and Nietzsche (Biney, 2011). He confessed later in life how the work of Marcus Garvey influenced him. As a voracious reader, Nkrumah's immersion in the Arts prepared him for his future political life.

From Lincoln University, Nkrumah entered the Lincoln Theological Seminary as well as the University of Pennsylvania to pursue two different Master's degrees. He pursued a degree in Sacred Theology at the seminary, where he graduated in 1942 as well as a Master of Science degree in Education which he also graduated in 1943. Graduating on top of his class, Nkrumah was chosen to give the

valedictory speech. He spoke on the topic “Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands unto God” (Rooney, 2007).

He also took to preaching in Presbyterian churches in Pennsylvania and even in a Baptist church in Washington (Biney, 2011). In view of the fact the civil rights oratory in the US was prominent in black churches, a stint with the Baptist tradition had further improved Nkrumah’s rhetorical skills since he left Achimota. As Biney (2011) notes, even as a preacher in churches, there is evidence from one of Nkrumah’s congregant that “much of what Nkrumah preached in his sermons focused on Africa” (p. 18). Nkrumah’s classmate at Lincoln seminary, Everett A. Hewlett, confirmed that “he was a good speaker and the congregation enjoyed his talks” (Sherwood, 1996, p. 51). As a student, Nkrumah spoke on many student political platforms that deliberated on Africa. Notable among such occasions is his sharing of platform in 1942 with African American Congressman, Adam Clayton Powell, at a student meeting in Philadelphia on the topic “The Status of the Negro in Fighting for Democracy” (Biney, 2011, p. 25). Nkrumah, at this point of his education in the US, had not only developed deep oratorical skills but had become more passionate about Africa. He was, therefore, prepared to engage in a fight to eliminate colonialism back home in Africa.

In June 1945, Nkrumah left the US for the United Kingdom. He had arrived in the United Kingdom (UK) with the primary intention of pursuing a doctorate in law. He had begun to study logical positivism under Professor Ayer at the University College of London, when he abandoned his academic vision and got involved in the activities of the West African Students’ Union (WASU). Further, he offered to support George Padmore, the colonial revolutionist, to organize the 5th Pan-African

Congress which was scheduled to take place in Manchester in 1945 (Rooney, 2007). In the circles of Padmore, Nkrumah came into contact with other individuals who were burdened with the subject of colonialism. Some of these were Jomo Kenyatta, Ras Makonnen, Peter Abrahams, C.L.R. James and Richard Wright (Biney, 2011). Nkrumah became the vice president of WASU in October 1945 and was also made secretary of the Pan-African Federation (PAF) which was in charge of organizing the 1945 Pan-African Congress. Through the preparation for Congress, Nkrumah extensively widened his political connections with the help of Padmore. The 5th Pan-African Congress, which was chaired by W.E.B. Du Bois, arguably, became the biggest political platform which provided the rare opportunity for Nkrumah to deepen his knowledge in both political organization and developments of his arguments in addressing the problem of imperialism in Africa. Biney (2011) argues that “Gandhi’s nonviolent strategy of *Satyagraha*” (p. 2) became the guiding philosophical principle during deliberations at the Congress (Rooney, 2007). Gandhi’s idea of nonviolence was going to have great influence in Nkrumah’s liberation fight in the Gold Coast. In addition to all these, Nkrumah formed the *Circle* – a group which, according to Rooney (2007), “saw itself as the revolutionary vanguard in the struggle for West African unity and national independence” (p. 45).

In September 1947, Nkrumah received a letter from the United Gold Coast Convention (UGCC), the first political party in the Gold Coast. After a careful reflection over the decision, Nkrumah set off on 14th November 1947 from the UK to return to the Gold Coast, after twelve years of living in the US and the UK.

Nkrumah arrived in the Gold Coast in 1947 and formally began his appointment as secretary of this new party on 29th December, 1947 (Biney, 2011). At

this point, the nationalist struggle within the Gold Coast had just begun to simmer. The UGCC was composed of a few Gold Coast elites who lacked the power and skill in political organization and Nkrumah, certainly, had prepared himself for that needed task ahead. Nkrumah's organizational prowess and hard work quickly became evident. Biney (2011) observes that "with Nkrumah's appointment the social makeup of the movement changed considerably in a relatively short space of time" (p. 36). But in no time did Nkrumah fall out of favor with his bosses in the UGCC over ideological differences. Whilst the elite in the Party advocated to a gradual approach, Nkrumah believed in a militant but nonviolent approach in claiming independence. In the end, Nkrumah broke up from the UGCC to form his own party, the Convention People's Party (CPP), to begin his fight for the independence of the Gold Coast. His political approach attracted a youthful following all over the Gold Coast, soon making the CPP the largest political organization within the colony. Nkrumah had, therefore, provided a solid alternative, an alternative political organization which the masses could identify with and provide their (the masses) utmost support as a viable means of gaining independence from British colonial rule.

Research Questions

The politics and life of Kwame Nkrumah have been critically studied or examined from the perspectives of many disciplines, especially history, political science, diplomatic studies, sociology and religion. These differing studies shed light and contributed to the ongoing academic discourse on the personality and political life of Nkrumah.

However, the main focus of this present study is to examine the rhetoric which Nkrumah employed in his political speeches. First, what rhetorical strategies does he employ to create identification and solidarity with the masses? With this, I seek to examine the rhetorical inventions Nkrumah makes in order to establish a connection with his heterogeneous audience. Secondly, in what different ways does Nkrumah establish his credibility before his audience through his rhetorical inventions? With this question, I look at how Nkrumah presents himself in various images to seek the trust of his audiences. Thirdly, what strategies does Nkrumah employ to logically develop his argumentation? I examine his use of deductive and inductive methods in his arguments. Finally, how does Nkrumah achieve pathos in his speeches? I examine his use of memory and Africa's colonial experiences to draw the emotions of his differing audiences.

Significance of the Study

The personality and political life of Nkrumah has engaged the attention of scholars from varying academic disciplines. As a result of the critical attention which scholars invested in Nkrumah as a subject, many works have been produced to foster a deeper understanding of the personality and political life of Nkrumah. However, none of these works has paid a critical attention to the rhetoric of Nkrumah. Therefore, my pursuance of this key subject which underlies Nkrumah's political philosophy, politics and diplomacy is quite a significant venture which further sheds light on his personality and political life.

The present study of Nkrumah's rhetoric fills the gaping gap which has been created by other disciplines which are incapable of providing answers as regards issues that border on the rhetoric of Nkrumah. Therefore, a study of Nkrumah's rhetoric will provide some of the needed answers as we continuously search to gain a deeper understanding of him.

Further, it should be noted that the study of rhetoric has been dominated by Anglo-American traditions and, therefore, pursuing the present work will become a part of the growing body of work on African rhetoric. It will, therefore, contribute further to the study of rhetoric in Africa.

With the deepening of the culture of democracy in Africa, the study of rhetoric and the application of its tools are crucial for ensuring good governance and a more improved political discourse in Africa. This study shows the effectiveness of rhetoric in the shaping of ideas during public argumentation and further demonstrates the place of rhetoric in the struggle for independence in Ghana.

Limitations of the Study

A fundamental limitation of this study has been the poor state in which audio recorded versions of Nkrumah's speeches have been kept by the Ghana Broadcasting Corporation. Whilst a few of these recorded speeches can be fully accessed, most of them were not completely audible. Those speeches which were clearly audible, however, remained truncated at different stages of the speeches. It was, therefore, completely impossible to rely on the audio versions alone. As a result, the audio

versions of the speeches had to be carefully cross-checked with the printed published versions of the speeches to authenticate their (both audio and printed versions of the speeches) originality. So in situations where the audio versions failed, the printed versions were relied upon for the analysis. In that situation, their authenticity was also verified from different published sources before they were used finally to replace the corrupted audio versions for the study. However, despite all these limitations of the selected speeches, they do not in any way jeopardize the value of the research.

Literature Survey

Many scholarly works have focused on the different aspects of Nkrumah as a subject of academic enquiry. But none of these focus directly or wholly on the rhetoric of Nkrumah.

The only work I came across that provided great insight on Nkrumah's rhetoric was the work of Barbara S. Monfils' (1977) "A Multifaceted Image: Kwame Nkrumah's Extrinsic Rhetorical Strategies." However, Monfils' work on Nkrumah's rhetoric mainly concerned itself with Nkrumah's application of dressing, images and symbols as rhetorical tools. The study, nevertheless, provided an insightful starting point for the present study.

The Jagger Library at the University of Cape Town provided me with notable African publications on Ghana's foreign policy and Nkrumah's political biographies. Notable among them are Scott Thompson's (1969) seminal work *Ghana's foreign*

policy, 1957-1966: Diplomacy, ideology, and the new state. This work provided me with a lot of insight in Nkrumah's foreign policy discourse both within Africa and beyond. This work was further given close support by Kwesi Armah's (2004) *Peace without power: Ghana's foreign policy, 1957-1966*. On the subject of Ghana's political history, I found the work of David Rooney (2007) *Kwame Nkrumah: vision and tragedy* to be of great benefit to my work. It is important to indicate that because of Rooney's detailed and insightful account of the historical realities covering the political activities of Nkrumah, it became the single biographical source material which was used extensively in this study.

Other key political biographical works which further shed light on Nkrumah's personality and political history include Ama Biney's (2011) *The political and social thought of Kwame Nkrumah*, June Milne's (2000) *Kwame Nkrumah: A biography*, Erica Powell's (1984) *Private Secretary (female)/Gold Coast*, Peter T. Omari's (1970) *Kwame Nkrumah: the anatomy of an African dictator*, Kwame Nkrumah's (1957) *The autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah*, Bankole Timothy's (1963) *Kwame Nkrumah: His rise to Power* and Henry L. Bretton's (1967) *The rise and fall of Kwame Nkrumah*.

The Chancellor Oppenheimer Library at the University of Cape Town provided me with immeasurable literature on rhetoric, both in published books and academic journals. Key among the books which were fundamental to the theoretical underpinnings of my research includes Aristotle's (2007) *On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. There are also the works of Chaim Perelman's (1982) *The Realm of Rhetoric*, Chaim Perelman's (1979) *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities: Essays on Rhetoric and its Applications* and Chaim Perelman and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca's

(1969) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Thomas B. Farrell's (1993) *Norms of Rhetorical Culture* and Phillipe-Joseph Salazar's (2002) *An African Athens: Rhetoric and the Shaping of Democracy in South Africa*.

I also benefitted immensely from reading articles from *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, *Communication Reports*, *Communication Quarterly*, *Journal of Speech*, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, *Journal of Black Studies*, *Communication*, *African Yearbook of Rhetoric*, *Journal of African American Studies*, *Western Journal of Black Studies*, *Sociology of Religion* and several others.

Further, Samuel Obeng's (1997) *Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah (Vol. 1-5)* provided tremendous resources as regards the collection of secondary data for my research.

Methodology

The primary data for this study mainly comprised recorded audio speeches of Kwame Nkrumah from the Ghana Broadcasting Corporation. Because the entire fidelity of these audio recordings for the study could not be guaranteed, published versions of the selected speeches published by Samuel Obeng (1997) were used to make up for the deficiencies inherent in the audio versions. In all, six major speeches were used for the study. Although the selection was justified by what I wanted to know (Patton, 2002), taking into consideration the research questions, the historical period for the selection of the speeches was quite crucial for the purpose of

the study. In view of this, conscious effort was made to select speeches which will be representative of the political life of Nkrumah with respect to temporal space.

Though Nkrumah's professional political life spanned over a period of nearly three decades from the 1940's to late 1960's, the study considered a period of about fifteen years (1950 -1964), a period which, undoubtedly, marks the height and intensity of Nkrumah's political career.

Therefore, the six key speeches which were selected for the study were done chronologically to reflect the rhetorical inventions of Nkrumah. In effect, the speeches mark three quintessential epochs in Nkrumah's political life: the pre-independence, independence and post-independence periods. If the speeches were to form a continuum, then Nkrumah's 1957 "Independence Declaration Speech" will be situated in the middle, whilst the pre independence and post-independence speeches will be located before and after 1957 independence period respectively. The pre-independence speeches comprise two main speeches: the 1950 "Positive Action Speech" and the 1954 "Motion of Independence Speech." On the post-independence side of the continuum, there are three main speeches. These are the 1958 "All-African Peoples' Conference Speech," the 1963 "Organization of African Unity Speech" and last but not least, the 1964 "One-Party State Speech." The chronological presentation of the speeches for the purpose of the analysis is crucial since it allowed the opportunity to see the invention and performance of each speech and its possible effects in respect to temporal space. It, therefore, provides an opportunity for critics to understand the effects of speech run into the other(s) and the changes which occur in Nkrumah's invention as and when the political situation demands such a rhetorical discourse.

The study employed vertical and horizontal rhetorical structures to analyze the speeches. The vertical structures comprised Aristotle's proofs: logos, pathos and ethos. On the other hand, the horizontal structures used in analyzing the speeches were forensic, epideictic and deliberative rhetoric. In view of the aims and purpose of the current study, the analysis with the vertical and horizontal structures was an appropriate method which aided in unravelling the rhetorical tools of Nkrumah. In addition, the speeches for the study were coded, using Aristotle's (2007) approach. This was performed by looking at Aristotle's proofs: ethos, logos and pathos. In addition to that, all the speeches were categorized as epideictic, deliberative and judicial.

Theoretical Framework

The research will use three main correlative approaches: Aristotle (2007) on Levels of Proofs. Aristotle established clearly the three regimes of rhetoric, namely forensic, epideictic and deliberative rhetoric. Forensic rhetoric is concerned with past actions and how they influence the present situation. Epideictic rhetoric is about praise and blame; it is concerned with present actions. Lastly, deliberative rhetoric is concerned about future action. The use of Aristotle's proofs and regimes will provide a helpful framework in understanding Nkrumah's rhetorical inventions.

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) bring the audience to the centre of argumentation. They argue that "choosing to single out certain things for presentation in a speech draws attention of the audience to them and thereby gives them a presence that prevents them from being neglected" (p. 35). Through the

creation of presence by the *rhetor*, the audience accepts a given thesis. Given that persuasion is audience centred, applying Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca's theory of argument will lead us into the nature by which Nkrumah uses argumentation to achieve persuasion among a given audience.

Lastly, Bitzer (1968) places situation at the centre of persuasion. He posits that without a situation, there can be no rhetorical state because it is the situation that gives birth to a response. Bitzer's theoretical framework is very central to the present study. This is because the theory allows for a critical examination of the various political situations which gave birth to Nkrumah's political speeches. The three theories, as I have outlined, would provide a firm theoretical foundation to the present study.

Thesis Outline

In this introductory Chapter, One, I have explained the background of my research, stated the research questions, established the significance of the study, indicated the limitations of the study, provided a literature survey, explained the methodology for the study and demonstrated a theoretical frame for the study.

The arrangement of chapters, as stated early, has been done chronologically according to the selected speeches for the study. In view of their unique rhetorical situations, each chapter deals with peculiar arguments for the purpose of that address. With regard to Chapter Two, I will examine Nkrumah's invention of protest rhetoric. The chapter will take a look at the paradox in the creation of a militant

rhetoric, which was non-violent in its approach. Chapter Three presents Nkrumah's invention of a Motion for Independence. I discuss Nkrumah's argument in tracing the history of the nation predating colonialism. I will examine the logical appeals through which the speech provides a central argument for the freedom of the colony. In Chapter Four, I will provide a discussion on Nkrumah's rhetorical performance on the birth of the nation. In doing that, I will go ahead to provide an analysis of the strategies through which the speech creates solidarity, launches a new foreign policy and performs a civil religion upon a nation's birth. Chapter Five takes a look at Nkrumah's invention of his ethos on the African platform. I will further analyse the epideictic strategies the speech employs to unite and celebrate Africa. In Chapter Six, I take a look at Nkrumah's rhetorical strategies in using fear to create presence. I will move on to examine Nkrumah's employment of the argument of inclusion of the parts within the whole. I will further discuss Nkrumah's strategy in addressing the composite audience. In Chapter Seven, I will examine Nkrumah's invention of rhetorical reality as against factual reality as a means of legitimizing his leadership. Beyond that, I will discuss the speech's argument in framing subversion as neo-colonial influence and how through the argument of association Nkrumah equalizes the CPP with the republic. Last but not least, in Chapter Eight, I will provide a conclusion for the study.

CHAPTER TWO

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S DECLARATION OF 'POSITIVE ACTION' IN THE GOLD COAST ON 8TH JANUARY 1950 IN ACCRA

Introduction

The 1950 riots in the Gold Coast which prefaced the first general elections under the British Colonial Government were called forth by a plethora of rhetorical performances of Kwame Nkrumah. On the 8th of January, 1950, Kwame Nkrumah, the Leader of the CPP, declared 'Positive Action' in the Gold Coast. After the aftermath of the 28th February 1948 riots which shook the colony, the Watson Commission was set up by the Colonial Government to examine the causes of the nationwide unrest. The four-member committee, chaired by Mr. Aiken Watson, K.C., started its work in April 1948 and submitted its report to the government in June 1948 (Nkrumah, 1957). Amongst its proposals, the Commission indicated the need for a constitutional review of the present Gold Coast constitution. In response to the latter proposal, the Coussey Commission was set up in December 1948 to review the constitution accordingly (Rooney, 2007). When it finally published its report in October 1949, it indicated an increase in African (referring to black Gold Coasters) representation in colonial governance but did not indicate a time frame for the independence of the Gold Coast.

On the 20th of November 1949, being disconsolate with the silence of the Coussey Commission's report on the country's independence date, Nkrumah organised a meeting of Gold Coast People's Representatives Assembly to put forward an arrangement of a Constituent Assembly in order to demand self-government (Rooney, 2007). On the 15th of December 1949, Nkrumah made three significant rhetorical moves, which were suggestive of his unrelenting decision to press on with his intention for a civil protest within the Gold Coast. First, he wrote a letter to the Governor expressing the CPP's intentions of calling for a nationwide protest if the CPP's recommendations for immediate self-government were declined by the Colonial Government (Rooney, 2007). Secondly, on this same day, even before the Colonial Government could respond, Nkrumah personally wrote an editorial of the CPP's newspaper, *The Evening News*, with a title "the Era of Positive Action Draws Nigh." In this editorial, Nkrumah inveighed, "too long have we left the destiny of our country to be toyed with. We shall no longer wait for freedom to 'come' to us, we shall march forward to demand our right ourselves" (Timothy, 1963, p. 86). In the third activity, the CPP held a rally at the West End Arena in Accra where Nkrumah explicated 'Positive Action' to the masses (Rooney, 2007).

At the rally, he sought to indicate the failure of all the key institutions in advancing the freedom of the Gold Coast. He noted:

Get ready, people of the Gold Coast ... The Coussey Committee has failed to grant the people of this country Full Self-government for the country; the Legislative Council has failed to demand Self- government for the country; the Chief's Territorial Councils have failed to demand Self-government for the country; and the British Government has tactfully refused to grant the

country its true and legitimate demand for Self-government. The people of the Gold Coast now emphatically refuse to remain any longer under Colonial status; they demand Dominion Status Now (Timothy, 1963, p. 87).

Nkrumah ended the 15th December rally with a two-week ultimatum, demanding the setting up of a Constituent Assembly within the territory (Timothy, 1963). These rapid and consistent rhetorical acts raised the momentum and the mood of protest in Accra, thereby, increasing the moral pressure for freedom on the Colonial Government. True to their posture, the government failed to respond positively to Nkrumah's demands for self-government but rather decided to enter into negotiation with Nkrumah after the New Year of 1950 (Timothy, 1963). However, on 8th of December 1950, before a mass gathering of CPP supporters at the West End Arena in Accra, Nkrumah declared 'Positive Action' in the entire Gold Coast.

My purpose in this Chapter is to consider a number of issues. First, I argue that Nkrumah purposefully employed the collective memory of his audience to establish the foundation of his argumentation in the address. I will continue to examine the strategy of how Nkrumah merged two different "enemies" into a single element of "opposition" to the independence of the Gold Coast. Secondly, I will explore the Speech's strategy of blame and accusation on one side as against praise and defence on the other side. Thirdly, I will take a look at Nkrumah's application of coercive rhetorical strategy, looking at its relevance within the protest speech. I will conclude by looking at Nkrumah's rhetorical consistency in his use of words and place within his protest address.

Since Nkrumah's address on 8th January 1950 is premised on both his declamation at the West End Arena and his article three weeks earlier on the 15th December 1949, they inform very much the rhetorical effect of the 8th January address. In fact, I intend to present my analysis of 8th January speech as a final sequel to the subject of 'Positive Action' which received rhetorical force as a result of the two activities (*Accra Evening News* article and speech) which occurred on 15th December 1949.

Merging the Enemies

One of the key strategies of Nkrumah in this address was his reliance on the collective memory of his audience in order to effect his "rhetorical transaction" (Gregg, 1971, p. 72). Palmer-Mehta (2009) notes that "collective memory is a rhetorical, cultural process arbitrarily connected to official historical discourses (which are themselves arbitrarily constructed) and personal memories, and utilized by *rhetors* and audiences to mutually constitute a public for particular purposes" (p. 157). For the speaker's successful application of his audience sense of collective memory, we can agree with Perelman (1969) who argues that the good speaker is the one who is "animated by the very mind of his audience" (p. 24). That is, through the application of collective memory, Nkrumah sought to make the audience appreciate the efficacy of civil protest which served to build the ego of the masses for future action. Gregg argues that "as the result of attacking enemies, protestors appear to experience and express feelings of ego-enhancement, ego-affirmation, and even ego-superiority" (p. 84). Nkrumah noted:

nothing strikes so much terror into the hearts of the Imperialists and their agents than the term Positive Action. This is especially so because of their fear of the masses responding to the call to apply this final form of resistance in case the British Government failed to grant us our freedom consequent on the publication of the Coussey Committee Report.¹

Nkrumah indirectly was reminding the audience of the effects of the 28th February 1948 riots on the British colonial administration which necessitated the present constitutional review which had been presented by the Coussey Committee. The 28th February riots were carried out by the masses all over the Gold Coast and it shook the colonial administration to the extent that the then Governor, Sir Gerald Creasy, who had only been at post for less than two years, had to be immediately replaced by Whitehall with Sir Charles Arden-Clarke as a result of Creasy's incapacity to manage the nationwide riots within the colony.

The effect of the 28th February civil protest on the colonial administration was undeniable. During the riots, mobs attacked shops and office belonging to the United African Company (UAC). In addition, European and Syrian traders all over the Gold Coast were also not spared of the loot (Rooney, 2007, p. 64). This situation certainly disrupted economic activities and interest of the Colonial Government. The masses became the heroes and martyrs of the riots. Nkrumah strategically avoided referring to the benefits of the commotion of the 28th February civil unrest since it may have been suggestive of his call for a violent protest which he definitely wanted to avoid. However, reminding his audience of that collective memory – the success

¹ Positive Action (PA) 1. All references to the speech will be in the writer's format and referred to as

of the February riots - was quintessential to his present call for action. He therefore alluded to it in the 15th December editorial of the *Accra Evening News*. He cried out:

shall the blood of our beloved brethren who were shot at the Christiansborg Crossroads in February last year be shared in vain? These are the questions that confront us today in our present struggle to free this nation from the grip of Colonial misrule and misgovernment (Timothy, 1963, p. 86).

In effect, Nkrumah argued for a continuation of the effective sacrifices which had begun and had become a source of hope for the present protest which is the object of his present address. Thus, *memory*, according to Palmer-Mehta (2009), “can be a powerful source of rhetorical invention” (p. 157). Parry-Giles and Parry-Giles (2000) in arguing in support of collective memory, indicate that “unlike individual memory, which is often only present in thought or confined to documents reserved for private consumption, collective memory is public; it is the publicity of collective memory that establishes its political/rhetorical power” (p. 418). Nkrumah, therefore, used collective memory of the previous civil protest to boost the ego of the audience as a means of soliciting for their full participation in the 8th January civil protest.

Nkrumah resorted to a move of association (Perelman, 1969). By the process of association, Perelman argues, the speaker is able to bring together differing elements by ensuring consonance in them. Nkrumah tried to rhetorically merge the Colonial Government and the opposition party, the UGCC, as a single force of resistance against self-rule, whilst on the other hand, he sought to build legitimacy for the CPP’s protest movement by courting the support of the traditional authority within the colony. The former association becomes what Perelman regards as a

negative association whereas the latter becomes a positive one. The prime purpose of this rhetorical act was to arouse the anger and the frustrations of the masses against the Colonial Government whilst at the same time ensuring a massive support for the nationwide civil disobedience. Nkrumah presented himself and the CPP as victims of the manipulative acts of the Colonial Government and the opposing UGCC. He inveighed:

the term Positive Action has been erroneously and maliciously publicised, no doubt by the Imperialists and their concealed agent-provocateurs and stooges. These political renegades, enemies of the Convention People's Party and for that matter Ghana's freedom, have diabolically publicised that the C.P.P.'s programme of positive action means riot, looting and disturbances, in a word, violence.²

By these words, Nkrumah placed the Colonial Government and the U.G.C.C., which he indirectly referred to as "concealed agent-provocateurs," as standing in opposition to the freedom which the C.P.P. was fighting for. In a sense, he presented the two groups as "enemies" before the audience.

In furtherance of the above rhetoric move, Nkrumah went ahead and presented a narrative of his meeting with the Ga Traditional Council, the authority which had traditional jurisdiction in Accra, the capital of the Gold Coast. This detailed narration was meant to provide first-hand information as to what took place at that important meeting. White (2006) argues that "narrating/storytelling is one of the most effective means of public speech" (p. 37). The narrative which Nkrumah

² PA 2.

provides in the speech lends credence to the negative association of the opposition party and the Colonial Government. As a rhetorical strategy, the narration was employed by Nkrumah not only to disclose the sinister motives of the opposition against his course for freedom but also to get the audience to empathise with him as a victim of the opposition's attack. Foss (1996) defines a narrative as a "way of ordering and presenting a view of the world through description of a situation involving characters, action, and settings" (p. 400). The question we ask then is beyond the above what view did Nkrumah intend to present to his audience through his vivid narrative within the speech? First of all, the speech presented minute details of the meeting with the Ga Traditional Council. He remarked:

some citizens of Accra, including myself, were invited to a meeting of the Ga Native Authority and the Ga State Council on Thursday, October 20, at 1 p.m. 'to discuss,' as the invitation stated, 'the unfortunate lawless elements in the country and any possible solution.'³

Nkrumah first introduced the term 'Positive Action' in his speech at a political rally in Accra in June 1949 (Nkrumah, 1957) but his political activities were associated with promotion of violence and this was being fuelled by both the Colonial Government and the leadership of the UGCC as a means of breaking the frontline of the mass support for Nkrumah's freedom movement. The government radio even announced that Nkrumah had been banished from Accra (Nkrumah, 1957) when this was not the case. At the meeting with the traditional authorities some members of the UGCC, including its leader, Dr. J.B. Danquah, were present and it was obvious from the discussions at the meeting that the UGCC Party members had wanted the

³ PA 2.

traditional authorities to stop Nkrumah from carrying out his political activities within Accra. But this plan was not going to work out. Nkrumah continued:

at that meeting, I had the unique opportunity of explaining what Positive Action means, to the satisfaction of the Ga Native Authority and the Ga State Council, and the meeting concluded with a recommendation by them that I should call a meeting to explain to the members of the Convention People's Party, as I did to them, what I mean by Positive Action in order to disabuse the minds of those who are going about misinterpreting the Positive Action Programme of the Convention People's Party.⁴

From the words of Nkrumah, the traditional authority which seemed impartial in hearing what he was about, saw the legitimacy in his actions. This decision by the Council was what led to Nkrumah's speech on "What I Mean by Positive Action" on 23rd October 1949, three days after his meeting with the Council. This political rally in Accra undoubtedly, further gave Nkrumah a firm platform for his protest rhetoric on non-violence. In effect, Nkrumah took opportunity and dispelled all the rumours which had been fuelled by the government radio and the UGCC members. He noted:

I must take this opportunity to dispel the wild rumour that the Ga Manche said at the meeting that the Convention People's Party should be suppressed and that I should be deported from Accra. Nothing of the sort was ever

⁴ PA 3.

suggested by the Ga Manche even though some of the speakers tried to convey such an idea, but the Ga Manche promptly over-ruled that.⁵

Nkrumah sought to establish the fairness of his political actions and in a subtle manner indirectly presented the Ga Traditional authority as being somehow sympathetic to his just course of the pursuit of non-violence. His use of the legal expression, “over-ruled” expressed a rhetorical sense of positive judgment in favour of Nkrumah and the course of the CPP. Though the position of the traditional authority may have been a neutral one as regards the political activities of the CPP, Nkrumah’s choice of words in his narration provided not only the support of the Council to the activities of the CPP but established a legitimacy of the civil protest which Nkrumah was calling for.

Nkrumah’s split from the UGCC in July 1949 (Nkrumah, 1957) to form the CPP had basically been based on ideological differences. Whilst the UGCC’s operated with a moderate view, Nkrumah’s ideology was somewhat militant in posture. It was “self-government now.” As the CPP gained political grounds within the Gold Coast, so did the gap between Nkrumah and the leadership of the UGCC widen. Naturally, whilst the UGCC was searching for a means to curb the seemingly militant approach of Nkrumah, Nkrumah continuously fuelled the disaffection of the masses against the UGCC. He did so by rhetorically associating the political tactics of the UGCC with that of the Colonial Government, thereby making Gold Coasters to perceive the UGCC as a political organization which was not interested in the pursuance of freedom of the Gold Coast and which appeared as though it stood in the way of freedom. Nkrumah continued, “party members, imagine the wicked

⁵ PA 4.

misrepresentation, chicanery, falsehood, the untruths, the lies and deception, in such news. This is the way our struggle is being misrepresented to the outside world; but the truth shall ultimately prevail.”⁶At this point, having built an argument on the supposed machinations of both the Colonial Government and the UGCC, Nkrumah had completed setting the stage to present the Colonial Government and the UGCC as the enemies who were against the good cause of the CPP. By so doing, he evoked the anger and energy of the audience in support of the call for ‘Positive Action.’ Through effective narration, Nkrumah partly succeeded to advance an argument for the nationwide protest.

Positive Action: Defending and Praising whilst Accusing and Blaming Detractors

The term ‘Positive Action’ was an invocation of Gandhi’s philosophy of nonviolence. ‘Positive Action’, therefore, became the underlying principle during the Fifth Pan-African Congress which was held in Manchester in 1945 and Nkrumah had personally been inspired by Gandhi (Padmore, 1947).

This Conference was mostly attended by Africans, both in Europe and from mainland Africa. Most of the participants at this conference later became part of the first generation freedom fighters in the emancipation of Africa from colonial rule. Nkrumah’s call for a nonviolent protest brings to the fore the spirit of the Manchester meeting out of which the architecture of the African freedom liberation was drawn. As co-secretary with the Trinidadian George Padmore at this conference, Nkrumah

⁶ PA 5.

enacted his authority and commitment to the values and core principle for African liberation which was born out of the Manchester conference. Calling for Positive Action, therefore, represented no more a singular act which had been initiated by Nkrumah, but it was an obedient enactment of the anti-colonial mandate which had emerged from the deliberation of the 1945 Pan-African Conference. By so doing, Nkrumah brought to bear, five year later in 1950, the memory, authority and nostalgia of the 1945 conference on the current struggle in the Gold Coast.

Mahatma Gandhi, a man who successfully led India's struggle for independence, employed this principle of nonviolence throughout India's struggle to independence (Gandhi, 1961). Rhetorically, Nkrumah's invocation of Gandhi's philosophy was an indirect appeal to the latter's authority (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). In this type of argument, the speaker "uses the acts or opinions of a person ... as a means of proof in support of a thesis" (p. 305). Nkrumah, therefore, sought to rub unto himself the prestige of Gandhi and to situate the Gold Coast's struggle within a similar structure as that of India. In other words, Nkrumah perceived the parallels in the struggles of India and the Gold Coast – both countries were connected to Britain through colonialism. Nkrumah sought to replicate Gandhi's success in India in the Gold Coast.

By and large, Nkrumah repeatedly indicated through the speech's rhetoric that in principle the country's quest for independence had been duly acknowledged nationwide. He said:

it is a comforting fact to observe that we have cleared the major obstacle to the realisation to our national goal in that ideologically the people of this

country and their chiefs have accepted the idea of self-government even now.⁷

This argument and direction of his rhetoric indirectly referred to the nationwide participation in the 28th February 1948 riots which shook the foundations of the Colonial Government. The speech goes ahead to argue for “strategy and the intensity and earnestness of our demand.”⁸ Nkrumah, therefore, called for a consistent application of the strategy of nonviolence which is expressed in ‘Positive Action.’ The legitimacy for ‘Positive Action’ which the speech argues for is not only expressed on behalf of the native and traditional authority but it is further extended to the British Colonial Government as well. Nkrumah argued:

the British Government and the people of Britain, with the exception of die-hard Imperialists, acknowledge the legitimacy of our demand for Self-government. However, it is and must be by our own exertion and pressure that the British Government can relinquish its authority and hand over the control of affairs, that is the Government, to the people of this country and their Chiefs.⁹

In a sense, he argued that the quest for the freedom of the people of the Gold Coast was a universal fact which, strangely enough, is acknowledged and shared by both the colonized and the colonizer. However, this acknowledgement by the colonizer could only materialise into reality through the pursuance of a civil disobedience, which Nkrumah called ‘Positive Action.’ Nkrumah now only needed a coordinated

⁷ PA 6.

⁸ PA 6.

⁹ PA 6.

and a consistent strategy and that was what he was calling the people of the Gold Coast to adopt. Knowing that the Colonial Government could employ different strategies to brake the front of the masses for 'Positive Action,' Nkrumah used the speech to establish several rhetoric layers of legitimacy for his call for civil disobedience as a means of further strengthening the support of the people of the Gold Coast. He went ahead to wrap his argument in a moral rhetoric to establish a deeper justification. But as Nkrumah pursued this moral justificatory rhetoric, he tried to indirectly display his practical wisdom in the course which he is calling the whole nation to join him to pursue. He explained:

There are two ways to achieve Self-government: either by armed revolution and violent overthrow of the existing regime, or by constitutional and legitimate non-violent methods. In other words: either by armed might or by moral pressure. For instance, Britain prevented the two German attempts to enslave her by armed might, while India liquidated British Imperialism there by moral pressure. We believe that we can achieve Self-government even now by constitutional means without resort to any violence.¹⁰

There could be no doubt that Nkrumah's audience comprised Second World War veterans who had largely led the 1948 riots. This is probable because Nkrumah and J.B. Danquah had addressed them shortly before these ex-servicemen embarked on the landmark riots (Rooney, 2007). The veterans after the two World Wars had come back home feeling despondent and disillusioned with the colonial situation back home in the Gold Coast. Three World War veterans were shot dead during the protest of veterans on 28th February 1948 on their way to present a petition to the

¹⁰ PA 7.

Governor. This was upon the order of Superintendent Colin Imray, a British Colonial police officer. The anger, which was sparked among these veterans, escalated the fire of nationalism within the Gold Coast, thereby propelling the veterans to naturally support any movement that was working to seek the freedom of the Gold Coast. Naturally, they were, therefore, ready to support ‘Positive Action.’

The speech’s perfect rhetorical example from the World Wars was appropriate as Nkrumah sought the judgment and assent of the veterans who formed a key constituency for the success of his call for civil disobedience. The rhetorical effectiveness of Nkrumah’s call for ‘Positive Action’ is heightened by the fact that these veterans had returned from a war which had only ended half a decade ago in the year 1945, knowing very well that the memories of the War was still fresh not only in the minds of the 63,000 ex-servicemen who had fought mostly in the Middle East and Burma (Rooney, 2007) but also for the numerous black families who had in one way or the other lost a relation in the military campaign which had nothing to do with their own freedom back home in the Gold Coast.

In citing the examples of British and the Indians, Nkrumah makes key rhetorical moves. Nkrumah in a forensic move provided a defence for his choice of “moral pressure” as against “armed revolution.” Whilst the two methods work, placing them side by side presented the military choice as opposite to the “non-violent method,” thereby making the military option appear to his audience as immoral. Therefore, whilst Nkrumah pursued freedom from a legitimate and moral standpoint, Britain, when its own freedom was under threat made a violent and a seemingly immoral choice. A violent choice whose consequence can in no measure be compared to the current choice being made by the people of the Gold Coast. The

speech, therefore, in an ironical twist, provided a rhetorical mirror for the British Colonial Government to weigh its own past actions vis-à-vis the legitimate and the “moral” choice being made by a people in search for their own freedom. In a sense, Nkrumah presented a firm defence for the choice of nonviolence and rather accused the Colonial Government of being a culprit of the violent acts which the government accused the CPP of having committed.

Nkrumah used the rhetorical example of India’s success story as a means to praise the CPP’s choice of nonviolence which he made as a legitimate strategy for the fight for independence. He used India’s example to create “presence” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, pp. 34-37) in the minds of the audience to show the hope of expected freedom. India, among the former British colonial territories, had become a unique example of a colony which pursued freedom non-violently and prevailed. The strong moral undertone which under laid the successful work of Gandhi is selected for praise and Nkrumah appropriated for himself and the people of the Gold Coast, the moral authority and conduct which he perceived as a “constitutional means.” If the strategy of nonviolence is within the legitimate and constitutional rights of the people of the Gold Coast, then rhetorically, any call for the curtailment of “Positive Action” remained unconstitutional, illegitimate and immoral. The speech praises the course of nonviolence whilst blaming political elements and soliciting the wrath of the audience against them for calling for the annulment of ‘Positive Action.’

Coercive Rhetorical Strategy

In examining the effects of Nkrumah's invention in this speech, I cannot but agree more with James Andrews (1969) when he posits that "to deny coercion any place in the process of social change is perhaps to hope for the attainment of the ideal and not to describe realistically the rhetorical process" (p. 187). It is clear that protest rhetoric in most cases does apply some element of coercion and this is a notable feature in Nkrumah's call for 'Positive Action.' In fact, just as the speech makes an effort to rationalise the call for nonviolent protest in the Gold Coast, the persuasive force which is applied in the speech largely tries to, in the words of Andrew (1969), "rationalise the goals of coercions" (p. 195). The 8th January 1950 speech which climaxed the final call into being 'Positive Action' marked a climactic coercive rhetorical action which had been building momentum several months early in 1949.

Nkrumah's new paper articles and speeches before the end of 1949 served as rhetorical exemplars of his application of coercive rhetoric in heralding the 8th January 1950 speech. On 15th December 1949, Nkrumah made a speech at the West End Sports Arena where he threatened the Colonial Government. He warned:

the people of this country will be waiting patiently for two weeks from today, December 15, 1949, during which period the British Government might announce, through the Governor, the acceptance of the principle of a Constituent Assembly; otherwise, P.A. may be declared any time after the said two weeks (Timothy, 1963, p. 87).

Nkrumah sustained a consistent coercive rhetoric up to the 8th January ‘Positive Action’ speech and this is in line with Simons’ (1970) position of the need for the leadership of protest movements to provide a consistent rhetoric for an effective protest.

In the 8th January speech, Nkrumah also called for a consistency not only in the actions of his audience. He provided rhetorical examples of free societies whose sustained hard work produced results in the end. This strategy was a call for the audience to emulate a desired end. He argued:

We live by experience and by intelligent adaptation to our environment. From our knowledge of the history of man, from our knowledge of the Colonial liberation movements, Freedom or Self-government has never been handed over to any Colonial country on a silver platter. The United States, India, Burma, Ceylon and other erstwhile Colonial territories have had to wage a bitter and vigorous struggle to attain their freedom. Hence the decision by the Convention People’s Party to adopt a programme of non-violent Positive Action to attain Self-government of the people of this and their Chiefs.¹¹

The speech admonished the audience to work by giving their assent to and participation in the call for ‘Positive Action.’ It is on the basis of the hope of freedom, which Nkrumah placed before the audience that he firmly made a call for Gold Coasters to also be ready for a similar “bitter and vigorous struggle” as a means of ensuring independence in the Gold Coast. The speech called on Gold Coasters to

¹¹ PA 8.

not only appreciate the need for freedom but the cost as well. To pay the needed price for freedom, Nkrumah placed before his audience the road map for the struggle. Simons (1970) argues that “the survival and effectiveness of any movement are dependent on adherence to its program, loyalty to its leadership, a collective willingness and capacity to work” (p. 3). Nkrumah, therefore, called the masses to participate effectively in his declaration for civil disobedience. The efficacy of Nkrumah’s declaration of ‘Positive Action’ is dependent on the effective participation of the masses. In this rhetoric, Nkrumah as leader of the protest movement had brought to the masses a freedom programme to be given participatory assent by the masses. This programme hinged on “non-violent Positive Action.” To Simon (1970), “the product of any movement is its ideology” (p. 4) thus, justifying Nkrumah’s constant need to bring the energy of the masses in line with the adopted ideology for the civil protest.

Nkrumah’s consistent emphasis on nonviolent protest provided a forensic justification for the survival of his independence struggle. As he called for a “vigorous struggle” for freedom, he reminded the masses of how it (struggle) ought to be nonviolent as a way of sticking to the ideological position which had been adopted by the CPP. The careful balance which the speech sought between moderate and militant coercion would be examine in detail later in this chapter. The speech’s emphasis on “nonviolence” was a strategy to further boost Nkrumah’s rhetorical defence against the accusations from the Gold Coast Colonial Government. The administration was suspicious that Nkrumah’s call for civil disobedience was a strategy to destabilize the country through violent protest (Nkrumah, 1957). He had taken a serious cue from the aftermath of the February 1948 riots and aligned his

rhetoric accordingly. What was Nkrumah's rhetorical contribution to the events which resulted in the 28th February 1948 nationwide riots in the Gold Coast and how did he strategically insulate the 8th January protest speech from similar accusations?

In the year 1948, a number of economic and political developments within the Gold Coast made it ripe for political agitations for independence. In rhetorical terms, these incidents produced the right exigencies whilst Nkrumah and Dr. J.B. Danquah, the leader of the UGCC, were there to provide the appropriate rhetorical responses. There was an outbreak of swollen shoot disease affecting cocoa, the major cash crop in the Gold Coast. The government, therefore, called for the cutting down of all affected cocoa trees nationwide, a situation which naturally incensed the farmers who possessed the economic strength of their communities. The second issue was inflation in the Gold Coast which was exacerbated by the high prices of imported goods by the European traders who had monopolised imports rights through their membership of the Association of West African Merchants (AWAM).

The Third issue and the final straw was the disillusioned ex- servicemen who were demanding gratuities promised them before going to war on behalf of the British government. Meanwhile, on the heels of this turbulent situation within the Gold Coast, Rooney (2007) reports that "Nkrumah and Danquah were talking to groups throughout the nation" (pp. 57-61) about independence. As part of deliberating on the strategy to achieve independence within the colony, it is reported that "Nkrumah was the first person to proposed strikes and boycotts in the UGCC for the demand for self-government" (Rooney, 2007, 62). As I have already indicated, Nkrumah and Dr. Danquah had had a meeting with the ex-servicemen before the latter marched to the Governor to express their grievances in February 1948

(Nkrumah, 1957). Whilst the content of his address remains unknown, it is highly plausible that Nkrumah might have instigated the nature of the intended veterans' protest in view of his early rhetoric on the strategies and approaches for the independence struggle of the Gold Coast.

After going through a short detention as a punishment for his contribution in the February 1948 riots, Nkrumah realised the need to pursue a new rhetorical trajectory that may, perhaps, demonstrate his abhorrence for violent protest in the face of a call for 'Positive Action.' But knowing his audience and the majority of the CPP supporters (the youth and ordinary people on the streets), it becomes quite interesting, from a critical point of view, to think whether Nkrumah really meant his rhetoric for a "non-violent" protest in the Gold Coast whilst in the single breath, he was indirectly calling on the masses to "wage a bitter and vigorous struggle to attain their freedom." His 8th January speech presented a rhetorical paradox whose essence could only be understood in view of the past political events within the Gold Coast.

How could Nkrumah's proposition for a protest struggle by the masses who had no legitimate platform for public deliberation be devoid of public violence? To this end, it is difficult to make any definite claims but, perhaps, to state initially that one strategic means by which the independence struggle in the Gold Coast could, perhaps, have been sustained was Nkrumah's adoption of two key rhetorical strategies which needed to be applied side by side. The first, was the strategy of inventing a rhetorical disclaimer through the emphasis on non-violent protest. By this strategy, Nkrumah sought to distance himself from any future violent acts of the masses in the course of political protest acts in the future. In so doing, the colonial authorities could have perceived the genuineness of his civil protest intentions.

Secondly, he sought, in the course of his non-violent rhetoric, to produce cues for militant protest, which though was not a direct advocacy for violence in the Gold Coast, but had the persuasive power to instigate the masses to do same. This second strategy will be explored further in the discussion. The 8th January address was, therefore, a flirtatious approach between a moderate and a militant rhetoric.

Nkrumah's militant approach is demonstrated in his dismissal of deliberative strategies which had not facilitated the granting of independence in the past. In soliciting for the cooperation of the masses for the civil protest, he sought to create an ideological alliance with the masses He argued:

We have talked too much and pined too long over our disabilities – political, social and economic; and it is now time that we embarked on constitutional positive steps to achieve positive results. We must remember that because of the educational backwardness of the Colonial countries, the majority of the people of this country cannot read. There is only one thing they can understand and that is Action.¹²

For Nkrumah, though the chiefs and Gold Coast elites had been members of the Colonial Legislative Council, their participation had not yielded any positive results as regards the final independence of the people of the Gold Coast (Timothy, 1963). Since the major constitutional proposal which promised a better native participation only came out after the 1948 riots, it meant that continuous protest involving the masses could force the British government into finally capitulating. Further, Nkrumah's words served as a veiled attack on the leaders of the UGCC who formed

¹² PA 9.

the elite in the Gold Coast and only believed in the tools of refined deliberation. Their (elites) philosophy for the independence struggle was parallel to that of Nkrumah. Nkrumah believed that it was the force of the masses of the people that was going to bring about independence. Nkrumah had to leave the UGCC, the political party which was dominated by the Gold Coast elite, to form the CPP in order for him to maximize the full strength of the masses for the independence struggle (Rooney, 2007). He perceived that the real strength of the masses could be channelled through “action;” it was this kind of “action” which was demonstrated during the 28th February 1948 riots that shook the foundations of the British Colonial Government.

Nkrumah knew the weakness and strength of the masses and he skilfully exploited them to achieve his rhetorical ends. Gregg (1971) argues that in protest rhetoric, “there appears to be a strong need to recognize and proclaim that one’s ego is somehow ignored, or damaged, or disenfranchised” (p. 76). Nkrumah highlighted “the educational backwardness” of the masses which was an intentional system put in place by the Colonial Government. In a sense, the speech presented the masses as victims of the evils of colonialism. A situation which could have been avoided had they been a free people. Through these words, the speech sought to demand the anger of the audience towards the Colonial Government, thereby increasing their resolve to participate in the speaker’s call for civil disobedience. It is a further invocation of all the good things in life, though unmentioned in the speech, which have been denied the natives under the colonial regime.

In protest rhetoric, after the ignored ego has been identified, the speech “extols, and describes in exaggerated fashion the strengths and virtues of the ego

sought after” (Gregg, 1971, p. 76). In the speech, the positive ego was the ability of the masses to bring into effect the protest act. In a sense, Nkrumah sought to identify himself with the masses whose support he urgently needed for the success of the present call for ‘Positive Action.’ The speech, therefore, appropriately aligned the call for ‘Positive Action’ with the perceived ego of the masses. This is in line with Johnstone’s (1974) words: “in arguing for its position, a discourse makes certain demands upon its auditor, [and] seeks certain commitments from him” (p. 313).

Earlier in this discussion, I attempted to explore the speech’s paradox in its application of moderate and militant coercive rhetorical strategies whilst trying to find the reasons for these rhetorical choices by Nkrumah and how they added to the persuasive effect(s) of the address. Franklyn Haiman (1967), discussing the role of rhetoric in civil obedience, observes that “the new rhetoric is ‘persuasion’ by a strategy of power and coercion rather than by reason and democratic decision-making” (p. 102). If we are to go by what Haiman claims to be the “new rhetoric,” then in what ways did the application of coercive rhetoric in the 8th January speech, whether militant or moderate, help to sustain the relevance of Nkrumah’s rhetoric for his audience and his call for civil disobedience?

Even though Nkrumah’s protest rhetoric for the freedom of the Gold Coast was coercive in nature, he used the speech to dismiss sinister motives of the CPP in the pursuit of freedom. Rather, he indirectly accused the UGCC which the Colonial Government might have seen as a moderate ally with their hidden intents though they (UGCC) might not have appeared as militant in their *modus operandi*. He argued:

We have been unduly criticised by our political opponents who say that it is wrong for us to tell the Imperialists that we shall resort to non-violent strikes and boycotts as a last resort, if need be, to attain our freedom. Their contention is that we should have kept this secret and spring a surprise on the Government. As for us, our faith in justice and fair play forbids us to adopt such sneaky methods.¹³

The speech cast the CPP into a moderate light and established some sense of goodwill in its action. This revealed a veiled contradiction of the UGCC that had earlier criticised Nkrumah for his intentions to call for a civil protest but strangely supported a more sinister plan of a secret protest action. Nkrumah presented his Party and its actions as democratic,¹⁴ making the Party's actions appear to the British Colonial Government as not only reasonable and fair but operating from a moderate point of view. In discussing protest movements, Simons (1970) argues that "moderate tactics gain entry into decision centres" (p. 9). He continues to observe that "because of their ethos of respectability moderates are invited to participate in public deliberations" (p. 8). This was part of the strategy of Nkrumah, to leave the door of deliberation constantly opened between him and the colonial administration. Therefore, in demonstrating this level of open-mindedness, he talked about the CPP using "open methods" which were "fair and above board in our dealings," "[w]e have nothing to hide from the British Government."¹⁵ But Nkrumah's intermittent swings between modest and militant rhetoric is notable, making him, perhaps, appear enigmatic to the Colonial Government, in terms of his strategy; however, remaining

¹³ PA 11.

¹⁴ PA 11.

¹⁵ PA 12.

rhetorically meaningful so far as his purpose of gathering and awakening the masses' interest for the course of civil protest is concerned.

Nkrumah's protest speeches as well as his writings (the 15th December editorial in the *Accra Evening News*) which heralded the 8th January 1950 address were militant in posture. Part of the militant tactic was, as Simons (1970) argues, to "confer visibility" (p. 8) on himself and the CPP. This visibility of the activities of the CPP was essential to attract the masses into the fold of the Nkrumah's movement since numbers underlie the strength of the activities of protest movements. Militancy, according to Simons, provides "ready access to the masses" in protest movements (p. 8). It, therefore, afforded Nkrumah an effective rhetorical tool to be able to access the power of the masses who were in search of the appropriate conduit to express their political grievances. In an address on 15th December 1949, three weeks before the 8th January 1950 speech, Nkrumah pointed out his intentions to the Colonial Government. He mildly warned:

The people of this country will be waiting patiently for two weeks from today, December 15, 1949, during which period the British Government might announce, through the Governor, the acceptance of the principle of a Constituent Assembly; otherwise, Positive Action may be declared anytime after the said two weeks (Timothy, 1963, p. 87).

In October 1949, though the Report of the Constitutional Review of the Coussey Commission had provided increased participation of natives in Gold Coast colonial governance, Nkrumah's rhetoric did not give recognition to what was seen as a positive constitutional development for the natives. Essentially, Nkrumah provided a

consistent rhetoric which sought to deepen the demand for total independence of the Gold Coast. “Coercive rhetoric,” according to Andrews (1969), “must polarise in order to be effective” (p. 194).

With his militant demands, he set a more vigorous agenda for deliberation by the British government. Though the call for independence had been made earlier by earlier generations, Nkrumah’s rhetoric sought to demand for a clear time line for independence. His posture further deepened the suspense within the colony, which had been generated by the aftermath of the 1948 February riots. He noted, “people of the Gold Coast get ready, be prepared; save and spend wisely and wait for the day should it come” (Timothy, 1963, p. 87). Through his rhetoric, he prepared the minds of the masses towards the possibilities of ‘Positive Action’ and raised the expectations of his audience as to what civil protest will achieve in the Gold Coast.

Simons (1970) argues that “an energized membership is the strength of any movement and its esprit de corps is essential to goal implementation” (p. 6). The numerous announcements had in no doubt, aided in the psychological preparation of the masses which was needed for such a nationwide protest. By the end of December 1949, Nkrumah had set the nation, both natives and Colonial Government, ready for ‘Positive Action.’

A *rhetor* should know the “end” of his deliberation (Aristotle, 2007, p. 49). Therefore, the choice of a militant or moderate rhetoric will elicit not only differing responses from the audience but will attract particular audiences. Simons (1970) makes a clear distinction between the supporters of both kinds of rhetoric: moderate and militant. According to him, whereas “militant supporters are easily energized;

moderate supporters are more easily controlled” (p. 9). To some extent, Simons’ position provides some justification for Nkrumah’s rhetorical choices. Nkrumah made key choices which allowed him to draw the support and participation of appropriate constituency for the civil protest. It further implies that whilst Nkrumah might have targeted militant supporters, he might have had difficulty controlling them as to the extent they can go. Could this have influenced Nkrumah’s continuous emphasis on the need for a non-violent protest, knowing that once militant supporters are unleashed for ‘Positive Action,’ no amount of rhetorical force could prevent them from getting to the end of their passionate desires?

Simons (1970) continues to argue that “having aroused their following the leaders of militant movement frequently become victims of their own creation” (p. 9). Any attempt by Nkrumah to curb the energy of his aroused audience also was potentially disastrous for the future actions of the CPP. So the 8th January address presented a deliberate swinging of Nkrumah’s invention on the protest rhetoric continuum with militant and modest rhetorical appeals on both ends.

Soon after New Year, the Colonial Government arranged a meeting with Nkrumah to consider a possible cancellation of ‘Positive Action’ which had been scheduled for 8th January. The Colonial Secretary, “who had had experience of high-level negotiations during the independence campaign in India,” (Rooney, 2007, p. 83) had been tasked by the Colonial Governor, Arden-Clarke, to meet with Nkrumah for the meeting. Rooney, presents Saloway’s account of the meeting in his work but this account, however, contradicts that of Nkrumah. According to Nkrumah’s account which was recorded several years after this meeting, he (Nkrumah) rejected the request of the Colonial Government for him to call off the civil protest. In his

words, he had warned the Colonial Secretary that if the Government declined their request for the setting up of a Constituent Assembly “then no alternative remains to me but to keep my word with the people and to declare Positive Action” (Nkrumah, p. 116). On the other hand, it is reported that at the meeting, Nkrumah “agreed not to start Positive Action” but was after the meeting with the Colonial Secretary, “forced by the extremists both within the CPP and the TUC to go back on that decision” (Rooney, 2007, p. 83). These two contradictory accounts may not present an attraction to the critic’s eye as to their subtle converging point. Both accounts clearly reveal the extent of the pressure of the militant supporters necessitating Nkrumah’s call of the civil protest in the Gold Coast.

The 8th January address, therefore, represented a rhetorical challenge for Nkrumah. Thus, whilst he tried to sustain the militant rhetoric which had heralded the speech, Nkrumah also used his rhetoric of non-violence to “portray himself as a brakeman, [with] a finger in the dike holding back an angry tide” (Simons, 1970, p. 10) of militant supporters within the Gold Coast. Thus, this constant swing by Nkrumah’s protest rhetoric, presented a rhetorical struggle in which he sought to achieve the purpose of his protest rhetoric, whilst at the same time seeking desperately to achieve a careful balance in order to ensure both an effective protest and seeking to put measures in place that will ensure the continuity and sustenance of the civil protest which he had initiated within the Gold Coast.

Rhetorical Consistency of Words and Place

Beyond the confines of militant and coercive strategies, Nkrumah's protest rhetoric cannot be complete without a look at Nkrumah's consistent rhetorical approach which led to the climax of the 8th January invention. Nkrumah's first use of 'Positive Action' occurred in June 1949, more than 6 months before it was actually called into being in January 1950. The use of temporal space provided him the opportunity to build a gradual momentum which ensured the masses' acceptance as regards the ultimate purpose of his call for a civil protest in the colony. The consistent protest rhetoric increased the confidence and willingness of the masses who were being summoned for participation in the protest. Simons (1970) argues that leaders of social movements are expected to be consistent and they "must nevertheless be prepared to renounce previously championed positions (p. 6). Thus, the consistent appeal for 'Positive Action' inundated the minds of the masses for the protest act; thus rendering Nkrumah's declaration of 'Positive Action' on 8th January as a mere performative act. In other words, between Nkrumah's protest appeals, before the final declaration of 'Positive Action,' actually form the bringing into being of the protest, making the final declaration as non-surprising call. In the speech, he noted:

As already explained, Positive Action has already begun, by our political education, by our newspaper agitation and platform speeches and also by the establishment of the Ghana schools and Colleges as well as the fearless and legitimate activities of the C.P.P.¹⁶

¹⁶ PA15.

The 8th January declaration rather began as a physical protest movement which served to continue, what can be termed as, a psychological movement which had been operating before the present declaration of ‘Positive Action’. Nkrumah’s consistent rhetorical invention marked the effective continuation if not the beginning of ‘Positive Action.’ Beyond the consistency in words and action, the success of Nkrumah’s protest rhetoric was highly augmented by his consistent use of physical space. On the rhetoric of place in protest, Endres and Senda-Cook (2011) posit that “social protest is not just about what is said. It is often just as important where the event occurs because of the meanings places hold and the particular memories and feelings these places evoke for the attendees” (p. 268). The West End Sports Arena in Accra became a physical place of colonial resistance and this was particularly evident during the series of public deliberations which took place up till the call for ‘Positive Action’ in the Gold Coast. Beginning from Nkrumah’s initial explanation of the meaning of ‘Positive Action;’ the declaration for the final protest in January 1950, Nkrumah repeatedly engaged the masses with his protest rhetoric at the West End Arena, giving the audience a new rhetorical meaning and association of the place as a symbol of protest.

Endres and Senda-Cook (2011) further argue that “during a protest event, human bodies interact with the physical structures to change allowing it to take on significance that might otherwise remain unrealised” (p. 263). The large audiences which gathered at the West End on the different occasions to listen to Nkrumah symbolically became associated with the strength and might of the resistance against the Colonial Government. The consistent physical response of Nkrumah’s audience to meet at the West End Arena, in a rhetorical sense, was not only a constant warning

to the Colonial Government but also, they gave indication to the Colonial Government of what the final outcome of 'Positive Action' may be, if Nkrumah finally called it into being in the Gold Coast.

For the masses, Nkrumah's consistent engagement with them at that physical space as regards the state of affairs on the protest, allowed them to own the protest movement. The physical connection which they had associated with the West End was extended to the protest, making their own; they were also ready to ensure continuity and to effect the protest to its logical end. Since 'Positive Action' was an idea which was hatched out of a continuous deliberation at the West End Arena, it was only appropriate for the final call for the civil protest in January 1950 to be made at the symbolic ground for colonial protest.

The West End, as a place for protest rhetoric, provided a triangular semiotic connection between Nkrumah, his supporters and the Colonial Government which ultimately evoked different feelings towards the call for the civil protest. Nkrumah's repeated engagement with the masses at this physical place hallowed it as a place of protest in the Gold Coast. So on 8th January 1950, when he summoned the masses to the West End to make a final declaration 'Positive Action' at around 5 o'clock, (Nkrumah, 1957) the masses responded accordingly because they could duly identify themselves with the place and purpose of the meeting. In other words, Nkrumah, the audience and the West End Arena had merged into a single symbolic rhetorical meaning, the protest against colonial domination in the Gold Coast.

Conclusion

The chapter has tried to discuss the numerous rhetorical strategies which Nkrumah utilised in his protest address in order to attract the support of his audience. The speech explored the collective memory of the audience to energise them for the call of the impending protest. Through this strategy, Nkrumah was able to forcefully remind the audience of the positive effects of a past protest on the decisions of the Colonial Government. Thus, through the invocation of a previous protest, the speech solicited a renewed support for the call for civil protest in the present time. The speech's rhetorical effort in merging the aim(s) of the Colonial Government and the UGCC allowed the audience to draw a fine mental line between those who are for the independence of the Gold Coast and those who are against such a move. This strategy is further deepened through judicial and epideictic rhetorical strategies. Again, by the speech's application of coercive strategy, Nkrumah logically rationalised his protest speech and evoked the militant support which was needed to effect the goals of his address. Nkrumah's consistency in his use of words and place provided the right momentum that was needed to achieve an effective rhetorical invention for the 8th January 1950 protest. The speech stands as an archetypal protest rhetoric that pulled closer the long call for the people of the Gold Coast for independence. Beyond Nkrumah's call for Positive Action, which resulted in what might be referred to as the first elections within the Gold Coast, the next Chapter (Three) will proceed to examine Nkrumah's rhetorical invention which laid the foundation for the deliberation of the Gold Coast's independence.

CHAPTER THREE

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S MOTION OF INDEPENDENCE ON 10TH JULY 1953 IN ACCRA

Introduction

In Chapter Two, we examined Nkrumah's 1950 'Positive Action' protest rhetoric. The result of this protest resulted in the first elections which allowed political party representation in the Gold Coast Colonial Parliament. This opportunity for formal parliamentary deliberation provided the opportune moment for a closer discussion of the subject of independence. In this Chapter, we will examine how within the Gold Coast parliamentary space, the subject of independence was further advanced by Nkrumah.

On 10th July 1953, Nkrumah, the first black Prime Minister of the Gold Coast introduced into the Legislative Assembly of the Gold Coast, a Motion for Independence which will be viewed later as a momentous speech.(Nkrumah, 1957, p. 189). The purpose of this Legislative Motion (a motion in the Assembly which is debated upon by members of the Assembly after which a decision is arrived at through a vote by the members) was to call on the British Colonial Government to "make constitutional and administrative arrangements for independence so that all members of the Assembly be elected directly by secret ballot, and Cabinet members be members of the Assembly and directly responsible to it" (Rooney, 2007, p. 109). Though the British Colonial Administration had increased the African representation

in its administration, especially within Gold Coast Legislative Assembly, the Colonial government still held sensitive portfolios within the Cabinet and were virtually in control of the political reigns of the Colony. Three key portfolios which were defence, finance and justice were still controlled by the Colonial administration. With this prevailing situation, it meant the Prime Minister, though designated as the Leader of Government Business, akin to that of the British administration, was in the true meaning of the designation, no 'leader of government business' since he could not exercise administrative power over the government's financial purse and the two other key functions of government (defence and justice) whose control are crucial to any meaningful form of governance.

In sum, as Prime Minister with a cabinet, the new government was a shadow of what it should have been in the real sense. Sir Arden-Clarke, the Governor of the Gold Coast, was not functioning as a ceremonial head of the Gold Coast as a shadow of the British monarch, but had the power to revoke or ratify any proposal by the Gold Coast Cabinet. In essence, not much had been changed (Rooney, 2007). In view of these developments, Nkrumah, upon a meeting with the National Executive of the CPP (Nkrumah, 1957), decided to demand that an Act of Independence be simultaneously passed by the British Parliament and the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly to declare the Gold Coast, under the new name of 'Ghana' as a sovereign and independent state.

On the day of this Motion, the Legislative Assembly was filled to capacity and large crowds had gathered outside the Assembly Hall (Nkrumah, 1957). As stated earlier, in terms of power, the British still exercised a greater control of the Colonial Administration. However, in terms of numbers, African were the majority

in the Legislative Assembly. So on this day, there was a great African presence in the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly when Nkrumah delivered this address. As the Leader of Government Business, Nkrumah had the responsibility of setting the agenda for deliberation for the Assembly. The Motion for Independence, as contained in the address, became the official deliberative activity of the Assembly for the day and it went on a few additional days (Nkrumah, 1957).

Since the last quarter of 1940, Nkrumah, through a number of speeches, had called for the independence of the Gold Coast from the British government. This had forced the Colonial Government into making gradual political concessions for Africans which saw the transformation of Nkrumah's position as Leader of Government Business to the position of the Prime Minister. But the Motion for Independence, a major rhetorical invention of Nkrumah, was to become the final straw to break the back of British resistance in the granting of independence to the people of the Gold Coast. In form, the address was a deliberative piece. There was the need for further parliamentary debate by member of the Assembly on the address before it could be finally put to vote. The speech, though deliberative, took an epideictic turn in the end.

My arguments are going to be presented in three different parts: that the speech is an artistic mosaic which presents the travel of resistance from the beginning of colonialism to the threshold of independence. Nkrumah presents this 'travel' as reaching a climactic stage through him. This psychological/spiritual travel is presented as part of the larger and long African travel of emancipation from the claws of colonialism and imperialism. Second, the speech seeks to reveal the God-given right of the freedom of all societies, therefore making the usurpation of this

natural right of Africans seems unjustified. Third, the speech casts Britain and the Gold Coast in a religious metaphor in which the former provides religious guidance in the latter's spiritual travel. This new spiritual role becomes a means for Britain to redeem her ethos in order to foster a new and lasting bond with her Colony. Drawing mainly from Perelman (1982), I would examine how the speaker employs the travel motif as an argumentative tool to create an emotional presence. Further, I would examine the overall reception and impact of the address within the historical and political context of the speech. I would conclude the chapter by examining how the Nkrumah rhetorically switches between the different audiences as a strategy for negotiating his argument and causing an adherence to his central thesis: the freedom of Africans from colonialism.

The Travel of a Nation

Within space and temporal context, the speech evinces the present position of Africans in their long travel in search of freedom. In the present time of the speech, Africans find themselves “stand[ing] at the threshold of self-government”¹⁷ and making a formal request to the British government to grant them independence. Nkrumah refers to this moment as “this solemn hour.”¹⁸ For Nkrumah, the task which he is about to carry out is a huge responsibility since this has been the moment generations of Africans in the Gold Coast have literally been “travell[ing]”¹⁹ in search for. He symbolically requests for spiritual strength being “deeply conscious of

¹⁷ Motion of Destiny (MOD) 17. All references to the speech will be in the writer's format and referred to as (MOD).

¹⁸ MOD 2.

¹⁹ MOD 17.

the grave implications of what we are about to consider”²⁰ for him to be able to “do my duty as it should be done.”²¹ Nkrumah clearly reveals that “their” presence in the Legislative Assembly as Gold Coasters is for one thing and he declares that “[t]oday we are here to claim this right to our independence.”²² The pronoun “we” do not only represent the African delegates physically present in the Assembly but the millions of Africans, both dead and alive, who have suffered through the different stages in the travel in search of freedom. In a sense, he present himself, in terms of his physical presence and words, as representation of the entire Gold Coasters, both past, present and future generations. How is this travel depicted in both spiritual and psychological terms to create a presence? (Perelman, 1979) Where does Nkrumah plot his own position on the continuum of the spiritual/psychological travel of Africans in search of independence? According to Perelman, “[e]very argument implies a preliminary selection of facts and values ... and an emphasis which varies with the importance given them.” Perelman (1982) further argues that “choosing to single out certain things for presentation in a speech draws the attention of the audience to them and thereby gives them a presence that prevents them from being neglected” (p. 35).

The speech begins the “travel” with the statement “[i]n this solemn hour,”²³ “today we are here to claim this right to our independence”²⁴ which puts the journey in present time. From this present time, the speech moves into the past “we have travelled long distances from the days when our fathers came under alien

²⁰ MOD 2.

²¹ MOD 2.

²² MOD 4.

²³ MOD 2.

²⁴ MOD 4

subjugation”²⁵ and moves into the future - “The heroes of our future will be those who can lead our people out of the stifling fog of disintegration through serfdom, into the valley of light and purpose.”²⁶ The argument of the “African travel” is made meaningful by Nkrumah’s justification of the present through the past and showing the way forward into the future. The travel of Africans, in symbolic terms, is likened to the journey of the Biblical nation of Israel in search of their freedom from the hands of Pharoah in fulfillment of God’s mandate of deliverance of his people. In this symbolic journey, Nkrumah positions himself as Moses, who in his inadequacies is empowered by God’s strength to bring deliverance to God’s people. Nkrumah notes that “as the great honour of proposing this Motion has fallen to my lot, I pray God to grant me the wisdom, strength and endurance to do my duty as it should be done.”²⁷

According to Nkrumah, he is not unaware of the implications of the huge request they (including Nkrumah and the rest of Gold Coasters) are about to make; that is, the granting of total independence from Britain which, according to him, may have great implications. At this moment in the speech, it becomes evident that Nkrumah presents himself not only as performing a political function as the Prime Minister of the Gold Coast but casts the speech in Christian religious symbolism. In this style, he presents himself as a prophet who has been chosen by Yahweh to lead His people. For him, there is no returning without the granting of freedom because “we have travelled long distances from the days when our fathers came under alien subjugation to the present time. We stand at the threshold of self-government and do

²⁵ MOD 17.

²⁶ MOD 21.

²⁷ MOD 2.

not waver.”²⁸ Gold Coasters, like the Israelites, had to suffer for several generations under Pharaoh’s tyrannical rule until the appearance of Moses. Nkrumah finds himself in a similar position and, like Moses, appears to be symbolically saying to the British government, “Let my people go.”²⁹ The speech’s rhetorical exploitation of the Moses-Pharaoh symbolism is poignant. Though the speech is set in a deliberative fashion, in view of the political situation and place of its delivery, Nkrumah subtly relies on a non-negotiable stance, signaling a sense of urgency for the independence of the Gold Coast. Again, this sense of urgency, which is projected through the above symbolism, is further accentuated by the divine support which is captured in the Moses and Pharaoh’s encounter. The speech, therefore, presents the argument that is suggestive of the lack of justification in maintaining the status quo; that is, the continuous existence of the Gold Coast as a British colony.

The movement of the narration from the present to the past gives meaning to the present. Nkrumah recounts the brave deeds of those “who opened the path which made it possible to reach today the great moment at which we stand.” He invokes the sufferings of the men and women who laid their lives to further the cause of resistance to British colonial rule. The names of these individuals appear in literally the Hall of Fame of colonial resistance. He recounts great events in the journey of colonial resistance which form emotional landmarks of the people of the Gold Coast.³⁰ Among these are “the valiant war against the British, the banishment of Nana Prempeh the First to the Seychelle Islands; the temporary disintegration of the

²⁸ MOD 17.

²⁹ Exodus 3: 1-15.

³⁰ MOD 22-27.

nation and its subsequent reunification”³¹ Nkrumah further pays tribute to great men such as “John Mensah-Sarbah, Atta-Ahumah, Sey and Wood”³² who gave their lives to resist colonialism. In effect, evoking these emotional landmarks and individuals of Gold Coast colonial resistance creates what Perelman (1982) refers to as presence which acts directly on the sensibility of the audience. Since these past events, which have been narrated in the speech, form a shared historical, religious and political memory for both the British government and the people of the Gold Coast, evoking them creates a rhetorical effect. The entire experience “increases the adherences of the members of an audience to thesis that are presented for their consent” (Perelman, 1982, p. 9) by the speaker.

In as much as the long journey of African colonial resistance has made remarkable progress, the climax of the journey is located within the present time of the speech. The speech builds a steady momentum by tracing the journey of colonial resistance from the past to the present. Though they merge together in the present time through Nkrumah, the speech carefully outlines two major developments in colonial resistance: independence and constitutional development in the Gold Coast. From the earliest activities of “the Fante Confederation” (Padmore, 1953, p. 32) through to June 1949 when the CPP was formed (Rooney, 2007), there had been a progressive development in the fight towards independence. Nkrumah, therefore, declares that “the country moves forward to its proud goal.”³³ In a spiritual symbolic vision, Nkrumah further announces to his audience that “the positive and tactical action we have adopted is leading us to the New Jerusalem, the golden city of our

³¹ MOD 22.

³² MOD 24.

³³ MOD 26.

hearts' desire!"³⁴ Through this metaphor, Nkrumah envisions the Biblical idea of heaven which marks a period of eternal bliss out of the trouble and tribulation of life on earth. In effect, Nkrumah creates a presence which makes "things future and remote appear as present" (Perelman, 1979, p. 17) in the minds of the audience.

With the constitutional development, Nkrumah narrates the different and slow positive developments from the establishment of the first Legislative Assembly in 1850, the Guggisburg Constitution in 1925, the Burns Constitution in 1946 and the Coussey Constitution in 1951. These developments reveal the seamless chronological nature of Africans' resistance to colonial rule marking the long journey from the distant past to the present as the people of the Gold Coast stand on the "threshold of self-government."³⁵ Nkrumah's voice at this symbolic moment echoes the total voice of resistance over the long temporal space occupied by the different generations of Africans on the continent and, as he further acknowledges, "with our enslaved brothers dragged from these shores to the United States and to the West Indies."³⁶

On the journey continuum, the speech places Nkrumah in the middle which coincides with the climax of the journey as he makes a formal request for freedom for the people of the Gold Coast. This middle part of the journey becomes crucial since the future of the Africans on the continent and those in the diaspora depended on it. Nkrumah sees the deliberation on independence as a major epoch in the African journey for freedom. This momentous occasion also marks the climax of his

³⁴ MOD 17.

³⁵ MOD 17.

³⁶ MOD 22.

ethos as he etches his name in history among the men and women who led the tortuous journey in Gold Coast colonial resistance. He declares:

at this time, history is being made; a colonial people in Africa has (sic) put forward the first definite claim for independence. An African colonial people proclaim that they are ready to assume the stature of free men and to prove to the world that they are worthy of the trust.³⁷

In 1953 as Nkrumah put forward this motion for independence, there were less than half a dozen countries which were free nations in Africa. Nkrumah's requests for independence, therefore, became a litmus test which, as he indicated, held the key to Africans and African Americans' liberation who were looking for a ray of hope in the midst of their desperation under the powers of imperialism on the African and in the diaspora.

The speech in a symbolic sense, crosses the present hurdle of being at "the threshold of self- government"³⁸ and peeps prophetically into the future after the attainment of independence. Nkrumah, in his vision, reflects on the purpose of independence and, like Moses, Nkrumah speaks prophetically from the top of the mountain, Nkrumah envisions that "the heroes of our future will be those who can lead our people out of the stifling fog of disintegration through serfdom, into the valley of light and purpose."³⁹ To him, the people of the Gold Coast are on the "threshold of self-government." However, the future journey of the people will demand a new vision and mandate. He, therefore, declares:

³⁷ MOD 31.

³⁸ MOD 17.

³⁹ MOD 21.

Mr. Speaker, when we politicians have long passed away and been forgotten, it is upon their shoulders that will fall the responsibility of evolving new forms of social institutions, new economic instruments to help build in our rich and fertile country a society where men and women may live in peace, where hate, strife, envy and greed, shall have no place.⁴⁰

The speech, therefore, looks at the African journey as a long one which is unlimited by the search for freedom but has become long in fulfillment of the total destiny of the African within time and space. Nkrumah as a prophet has positioned himself within present time to bring to fulfillment a part of this crucial mandate: the independence of the people of the Gold Coast. Since the future journey of the people of the Gold Coast is inextricably locked up with the outcome of the present action, the fight for independence then becomes the key in releasing the future of the African people.

Freedom: A God-given Right

Second, the speech seeks to reveal the God-given right of freedom for all societies, thereby making the usurpation of this natural right of Africans seems unjustified. The arguments appeal not only to the British Colonial government, but it becomes a general appeal expressing the will of Africans to be free. Since Nkrumah's Motion was the first in its kind, it was to become a key deliberative step for all colonies in Africa. In effect, it needed not only to address the peculiar situation facing the Gold Coast, but to be able to speak on behalf of Africans and as a

⁴⁰ MOD 39.

matter of fact, appeal to a universal audience – an audience which believed in the total freedom of mankind. Nkrumah's argument appeals to the logical mind of any person who believes in the right for the individual to be free. Perelman (1982) argues that "a convincing discourse is one whose premises are universalizable, that is, acceptable in principle to all the members of the universal audience" (p. 18). Africans, in general, as a matter of fact, becomes part of this universal audience which Nkrumah seeks to persuade. The principles which he shares through his rhetorical invention become appealing even more to societies in Africa still under colonial domination. Nkrumah appeals to this universal principle, the God-given right for every individual to be free, as part of his invention to negotiate for the independence of the Gold Coast. Nkrumah asserts that:

Mr. Speaker, we have frequent examples to show that there comes a time in the history of all colonial peoples when they must, because of their will to throw off the hampering shackles of colonialism, boldly assert their God-given right to be free of a foreign ruler. Today we are here to claim this right to our independence.⁴¹

He reminds his British audience about the request that was made for independence by British former colonies on the basis of this philosophical assumption. This assumption, in effect, became the cornerstone of the American Declaration of Independence in 1776, not forgetting that the United States of America is one of Britain's largest colonies. This reminder becomes relevant to Nkrumah's argument of the freedom of the Gold Coast from British colonial domination. The quest for independence by any society from foreign domination has mostly always been

⁴¹ MOD 4.

premised on the evocation of fundamental universal human values. Since the beginning of human civilization, people have always been in search of their freedom whenever freedom had been usurped by a foreign territory. As part of his rhetorical invention, Nkrumah tries to adapt to his British audience by choosing a premise of argumentation which his audience already hold (Perelman, 1982). The colonial master, Britain, and the colony, the Gold Coast, share relatively the same biblical culture (Quartey, 2007), however different their perspectives (Salazar, 2002). The appeal by Nkrumah to the God-given right of every society seeks to convict the moral consciousness of the British Colonial Government.

For Nkrumah, the God-given right of any society to rule themselves should not be taken away from them on the basis of colour or social development since it is the inalienable right of every society to rule itself. It apparently becomes ridiculous, in logical terms, for any supposedly superior society to take over the right of self-rule from any other society the former considers weak. The senselessness which the speaker associates with foreign domination of any society is further accentuated by three crucial rhetorical questions in the speech which seek to push the arguments further. Nkrumah questions: “for who but a people themselves can say when they are prepared? How can others judge when that moment has arrived in the destiny of a subject people? What other gauge can there be?”⁴² These fundamental questions reinforce the argument that the privilege of self-government is the preserve of every society and, therefore, any power which ignores this only causes a natural aberration. Nkrumah in effect questions British Colonial rule in the Gold Coast and justifies the

⁴² MOD 8.

request for independence in the colony. Such a question “aims at inciting action, or at least at creating a disposition to act” (Perelman, 1982, p. 12).

Another key dimension which arises out of this initial argument is the excuse given by the British government regarding the readiness of Gold Coast to assume this God-given right when they are given the opportunity to rule themselves.

Nkrumah replies:

Mr. Speaker, never in the history of the world has an alien ruler granted self-rule to a people on a silver platter ... I say that a people’s readiness and willingness to assume the responsibilities of self-rule is the single criterion of their preparedness to undertake those responsibilities.⁴³

In effect, Nkrumah asserts through this deliberative motion that Gold Coasters will take back their freedom since it is not within the power of Britain to, as it were, ‘grant’ freedom. In this kind of rhetoric, Nkrumah argues in a sense that the power for the colonized to become free really does not lie within the bosom of the colonizer, but the colonized itself. In effect, the colonizer does not “grant” freedom but it is rather taken by the colonized. Nkrumah’s rhetoric, therefore, injects not only vigor to his fellow Gold Coasters and Africans in general, but changes the power play that exist between the colonized and the colonizer. In addition, the successful participation of Gold Coasters in British Gold Coast Colonial Administration becomes a testimony of their ability to manage their own political affairs. It gives credence to the argument that people of every race and creed possess the God-given ability to manage their own political affairs. Nkrumah confesses that:

⁴³ MOD 9.

We are encouraged in our efforts by the thought that in so acting we are showing that we are able to govern ourselves and thereby we are putting an end to the myth that Africans are unable to manage their own affairs, even when given the opportunity.⁴⁴

The good performance of Nkrumah and his CPP government in the Gold Coast colonial administration had become evident to all. It served to build his ethos as an emerging African leader who understood the demands of formal political governance and had successfully demonstrated his capacity for leadership in the Gold Coast. A political scientist, Yaw Saffu (2008), reflecting on the Gold Coast struggle for independence notes, “the then Governor of the Gold Coast, Sir Charles Arden-Clarke and his closest advisor, Sir Reginald Saloway, the Colonial Secretary, came to respect the ability of Nkrumah and his ministers and were impressed by their unexpected willingness, once in office, to be moderate, reasonable and statesmanlike” (p. 58). As Prime Minister, Nkrumah had demonstrated his capacity and understanding of the official demands of deliberation in the Legislative Assembly. Commenting on Nkrumah’s deliberative skill, Bankole (1963) remarks that “[h]is eloquence [was] fiery, although he tend[ed] to curb himself when speaking in the Assembly” (p. 124). Nkrumah’s argument, as regards the ability of Africans to rule themselves is heavily supported by his personal ethos as a good leader and this had been testified by the British themselves. In the minds of the audience, this presumption of Nkrumah’s show of good leadership furnishes the audience with a sufficient basis upon which they could rest a reasonable conviction that the destiny of the God Coast can be left in the hands of Nkrumah.

⁴⁴ MOD 10.

Though the speech by virtue of the context is in the deliberative genre, Nkrumah turns the stage into an epideictic performance. He reminds the audience of the pride in Africa's historical past and extols the beauty of Ancient Ghana's civilization. Nkrumah recounts:

In the very early days of the Christian era, long before England had assumed any importance, long even before her people had united into a nation, our ancestors had attained a great empire, which lasted until the eleventh century, when it fell before the attacks of the Moors of the North. As its height that empire stretched from Timbuktu to Bamako, and even as far as the Atlantic. It is said that lawyers and scholars were much respected in that empire and that the inhabitants of Ghana wore garments of wool, cotton, silk and velvet. There was trade in copper, gold and textile fabrics, and jewels and weapons of gold and silver were carried.⁴⁵

In examining the past, Nkrumah positions himself as a bard and “performs” (Austin, 1975) the epic history of the ancient African empire. As a bard, he educates his audience. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), “the educator has been commissioned by a community to be the spokesman for the values it recognizes” (p. 52). Through his eulogy, Nkrumah reminds his audience of the great achievements and values of Ancient Ghana which even predate the formation of England as a nation. This great empire of Africa, managed by Africans, “lasted until the eleventh century, when it fell before the attacks of the Moors of the North.”⁴⁶ Africa's progress and civilization has always been stamped by foreigners such as

⁴⁵ MOD 20.

⁴⁶ MOD 20.

the “Moors of the North” and kingdoms like England. The enactment of the story of Africa’s past reveals first the glory and great leadership which Africans demonstrated in the past, leading to the establishment of a great empire to the envy of the world. Secondly, the story brings to the fore the evils of human societies and powers which have always worked to curtail the progress and natural cohesion of people of the African continent. This epic narration seeks to bring into being this glorious past into the present. To Nkrumah, reminding Gold Coasters of their glorious past as Africans is a means of creating in them an awakening for the present and push for freedom in order to bring into reality Africa’s glorious past in present time. He argues, “take pride in the name of Ghana, not out of romanticism, but as an inspiration for the future.”⁴⁷ Nkrumah connects Africa’s glorious past to his visions and hopes of the future of the Gold Coast through this declaration. He notes:

What our ancestors achieved in the context of their contemporary society gives us confidence that we can create, out of that past, a glorious future, not in terms of war and military pomp, but in terms of social progress and of peace.⁴⁸

Nkrumah reminds the nation of the forgotten sins of Britain in her initial contact with the Gold Coast. Colonialism took away the natural rights of political leadership from Africans in the Gold Coast and Africans never accepted it. The quest of the natural right to be free became the moving force behind colonial resistance by different generations of Africans in the Gold Coast. Evidence of resistance to colonialism began just two decades after the signing of the Bond of 1844 which only

⁴⁷ MOD 21.

⁴⁸ MOD 21.

gave Britain trading rights in the Gold Coast. Nkrumah refers to the words of Padmore (1953), the famous Pan-Africanist, to make his argument clear:

When the Gold Coast Africans demand self-government today, they are, in consequence, merely asserting their birthright which they never really surrendered to the British who, disregarding their treaty obligation of 1844, gradually usurped full sovereignty over the country (pp. 29-30).

The image of the “birthright” invokes the biblical story of Jacob and Esau⁴⁹ where through a legitimate agreement Jacob usurps the brother through an immoral means. By inference, the usurpation of the Gold Coast by Britain becomes not only immoral but also a wanton breach of trust. Nkrumah judges and accuses Britain of their wrongful acts and makes “present”⁵¹ (Perelman, 1979, p. 17) in the memory of the audience the past and forgotten sins of Britain.

In a forensic tone, the speech further reminds the British Government of its supposedly fundamental aim of colonization. In agreement with Perelman (1982), Nkrumah adapts to his audience by “choos[ing] premises of argumentation theses which his audience already holds” (p. 23). He refers to the words of two former British Colonial Secretaries, Mr. Creech Jones and Mr. James Griffiths, who in previous years had reiterated Britain’s fundamental aim of colonization as guiding these colonies to the ultimate attainment of their freedom.⁵⁰ To support his claims, Nkrumah further quotes the current Colonial Secretary, Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, who had also in similar terms declared that “We all aim at helping the Colonial Territories

⁴⁹ MOD 35.

⁵⁰ MOD 14-15.

to attain self-government within the Commonwealth.”⁵¹ Nkrumah takes his argument to another level as he refers his audience to the “British North America Act of 1867, which conceded to the provinces of Canada, complete rule.”⁵² Nkrumah, therefore, had not only been successful in reminding the Gold Coasters of their heroic past but had at the same time reminded the British government of its past promises to Britain’s colonies in Africa. At this moment, Nkrumah had turned successfully the epideictic stage into a forensic one. He had proffered incontrovertible evidence in the face of the audience, leaving the colonial government with very little defence. Nobody at this point probably captured the effect(s) of Nkrumah’s rhetorical invention than the British historian, David Rooney (2007) who observes:

Nkrumah’s ... approval of British policy under Creech Jones, Griffiths and Lyttelton, made a strong impact on Whitehall and Westminster. His oratory, which suggested a confident grasp of the wider issues faced by his government, gave a great boost to the CPP as it prepared for a more difficult and complex electoral struggle (p. 111).

So far as independence for the Gold Coast was concerned, Nkrumah had demonstrated that the Gold Coast was in support of the above colonial policy of the British Government. This situation presupposes “a meeting of minds” which is the essence of argumentation (Perelman, 1982, p. 9). Nkrumah notes that “[t]here is no conflict that I can see between our claim and the professed policy of all parties and governments of the United Kingdom.”⁵³ He continues that the Gold Coast has in essence met the requirement for independence which had been declared as British

⁵¹ MOD 14-15.

⁵² MOD 15.

⁵³ MOD 16.

Colonial Policy.⁵⁴ Nkrumah states proudly that “our economy is healthy, as good as any for a country of our size. In many respects, we are much better off than many sovereign states. And our potentials are large.”⁵⁵ In deliberative terms, the speech exhausts major rhetorical moves to justify the granting of independence to the people of the Gold Coast. Nkrumah had successfully demonstrated his symbolic positions as a prophet and a bard to an African nation and provides a vivid reminder to Britain of her promises to her colonies. Beyond this, we move further to look at the different audiences and their reception of the Motion of Independence.

The Different Audiences and Reception

The speech sought to address three different target groups which formed the immediate audience (Perelman, 1982, p. 14). The first was the British Colonial government; the second, members of the opposition in the Assembly. Nkrumah’s party members in the Assembly formed the last group of his immediate audiences. But the speech also appealed to a large remote audience of fellow African citizens on the continent together with those in the diaspora. It is essential to note that, perhaps, the prime targeted audience of the speech, was the British Government for the sole purpose of getting its assent for the granting of independence to the Gold Coast. In the course of the speech however, there are instances where Nkrumah “neglect[s] one part of the audience” (Perelman, 1982, p. 13) to address the rest in the Assembly. It reveals Nkrumah’s subtle strategic means of maneuvering his audience to achieve persuasion.

⁵⁴ MOD 15.

⁵⁵ MOD 16.

He drew on a quotation in the address⁵⁶ to inspire African Members of the Assembly, but this rather sought to draw the attention of the British government that the quest for independence was being carried out Africans within the confines of deliberative prescriptions. This move was rhetorically important since any display of civil disobedience by Africans in the Gold Coast was going to forestall the gains made so far regarding the fight for independence. Though Nkrumah was constantly taunted by the opposition in the Assembly, he responded to them by proving the logical essence of his participation in the colonial administration.⁵⁷ Again, his response to the opposition section through a seeming neglect of the rest of his audience really provided an additional conduit to address the British Colonial audience.

The speech had a good reception among the different groups in view of the successful debates which followed onwards, leading to the final acceptance of the motion for the independence of the Gold Coast (Nkrumah, 1957). Nkrumah, reminiscing about the atmosphere at the end of the address notes that “the acclamation that burst forth was such that one expected the roof and walls to collapse” (p. 206). Though the motion was received well by the larger audience, it came as a shock to the British Colonial Government (Milne, 2000) which was not expecting such a motion any moment soon. Nkrumah had earlier tested the pulse of the people and the colonial administration and had taken advantage of the rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968). Milne (2000), remarking about the speech, noted that “Nkrumah’s ‘Motion of Destiny’ Speech was one of his finest” (p. 65) Rooney (2007) notes it as “a dignified and moving speech” (p. 109). Lastly, Timothy (1963)

⁵⁶ MOD 2-3.

⁵⁷ MOD 6.

described the address as “the greatest speech Nkrumah has yet delivered in the Gold Coast Legislative Assembly” (p. 131). The Motion of Independence marks a great rhetorical achievement in the political life of the Gold Coast. It undoubtedly set clearly a blueprint for the journey of independence of the people of the Gold Coast. If there is anything like a rhetorical continuum of Kwame Nkrumah, this speech will mark the middle point. Nkrumah’s rhetorical performance in the Motion of Independence, undoubtedly, eclipsed his oratorical achievement in the previous decade.

An Invitation for Redemption

In another rhetorical move, Nkrumah casts the relationship between Britain and her colonies in religious terms. This invention is meshed with the earlier argument of man’s God-given right to freedom. Nkrumah notes:

Among the colonial peoples, there is a vast, untapped reservoir of peace and goodwill towards Britain, would she but divest herself of the outmoded, moth-eaten trappings of two centuries ago, and present herself to her colonial peoples in a new and shining vestment and hand us the olive branch of peace and love, and give us a guiding hand in working out our own destinies.⁵⁸

In the above quotation, the image of “a new and shining vestment” denotes a renewed spiritual position conferred on Britain as a prelate. Thus, Nkrumah invites Britain in the performance of the African spiritual journey by serving as a guide to “her colonial peoples” in the journey in search of their God-given right to freedom.

⁵⁸ MOD 20.

The call to Britain to renew herself in the eyes of Africans becomes a crucial one as it provides a means for Britain's redemption from, as it were, the "moth-eaten trappings of two centuries ago." Nkrumah provides bait for Britain through an epideictic turn, setting a benchmark for Britain to live up to a higher ethos. He remarks:

The heroes of our future will be those who can lead our people out of the stifling fog of disintegration through serfdom, into the valley of light and purpose, endeavour and determination will create that brotherhood which Christ proclaimed two thousand years ago, and about which so much is said, but so little done.⁵⁹

Nkrumah employed the above epideictic strategy to "edify" Britain to act in the positive interest of the people Gold Coast, that is, by granting her independence. By such an act it will qualify Britain to partake in the larger spiritual journey which will lead to the fulfillment of a spiritual universal "brotherhood." This brotherhood can only become a reality through cooperation between the colonial master and the colonized. Nkrumah quotes Padmore's words on co-operation⁶⁰ that should exist between Britain and the Gold Coast as the only way to ensure peace. With his prophetic tone, Nkrumah wraps up the logic of his speech by pronouncing goodwill and spelling doom, leaving Britain to make a choice.

In the peroration of the speech, Nkrumah completes his spiritual assignment by presenting two poignant images in quotations: first from the Bolshevik Novelist

⁵⁹ MOD 20.

⁶⁰ MOD 36.

Nikolai Ovstrovsky, the Soviet realist writer; and, second, the British First World War poet, Rupert Brooke.⁶⁶ He says:

Mr. Speaker, for my part, I can only re-echo the words of a great man:
 “Man’s dearest possession is life, and since it is given him to live but once,
 he must so live as not to be besmeared with the shame of a cowardly
 existence and trivial past, so live that dying he might say: all my life and all
 my strength were given to the finest cause in the world – the liberation of
 mankind.”⁶¹

Nkrumah shows the completion of his rhetorical invention through the presentation of the motion. The peroration becomes a high rhetorical point of his speech. Nkrumah has symbolically succeeded in presenting himself as the good man (Quintilian, 1987). He has heeded to God’s calling like Moses and brought his work to an end, though the journey of the nation will continue after him. In this singular attempt, he had spiritually united himself with Christ in terms of the essence of Christ’s crucifixion as, in words, he had pronounced the liberation of the people of the God Coast from the bondage of imperialism. He is ready to die through this process of liberation. This is echoed in the introductory line of Brooke’s war poem “1914 I: Peace”: “Now God be thank’d, Who has match’d us with His hour!”⁷⁰ The poem is one of Brooke’s First World War poems with a theme of religious calling for soldiers to engage in something purposeful and useful to humanity. As a fighter for independence, Nkrumah had responded to that call. The speech ends with a stroke of pathos as Nkrumah symbolically embodies within himself the sacrificial

⁶¹ MOD 40.

lamb which is to be expended to bring into reality the liberation of the people of the Gold Coast.

Conclusion

The chapter has examined the rhetorical justification for the independence of the Gold Coast. It first began by examining the nation's journey in a metaphorical sense by tracing the past to the present. The travel motif allowed the audience to perceive how the dream of a nation has been truncated through colonial domination. The travel motif, therefore, provided a logical justification for the elimination of imperialism to allow the nation to continue its travel into her future. The travel image becomes a logical appeal which provides a clear lens for assessing the challenges of colonialism. Again, this logical appeal brought to the fore by the travel image is further accentuated by the speech's argument of freedom as a divine right to humanity. The argument provides rhetorical examples to justify its claim for freedom. In an analogy, the speech cites Britain and the United States in their justification for fighting to protect their God-given freedom as nations. The citation of these rhetorical examples, presented in an indirect manner, provides a rhetorical irony in the colonizer's justification for imperialism. Lastly, the speech in an epideictic tone praises the colonizer, Britain, to cooperate with the colony by giving freedom in order to foster a new and noble relationship or spell doom for its future as an imperialist.

The Motion for Independence laid the foundation stone for the independence of the Gold Coast. It was a rhetorical statement which opened the door of formal

deliberation between Gold Coast nationalist and the British government. The product of these deliberations was Ghana's independence on the 6th of March 1957. In the next chapter, we will discuss how, on the heels of Ghana's independence declaration, Nkrumah launched a rhetorical invention which was to become the blueprint of Ghana's foreign policy in Africa and beyond.

CHAPTER FOUR

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S INDEPENDENCE

DECLARATION ADDRESS OF 6TH MARCH 1957 IN ACCRA

Introduction

In the last Chapter, Three, I discussed Nkrumah's rhetorical invention in the Gold Coast Assembly which preceded Ghana's Independence Declaration in 1957.

Chapter Four focuses on this subject.

The birth of a new nation is usually characterized by public orations. This was the situation on the 6th of March 1957, the day of Ghana's independence. Within a period of twenty-four hours, three momentous speeches had marked the oration of Nkrumah on the birth of the new nation Ghana. The first speech was made on the evening of the 5th of March in Parliament before members of the Assembly and the Colonial Government, a few minutes before midnight in Accra. The delivering of the second speech was begun to coincide with midnight. The second was at the Old Polo Grounds, across the street from the Assembly building. The third speech was delivered the next morning on the 6th of March, the day of Ghana's Independence. It was delivered during the official opening of the new Parliament - the Independence one.

The first and third speeches delivered by Nkrumah in Parliament(s) immediately before and after Independence, draw attention to some key issues. The first speech marked Nkrumah's last task of, in the words of Salazar (2002),

“speaking on behalf of the nation to those who also spoke on behalf of it” (p. 21). It was Nkrumah’s last duty as Prime Minister under the British colonial regime, Leader of an old Colonial Cabinet having to say farewell to representatives of the people in the Gold Coast Parliament. David Rooney (2007) reports that Nkrumah in his speech that evening on the 5th of March “looked back over the great struggle for independence and concluded with the words ‘by twelve o’clock midnight, Ghana will have redeemed her lost freedom’”(p. 186). As the first and last Prime Minister of the Colonial Parliament for a period of six years, Nkrumah formally needed to mark an end of Colonial Government business through a befitting oration in the Assembly and he chose to do that just a few minutes before midnight, before the first hour of a nation’s independence. In a rhetorical sense, the effect in the use of space (the Assembly building) and time (before midnight) for the delivery was significant, preparing the audience for what was to happen at midnight: the birth of a new nation.

Again, the third speech on the morning of the 6th of March marked a new era. The Assembly was in effect differently constituted, not in terms of a change of the representatives of the people, but it marked a new period in the founding of a nation. The British Colonial Governor had only become a shadow of British colonial representation in the parliament of the “nation.” This was certainly a dramatic change. Many dignitaries, both local and from abroad, were present to witness the first ceremonial session of the new parliament. Notable among them was the Duchess of Kent. In her speech, she expressed the cordial wishes of the Queen of England to the people of Ghana (Rooney, 2007). In a similar ceremonial tone, Nkrumah spoke in his new capacity as the head of the nation before properly constituted representatives of the Parliament of Ghana, not the Gold Coast. He

delivered a lengthy speech in which he noted “the warmest feelings of friendship and goodwill” (Rooney, 2007, p. 187) which existed between Ghana and Britain even as the newly independent nation parted ways with its colonial master. The two speeches made by Nkrumah on the floor of the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ parliaments, that is, the evening of 5th March and the morning of 6th March, are important in their own rights. The former, marking the end of public deliberation within the rules and confines of the colonial administration; the latter, symbolising the beginning period not only of the deliberations of the new Assembly, but more importantly what the Assembly could freely and legitimately have as its business.

Ghana’s independence had been partly borne out of parliamentary deliberation in the Gold Coast Assembly. Nkrumah’s 1953 Motion for Independence, as discussed in the previous chapter, was a key success of public deliberation in the colonial parliament. The various disagreements which occurred between the Nkrumah and the opposition National Liberation Movement (NLM) led to many debates and issues involving Whitehall and a debate in the British Parliament (Rooney, 2007). Perhaps, this may be the reason for Nkrumah’s deliberate inclusion of the public Assembly to feature prominently in the activities during the final hours to the nation’s independence. But the greater battle for independence had been fought by the ordinary people on the streets and market places. These ordinary Gold Coasters had been present at the numerous political rallies and campaigns and they represented the human force in all the demonstrations that were organised by the CPP which ultimately served as an unbending force to change the policies of the British Colonial Government. It was the physical struggles within different parts of the Colony that opened the door for legitimate discussions

of independence in the Colonial Assembly beginning from 1951 when Nkrumah was voted to office as Leader of Government Business. Therefore, it was rhetorically expedient for the oration marking the birth of the nation to be done in the midst of the people who symbolically worked to conceive the nation, to be witnesses to the nation's birth. In other words, the newly born belongs to the people and, therefore, it was only appropriate that they should be present during the final minutes of travail and the delivery of the nation (Salazar, 2002). In fact, the nation was born through an extempore rhetorical "performance" of Nkrumah before the people at the Old Polo Grounds in Accra.

Extempore addresses had characterized many of CPP political rallies (Rooney, 2007; Timothy, 1963). Within the Colonial Assembly, Nkrumah had to play by the rules of parliamentary speech, instead of his fierce public rhetoric (Timothy, 1963). However, at midnight, as he stood before the people to declare independence, those with whom he had endured through the struggles, Nkrumah's rhetoric, once again, was freed from all formal parliamentary restraints. He could reach the people with his characteristic tone and unbridled rhetorical fervour. He was once again, on a very momentous occasion, in his oratorical elements.

My take in this piece is to attempt to discuss Nkrumah's rhetorical construction of his Independence Declaration with its underlying message examining the intended effects. I will look at Nkrumah's "performance" of the nation's birth. Winding back the clock, I will attempt to analyse and show the hidden message within the Declaration in relation to its target "audience" (Perelman, 1982, p. 14). Secondly, I will take a critical look at Nkrumah's epideictic stance as a means of highlighting the major stories and incidents behind Ghana's independence struggle. I

will show how he employed the speech as a means of creating solidarity and unity as a strategy to deepen the emotional effect of the address. Thirdly, I will demonstrate Nkrumah's craft in his effort in revealing the new nation's foreign policy immediately after its birth. Lastly, I will conclude with the speech's application of civil religion as a counter hegemonic tool to colonialism.

The Birth of a Nation

"At long last the battle has ended, and thus Ghana, your beloved country is free forever."⁶² This declarative sentence ended the birth pangs of the the new nation Ghana – the first country to become independent in Sub-Saharan Africa. Nkrumah, through this performative act (Austin, 1962), had symbolically ushered the Gold Coast into a nation. In other words, the *rhetor's* performance does not only usher a new era, but calls into being a nation which hitherto was non-existent. Nkrumah's declaration was received with a thunderous shout from the sea of people who had gathered at the Old Polo Grounds to receive the news of independence.

Independence declaration is a momentous political and a psychological activity in the life of any nation. Though the request for Gold Coast's independence had been agreed upon by Whitehall (Nkrumah, 1957, pp. 281-282), it is Nkrumah's proclamation that gave it performative power, rendering it rhetorically effective. However, the uniqueness of Nkrumah's declaration of independence transcended, calling a nation into existence. It was by giving the nation a name which in essence

⁶² Independence Declaration Speech (ID) 1. All references to the speech will be in the writer's format and referred to as (ID).

will embody the destiny and ideals of the new nation. Nkrumah called the new nation “Ghana” (Nkrumah, 1957). Naming the new nation is in line with the Ghanaian culture of outdooing the newly born. The newly born is recognised by the entire society with its identification. Without a name, the individual has no recognition within the setup of the society. In a rhetorical move, Nkrumah’s declaration of independence becomes complete, partly through the name “Ghana,” since “Gold Coast” as a name was a mere colonial tag which had no association or connection as a name with any traditional state within the Gold Coast. By naming the nation “Ghana,” Nkrumah was rhetorically summoning into being once again that old celebrated past civilization of Africa (Padmore, 1953) into a new form as a means of giving inspiration to the new citizens.

A nation is made up of citizens. Through words, a new group of citizens were being constituted independent of their immediate past. Metaphorically, the birth of the nation constitutes the people’s birth anew. The people, in a sense, are now new born babies (Salazar, 2002). Though in their old self, Nkrumah called for the people to shed off their old colonial sense of thinking in order to embrace their new selves as citizens of the new nation. He warned the people that “we must change our attitudes and our minds. We must realise that from now on we are no more a colonial but a free and independent people.”⁶³

Since the essence of rhetoric is to cause change (Perelman, 1982), Nkrumah’s call for a change in attitude was key to the Declaration. A nation’s transition from a colonial state to independence is marked by physical changes but it has got a lot more to do with the mind. The use of symbols tends to give effect to the *rhetor’s*

⁶³ ID 3.

performative act in declaring the nation's birth. These symbols which give physical effect to the *rhetor's* words can be referred to as the extrinsic rhetorical strategies which Hillbruner (1966) defines as "those factors exterior to the speech itself, although of salient significance to it" (p. 5). Nkrumah knew the importance of symbols to the people of Ghana. In an open letter to the Queen of England three months after Ghana's independence, Nkrumah justified the replacement of the Queen's effigy with his own on the Ghanaian Pound by explaining "my people cannot read or write. They've got to be shown that they are now really independent. And they can only be shown by signs" (Nkrumah, 1957). Thus, in declaring independence to the people, symbolism was to play a key role if Nkrumah's rhetorical performance was to have any meaningful effect on his audience.

Before the audience at the Polo Grounds, the Union Jack, the only flag which was known to the people of the Gold Coast, came down slowly. According to Powell (1984), "there was a stunned silence" (p. 108) among the immediate audience whilst the new colourful flag of Ghana for the first time was unfurled in the midnight skies. The new Ghanaian flag covered the wooden dais upon which Nkrumah stood with some members of his Cabinet to deliver his speech. Whilst the audience listened to Nkrumah, they constantly beheld the new flag. With the display of the flag, Nkrumah's rhetorical declaration had been effectively augmented with symbolic visual evidence. Aside the symbol of flag, there was also the use of sound – the national anthem. The new anthem was played so many times particularly at the end of Nkrumah's address. Perelman (1982) argues that "to create presence it is useful to insist at length upon certain elements; in prolonging the attention given them" (p. 37). The repetition of the new anthem, therefore, sustained the mood of

independence and its associated images which all together deepened the emotional mood of the audience.

Nkrumah's British Secretary, Erica Powell, who was among the crowd that night, aptly summarises the mood of the audience and the effect of the nation's birth. Powell (1984) notes, "sobs could be heard and hands wiped tears from eyes. The mood was now sober, as if they suddenly realised that this child they had helped give birth to was going to be no small burden to bear" (p. 108). Nkrumah, as a *rhetor*, knew how to take advantage of physical setting to achieve the needed rhetorical effect (Monfils, 1977) among his audiences. Though he had declared the nation's birth in very few words, he had created the appropriate rhetorical mood to effectively reach his audience with the rest of his message.

Creating Solidarity and Unity

In a complex move, Nkrumah showed appreciation to some key sections of his audience as a means of creating solidarity and unity between his government and these different groups of audiences. Whilst the mention of these groups on the surface may appear as a simple gesture, it was a strategic rhetoric move by Nkrumah. Nkrumah's careful selection was based on major issues and developments directly connected with the independence struggle. He noted:

I want to take the opportunity to thank the chiefs and people of this country, the youth, the farmers, the women, who have so nobly fought and won this battle. Also, I want to thank the valiant ex-service men who have so

cooperated with me in this mighty task of freeing our country from foreign rule and imperialism.⁶⁴

Nkrumah crafted these lines to achieve a multi-layered effect on both his immediate and remote audiences. For a clear understanding of his rhetorical choice, there is the need to unravel, first, what might have prompted the statement, secondly, the expectations which the audience held and, lastly, the intended effect of the above statement on the different sections of the audience. To do this effectively, we shall examine briefly historical accounts which inform some rhetorical choices the speaker made and how these accounts to some extent might have presently shaped the expectation(s) of the different groups which Nkrumah was supposed to address.

The first group Nkrumah mentioned was the “chiefs.” Nkrumah acknowledged them to give them some recognition. During several decades of colonial rule in the Gold Coast, traditional chiefs had played a key role within the British system of Indirect Rule. Over time, they emerged as powerful political figures within the Colony. Six years before independence, Nkrumah’s CPP hatched a strategy to weaken the powers of paramount chiefs within the Colony in order to give power to the ordinary people. The two main targets of Nkrumah had been the *Asantehene* and the *Okyehene* and their powerful state councils. This antagonism from Nkrumah had driven these two powerful traditional authorities to back the opposition Party, the NLM (Rathbone, 2000). The chiefs, therefore, saw supporting the NLM as the means of restoring their diminishing political authorities in their traditional communities. In 1954, another key opposition movement had emerged within the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast. Some influential chiefs within

⁶⁴ ID 2.

these territories had come together to form the Northern People's Party (NPP) to voice their displeasure over the government's neglect of their territories in terms of development (Rathbone, 2000). With the backing of the chiefs and their people's, the NLM posed a huge threat to the CPP. The most serious act of the NLM was its call on the Colonial Government for Ashantis to secede from the Colony before independence (Rooney, 2007). This development presented a challenging situation for Nkrumah. At this point, the political climate within the Colony had become quite volatile just before independence. This polarization, which had been fuelled mainly by the NLM with its staunch support from the chiefs, seriously attracted the attention of Whitehall which led to a debate in the British Parliament over the situation in the colony (Rooney, 2000).

For the Ashanti chiefs and people on the night of Ghana's Independence Declaration, Nkrumah, in the words of Lee and Campbell (1994), still "remained on trial" (p. 43). Nkrumah knew he needed to address this key exigency (Bitzer, 1968) which bothered on national cohesion and unity which were necessary ingredients for stability especially after a nation's independence. For the international audience, especially the British, Nkrumah had to demonstrate in his Independence Declaration speech that he was a leader who was ready to bridge the divisive gap among the citizens of the new republic. Therefore through his invention, he was bringing into being a nation which was ready to move in a single direction as it took its first tottering steps in freedom. Nkrumah was aware of the situation and responded to it (Bitzer, 1968). He, therefore, declared:

I am depending upon the millions of the country, the chiefs and people to help me to reshape the destiny of this country. We are prepared to build it up

and make it a nation that will be respected by every other nation in the world.⁶⁵

By this request, Nkrumah was not only making an effort to reconcile with the chiefs, but was making an indirect promise to restore them to their old political status within the Colony – an issue which had become the main bone of contention between the chieftaincy institutions and the CPP government. Through the statement, Nkrumah attempted to establish communion between himself and the chiefs. To Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), “every technique promoting the communion of the speaker with his audience will decrease the opposition between them – an opposition which is harmful when the task of the speaker is to persuade” (p. 321). It symbolised a positive way by which Nkrumah allayed the fears of the large group of opposing chiefs who might have been harbouring a future of uncertainty after independence when Nkrumah would have assumed full control of the new state. The expression of unity was also partly Nkrumah’s attempt to signal the British Colonial Government of his own commitment to unity, irrespective of the long period of bickering before the nation’s independence.

Moving from the chiefs, Nkrumah strategically expressed appreciation to “the youth,” a crucial constituency upon which the CPP was built. By so doing, Nkrumah was keeping faith with this key group as part of his political strategy. Throughout Nkrumah’s fight for Ghana’s independence and beyond, the youth will be his greatest stronghold. At the nation’s independence, there was the need to acknowledge their contribution and create solidarity for the future. By duly acknowledging “the youth,” Nkrumah was indirectly invoking a shared history

⁶⁵ ID 4.

among the audience. He was giving meaning to the formation of his own party, the CPP, and the successful fight towards the nation's independence. In fact, he was telling the story of Ghana's independence. A little over a decade before independence, the youth within the Gold Coast had emerged as a major force in the Gold Coast nationalism movement. Ten years prior to Ghana's independence, the Ashanti Youth Organization had been formed (Rooney, 2007). As a political strategist, Nkrumah had carefully observed the effectiveness of the youth in the 1948 boycott and foresaw their possible influence in the larger struggle for independence. He could easily identify himself with the youth group and saw their course as part of the larger course for which he was fighting for independence. In the words of Rooney (2007), Nkrumah "gave the young men the chance to kick over their frustrations with a vision of a new democratic society in which an elected council would replace the chiefs and their elders" (p. 77).

He perceived the youth as a quintessential tool in the Gold Coast nationalism movement. When Nkrumah and compatriots were imprisoned for weeks after the 1948 riots, students and teachers embarked on demonstrations all over the country. In fortifying his relationship with the youth, Nkrumah formally established the Committee on Youth Action (CYO) in 1949 which he employed to pursue the radical agenda of "Self Government Now" (Rooney, 2007, pp. 67-70). The youth group after the formation of the CPP in June that year was to become an effective arm of Nkrumah's party in Nkrumah's pursuit towards Ghana's independence. By acknowledging the youth, Nkrumah had imprinted their name in history and had given the youth their due in the entire struggle for the independence of the Gold Coast. He had, therefore, noted through rhetoric their unique sacrifices which had led

to the nation's independence. Nkrumah used the speech as an opportunity to renew his solidarity contract with the youth group and this solidarity will continue even after independence.

Aside the youth group, Nkrumah mentioned "the farmers ... who have so nobly fought and won this battle"⁶⁶ in the Declaration. Before the 1951 general elections in the Gold Coast, Nkrumah had taken great political advantage of the cocoa farmers' disaffection with the British colonial policy of cutting down swollen shoot infected cocoa trees. This situation had drawn the massive support of the farmers towards him during the 1951 elections (Rathbone, 2000). Thus, Nkrumah literally stood on the shoulders of the cocoa farmers to come into political office. However, in the year 1954, the fall of the world cocoa price affected Nkrumah government's cocoa pricing policy. Therefore, the political advantage which Nkrumah took regarding the cocoa crises in 1951, would come back to haunt him. The love of the farmers for Nkrumah ironically turned into a bitter disaffection.

This economic situation partly led to the establishment of the opposition party, NLM (Rooney, 2007), which took political advantage of the 1954 cocoa crises, just as Nkrumah had done in 1951. Politically, the NLM was going to taunt Nkrumah's government throughout the years before and after Ghana's independence (Rooney, 2007). So in declaring the nation's independence, Nkrumah again used the speech to give recognition to cocoa farmers, whose disaffection with him (Nkrumah) had naturally provided a strong support base for the opposition NLM. In the address, Nkrumah was attempting to renew his relationship with the farmers by re-identifying himself with the fundamental course of independence that drew them towards his

⁶⁶ ID 2.

own course six years earlier. The recognition was a means of reminding the farmers of the noble deeds they (Nkrumah and farmers) fought for which had finally yielded the fruits of independence.

Another key group in the independence struggle had been “the women.” An important group whose support Nkrumah still needed to court even after the nation’s independence. Remembering the role of women in the independence movement in Ghana partly reveals crucial sections of Gold Coast nationalism. Nkrumah used to highlight the historic contribution of women in CPP during the struggle for independence. It invoked indirectly some political performances of women which should not be lost in Ghanaian political and public memory.

Women had formed a great support to Nkrumah during the turbulent days of the independence struggle. After the 1948 Riots, Nkrumah, fearing immediate arrest, had gone into hiding with two women supporters in Accra (Rooney, 2007). This revealed the challenges women had to endure alongside the men, in keeping alive the flame of nationalism within the Colony. Again, women demonstrated charisma and leadership in the CPP. Such records are vivid in the annals of the party. The hymn ‘Lead Kindly Light’, which was sung at CPP rallies, was adopted by the party after a woman at a UGCC rally in 1949 burst into singing upon Nkrumah’s announcement of his resignation from the UGCC (Rooney, 2007). Milne (2000) provides an emotional account of a CPP woman, who at a Party rally “got on the platform and ended a fiery speech by slashing her face with a razor blade. Smearing blood all over her body she challenged men to be prepared to shed blood in the cause of independence” (p. 60). According to Rooney (2007), during the early beginnings of the CPP, “women flocked the Charismatic new leader, and were effectively used to

organize branches in every community (p. 77). Four women, namely, Mrs Letitia Quaye, Mrs Hannah Cudjoe, Madam Ama Nkrumah and Madam Sophia Doku (Milne, 2000) were appointed in the Party as Propaganda Secretaries who travelled countrywide campaigning for the CPP. Women had been a fortress for Nkrumah and had responded to his call to free the nation from colonial rule. As Nkrumah acknowledged the women, he sought to solicit their continuous support in the coming years to come. He used the speech to endear himself and his new government to the womenfolk who had been a political bastion not only for the CPP but also from the transition of a colony into freedom.

The last group to be selected for praise in Nkrumah's address was the ex-service men. They might have seemed the most important for being singled out in a different sentence for special emphasis. Nkrumah continued: "Also, I want to thank the valiant ex-service men who have so cooperated with me in this mighty task of freeing our country from foreign rule and imperialism."⁶⁷

The reference to "valiant ex-servicemen" only reveals Nkrumah's attempt in appealing to what Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) refer to as symbolic relation. They explain that "the symbolic connection brings about transferences between the symbol and the thing symbolized" (p. 332). Warwick (1996) also refers to it as symbolic liaison and argues that it is "a whole universe of experience shared by the rhetor and audience upon which the rhetor can draw to gain acceptance of his or her position" (p. 190). In this instance, the symbolic relation Nkrumah invoked is a shared memory of the audience of the singular most heroic deed in Gold Coast nationalism which saw the loss of the lives of three brave ex-service men, leading to

⁶⁷ ID 2.

the 1948 Riots (Rooney, 2007). The valiant action of the ex-service men has become a watershed in Gold Coast's nationalism. It was on the heels of this famous riot that sustained effort against imperialism in the Gold Coast began. The mention of "ex-service men" is evocative of the many painful stories and the difficult sacrifices ordinary brave men and women had to endure in order to challenge colonial rule. In a sense, it invokes an intense pathos in the audience and creates a sense of "communion" (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 332) between Nkrumah and the audience.

In another sense, the evocation of the "ex-servicemen" reveals the level of cooperation which prior to independence existed between Nkrumah and these retired soldiers. Perhaps, this "cooperation" brings to the fore Nkrumah's influence on the veterans at a meeting on the 20th February 1948 (Rooney, 2007) which might have defined the nature of that fateful protest which shook the foundation of the colonial power in the Gold Coast. It is important to state that the effect of the 28th February Riots did not only spark nationalism within the borders of the Gold Coast but also created a rippling effect all over Africa. With Nkrumah's continental vision, the Independence Declaration speech provided a clear opportunity to lay his claim as an architect of the fateful 28th February riots. From a rhetorical point of view, through "cooperation" with "the valiant ex-service men," Nkrumah had engineered in 1947, arguably, one of the most important acts of Gold Coast nationalism and was declaring the Gold Coast's independence in the period marking almost a decade after the Riots.

Beyond using the speech to establish the needed solidarity with different constituencies within the audience, Nkrumah further employed the speech in

articulating a clear Pan-African view. In the next section, I attempt to examine this key strategy in Nkrumah's address.

The Pan-African Agenda

In the second part of the address, the speech sharply moves from Ghana's independence to focus on Pan-Africanism which would be at the centre of Nkrumah's foreign policy at independence. On 6th March 1957, when Nkrumah was proclaiming Ghana's independence, there were only eight independent African nations. These were Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, Egypt, Ethiopia, Sudan, Liberia and South Africa. Nkrumah's audience was, therefore, not limited to those at the Polo Grounds that night. Outside Ghana, the speech was reported to an extended international audience through radio broadcast. But Nkrumah's speech targeted and attracted two key groups of extended audiences. The first group was the millions of Africans living under colonial rule in Africa; the second group involved western countries with colonial holdings in Africa. Nkrumah had targeted the speech to have a *perlocutionary* effect on both groups of the extended audience.

For the first group of audience (Africans), they were simply in dire need of continuous hope and inspiration to fight their own colonial battles in their respective African territories. Since nationalism activities were gathering momentum in different part of the continent, the situation in Africa obviously presented an exigency for Nkrumah in his Declaration address. As a result, many African countries looked to Nkrumah to provide direction and inspiration to free their territories from colonial rule. The second group, the colonialists, especially the

British and French governments, were wary as to the possible implications Ghana's independence meant for their other colonies in Africa. Though most independence celebrations are characterized by epideictic orations, Nkrumah used the speech to address this key Pan-African exigency in the light of Ghana's foreign policy.

Nkrumah noted:

We are not waiting, we shall no more go back to sleep anymore. Today, from now on there is a new African in the world, that new African is ready to fight his own battle and show that after all, the black man is capable of managing his own affairs. We are going to demonstrate to the world and to the other nations, young as we are that we are prepared to lay our own foundations... I made a point that we are going to see that we create our own African personality and identity.⁶⁸

This statement provided a hint of Nkrumah's Pan-African ideology. The statement clearly invoked a firm view which had been highlighted by the participants of the 5th Pan-African Congress in Manchester (Padmore, 1963). This idea had been articulated more clearly by Padmore (1953) in his work, *The Gold Coast Revolution*, four years before Ghana's independence as he witnessed progressive political developments within the Gold Coast. He argued:

For too long have Africans slept. But now they are awakening-and rapidly-to the realization of their inferior status, to a consciousness of their rights in the world of men and nations. And having awakened, they will not again fall back asleep. They will fight – and by every means, as recent events have only

⁶⁸ ID 5.

too well demonstrated – to secure their rightful heritage as free people in a free word (p. 9).

By re-invoking the words of Padmore (1953), Nkrumah had brought about their fulfilment as he declared Ghana's independence. At the 1945 Pan-African Congress in Manchester, Padmore played a pioneering role alongside Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois. Nkrumah had worked with Padmore so closely and Padmore was going to be a great influence on Nkrumah's nationalism and Pan-African ideas in the years of struggle prior to 6th March 1957. Padmore's contribution and organisational abilities at Manchester had been extraordinary. Du Bois, in recounting events at Manchester, referred to Padmore as "the organizing spirit of that congress" (Padmore, 1963). By referring to Padmore, Nkrumah did not only stand on the authority of a revered Pan-Africanist, but was transferring values and reinterpreting Padmore's words in the light of a new context (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). First, Ghana's independence was seen as the first in its kind in Sub-Saharan Africa. Secondly, it was a reminder or a call of Nkrumah's remote audience in Africa of the need to fulfil the Pan-African dream in their territories.

With Padmore's words, Nkrumah was promising citizens of the new nation the creation of "our own African personality"⁶⁹ which is a response to Padmore's quest for a "rightful heritage." Nkrumah had symbolically become a representation of the "new African" with all the positive attributes that will inspire Ghanaians and the rest of Africa. The call for the creation of an "African personality" was a call to Ghanaians and the rest of Africans to develop self-pride and re-embrace African

⁶⁹ ID 5.

heritage and values. It was a demonstration of pride in the African self as a unique personality capable of making notable contribution in the modern world.

Twelve years earlier at the Manchester Congress, a fairly good number of African liberation fighters were present. This was unprecedented in the history of the Congress (Padmore, 1963). Notable among them were Obafemi Awolowo and Jaja Wachuku of Nigeria, Wallace-Johnson of Sierra Leone, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, Peter Abrahams and Mark Hlubi of the Union of South Africa and Dr. Hastings Banda of Nyasaland. They had embraced the resolutions at the Congress and left Manchester as agents of political change in Africa. As he brought back vivid memories of the Manchester Congress, Nkrumah at this point, directed the speech's focus unto the remote African audience. He brought the speech to its highest point when he made a call which was at the heart of his Pan-African agenda. He stated:

We have done the battle and we again rededicate ourselves not only in the struggle to emancipate other territories in Africa. Our independence is meaningless unless it is linked up with total liberation of the African continent.⁷⁰

Nkrumah appealed to the argument of the parts and the whole (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca argue that “the whole is treated as similar to each one of its parts...what is true of the whole is true of the part” (p. 231). The underlying argument is that if Africa is not free [the whole] then the freedom of its part [Ghana] remains inconclusive. The speech provides a forceful

⁷⁰ ID 6.

voice in articulating an African policy regarding the future of the continent in relation to imperialism.

The only way to ensure proper economic emancipation and political freedom for any country is to ensure total freedom of Africa. It was a clear announcement that Ghana's independence, though a good sign, was not a complete achievement within the context of the "whole." It, therefore, becomes a part and probably the beginning of a larger fight for the total emancipation of the Africa. Whilst it served as an implicit threat to imperialism on the continent, it provided as a direct source of encouragement and hope to all Africans still looking out for a ray of hope to bring about their ultimate salvation from colonial servitude. It was a faithful promise by Nkrumah to the remote African audience. In other words, Nkrumah wanted to create a rhetorical agency that will be relevant and effective in Africa beyond the primary exigency which summoned the speech into being.

On the platform of Ghana's independence, he had made a loud and urgent call to the rest of Africans to wake up and free Africa to become whole. It was in the larger interest or purpose of Africa's liberation that Ghana's independence was fought for. Though Gold Coasters had been freshly liberated from colonialism, in a metaphorical sense, they were being conscripted into the duty of a continental liberation movement. This, for Nkrumah, could not be a matter for negotiation. Nkrumah had, therefore, constituted the remote African audience into a rhetorical audience. Farrell (1993) argues:

the potential of rhetoric is best realised through a prescribed form of engagement with an audience as an agency of art ... it is the rhetorical

audience (the “one who decides”) that functions as the efficient cause of the enactment of rhetoric as practical art (p. 68).

The speech had certainly set a new urgency in motion in Africa. For the Western audience, especially the British and other countries with colonial holdings in Africa, Nkrumah’s declaration represented an implicit warning to them. It meant that the success of Ghana’s struggle was going to be replicated in the other African colonial territories to bring about their freedom. It revealed a sign of a haunting urgency as Nkrumah called on the new citizens to “rededicate ourselves... in the struggle to emancipate other territories in Africa.”⁷¹ Such a call has the rhetorical potential of weakening the moral defence of Colonial Governments against Nkrumah’s urgent quest for independence all over in Africa. His statement sounded the strong resolve and possibly imminent collapse of the formidable walls of imperialism in Africa. What then was the source of strength for this resolution? Nkrumah’s speech applied what Pierard and Linder (1988) refer to as civil religion which the next section of the Chapter examines.

Civil Religion

Since the beginning of Nkrumah’s involvement in the struggles for independence in the Gold Coast, Nkrumah in a rhetorical posture had cast the whole struggle for independence within a civil religious practice. He had, therefore, employed the Christian religion as a counter hegemonic tool against colonialism (Simms, 2006). This practice of employing religion was not going to be a one-time

⁷¹ ID 6.

activity but a permanent rhetorical feature throughout the period of almost two decades when Nkrumah was Prime Minister and later President of Ghana. The choice of such a peculiar rhetorical trademark could not have been an accident but a purposeful choice to achieve a particular end. To engage in a meaningful discussion, it is important to have a brief sketch of Christian religion and politics in the Gold Coast till the time of the nation's independence. Religion seems to be, as Pobee (1991) asserts, "one of the important institutional structures making up the total social system" (p. 11). Pobee continues to note that:

in most of the communal activities and other social institutions of African peoples are inextricably bound up with religion and all the spirit-world. Birth, puberty, marriage, death, widowhood, harvest and installations to traditional offices all partake of a religious nature. Political life itself is laced with religion (p. 11).

By 1957, the Christian religion had been well institutionalised in the major cities and towns in the Gold Coast, if not in the hinterlands. Most of the black educated elites have embraced Christian values as a result of their education in missionary schools which were supported by the Gold Coast Colonial administration. The general populace who although may not have necessarily embraced Christian religion had come to associate with it respect and superiority compared to their own traditional religious practices which the missionaries had tagged as heathen and uncivilized. For the new black political elite like Nkrumah, countering colonialism called for speaking in the religious language of the colonizer and indulging in religious symbolism which represented for the masses the source of power and authority of the white colonizer. Though he confessed not being fond of

organized religion (Rooney, 2007), Nkrumah constantly sustained and reinforced that symbolic image of Christian religious power through his rhetorical invention even after Ghana's independence (Monfils, 1977). In some ways, it reveals Nkrumah's level of commitment to sustain a high level of rhetorical engagement with the ordinary people in the Gold Coast struggle for independence.

Since the main purpose of the *rhetor*, in the view of Perelman (1979), is to ensure "a meeting of minds" (p. 11) with his audience, Nkrumah tried to identify with the people of the Gold Coast through his application of Christian images. Indeed, Gold Coasters fundamentally interpreted life through their religious inclination. When Nkrumah laid a proposal for Gold Coast independence in the Gold Coast Colonial Assembly in 1953, he had spoken metaphorically in a prophetic tone like Moses who had appeared before Pharaoh to demand for the freedom of the people of Israel. He had chronicled in the 1953 speech the forebears of Gold Coast nationalism who could not reach the promise land of Ghana's independence.

As Nkrumah declared Ghana's independence on the 6th of March 1957, he continued what he had begun five years earlier by acknowledging the providence of God in the entire struggle of the people of the Gold Coast. He noted: "but today, may I call upon you all that at this great day, let us all remember that nothing in the world can be done unless it had the purported support of God."⁷² The speech's continuation of civil religion renders it rhetorically poignant. Nkrumah had symbolically led the people into the promise land of freedom. He had interpreted before the new citizens the success of independence as an act of God's providence which has yielded the fruits of freedom to God's people. In a sense, he reconstituted the Polo grounds into

⁷² ID 6.

a hallowed place, a place where the freedom of the nation had been declared. Thus, through God's providence, the people had experience a renewal of self within the politico-religious ceremony which Nkrumah had performed. The people had been called to worship and the mundane public meeting of citizens had been, for a moment, transformed into a religious ceremony of thanksgiving. Through words, the audience had been "performed" as citizens of a new nation, inspired for Pan-Africanism and had been turned to worship God for his providence. The different transitions which the audience are conducted through via Nkrumah's words are rhetorically effective and striking. He had called on them to pray and reflect for a moment:

Fellow Ghanaians, let us now ask for God's blessing and for only two seconds, in your thousands and millions I want to ask you to pause for only for one minute and give thanks to Almighty God for having led us through obstacles, difficulties, imprisonments, hardships and sufferings to have brought us to the end of our troubles today. One minute silence.⁷³

Nkrumah called for a minute silence and the audience responded accordingly. Such a moment of reflection becomes heavy-laden with emotions as the audience are made to go through a quick kaleidoscope of the different phases of the long struggle to freedom. Nkrumah had identified himself with the audience and had joined with them so that together they could experience remembrance. To Aristotle (2007), "[there is persuasion] through the hearers when they are led to feel emotion by the speech" (p. 39). As Nkrumah spoke about the "difficulties, imprisonment hardships

⁷³ ID 7.

and suffering,”⁷⁴ he stood on the dais together with his comrades wearing caps with the inscription PG – (meaning Prison Graduates). Just as Powell (1984) clearly puts it, it was “a reminder of what they had suffered to get where they were that day” (p. 108). Nkrumah had, therefore, physically and symbolically become an embodiment of the entire struggle which the people of the Gold Coast had had to experience. The inscription “PG” on their caps had provided them a unique place in the minds of the audience. Nkrumah as well as his colleagues had earned what Aristotle (2007) refers to as “good will” (p. 112) from the people and were deemed honourable. In talking about honor, Aristotle (2007) points to acts “that bring honor rather than money; and whatever someone has done not for his own sake; and things absolutely good and whatever someone has done for his own country, overlooking his own interest” (pp. 77-78). Nkrumah succeeded in pointing to his honourable deeds to the audience. Thus, as he called unto the audience for a thanksgiving prayer to God, he had indirectly also focused the audience’s attention to his ethos. Together with the people, Nkrumah had celebrated the providence of God and had ended the civil religious ritual with a call for the playing of the new national anthem. As the anthem was being played whilst Nkrumah remained quiet, there was an emotional outburst among the audience. Powell (1984), Nkrumah’s British secretary, in her own vivid accounts notes:

as the national anthem was played over and over again, sobs could be heard and hands wiped tears from eyes. The mood was now sober, as if they suddenly realised that this child they had helped give birth to was going to be no small burden to bear (p. 108).

⁷⁴ ID 7.

Nkrumah ended his address with a call and response act with the audience. He shouted “freedom”, which the crowd responded by repeating freedom.⁷⁵ In the end, the energies of the orator and the audience were infused together. Together, Nkrumah with the people had pronounced the independence of the nation by declaring it publicly, thus bringing to an end not only the civil religious ceremony but more importantly, bringing into being a new nation and her citizens.

Impact of the Address

The declaration of independence to a people who have had been under colonial rule for an extensive period will be undeniably received with great excitement and jubilation. Such was the reception of Nkrumah’s Independence Declaration speech. Any critical assessment of the speech’s impact on the immediate audience cannot ignore the role of symbolism in determining the rhetorical effectiveness of Nkrumah’s invention. Nkrumah successfully employed the new national symbols of naming, flag and anthem to create a sense of nationhood which was non-existent prior to the 6th of March. Through symbolism, Nkrumah had set a new psychological paradigm as a conscious means of weaning Ghanaian citizens from perceiving their place within the new independent community through British colonial images. By forcefully bringing these symbols to the attention of the new citizens through the speech, Nkrumah had not only “create[d] the desired emotions” (Perelman, 1982, p. 37) in them but had also established a presence in the

⁷⁵ Evidence from audio version of speech.

minds of the audience thereby “prevent[ing] them [national symbols] from being neglected” (Perelman, 1982, p. 35).

A few months after independence in 1957, Nkrumah had replaced the effigy of the Queen of England with his own on both the Ghanaian postage stamps and currencies (Fuller, 2008). The justification which he had provided for this action underscored his conscious use of symbolism. In an open letter to the Queen, Nkrumah (1957) had asserted that “many of my people cannot read or write. They’ve got to be shown that they are now really independent. And they can only be shown by signs” (p. 12). In fact, what Barbara Monfils (1977) refers to as Nkrumah’s employment of “Operation Psychology” (p. 313) soon after Ghana’s independence, had rather begun at the Polo Grounds on the 6th of March. The practice was going to be sustained throughout Nkrumah’s time as president of Ghana. Thus, at the Independence Declaration, the people did not just witness an end to colonial rule but the speech had generated a new sense of identity and pride for the Ghanaian citizen through Nkrumah’s employment of symbolism.

With regard to Nkrumah’s long battle with the chiefs who had been the main supporting force behind the opposition NLM, Nkrumah had used the speech as a means of restoring the power of the chiefs who prior to 1951 had enjoyed political power and the cooperation of the Colonial Government. Through the 6th of March speech, Nkrumah had made a call to unite with the chiefs to develop the new nation. This had been a positive sign to the British government which had been accused of courting the NLM to delay independence. The address portrayed a picture of a leader who was ready to unite his entire citizenry in order to pursue a national cause. However, Nkrumah’s assurance and goodwill to the chiefs was never going to see

the light of day after independence. Later events had revealed that the rhetoric of unity and restoration during the 6th of March speech was only a façade (Rooney, 2007) as Nkrumah had only sought to increase his credibility taking advantage of the media spotlight which is usually thrown on such national occasions. Nkrumah's deviation from his promises to the chiefs would deepen the antagonism towards his government till his overthrow nine years later after declaring the Ghana's independence. With hindsight, the U- turn which Nkrumah took after his speech represents a low point regarding the long-term impact of his Independence Declaration speech. But within the short term, the speech achieved immediate success as a gesture of unity on the birth of a new nation.

Undoubtedly, the speech had a positive impact on Pan-Africanism. In 1960, three years after the Independence Declaration speech, as many as seventeen countries in Africa attained their independence. Whilst it will be an over stretch to claim that Nkrumah's 1957 speech at independence resulted in this huge success, it could be argued that the speech's strong Pan-African emphasis, no doubt, contributed to this African success story. The independence address laid a firm foundation for Nkrumah's Pan-African agenda. An example was the formation of the Ghana-Guinea Union and the organisation of the All-African People's Conference in 1958 (Rooney, 2007), which is considered among Nkrumah's greatest diplomatic success. Beyond Africa, Nkrumah's Independence speech had had positive effect as far as in the West Indies. Leaders in the West Indies like Norman Manley, the Prime Minister of Jamaica, began fighting for the attainment of full sovereignty for the West Indies Federation (Rooney, 2007). In the United States, Ghana's independence,

Rooney (2007) argues, “created an excitement and a momentum which merged with the civil rights struggles of the ensuing decade” (p. 206).

Conclusion

All in all, it could be concluded that Nkrumah’s Independence Declaration was largely a successful one in view of its far reaching impact. As a key oratorical invention, the speech arguably was a strong attempt in initiating a new sense of Ghanaian citizenship and the belief in the African self – a sense of self recognition and citizenship needed for the building of a new nation. Through the use of symbolism, Nkrumah replaced British colonial images which had for generations become a part of the consciousness of Gold Coasters with images of the new nation. So far as Nkrumah’s Pan-African agenda is concerned, the speech served as a launching pad for Nkrumah’s foreign policy. After 1957, Nkrumah’s oration and activities within Africa and beyond would be premised on the foundation which he had laid in the 6th of March address. Through the address, Nkrumah had performed the nation through a civil religious ceremony upon which he established himself as a high priest ready to lead and guide his people in the course of God’s providence. Though the independence speech of a small nation in Sub-Saharan Africa, it marked the beginning of Nkrumah’s formal oratorical establishment as a true Pan-Africanist. Through the address, Nkrumah’s voice emerged as a notable voice amongst many in the fight to free Africa from colonialism.

Through his rhetoric, Nkrumah had given a hint of his African liberation agenda on the platform of Ghana’s independence celebration. This statement,

obviously, showed the future trajectory of Nkrumah's political focus. The next Chapter (Five) will demonstrate Nkrumah's rhetorical strategy in launching his African liberation project in 1958, a year after Ghana's independence.

CHAPTER FIVE

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S ADDRESS AT THE ALL-AFRICAN PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE ON 8TH DECEMBER 1958 IN ACCRA

Introduction

As demonstrated in Chapter Four, the year 1957 had marked an important milestone in the liberation struggle of Africans from Western colonial rule. Ghana had become the first Sub-Saharan country to gain her independence from British colonial rule. Zolberg, as noted in Thompson (1969), considered Ghana's independence at the time as "the most important event in the history of modern Africa" (p. 28). The new citizens were revering in their freedom and this small West African territory had become the major political agenda in the last quarter of the 1960 when the subject of colonialism in Africa came up for deliberation. Among the major actors in international politics, people became concerned as to the political future of Ghana in respect of her foreign policy direction and its ramifications for the rest of the dependent territories in Africa. Kwame Nkrumah, a man who had led Ghana to independence, quickly assumed a new space on the world's political stage, wielding a symbolically important flag of African nationalism which naturally attracted him to the attention of the many African nationalists and political actors who were deeply concerned about the colonial question in Africa and beyond.

With all the spotlights on the new nation Ghana and its leader, Nkrumah, he decided to act by taking advantage of the fresh political wind and media spotlight which had been brought about through the nation's independence. In essence, he had come to understand and appreciate the political climate in Africa at the time and decided to act quickly. How then did the year 1958 become so relevant to the anti-colonial struggle? The answer is simple. Nkrumah organised three key diplomatic activities in Accra at which he made key addresses which, perhaps, were to change further the subject of colonialism in Africa forever. The first event occurred in April when Nkrumah organised and addressed the first ever Conference for heads of newly Independent African States in April. Seven months after this important meeting of the new African leaders, Nkrumah established the Ghana-Mali Union as a precursor to his dream of continental unity. The last and probably the most important event was the All-African People's Conference (AAPC) which was held in December 1958.

In his preparation for the Conference in December, Nkrumah was highly spirited and had prepared to speak to as many as three hundred delegates from within Africa and beyond (Rooney, 2007). In fact, this was, in the words of Hadjor (1988), "the first genuinely All-African assembly" (p. 88) because of the good representation of Africans from every corner of Africa. There were twenty-eight African countries whose representatives were present in Accra. In addition, sixty-two nationalist organizations were represented at the conference (Armah, 2004). Nkrumah's timing for the conference was appropriate, especially just a year after Ghana's independence. According to Thompson (1969), the December 1958 conference was "timed to meet the needs and mood of a rebellious continent" (p. 61). In essence, the

situation (Bitzer, 1968) was ripe and Nkrumah was ready to provide an appropriate response.

In what ways did Nkrumah use the speech to establish his own ethos as a new leader among ‘leaders’ who did not have legitimacy in their own territories? How did he create a balance by establishing his own legitimacy on the platform of African nationalism and at the same time as a source of inspiration to freedom to people who were in search for inspiration in pursuance of their own struggle? In what different ways did the speech take the audience through differing rhetorical journeys? What kinds of effects did the speech create within the audience as they were positioned as agents of Nkrumah’s rhetorical end? How did the speech, though fundamentally deliberative in nature, become a platform for the celebration of the African spirit? My argument in this piece is simply anchored on the central issues which the above questions seek to probe.

Establishing Ethos

In December, Nkrumah was certainly not oblivious of what was at stake as he prepared to address the biggest continental audience of African freedom fighters he could ever imagine. This was certainly a huge opportunity for his vision of African liberation and the gathering in no doubt was very appropriate for the subject of his address. Nkrumah needed not just any kind of audience for his rhetoric if his vision was ever going to see the light of day. Unmistakably, Nkrumah had a rhetorical audience. Farrell (1993) puts it right when he says:

The potential of rhetoric is best realised through a prescribed form of engagement with an audience as an agency of art ... it is the rhetorical audience (the “one who decides”) that functions as the efficient cause of the enactment of rhetoric as practical art (p. 68).

Among some of the key delegates who were present in Accra were Jomo Kenyatta, Tom Mboya, I.T.A. Wallace Johnson and Franz Fanon, just to mention a few. If Nkrumah was going to make any headway with his address, he needed to forcefully define himself before his audience. In other words it was imperative for Nkrumah to clearly establish his ethos, for this was, perhaps, the greatest strength he brought to his speech. To Aristotle (2007), “there is persuasion through character whenever the speech is spoken” (p. 38). Though a lot of the delegates had heard about Nkrumah, for most of them news about Ghana’s independence was all over Africa. Some of the delegates had met Nkrumah during the April conference in Accra. It was going to be their first encounter with him. In preparation to send out a call for the conference a few months earlier, George Padmore had wanted the conference to be entitled as a Pan-African conference. However, Nkrumah objected to that title and rather decided to call it the All-African People’s Conference. This, according to Thompson (1969), was “to make it clear that Ghana and Nkrumah had begun a new tradition” (p. 58).

Certainly, Nkrumah had begun a journey which seemed to be set on a different rhetorical trajectory. A rhetoric that was his own which sought to establish him as a brand and to highlight himself at the forefront of the anti-colonial struggle in Africa. In the opening of the address, Nkrumah outlined the giant steps he had taken so far as a means of furthering the cause of decolonization of Africa. The novelty and uniqueness of the conference was clearly highlighted in the opening of

the speech. He signalled, “This assembly marks the opening of a new epoch in our Continent’s history and it will be recorded in our annals as illuminations worthy of its significance as the First All-African People’s Conference.”⁷⁶ The “new epoch” was under Nkrumah’s direction as he had brought together freedom fighters to deliberate on the colonial issue on the soil of an independent territory. He noted:

Never before has it been possible for so representative a gathering of African Freedom Fighters not only to come together, but to assemble in a free independent African State for the purpose of planning for a final assault upon Imperialism and Colonialism.⁷⁷

Stating this historical meeting is not enough, the speech goes on to highlight on the successes achieved prior to this historic meeting. Nkrumah reminded the audience: “Only eight months ago I had the honour to welcome to our country political delegates on a different level—that is, the official representatives of the Governments of the independent African States.”⁷⁸ (That is, prior to his current effort at organising the present conference, he had met earlier in April 1958 the heads of governments of the newly independent states. This gradual built up of Nkrumah’s achievement forms essentially a strategic means of establishing his ethos). Whilst the speech sought to, on the surface, apprise the delegates of previous efforts which had culminated in the present conference, it was an obvious rhetorical choice, a subtle means in bringing the speaker’s ethos to the fore, giving him legitimacy to deliberate on the subject of the present conference. Just as Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) note, “the

⁷⁶ All-African People’s Conference Speech (AAPC) 2. All references to the speech will be in the writer’s own format.

⁷⁷ AAPC 3.

⁷⁸ AAPC 6.

speaker must have qualifications for speaking on his subject and must be skillful in its presentation” (p. 52). Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca continue, “self-praise constitutes only an indispensable means to attain a legitimate end” (p. 319).

Further, the speech does not end with these latest records of Nkrumah’s good will, but goes back thirteen years later to make alive Nkrumah’s contribution during the 1945 Pan-African Congress in Manchester. So far as the liberation of Africa is concerned, Manchester remains a hallowed place to African freedom fighters. It was in Manchester that a firm blueprint for decolonization of Africa was laid for the first generation liberation fighters in Africa, a number of which were present in Accra. Nkrumah recollected:

The climax of our earlier Pan-African Congresses was the Fifth, which was held in Manchester in 1945, where I had the good luck to be made a joint secretary with Mr. George Padmore, who is now my advisor on African affairs. That Congress was perhaps only less historic than this first All-African People’s Conference.⁷⁹

In effect, Nkrumah demonstrated his pedigree on the subject of African liberation. If Padmore with all his experience and expertise is Nkrumah’s advisor on African affairs, then what else could the delegates have expected from Nkrumah in terms of his competence in providing a clear direction on the African colonial issue? We cannot agree more with Salazar (2003) when he declares that:

ethos qualifies, in rhetoric, the authority an audience accords a speaker to address a debatable issue. (It does not mean the audience, or parts of it,

⁷⁹ AAPC 15.

agrees with the speaker or even has trust, it simply recognises the latter's competence, defined itself in a variety of ways)" (pp. 4-5).

Thus, in a sense, there seems to be a correlation between the force of an argument and the level of prestige of the speaker (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969), a situation which we cannot be oblivious of, looking at Nkrumah's address.

Interestingly, in view of the reverence which has become associated with the 1945 Manchester Conference, Nkrumah's attempt to subordinate its importance to the AACP revealed his underlying attempt to make history and at least establish himself in the midst of great voices of African liberation. In other words, through his address, he attempted to place himself on a higher ethical plane. By this effort, he came across to his audience as a man who was not only endowed with practical wisdom but possessed the virtue and good will (Aristotle, 2007) necessary to lead the rest of Africa into freedom.

Thus, this public record of Nkrumah's foremost contribution to the liberation struggle is central to understanding Nkrumah's rhetoric on African unity. Though it does not begin with the AACP speech, at least, Nkrumah's invention in the address, somehow provided a vivid chronicle from his completion of Ghana's independence struggle and the beginning of his larger pursuit of Africa's decolonization.

It should be noted the Accra Conference had a strong representation from the few independent territories in Africa. The greatest number of delegates who were present in Accra were from territories which still remained under colonial rule. Obviously, Nkrumah's image as presented before his immediate audience could only exude in them a deep feeling of reverence for the man who had not only led his

people into independence but had provided a concrete platform for the deliberation on the state of Africa. To Aristotle (2007), “character is almost, so to speak, the most authoritative form of persuasion” (p. 39). Now with this gradual building of his premise for the present discussion, Nkrumah remarkably hit on his own words, words which would forever remain at the cornerstone of his foreign policy when he had declared Ghana’s independence a year ago. He stated, “As I have always declared, even before Ghana attained her present sovereign status – ‘the independence of Ghana will be meaningless unless it is linked up with the total liberation of Africa.’”⁸⁰ By invoking Ghana’s independence Nkrumah succeeded in two key things. First, on the national level, he intertwined the destiny of Ghana and the rest of the dependent territories in Africa. Secondly on the personal level, he “establish[ed] a sense of communion centred around particular values recognized by the audience” (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969, p. 51) with the audience that was present before him in Accra. The double invocation deepened his ethos and provided him with enough legitimacy before the audience. Not only did Nkrumah invoke his earlier promise by referring to his words at Ghana’s independence but he also used it as an occasion of renewal of his foreign policy promise, a promise that was to bring hope to black people in the remaining dependent territories in Africa. In effect, Nkrumah added a new layer of assurance and made fresh his sacred bonds with the larger African community. He intoned, “we have not moved from this promise nor shall we budge one jot from it until the final goal has been reached and the last vestiges of imperialism and colonialism have been wiped off this African

⁸⁰ AAPC 9.

Continent.”⁸¹ Obviously, the masses of the people under colonial rule in Africa had high expectations in terms of receiving support from countries which had already become free. Therefore, Nkrumah’s renewed promise became what Bitzer (1968) refers to as “a fitting response, a response that fits the situation” (p. 9).

The Different Rhetorical Journeys

As part of his invention, Nkrumah engaged his audience through the application of differing forms symbolism. In this situation, he made the auditors to constantly engage themselves in a form of assessment in relation to the central message of his address. In other words, their experience of different symbolisms allowed them to engage Nkrumah’s rhetoric from different angles. In one of these experiences, the speech symbolically constituted the conference into a meeting of the CPP. Nkrumah declared, “my real role here today is that of a Leader of a Political Party, and it is as the Chairman of that Party that I want to address you.”⁸² Why would the Prime Minister of a newly independent country refuse to address an international audience as the head of government but instead with his Party credentials? This can be viewed from several rhetorical stances. Before I get into that discussion, it is important to consider an idea first and foremost.

The success of Ghana’s independence, perhaps, was greatly dependent on the successful machinery of the Nkrumah’s CPP. Though the CPP had been formed less than a decade before Ghana’s independence, it succeeded in becoming a mass

⁸¹ AAPC 10.

⁸² AAPC 1.

party which quickly attracted ordinary people from all over the Gold Coast to fight for independence. Nkrumah had always had a strong belief in the CPP structures. He always believed it was the only Party that had the capacity to lead Ghana into independence. This belief rang true when the CPP, under his leadership, succeeded in claiming independence for Ghana from Britain.

After Ghana's independence, whilst the popularity of Nkrumah soured all over Africa, so did the CPP. Nkrumah became a symbolic extension of the CPP and the CPP, Nkrumah. With this premise established, I will attempt to answer my earlier question. Nkrumah's strategy in deciding to address the conference as a "Leader of a Political Party" first, heightened the serious nature of the address. Addressing the audience in his capacity as Prime Minister would have given the speech a deeper epideictic effect, since his new status will have naturally turned the address, to a large extent, into a celebration. Nkrumah's ability to minimise, if not eliminate completely, his Prime Ministerial status sustained the mood which he wanted the address to be characterised with. In that sense, he identified himself with the rest of the freedom fighters who were still in vigorous pursuance of freedom for their dependent territories. To Endres (2011), identification "reinforced commonality between the speaker and audience" (p. 6). Deliberating about the colonial question, therefore, became a shared experience between the Nkrumah and his different audiences.

On the other hand, the symbolic identification of the delegates as CPP members rubbed on them a sense of hope. Since the CPP had won victory for Ghana, it invoked a positive feeling within the international African audience as they reflected on their own struggles within their dependent territories. This kind of

rhetoric which allows the audience to rationalise their position in different symbolic forms produces fresh possibilities and energies which hitherto were absent in them. The audience, after bridging the gap between themselves and the speaker (Nkrumah), can appreciate in whole Nkrumah's central message as it unfolds in the cause of the address. The delegates, as symbolic members of the CPP, owed it a duty to consider the deliberation of a Party leader with considerable respect, especially for his achievement as the first Party leader in Sub-Saharan Africa who had led his people to achieve independence for his nation.

From the symbolic representation of himself as Party Chairman and the audience as members of the CPP, Nkrumah turned to another rhetorical tradition which characterised his invention – the Christian religious tradition. According to Murphy (1997), “rhetorical traditions organise the ‘social knowledge’ of communities and make available symbolic resources for the invention of arguments aimed at authoritative public judgments” (p. 72). Murphy continues to argue that, “rhetorical traditions, serves a functional purpose by providing people with an intelligible “cultural grammar,” through which they might speak to each other, define pressing problems as public, and address those issues” (p. 72). Christian religion formed a part of Nkrumah's rhetorical tradition. In other words, it was a rhetorical commonplace for Nkrumah's invention, particularly during the years of struggle before Ghana's independence. How did Nkrumah manipulate religious symbols for the purpose of his address? To understand the impact of Nkrumah's religious rhetoric, we need to appreciate the formation of Nkrumah's religious background as an African liberation ideologue and the role of colonizer's religion within the socio-political life of Ghanaians at the time of Ghana's independence.

Early missionaries who introduced Christianity in the Gold Coast collaborated with the British Colonial authorities to subdue the natives for colonial rule through religious indoctrination. Simms (2003), a sociologist, refers to a statement made by Lord Lugard and notes that the missionaries taught the natives that “God had elevated Europeans above Africans, blessing them with ‘brains, capital, and energy,’ and that God had charged ‘the native races to progress’ by submitting to the teachings of Christ and the policies of the colonial officials” (p. 467).

In view of this, curriculum in colonial missionary schools was designed to support the religious and political agenda of the British. Kwame Nkrumah was a product of colonial missionary education in the Gold Coast (Rooney, 2007) and also as a student in the United States, he had studied Christian religion and later preached in Christian churches for pecuniary rewards (Nkrumah, 1957). According to Simms (2003), these colonial missionary schools produced “a cadre of anti-colonial thinkers that eventually led the Gold Coast revolution” (p. 468). With the advent of Christianity in the Gold Coast, the natives, even when majority of them were not necessarily adherents of the new Christian religion brought by the British colonialist, had naturally accepted Christian doctrines and values and had come to perceive it (Christianity) as superior as part of the their colonial experience. If Nkrumah was to identify with the people, then at this point it was rhetorically crucial for him to speak authoritatively through the invention of metaphors whose sources invoke Christian religious images which the people, even after independence, still associated with political power and authority.

Through the ideological subordination of the natives by the use of Christian religion, anti-colonial ideologues like Nkrumah learnt to craft a rhetoric which sought to tap from the religious traditions and use them as counter-hegemonic tools. The fundamental part of the Christian doctrine which Nkrumah borrowed was the concept of Christ's redemption of mankind. In this direction, Nkrumah symbolically considered himself as a Messianic figure in the image of Jesus Christ in order to save the people of the Gold Coast from the supposed tyranny of the British colonial rule. Nkrumah saw his political persecution in the Gold Coast as akin to that of Jesus as he died on the cross to save mankind (Simms, 2006). These parallels which Nkrumah drew extensively would be given form in the discussion.

Nkrumah's exploitation of the Christian religious traditions and values, in view of the colonial situation, fitted perfectly into the rhetorical frame within the anti-colonial struggle and because the people of the Gold Coast appreciated, to a large extent, these Christian values, Nkrumah's argument probably became more meaningful to them. Nkrumah awoke in the masses a new sense of nationalism and he was ready to lead them from their woes as a colonised people. Murphy (1997) argues that "rhetorical traditions exist as a linguistic potentiality, but can only be actualized in a collaborative performance of speaker and audience" (p. 72). For the Gold Coasters, Nkrumah's Messianic appeal fell within their value system and, therefore, resonated with them to the extent that they rallied behind Nkrumah to free the country from colonial rule.

Barbara Monfils' (1977) study on Nkrumah's symbolic religious representations provides illumination with respect to the rhetorical strategy by which Nkrumah employed in designing a rhetorical image of himself as Jesus Christ.

Through this strategy, he was able to successfully immerse himself within the religious traditions which had been firmly established by the Western missionaries in the Gold Coast. She notes that “Nkrumah was described as ‘Messiah,’ ‘Redeemer,’ ‘Saviour of Africa,’ ‘Pillar of Fire,’ and with other similar epithets. Nkrumah’s life was paralleled with Christ’s (Monfils, 1977). Further, Nkrumah had his own version of the Beatitudes in the New Testament which was published in the Party’s newspaper, *Accra Evening News* (Simms, 2006). If Nkrumah was symbolically Gold Coast messianic figure, then leading the Gold Coast into independence, in a sense, sanctioned his civil religious and political position in the new nation Ghana. This allowed Nkrumah to continue his Christ-like rhetoric image which he had begun before the nation’s independence. As cited by Monfils (1977), the *Accra Evening News*, in extolling the ethos of Nkrumah, writes that “like Christ, Nkrumah was the only child of his mother and father” (Monfils, 1977, p. 322). So by 1958, as a result of Ghana’s successful fight against colonialism, Ghanaians and African freedom fighters, in rhetorical terms, had to a considerable degree, been made to perceive and sanctioned Nkrumah’s Christ-like image.

So at the AACP meeting, Nkrumah put up a rhetorical performance which was to serve as an exemplar of his already known Christian religious symbol. To succeed in his entire appeal to his audience, Nkrumah moved the context of the speech from a political party meeting into a pseudo Sermon on the Mount where all the audience, in the context of the address, were constituted into his disciples. He performed a homily by enacting the words of Jesus Christ albeit in his own political version. He began his sermon:

My first advice to you who are struggling to be free is to aim for the attainment of the Political Kingdom – that is to say, the complete independence and self-determination of your territories. When you have achieved the Political Kingdom all else will follow. Only with the acquisition of the Political power-real power through the attainment of sovereign independence will you be in a position to reshape the vexations problems which harass our Continent.⁸³

Nkrumah called on all each of the apostles of African nationalism to focus on achieving political independence, something which the colonialist had denied the African but instead, had constantly drawn the African's attention and focus onto the heavenly reward of after-life whilst denying him of real material prosperity on earth (Simms, 2006). Nkrumah's rhetoric sought to give a new meaning to this Christian teaching, making it relevant to the fundamental cause of nationalism. He continued his civil sermon by talking about "power" in the same sense as the biblical Christ discussed the power of the Holy Spirit to his disciples in the New Testament.⁸⁴ Jesus instructed his disciples that the power of the Holy Spirit was to fulfil a purpose, which was to help the disciples spread the gospel throughout the world. Nkrumah in a similar fashion instructed his "disciples":

But this power which you will achieve is not in itself an end. It is the means to an end, and that is why the use to which power is put is so important.

Today, African is convulsed with the desire to be free and independent, and

⁸³ AAPC 21.

⁸⁴ Acts 1: 8.

coupled with this will to independence is an equal desire for some form of African union or federation.⁸⁵

The “power” which independence will bring to the other dependent countries was to be a means of bringing all Africans together for the growth of Africa. Whilst Jesus preached about the salvation of the world through the aid of the Holy Spirit, Nkrumah preached to the African disciples that the power of independence should be the ultimate medium for the salvation of the people of Africa. Nkrumah’s effort in sustaining a Christian religious rhetoric was a strategic means to employ an established tradition in his rhetorical invention (Murphy, 1997) as a means of achieving persuasion among his African audience.

From Christian symbolism, the speech moved on to appeal to the audience through the application of military symbolism. Nkrumah chose the peroration for this appeal to end the speech on a striking note, leaving his audience to think about themselves as real “freedom fighters” in the true sense of the words. With the presence of the hundreds of delegates before him, Nkrumah rhetorically conscripted them into a military troop. This symbolic positioning of his audience seems apt in view of the rhetorical situation. From 1947 when Nkrumah set foot on the Gold Coast till the time of Ghana’s independence a decade later, he had become an ardent fighter for independence and had not ceased to be at the forefront of the anti-colonial struggle in the Gold Coast. Over these years in search of African freedom, he learnt the hard way and came to appreciate the tactics of anti-colonial warfare. He fought for constitutional review in the Gold Coast which opened the doors for the first nationwide elections. As a result, it opened the doors wide enough for black people

⁸⁵ AAPC 22.

to gain access and take charge of the deliberative space within the Gold Colonial Assembly. Now as the symbolic commander-in-chief of the liberation army, prepared for the battle ahead, Nkrumah reminded his soldiers of the hidden dangers of colonialism:

Do not let us also forget that Colonialism and Imperialism may come to us yet in a different guise – not necessarily from Europe. We must alert ourselves to be able to recognise this when it rears its head and prepare ourselves to fight against it.

Friends and Comrades, I enjoin you to let us close our ranks. For the day we stand in serried line, that day Colonialism in Africa is defeated. And we must bury that pernicious system with all the speed. Only with the internment of Imperialism will Africa be free from menace and live and breathe in liberty, where men of colour shall walk with head held high in human dignity.

Fellow African Freedom Fighters still carrying the burden of Imperialism, pull together. We who have won our freedom stand uncompromisingly behind you in your struggle. Take heart, Unite your forces. Organisation and discipline shall command your victory. All Africa shall be free in this, our lifetime. For this mid twentieth century is Africa's. This decade is the decade of African independence. Forward then independence. To Independence Now. Tomorrow, the United States of Africa.⁸⁶

The words of Nkrumah marked an inspiration for his audience, giving them hope and strength for the “fight” ahead. Nkrumah had tasted the tactics of the colonialist and

⁸⁶ AAPC 33-35.

knew that independence was never going to be granted by the colonial masters until the native fought for it. He knew that achieving freedom in a colonial territory was never concluded alone on the negotiation table. If the dream of freedom was going to become a reality then there was the need for Africans to unite their “forces” by closing their “ranks.” For Nkrumah, the dream of having “the United States of Africa” was worth fighting for. It was the essence for fighting for Africa’s independence. He believed that when the “forces” of African freedom fighters are united, total independence can be achieved in Africa. In the same sense, when there was the United States of Africa, Africans will be formidable against colonialism. Nkrumah warned, “do not let the Colonial Powers divide us, for our division is their gain. Let us recall that our Continent was conquered because there were divisions between our own people, tribe pitted against tribe.”⁸⁷ By asking for unity, he was rhetorically averting the repetition of the history of colonization in Africa.

As Nkrumah argued for unity among Africans, he constantly appealed to the arguments of association by highlighting all the things which bring Africans together whilst at the same time dissociating Africa from Europe (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). The speech highlights the fact that Africa has clear geographical and culture distinctions from Europe. This argument is intended to appeal to some Africans who strangely believe in the legitimacy of colonialism. Some Africans have come to believe that European occupation of Africa was divinely sanctioned and therefore should not be contested. Nkrumah’s dismissed such unwarranted viewpoints that seek to legitimise colonialism. Presenting Africa as a single unit, he presented

⁸⁷ AAPC 32.

imperialists in adversarial images which were calculated to influence his immediate and remote audiences to see advocates of imperialism as hostile and inimical to African interests. Nkrumah warned, “Our enemies are many and they stand ready to pounce upon and exploit our every weakness.”⁸⁸

In another instance, Nkrumah alerted the freedom fighters, “we alone can grapple with the monster of Imperialism which has all but devoured us.”⁸⁹ The picture which the speech draws about imperialists creates a forceful presence which brings closer to the audience something which earlier on had looked quite distant (Perelman, 1982, p. 37). In effect, it evoked what Aristotle (2007) refers to as “fear”, thereby creating the desired emotions in the audience (Perelman, 1982). Nkrumah’s deep concern for a united Africa is deeply reflected in the way he rhetorically draws attention to imperialism as a common enemy. I refer to a statement by Burke which illustrates perfectly a situation when a group identifies a common enemy. Burke (1973) notes that “men who unite on nothing else can unite on the basis of a foe shared by all” (p. 193). Nkrumah’s invention of symbolic strategies enabled him to insert the audience in different emotional settings for the success of his rhetorical appeals. His deliberation on African unity also brings to the fore the epidictic turn of the address. This will be the focus of the next section of the discussion.

⁸⁸ AAPC 17.

⁸⁹ AAPC 28.

The Celebration of Africa

The timing and setting for Nkrumah's address were both significant to his invention. Ghana's independence in 1957 became a great source of inspiration to the rest of dependent colonies in Africa who needed strategy and hope for the purpose of their own struggle. It was Nkrumah, who on the day of Ghana's independence, took time to extol the African personality and this address afforded him a great opportunity to celebrate the new African personality which he considered as an emerging process. The speech, in an epideictic turn, celebrates the beginning of liberation in Africa as well as the African. It becomes a means of creating inspiration for the freedom fighters in Africa. Nkrumah carefully reminded the delegates of the difficulties of African liberation and the gains which had been made by virtue of the organization of the AAPC. He noted:

This assembly marks the opening of a new epoch in our Continent's history and it will be recorded in our annals as illuminations worthy of its significance as the First All-African People's Conference.

We have had Pan-African Congresses before-in fact, five of them but all of these, by force of circumstances, were carried on outside Africa and under much difficulty. Never before has it been possible for so representative a gathering of African Freedom Fighters not only to come together, but to assemble in a free independent African State for the purpose of planning for a final assault upon Imperialism and Colonialism.⁹⁰

⁹⁰ AAPC 2-3.

The African journey for total independence has been long and tortuous, but had been with some successes. The speech provides a momentary respite for the freedom fighters who had gathered in Accra to celebrate the independence of Ghana and more importantly of experiencing the rare opportunity of Africans to deliberate on the liberation of Africa “in a free independent African State.”⁹¹ Certainly, the speech injects pride in the freedom fighters, a form of pride which African liberation fighters could only have imagined and dreamt about. For the freedom fighters who formed the immediate audience of the address, the reality of what was only a dream yesterday became a source of hope for the fulfilment of a larger future dream: the total decolonization of Africa.

As a result, the freedom that seemed distant in the future was brought closer to the gathering ever than before. The setting for the meeting of African freedom fighters in a free land in Africa created a poignant presence (Perelman, 1982) for the audience. Through the invocation of history, Nkrumah brings the challenges of the Pan-African movement to the fore for public appreciation. It was only in the recognition of that unique history could the present be duly celebrated. For Nkrumah as an orator, this kind of historical education of the African in search for independence was fundamental to the struggle. This is because the African was not asking for freedom or a new civilization which never existed on the continent. Therefore, the engagement of the freedom fighters needed to be underpinned by the sense of reclaiming a lost freedom, personality, and a vibrant civilization which previously thrived in Africa some centuries back.

⁹¹ AAPC 3.

As an orator, Nkrumah, through an epideictic voice, in support of the argument of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), functions as an educator as he invokes the shared but perhaps forgotten values of Africans. Nkrumah remarked:

Much has been said and continues to be said about the inability of the African to rise above his low material wants. Frequent reference is made of his non-contribution to civilization. That this is an imperialist fact we all know. There have been great Empires on this African continent, and when we are all free again, our African Personality will once again add its full quota to the sum of man's knowledge and culture.⁹²

This reminder was crucial to the address because it sought to remove all inaccurate perceptions as regards the place of the African within the civilization of the world. It is a celebration of Africa's past and a rhetorical call for the enactment of this past glory in the near future. Through the speech, Africa's past glory is made to connect with its future in which the beauty of what Africa achieved in the past is invoked for celebration; whilst hoping for good things to happen in the future. Connected to the re-emergence of Africa's past civilization is also the emergence of the "African personality," an idea that Nkrumah popularised throughout Africa. This was first articulated clearly during Ghana's Independence Declaration Speech by Kwame Nkrumah on 6th March 1957. Nkrumah reiterated, "the African personality in liberty of freedom will have the chance to find its free expression and makes its particular contribution to the totality of culture and civilization."⁹³ The African personality which Nkrumah idolised can only be realised through the total freedom of Africa. In

⁹² AAPC 18.

⁹³ AAPC 19.

other words, freedom is the only means to unlock the potential of the African. This means Africans do not only find themselves in physical bondage but also under a spiritual yoke. Therefore, the spirit of Africa needed to be freed from colonialism in order to unleash the potential of its people.

In a forensic tone, Nkrumah tried to provide an answer to colonialists' critics who justified colonialism by claiming that it was the only means of helping the African to attain a level of civilization. Nkrumah explained:

How can slaves, denied the right of free expression and free thought, become servants or expose of the arts? Culture and civilization throughout the ages have flowed from a leisured class, an aristocratic class, with the background and material endowments which have made possible the devotion of this side of human endeavour. I say that once Africa is free and independent we shall see a flowering of the human spirit on the Continent second to none.⁹⁴

In the peroration, Nkrumah called on the African audience to unite and become a formidable force for colonialism. The speech ends in the hope that through the unity of its parts, Africa will become a formidable force that can negotiate for its total freedom from Western imperialism.

Effects of the Speech

Nkrumah's address had both immediate and remote impacts looking at a number of political events which followed the address in Africa. Whilst it may not be entirely

⁹⁴ AAPC 19.

accurate to credit Nkrumah with the immediate political developments in most of the dependent territories in Africa, perhaps, it can be fairly argued that his address, which served as the opening for the Accra Conference, became an appropriate and inspirational guide for the entire deliberation at the Conference. So far as certain major political developments occurred immediately after the speech, which to a greater extent, followed the speech's rhetorical prescriptions, it can be further asserted that Nkrumah's speech may have had substantial impact on these political activities which dominated the African political landscape at the time.

From the time of the Conference in late 1958 to the end of 1960, as many as seventeen new territories had gained their independence in Africa. This was certainly a remarkable feat since the number amounts to more than a double times the total number of countries which were already independent before the Conference in Accra. Undoubtedly, the mood which was initiated and generated by Nkrumah in the freedom fighters at this first ever conference of independent African States in Accra brought a new energy and spirit in African consciousness and the quest to fight for the total decolonization of Africa.

The Conference undoubtedly increased the tempo of nationalism in every corner of Africa. Indeed, Nkrumah's ethos among both the newly independent countries and the dependent territories cannot be underestimated. His high ethos among these constituencies is premised on two main reasons. First, his emergence as a leader of the first independent nation in Sub-Saharan Africa naturally provided inspiration to the other dependent territories. Secondly, on the heels of Ghana's independence, Nkrumah's call for the deliberation of the subject of decolonization at

the AAPC in Africa laid a firm foundation for his foreign policy which endeared him to fellow freedom fighters whose territories still languished under colonial rule.

In effect, many of the freedom fighters who were in Accra for the Conference testified that they left Accra with a resolve to change the state of affairs back in their respective colonial territories. Kanyama Chiume, a member of the African National Congress (ANC) based in Nyasaland at the time, confessed that “we went back to intensify the struggle for freedom ... with a conviction, in the light of the Accra spirit, that an independent Nyasaland will, like Ghana, be in a stronger position to help the liberation of Africa”(Thompson, 1969, pp. 61-62). Again, it is reported that when nationalism troubles erupted in the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Prime Minister Sir Roy Welensky blamed Nkrumah for it (Thompson, 1969). Further, there were also reports of riots that broke up in the Congo and “names hitherto unknown to the world, like Joseph Kasavubu, Lumumba, Tsombe and Ngagula have been spread across the front pages” (Nkrumah, 1957, p. 186). Thus, these troubles and many others drew the international community’s attention to look back at Nkrumah’s speech and the resolutions which were made by the delegates at the end of their deliberations.

Perhaps, another eventful development that is worth mentioning is the new realisation the speech enkindled among Africans about the need for unity. The central focus of Nkrumah’s address was on unity and the delegates could not have gone back home, forgetting such a dominant rhetorical appeal in Nkrumah’s address. He had warned, “do not let the Colonial Powers divide us, for our division is their gain. Let us recall that our Continent was conquered because there were divisions

between our own people, tribe pitted against tribe.”⁹⁵ Nkrumah’s action in calling for the conference logically underscores his passion and justification for the conference. This awakening for unity was essential for a continent that had been divided by imperialist forces.

Prior to Nkrumah’s rhetoric of unity at the Conference, invitation to the active political and trade union groups in almost every region on the continent was in itself a firm foundation for Nkrumah’s invention at the Conference. Kwesi Armah (2004), a Ghanaian diplomat who served in Nkrumah’s government, recollects that the Conference “brought many African nationalist leaders north and south of the Sahara desert into contact for the first time on African soil. They realised that it was in their mutual interest to preserve the independence and unity of Africa” (p. 58). Thompson (1969) presents the most vivid picture at the Conference when he notes how “Egyptians discovered Congolese nationalists, Kenyan labour organizers discovered their Moroccan counterparts, South African refugees found ears attuned to their needs” (p. 61). Thus, the attempt by Nkrumah to bring these differing groups together to deliberate on a common political interest was in itself a tool for uniting differing political and cultural experiences in Africa which hitherto was never a possibility. With the forging of new relationships across the various regions in Africa, Nkrumah also established life-long relationships which will later help in his continental political network (Thompson, 1969). Some of these political admirers continued to look up to Nkrumah for inspiration in view of his foremost leadership in the unification of Africa (Rooney, 2007).

⁹⁵ AAPC 32.

Interestingly, whilst Nkrumah's decision to speak for African unity might have had positive ramifications for the political fortunes of Africa, his invention at the AACP also became the nursery for bitter animosity towards his political views and his personality. Some of the new leaders that emerged on the African political stage felt Nkrumah's effort for Africa's unity was not borne out of a genuine interest for Africa, but was only for his personal political gains. Whilst this analysis may be beyond the limits of the present discussion, let it suffice to indicate that this animosity will perhaps become the bane of African unity. This is quite obvious especially with respect to developments which occurred during the formation of Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Addis Ababa half a decade after the Accra Conference. Whilst this antagonism might have been born, perhaps, out of genuine reasons, it nearly killed the long-term impact of Nkrumah's invention at the AACP Conference. Years later, even with the antagonistic tendencies which the speech invoked among certain leading political figures in Africa at the time, the speech, in no doubt, established a critical foundation that was necessary for the unity of African. Nkrumah, through his forceful rhetoric, woke up the continent to speed up the liberation process.

Conclusion

Nkrumah's own fight in the Gold Coast became a rhetorical exemplar to the freedom fighters who had gathered in Accra. He had, by his examples, pointed to them the way and given his audience a sense of direction. Through his examples, he took a huge step on the Pan-African stage. He used the speech to clearly highlight his

credibility to both his immediate African and remote international audiences. His rhetorical contribution on the liberation of Africa will later earn him an international space for the deliberation of the colonial question in Africa. In Accra, Nkrumah demonstrated his rhetorical prowess and showed his ability to provide leadership to the masses of freedom fighters ready to lead “a final assault upon Imperialism and Colonialism.”⁹⁶

At the AACPP Nkrumah was confronted with a unique rhetorical audience. He needed to persuade the delegates and, therefore, the rhetorical strategies needed to be multi-layered. As Party Chairman, Nkrumah subsumed his Prime Ministerial position under the CPP. In a sense, he reconstituted the meeting into a CPP meeting, thereby turning the audience into party members who had gathered for the purpose of deliberating on party strategy on Africa’s decolonisation. Nkrumah indirectly invoked the success of the CPP in Ghana. He, therefore, presented the CPP, under his leadership, as the model that can offer the strategies for Africa’s freedom.

Again, Nkrumah applied civil religion through an invocation of Christian religious tradition. He cast his audience, in symbolic terms, into his disciples who had gathered at his feet for eternal political principles which were to edify them to become “whole” in their search to free their countries from colonialism. Nkrumah situated his political leadership in Africa in a pseudo-religious context and changed the setting of his address into a spiritual one where freedom fighters who had gathered in Accra were made ready to go out into the rest of Africa to spread Nkrumah’s “good news” of the decolonisation of Africa. Through rhetoric, Nkrumah

⁹⁶ AAPC 3.

initiated his continental disciples to spread the gospel of African redemption from imperialism.

In another context, the speech turned the political deliberative gathering metaphorically into a military unit in preparation for warfare. This key symbolism casts the freedom fighters, once again, within the appropriate frame for the advancement of decolonization in Africa.

Lastly, Nkrumah used the speech to take stock of Africa's journey to freedom and celebrated the gains made so far in Ghana and beyond. The speech used the successes in Pan-Africanism and Ghana as an inspirational tool for the daunting task ahead. All in all, Nkrumah used his address at the AACP as a timely rhetorical intervention in pursuance of the ultimate freedom of Africans.

Nkrumah's effort in establishing a new political platform was a clear strategy of announcing that Africa was on the verge of establishing a novel 'political personality.' It is through this new image of the African that Nkrumah's ethos is clearly brought to the fore at the AACP. In other words, Nkrumah's invention at the AACP further augments the ability of the African to emerge from colonial domination through the harnessing of creative political ideas as African political forces assemble in Accra. Nkrumah's ethos is therefore premised on the ability of Africans to unite and deliberate on the colonial question which becomes the cornerstone for the establishment of the OAU. The next Chapter examines critically Nkrumah's rhetorical contribution for the formation of the OAU as a vibrant Union for the total liberation of Africa from colonial rule.

CHAPTER SIX

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S OAU ADDRESS ON 24TH MAY 1963 IN ADDIS ABABA

Introduction

The conceptualisation, formation and birth of the OAU was, to a large extent, through the rhetorical invention of Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah within a complex political context. The OAU was formed on the 25th of May 1963 at a Conference of Independent African Heads of State at Addis Ababa in Ethiopia. On the eve of the formation of the OAU, Kwame Nkrumah gave a speech at this Conference. This key speech is the central concern of this Chapter. Winding the clock back between the period of 1958 and 1961, three meetings of the new African leaders were held to discuss the establishment of a Union of the newly independent African nations. Kwame Nkrumah, on the eve of Ghana's independence on the 6th of March 1957, had declared that Ghana's independence was meaningless until there was a total decolonisation of the rest of Africa. Nkrumah declared Ghana's independence at midnight, outside the Gold Coast Assembly building. The venue for the declaration was significant in a rhetorical sense because independence had been achieved through deliberation in the people's Assembly. On this night, "the Union Jack was lowered and the new flag of Ghana, with the red, gold and green colours, was raised" (Milne, 2000, p. 77). A year later in 1958, he called for the first ever meeting to discuss issues on African unity and to develop new strategies for the decolonization of the rest of the dependent African territories. By this time, Ghana had become the

first black Sub-Saharan African territory to gain her independence. This became refreshing news for black people both within the continent and in the diaspora.

The first conference was held in Accra. It was attended by the heads of the eight newly independent African States from 15th to 22nd April, 1958. It was an important Conference since it marked the first ever meeting of black African leaders after their countries had gained independence from western colonial rule. In the same year, the Ghana, Guinea, Mali Union was formed. This was a hopeful sign of the possibility of Nkrumah's greatest agenda: the political union of Africa. The success of the Accra Conference sent positive signals of hope to the rest of the African countries still struggling under colonial rule. The Accra Conference was followed by the 1960 Addis Ababa Conference. It was attended by nine independent heads of States. This Conference carried further the initial agenda which was discussed at the 1958 Conference but failed to embrace Nkrumah's rhetoric of African political union. At the end of the ten-day meeting, Nkrumah's key agenda, the political unification of independent African countries, was deferred for consideration at the next conference which was scheduled two years afterwards in Addis Ababa. It was agreed that during the next meeting, the OAU should be formed. Later in 1961, another Conference was held in Casablanca which was attended by Ghana, Morocco, United Arab Republic, Guinea and Mali. Using the Casablanca platform, Nkrumah continued to press for African political unity. The support given to Nkrumah's ideas at the Casablanca conference was going to be, perhaps, the greatest support Nkrumah was ever going to receive in Africa in his quest for a continental political union. David Rooney (2007) argues that "no other conference of African powers during Nkrumah's lifetime was to give so much

support to African Union” (p. 290). Since Ghana, Guinea and Mali Union had been formed three years prior to the Casablanca meeting, Nkrumah enjoyed great support from these West African countries which had been duly represented by their leaders at the Conference. Out of the five countries present, three of them (Morocco, Guinea and Mali) spoke French, with only Egyptian and Ghanaian officials speaking Arabic and English respectively. The Conference, therefore, presented a multilingual setting. Nkrumah, as always, addressed the delegates in English through an interpreter. However, the positive signal which Nkrumah had received at Casablanca was going to be put into a crucible during the 1963 OAU Conference in Addis Ababa. This Conference will be attended by more than thirty independent countries in Africa. This was more than three times the number of attendants of any previous meetings of independent African leaders. It was going to be the biggest platform for Nkrumah’s rhetoric on Africa’s political unity.

What constituted the essence of Nkrumah’s Addis Ababa invention? What was the object of the speech and did it find space within the uncertain rhetorical discourse of African unity? Did the speech address the composite audience and what were their responses? I contend that the success of Nkrumah’s invention at Addis Ababa was largely hindered by major constraints within the rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1968). These constraints were born out of political developments which occurred before the Conference. Nkrumah’s failure to adequately address these constraints before and in Addis Ababa allowed them to finally eclipse the effectiveness of his rhetorical invention.

I intend, therefore, to do a number of things in this chapter. First, I will examine Nkrumah’s rhetorical arguments in the 1963 Addis Ababa speech. In so

doing, I will look at his application of fear and urgency as rhetorical tools; secondly, I will look at the argument of including the parts in the whole (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969), within his invention. In the second part of this chapter, I will attempt to look at the composite audience and Nkrumah's strategy in addressing them. In the last section of this Chapter, the key constraints which confronted Nkrumah's invention within the rhetorical situation will be carefully examined. I will conclude the Chapter with the response of the audience and the overall effect(s) of the speech.

The 1964 Addis Ababa address, if I should say, marks a climactic point of Nkrumah's rhetoric of African unity. It forms part of Nkrumah's rhetorical tradition which spans nearly a period of two decades. A rhetorical analysis of the Addis Ababa speech will, perhaps, not be complete if it is not perceived within the larger context of Nkrumah's invention on African political unity. Salazar (2002), in his *African Athens*, is right when he remarks that a speech never comes alone (pp. 19-20). This assertion is corroborated by Warnick (1996), who further indicates that "discourse never occurs in a vacuum; it occurs in a situation comprised of other text [and that] rhetors construct text with other text in mind" (p. 191). Nkrumah's rhetoric of continental unity emerged on the international scene from 1957 and had gained significant momentum after a period of six year in Addis Ababa. The audience at Addis Ababa had become, in the words of Myers (1999), "a continuous audience" (p. 55) of Nkrumah. They were aware that African political unity had for some time become commonplace in Nkrumah's rhetoric. The major challenge for Nkrumah was how to appeal to an audience with the same message albeit with the purpose of causing their adherence, as the entire African leaders on the continent

were at the deliberative point of deciding on the fate of the possibility of a continental unity. I discuss Nkrumah's invention by first, looking at how he employed fear and urgency in his speech.

The Sense of Urgency and Creation of Fear

As part of the opening remarks of the speech, it assumes a quick momentum. It sets out in a tone of urgency which tends to arouse a sense of fear within the audience. If the speech were to be music, it could have passed for an allegro. This kind of tempo sets the appropriate mood for the main focus of the speech. The sense of urgency is going to underlie the central message in the address. Nkrumah began, "[o]ur objective is African Union now. There is no time to waste. We must unite now or perish."⁹⁷ At this beginning point, Nkrumah established a central issue in his invention: the need to act quickly as a result of the looming danger. The essence of persuasion, notes Perelman (1982), is to "incite action" (p. 12) in order to bring about change. But the change which is needed by Nkrumah involves a sense of urgency. The sense of fear created by the opening words of the speech, further invokes a feeling of imminent destruction amongst the audience which serves as a catalyst for urgent action. Fear and urgency turn to reinforce each other. In Book Two of his *On Rhetoric*, Aristotle (2007) defines fear as:

a sort of pain and agitation derived from the imagination of a future destructive or painful evil... only what has the potential for great pains or

⁹⁷Organization of African Unity Speech (OAU) 1. All references to the speech will be in the writer's format and referred to as (OAU).

destruction, and these only if they do not appear far off but near, so that they are about to happen; for what is far off is not feared (p. 128).

Looking at the on-going discussion, we need noting two things from what Aristotle (2007) says about fear. The first is the “potential” of the danger causing “destruction”; second, when the supposed danger seems imminent.

The speech goes on to narrate how the momentum in the fight for independence on the continent has resulted in a dramatic swell of the number of independent states from eight (8) to thirty one (31) within a period of five years.⁹⁸ Nkrumah, therefore, acknowledged this positive change in fortune by praises as he described it as an “open testimony to the indomitable and irresistible surge of our peoples for independence.”⁹⁹ In an epideictic posture, Nkrumah took opportunity to extol the admirable virtues which had been displayed in the search for independence. It is a way by which Nkrumah informed the audience that each of the individuals constituting the immediate audience of the speech, had in some way, made substantial sacrifices beyond their personal interest for their countries. This is part of what Aristotle (2007) refers to as “honourable” (p. 75-78).

In extolling the noble deeds of his audience, Nkrumah is quick to note his unique contribution and pioneering role in the freedom movement in Africa. He remarked, “[at] the first gathering of African Heads of State, to which I had the honour of playing host, there were representatives of eight independent State (sic) only.”¹⁰⁰ Though the audience are not ignorant of Nkrumah’s efforts towards

⁹⁸ OAU 2.

⁹⁹ OAU 4.

¹⁰⁰ OAU 2.

liberation movements in Africa, the reminder perhaps increases his ethos and places him in a unique position which gives him deliberative legitimacy to be able to show the way for the future direction of Africa's liberation. If there was the need to highlight the honourable deeds and unique contributions of freedom fighters in Africa, then Nkrumah reserved for himself a double honour. He had been the first African to bring the newly independent countries to deliberate on continental unity in Accra. Nkrumah had written his name in memory as a doyen of Pan-Africanism by the late 1950's. Thus, from the onset of his speech, Nkrumah asserted his authority and ethos as a leader who understood the rudiments of African liberation struggle and possessed the knowledge needed to overcome the trappings of neo-colonialism in Africa. The noble deeds of Africans which Nkrumah extolled had been characterised by the "revolutionary speed"¹⁰¹ of the freedom fighters which had brought about freedom to the millions of people in Africa. This same "speed" is what is needed in Africa to in order to shape the future. He remarked:

In the task which is before us of unifying our continent we must fall in with that pace or be left behind. The task cannot be attacked in the tempo of any other age than our own. To fall behind the unprecedented momentum of actions and events in our time will be to court failure and our own undoing.¹⁰²

According to Perelman (1969), "the values eulogiz[ed] by the speaker must be ones deemed worthy of guiding our action for otherwise" (p. 52). Nkrumah brought to the deliberation table two basic propositions, that were, either we maintained the

¹⁰¹ OAU 3.

¹⁰² OAU 3.

“tempo” by working to unite ourselves or we slowed down and ended up in failure. By doing this, the speech thus provides the audience with only two deliberative options. In other words, the “debate is limited to the thesis that has been offered” (Perelman, 1969, p. 239). He created a presence in the minds of his audience which would be reinforced many times in the course of the address. The success of the “tempo” or “momentum” which Nkrumah delineated is quite significant in terms of its practical effects. In 1960, three years preceding Nkrumah’s address at Addis Ababa, as many as seventeen dependent African countries became free from colonial rule. Guinea became independent in 1958, a year after Ghana’s; between 1961 and 1963 six more countries also became independent. Thus, a steady momentum had been maintained which produced indubitably, the fruits of independence. In a logical sense, if a method had produced concrete results, then it needs replicating it, knowing its efficacy as a sure means of achieving the end results. Since choices are based upon the “end,” the deliberative speaker should not be ignorant of it (Aristotle, 2007, p. 49). Nkrumah thus showed a way to unity to justify the end.

What is the reason for Nkrumah’s urgency? What stimulates it? The urgency is the need to “lay the foundation” of a union government “here and now.” This is because the agents of colonialism pose a major threat to African countries after independence. Nkrumah asserted:

On this continent it has not taken us long to discover that the struggle against colonialism does not end with the attainment of national independence.

Independence is only the prelude to a new and more involved struggle for the right to conduct our own economic and social affairs, to construct our society

according to our aspirations, unhampered by crushing and humiliating neo-colonialist controls and interference.¹⁰³

He created a presence (Perelman, 1979, p. 17) before the audience by revealing in concrete terms colonialism which had metamorphosed into a more hideous form, neo-colonialism. This new form of colonialism, according to Nkrumah, is “a new and a more involved struggle” which requires the old zeal, a tool that was employed for the attainment of independence in Africa. Nkrumah, therefore, set the stage for a paradigm shift, that is, from momentum for attainment of independence from colonialism to momentum for African unity against neo-colonialism. In other words, nationalist movements in their separate African countries fought for their independence, but with the “new and a more involved struggle”¹⁰⁴ against neo-colonialism, Africans need to unite our forces. By highlighting the new form of colonialism and the strategy needed, Nkrumah “draw[s] the attention of the audience to them and thereby gives them a presence that prevents them from being neglected” (Perelman, 1982, p. 35). Up to this point in the speech, there is a conscious repetition of an imperative which appears in a correlative structure to achieve forceful effect.

“[w]e must unite now or perish.”¹⁰⁵

“we must fall into that pace or be left behind.”¹⁰⁶

“We must unite or sink.”¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ OAU 5.

¹⁰⁴ OAU 5.

¹⁰⁵ OAU 1.

¹⁰⁶ OAU 3.

¹⁰⁷ OAU 7.

These imperatives, in each case, accentuate in a similar fashion the two options given by the speaker which rhetorically limit the audience in their deliberative choice. In fact, the audience can only choose the good, that is, Nkrumah's desire for Africa's political unity which holds the key to the continent's economic development. On the other hand, they can choose the bad. This option presents a picture of Africa being left behind to be destroyed by the agents of neo-colonialism as a result of disunity.

The ominous schemes of the colonialists are brought closer to the audience through direct and indirect references. He described how Africans "have been threatened with frustration where rapid change is imperative and with instability where sustained effort and ordered rule are indispensable."¹⁰⁸ The sense of "frustration" and "instability" witnessed in Africa reminds the audience of examples of neo-colonial influence in places like the Congo and Algeria which as individual countries could not stand the might of colonialism thereby capitulating under such circumstances. A direct rhetorical example to deepen the argument is the speech's reference to the situation in South America, "We have already reached the stage where we must unite or sink into that condition which has made Latin-America the unwilling and distressed prey of imperialism after one-and-a-half centuries of political independence."¹⁰⁹ Words like "perish," "prey," "threatened," "ruthless," and "dangerous" create a picture of a formidable opponent ready to hunt down Africa. The words together present the danger of the forces of neo-colonialism. To Perelman (1979):

¹⁰⁸ OAU 6.

¹⁰⁹ OAU 7.

things present, things near to us in space and time, act directly on our sensibility. The orator's endeavors often consist, however, in bringing to mind things that are not immediately present...to make "things future and remote appear as present (p. 17).

Since the supposed enemy, neo-colonialism, seems stronger in might and its tactics appear daunting enough for any single African territory, it becomes not only imperative for Africans to unite but a matter of survival which needs all the urgency it deserves. The creation of presence by Nkrumah calls for the immediate action of African leaders to act "by crushing and humiliating neo-colonialist controls and interference"¹¹⁰ in Africa.

In view of this clear and present danger that neo-colonialists pose to Africa's political and economic freedom, the speech prescribes a continuous "tempo" in action. That is, African freedom fighters should move in a similar pace just as before to politically unite the continent in order to successfully combat the agents of neo-colonialism. Invoking fear through the creating of presence becomes a necessary catalyst for action.

African Unity: Inclusion of the Parts within the Whole

Nkrumah's proclamation on the need for Africa's unity which he made on Ghana's Independence Day was to become his mantra, a rhetorical commonplace, within his liberation discourse of Africa. At Addis Ababa in 1963, African unity was

¹¹⁰ OAU 5.

his watchword. The deliberative spotlight was thrown on the continent without any emphasis on individual states within Africa. He noted:

But just as we understood that the shaping of our national destinies required of each of us our political independence and bent all our strength to this attainment, so we must recognise that our economic independence resides in our African union and requires the same concentration upon the political achievement.¹¹¹

Nkrumah drew from the quasi logical argument of inclusion of the parts in the whole. According to Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), “the whole is treated as similar to each one of its parts” (p. 231). They further explain that “what is true of the whole is true of the part” (p. 231). Nkrumah projected the argument from the species to the genus. By so doing, he literally threw his audience into the bigger argument to enable them to perceive the extent of the African problem in view of the imminent threat of neo-colonialism. In effect, he filled the deliberative space with the bigger African problem (genus), in whose solution laid the ultimate salvation of separate African territories (species). Nkrumah continued:

The social and economic development of Africa will come only within the political kingdom, not the other way round.¹¹²

Africa, as a continent, becomes the focal point of discussion in the speech, not the limited interests of the individual states. The suppression of the challenges facing individual states in the speech allows a projection of the whole in the minds of the

¹¹¹ OAU 9.

¹¹² OAU 10.

audience, thus allowing the parts to remain only at the background. For when the whole becomes weak, the parts cannot stand on their own. This direction of the argumentation remodels what the audience must regard as most important. By this argument, Nkrumah made a rhetorical effort in bringing Africa to the fore. He pointed to some remarkable examples of the ‘whole’, “The United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, were the political decisions of revolutionary peoples before they became mighty realities of social power and material wealth.”¹¹³ These rhetorical examples are appropriate for Nkrumah’s invention. By analogy, they fit into the exact frame of Nkrumah’s vision for Africa. The examples tend to serve two important purposes. First, by logically projecting the whole over its parts implies that any supposed prosperity of a single African territory cannot be fully realised or complete without the prosperity of the bigger whole,¹¹⁴ in this case, Africa. Secondly, through the unity of the parts, the strength of the whole is maximised.¹¹⁵

In the speech, the argument of the ‘parts within the whole’ is not only applied to the African situation but to the neo-colonialists as well. Nkrumah further revealed the complex schemes of the neo-colonialists which worked perfectly to achieve a singular purpose. He noted, “we would be deceiving ourselves in the most cruel way were we to regard their individual actions as separate and unrelated.”¹¹⁶ He reminded the audience of the old schemes of the neo-colonialist by tapping into the long tradition of colonial exploitation in Africa¹¹⁷ which is shared by the audience.

¹¹³ OAU 10.

¹¹⁴ OAU 11.

¹¹⁵ OAU 10.

¹¹⁶ OAU 12.

¹¹⁷ OAU 12.

Murphy (1997) posits that “rhetorical traditions organise the ‘social knowledge’ of communities and make available symbolic resources for the invention of arguments aimed at authoritative public judgments” (p. 72). Thus, with the seemingly united actions of neo-colonialists, Nkrumah gave more credence to African unity in the face of the continent’s search for economic development and security to mitigate the subtle Western neo-colonial influences. Africa needs to become ‘whole’ in order to become economically and militarily powerful, instead of remaining poor and weak in its separate ‘parts.’

Unity, in view of Nkrumah's arguments, does not become an option, but a crucial necessity. Thus Africans cannot fail to unite if the agents of neo-colonialism are united in their singular purpose. In a series of rhetorical questions, Nkrumah rhetorically defended his deliberative proposition of Africa’s unity in his effort to cause adherence to his thesis by the audience:

Do we have any other weapon against this design but our unity? Is not our unity essential to guard our own freedom as well as to win freedom for our oppressed brothers, the Freedom Fighters? Is it not unity alone that can weld us into an effective force, capable of creating our own progress and Making our valuable contribution to world, peace? Which independent African State, which of you here will claim that its financial structure and banking institutions are fully harnessed to its national development? Which will claim that its material resources and human energies are available for its own national aspirations? Which will disclaim substantial measure of

disappointment and disillusionment in its agricultural and urban development?¹¹⁸

With these six rhetorical questions, the forcefulness of Nkrumah's position becomes apparent. In the face of the 'presence' which he had created, he reiterated in a rhetorical manner the absence of a better choice aside his thesis on African unity. In a sense, Nkrumah had argued and concluded that the thesis which he had presented for the audience's assent is the best deliberative choice they could ever make in view of the given situation. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) note:

this appeal, known classically as the *argumentum ad ignorantiam*, derives its force essentially from its very urgency, for it excludes the possibility of pausing for thought: the debate is limited to the thesis that has been offered and to what might possibly be opposed to it immediately (pp. 238-239).

Nkrumah had succeeded in creating a sense of urgency which needed immediate deliberative answer. Knowing the differing opinions of African leaders on African political unity (which will be examined in detail in the next section of the discussion), he had forcefully reminded them of the real, imminent but hidden dangers Africa faced as more countries fought to become free from colonial rule. As a *rhetor*, he exuded what Aristotle (2007) refers to as "practical wisdom" (p. 112) as he showed insight into the hidden strategies of the neo-colonialists.

In the next stage of the address, Nkrumah spent considerable time revealing startling statistics. He reminded the audience of what George Padmore (1953) refers to as Africa's continuous "rape" (p. 17) by the West and the tremendous resources

¹¹⁸ OAU 13.

which are still available for the economic development of the continent.¹¹⁹ At this point, the speech applies the rhetorical concepts of “association and dissociation.”

Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), in defining these terms, indicate:

By process of association we understand schemes which bring separate elements together and allow us to establish a unity among them, positively or negatively, by means of one another. By processes of dissociation, we mean techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating, separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole or at least a unified group within some system of thought (p. 190).

Nkrumah noted, among other things, that “[o]ur continent certainly exceeds all the others in potential hydro-electric power, which some experts assess as 42 per cent of the world's total.”¹²⁰ By the use of the pronoun “our”, he associated all the resources belonging to the individual countries in Africa as a unified whole whilst at the same time dissociating the rest of the world, “others”, which, for him, comprised an entirely separate entity from Africa. Through the means of association, he had identified Africans with one another breaking the artificial walls of the imperialists which have separated people of similar historical and cultural heritage. Nkrumah had presented a vivid picture of African unity. The argument further speaks to correct the wrong ties which still existed between France and her former colonies in Africa. Indirectly, Nkrumah had reiterated the idea that Africa as a single whole has a natural heritage and destiny entirely separated from the rest of the world. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) continue to say that “all association implies

¹¹⁹ OAU 19-35.

¹²⁰ OAU 20.

dissociation ... the two techniques are complimentary and are always working at the same time” (p. 190). Throughout the speech, Nkrumah constantly chose the first person subjective plural, “we” and object form “our” to rhetorically associate Africans with one another. The repetition of the pronouns is purposely done to achieve a rhetorical effect: that we are one people with a common destiny. It is a reminder of the uniqueness of Africans and the interconnectedness of their destinies in the realisation of their full potential as a people.

Addressing the Composite Audience

At Addis Ababa, Nkrumah was clearly presented with a composite audience. A speaker is confronted with a composite audience when the speaker is confronted with a heterogeneous audience representing different interests (Myers, 1999). This was a major challenge to his invention since there seemed to be differing interests among the audience. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) put it clearly, “It often happens that an orator must persuade a composite audience, embracing people differing in character, loyalties, and functions. To win over the different elements in his audience, the orator will have to use a multiplicity of arguments” (pp. 21-22).

Since the beginning of Nkrumah’s call for African unity, more than a decade before the Addis Ababa conference, the new African leaders together with other freedom fighters had become a key audience for Nkrumah’s rhetoric. The African leaders, in Edwin Black’s terms, as cited by Myers (1999), formed a “public that is ‘clustered about’ a set of defining commonplaces that relate to a subject of discussion” (p. 57). In other words, they had become an indispensable audience of

Nkrumah's rhetorical invention on his African unity project. At Addis Ababa, the African leaders formed Nkrumah's immediate and most important audience. If African unity was ever going to become a reality, Nkrumah needed to get this crucial section of his audience on board because they constituted the delegates who had the mandate to vote on the proposal for continental political unity. In sum, the delegates, so to speak, formed a rhetorical audience (Bitzer, 1968) for Nkrumah's invention.

From the Accra Conference in 1958, several groups began to emerge with differing opinions on African unity. The first category of groupings was the Casablanca and the Monrovia groups. The Casablanca group comprised Morocco, Ghana, the United Arab Republic (Egypt), Guinea and Mali whilst the Monrovia group was made up of Liberia, Togo, Senegal and Nigeria (Rooney, 2007, pp. 90-91). Nkrumah was the key mouthpiece of the Casablanca group which argued for a radical approach to continental unity. The Monrovia group, led by Nigeria, favoured a moderate view. Their view, in essence, expressed a rather gradual approach to African unity. The other groupings were those which advocated regional associations in place of continental unity. Two of these major groups were the *Afrique et Malgache* (UAM) and the East African Federation (EAF). The UAM was an association of former French colonies in Africa with membership of twelve countries. The main purpose of the group was to ensure close economic and political ties among members and with France. The EAF was formed by Julius Nyerere, President of Tanzania. The other member countries were Kenya and Uganda (Thompson, 1969, pp. 329-332).

Nkrumah was now confronted with these three major power blocs with varying interests at Addis Ababa. As a *rhetor*, he needed to address them adequately to get them on board. To Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), “a great orator is one who possesses the art of taking into consideration, in his argumentation, the composite nature of his audience” (pp. 21-22). The fate of Nkrumah’s rhetoric on African unity largely depended on these different African groups present at Addis Ababa.

In terms of deliberative end, the immediate rhetorical audience could be narrowed down to two main groups: those who favoured continental political unity and those who favoured gradualism through regional groupings (Thompson, 1969). It should be noted, however, that those who favoured gradualism were not necessarily in favour of regional groupings but the two groups stood on one side of the argument: Africans are not ready for a political union now. They simply were not interested in an immediate political unity of Africa. At this point, it became obvious that Nkrumah was seemingly fighting from a weaker position in terms of numbers since the other groups (the moderate and regional groupings) relatively had the majority of African leaders within their fold.

First, Nkrumah addressed the Monrovia group. He began by noting their view, “[i]t has been suggested that our approach to unity should be gradual, that it should be piece-meal.”¹²¹ The reference to “gradual” and “piecemeal” perhaps, immediately drew the attention of the members of the Monrovia group to Nkrumah’s argument as a response to their argumentative position. Next, Nkrumah placed the moderate position within the whole context of the African problem. He continued:

¹²¹ OAU 55.

This point of view conceives of Africa as a static entity with "frozen" problems which can be eliminated one by one and when all have been cleared then we can come together and say: 'Now all is well. Let us now unite.' This view takes no account of the impact of external pressures. Nor does it take cognisance of the danger that delay can deepen our isolations and exclusiveness; that it can enlarge our differences and set us drifting further and further apart into the net of neo-colonialism, so that our union will become nothing but a fading hope, and the great design of Africa's full redemption will be lost, perhaps, forever.¹²²

Nkrumah ridiculed the position of the group which he considered as untenable in the face of the present challenges in Africa. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) note "a statement is ridiculous as soon as it conflicts, without justification, with an accepted opinion" (p. 206). In the earlier part of the address, Nkrumah treated the audience with a vivid narration of the complex and evolving nature of Africa's challenges which the audience are perhaps "blind" to in view of their professed position on Africa's unity. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca further remark that that "ridicule is the penalty for blindness and is apparent only to those for whom this blindness is obvious" (p. 206). Through the metaphor of "drifting ... into the net of neo-colonialism" Nkrumah revealed a hidden danger and its consequence on Africa if the new leaders were to see the moderate position as the solution to the present challenge of neo-colonialism. Nkrumah made the moderate position to rhetorically appear weak and rendered it ineffective as a means of salvaging Africans from the "net of neo-colonialism."

¹²² OAU 55.

Immediately after addressing the Monrovia group, Nkrumah turned to speak to the section of the audience which fundamentally believed in regional integration in place of continental unity. He spoke particularly to the French group in West Africa and the East African group. He noted, “[t]he view is also expressed that our difficulties can be resolved simply by a greater collaboration through co-operative association in our inter-territorial relationships.”¹²³ After reminding the audience of the position of the French and Eastern African groups, Nkrumah moved on quickly to show the weakness of this deliberative position by again invoking the quasi-logical argument of the inclusion of the parts into the whole. He remarked that:

This way of looking at our problems denies a proper conception of their inter-relationship and mutuality. It denies faith in a future for African advancement in African independence. It betrays a sense of solution only in continued reliance upon external sources through bilateral agreements for economic and other forms of aid.¹²⁴

In this response, Nkrumah described the argument of regional groups as being narrow, looking at the parts without taking into full cognizance of the bigger whole. Nkrumah had demonstrated an understanding of the bigger problem devoid of temporal solution of the challenge of neo-colonialism. For Nkrumah, the solution of the African problem was located within a continental solution. For purposes of deliberation, he closed the argument of regional groupings by pointing to the huge economic potential of the “whole” which will be far more than what the “parts” (regional groupings) can attract.

¹²³ OAU 56.

¹²⁴ OAU 56.

There is the far more compelling advantage which this arrangement offers, in that aid will come from anywhere to a united Africa because our bargaining power would become infinitely greater. We shall no longer be dependent upon aid from restricted sources.¹²⁵

With this statement, Nkrumah concluded his address of the regional groups and all possible delegates who saw regional groupings as the viable option concerning African unity. Nkrumah had made an effort in addressing the composite audience. By his invention, he had advanced his arguments for African political unity which was generally shared by the Casablanca group. For them, Nkrumah's rhetoric of unity was an advancement of the groups' own position. With the two other groups, the moderate and the regional groups, Nkrumah had, to some extent, made strides to win them by addressing them separately. Myers (1999) notes that, "the speaker does not write off any of his significant audiences, but attempts to ingratiate himself with all of them" (p. 67). For a moment, the speech seemed to have addressed some of the core issues standing in the way of continental political unity. This approach seemed rhetorically effective. Myers further concludes that, "the ability [for a speaker] to formulate statements that communicate distinct, and perhaps even incompatible, messages simultaneously to diverse audiences is, therefore, crucial to political success" (p. 55). The effectiveness of this approach in Addis Ababa would be discussed during the last section of this paper.

After addressing the composite audience, Nkrumah made a climactic move as the speech gradually got to the end with a perfect rhetorical example. He created an emotional presence by drawing from the example of the USA which he likened to

¹²⁵ OAU 57.

the African situation. By this connection, he enacted in the minds of the audience, the historical formation of the United States of America. He allowed his audience to see in a flash, a vision of the Africa that he had rhetorically envisaged. This moment marked a highpoint in the Addis Ababa address. Nkrumah declared:

When the first Congress of the United States met many years ago in Philadelphia one of the delegates sounded the first chord of unity by declaring that they had met in "a state of nature." In other words, they were not in Philadelphia as Virginians, or Pensylvanians, but simply as Americans. This reference to themselves as Americans was in those days a new and strange experience. May I dare to assert equally on this occasion Your Excellencies (sic), that we meet here today not as Ghanaians, Guineans, Egyptians, Algerians, Moroccans, Malians, Liberians, Congolese or Nigerians but as Africans. Africans united in our resolve to remain here until we have agreed on the basic principles of a new compact of unity among ourselves which guarantees for us and our future a new arrangement of continental government.¹²⁶

The vision created in the speech, in a way hallows Addis Ababa. Nkrumah had reminded the delegates of their place within this historical epoch in the destiny of Africa. A landmark event akin to what happened in Philadelphia. The new vision presented by Nkrumah had the potential to cause the audience to re-evaluate their stance. It allows them to argue within themselves simultaneously as Nkrumah presents his arguments (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969), awakening in them to see their unique place in the shaping of the destiny of a continent in which they are

¹²⁶ OAU 62.

called to become major actors. Through Nkrumah's words, he renewed the audience from being separate parts into a single whole. In that situation, each member could now see himself as part of the larger whole, totally independent of their former selves. In effect, Nkrumah was, in a rhetorical move, trying to reconstitute the gathering in the minds of the audience within the light of what happened in Philadelphia. By so doing, he created in the audience for a moment, a new sense of a single African community in which all the audience have a new kind of citizenship as proud Africans.

In marking the peroration, Nkrumah made another decisive move. He invoked what seemed as the triumphant entry of Jesus into Jerusalem in John chapter 12, verses 9 to 11. He declared, "[w]e shall thus begin the triumphant march to the kingdom of the African Personality, and to a continent of prosperity, and progress, of equality and justice and of work and happiness."¹²⁷ Thus, when African unity is achieved, Africans shall reign supreme in Africa. This is an expression of a deep hope in the destiny of Africa. It will not be the victorious march of an individual hero but a "triumphant march" of all the freedom fighters to the kingdom" Nkrumah had already envisioned through his rhetoric. The freedom fighters who formed Nkrumah's immediate audience are, what Farrell (1993) refers to as, "the rhetorical audience (the "one who decides") that functions as the efficient cause of the enactment of rhetoric as practical art" (p. 68). Nkrumah had made a call for Africa's political unity in order to bring forth the African political kingdom. Through argumentation, he had created in his audience "a disposition to act" (Perelman, 1982, p. 12).

¹²⁷ OAU 73.

The speech ends with “Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hands unto God.”¹²⁸

Though it is a reference to Psalm 68 verse 31, it is particularly an invocation of Marcus Garvey’s call for the United States of Africa. It is a call for Africans to reclaim their past glory. In a rhetorical sense, Nkrumah had tapped into the social knowledge of the audience. I borrow from Murphy (1997) when he says that, “rhetorical traditions organise the ‘social knowledge’ of communities and make available symbolic resources for the invention of arguments aimed at authoritative public judgments” (p. 72). By ending the address with Garvey’s words, Nkrumah had partly invented his authority by appropriating unto himself the authority of Garvey and other Pan-Africanists in whose tradition he operated. Murphy further notes that, “invention as orchestration views rhetorical creativity as an effort to engage other voices and illuminate our circumstance by bringing their wisdom to bear” (p. 74). Through identification, Nkrumah had “reinforced commonality between [himself] and audience” (Endres, 2011, p. 6) and had invoke the noble ideals cherished and shared by the forebears of Pan -Africanism. In terms of Nkrumah’s rhetorical invention, invoking the authority of Garvey has not constituted his only proof, but had rounded off a well-developed argumentation (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). The speech ends with a call to the audience to fulfil the historical mandate of African liberation in Ethiopia, the spiritual land of African emancipation.

¹²⁸ OAU 74.

Limitations of the Address

A rhetorical speech is summoned into existence by a rhetorical situation. Without a situation, there cannot be a rhetorical speech (Bitzer, 1968). Bitzer notes three essential features of every rhetorical situation. These are the rhetorical exigency, rhetorical audience and constraints (pp. 6-8). He defines rhetorical exigency as any “imperfection marked by urgency” which needs to be addressed by discourse within a situation (pp. 6-8). In Addis Ababa, the dominant exigency was essentially the urgent need for a continental political unity. Rhetorical audience, as explained earlier, “consists only of those persons who are capable of being influenced by discourse and being mediators of change” (p. 7). Since the delegates which were present in Addis Ababa were voting delegates and, therefore, possessed the mandate to bring African political unity into reality, they can be appropriately regarded as a rhetorical audience in view of Bitzer’s (1968) explanation. Bitzer concludes that rhetorical situations comprise a number of “constraints made up of persons, events, objects and relations” that form part and parcel of the rhetorical situation since “they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence” (p. 8). Several constraints confronted Nkrumah within the rhetorical situation at the Addis Ababa conference. An attempt will be made to examine some of the key constraints which confronted Nkrumah’s address.

In Addis Ababa, it became absolutely clear that Nkrumah did not fully understand the complexity of the rhetorical situation. Before attending the conference, Nkrumah had, in the words of Scott Thompson (1969), “a most imprecise view of the African situation” (p. 319). He could not, therefore, analyse critically the challenges which the situation presented to his address. Nkrumah had

never spoken at a conference with such a high number of African heads of state in attendance (Thompson, 1969, p. 312) and it was never going to happen after the Addis Ababa's experience. At the conference, the dynamics were different in terms of the audience's position in relation to Nkrumah. He had had past experiences of speaking on behalf of Africa at the United Nations and other international platforms where the audience were predominantly Western leaders. Whenever he had spoken to Africans in Africa, the audience had taken inspiration from him. This was partly because most of them still laboured under colonialism in their own countries and needed a sense of direction and inspiration in their own course. But this time, quite a number of these African leaders had travelled to Addis Ababa as leaders of their newly independent countries. In terms of structure, Nkrumah had found himself in what Bitzer (1969) refers to as a complex and a less structured rhetorical situation (Bitzer, 1969, pp. 11-12). It was not going to be an easy task connecting all the different constraints to achieve the most appropriate rhetorical effect within the given situation. In other words, such a given situation as presented to Nkrumah in Addis Ababa, will pose tremendous challenges to the most experienced *rhetor*. I will try to examine the rhetorical constraints, their complexity and their relation to the rhetorical audience and how they affected the audience's response to Nkrumah's address.

Roughly three years preceding the Addis Ababa conference, a number of events were working to shape what was going to unveil later at the conference. Perhaps, the outcomes of these events, with Nkrumah as a major actor, were going to serve as major constraints to Nkrumah's rhetoric at the conference. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) argue "that the speaker's life, insofar as it is public, forms a

long prelude to his speech” (p. 320). This was just the case for Nkrumah at Addis Ababa.

One of the major constraints to Nkrumah’s rhetoric had to do with questions with regard to his personal credibility among the audience. Rooney (2007) reports that Nkrumah had a number of unresolved conflicts with his neighbours within West Africa. The first related to issues on territorial dispute(s) with Ghana’s immediate neighbours, Ivory Coast, led by Houphouet-Boigny and Togo, under the leadership of Sylvester Olympio. These unfortunate developments, Rooney argues, led the Togolese leader in “reject[ing] Nkrumah’s views on African unity and quickly turned to the francophone states for allies” (p. 282).

Beyond these conflicts, there were reports of strong antagonism of Nkrumah towards Nigeria, to the extent that Nkrumah had broken away from a joint airline board between Ghana and Nigeria which had been inherited from the British colonial administration. Nigeria had seen the common airline as a source of a viable economic co-operation between two neighbours in West Africa (Rooney, 2007). To a large extent, Nkrumah had, perhaps, lost his trust and credibility when it came to co-operation even within the sub region of West Africa. He had lost the confidence and trust of three strategic leaders who should have been his immediate source of support in Africa. These three leaders should have formed part of a crucial supporting audience for him in Addis Ababa. Sir Abubakar Tafawa Balewa, the Prime Minister of Nigeria, was a leading voice at the time within the Moderate group of countries; he had emerged as an African statesman and also represented a strong voice for African unity. Ivory Coast and Togo were important constituencies within the French group in West Africa. Losing the Nigerian and two other sub-regional

leaders was going to haunt Nkrumah at Addis Ababa. Certainly, these situations represented obvious constraints in Addis Ababa for Nkrumah. Aristotle (2007) asserts that “character is almost, so to speak, the most authoritative form of persuasion” (p. 39) but Nkrumah had, at this point, lost this quintessential element in his rhetoric.

Again, connected to Nkrumah’s antagonism of some West African leaders was also a second constraint. He overtly and constantly criticised the regional groupings: the UAM and the EAF. His criticisms naturally attracted strong opposition to his ideas from members of these groupings, especially Julius Nyerere (Thompson, 1969), who seemed to have become a strong force in the East African liberation movement. Nkrumah’s criticism of these groups is made obvious even in Addis Ababa.¹²⁹ With his biting rhetoric, Nkrumah had further deepened the apparent crack which only needed time to cave-in. The right moment was at Addis Ababa. In as much as Nkrumah seemed oblivious of the extent of the animosity he had already generated towards himself and his rhetoric, his invention at the conference further degenerated the already precarious situation. Bitzer (1968) further notes that the speaker’s invention to address given constraints within a rhetorical situation, can bring into the situation “additional important constraints” such as “his logical proof, and style” (p. 8). Perhaps, if Nkrumah were aware of the simmering antagonism towards his rhetoric, he probably would have modified his rhetorical posture. If he were truly aware, then it was quite suicidal for him to have entirely ignored such pertinent concerns. It, however, seems surprising, knowing who Nkrumah was, at least, in terms of rhetoric, to have totally avoided a defence of his

¹²⁹ OAU 56.

personal integrity in his address if he had really been on top of issues concern his audience perception about himself.

Another key constraint which was connected to Nkrumah's deteriorated credibility even before Addis Ababa was accusations of subversive activities in which he was implicated. Fingers pointed at Nkrumah with assassination attempts on both Sylvester Olympio (Rooney, 2007) and Houphouet-Boigny (Thompson, 1969). Nkrumah was accused of the assassination of President Olympio on 13th January 1963, just three months before the Addis Ababa conference. He needed to extricate himself convincingly from these accusations but this never happened. If he did, it was not forceful enough to silence the overwhelmingly negative publicity which was all over in Africa. Some rhetorical situations can mature and decay over time (Bitzer, 1969) but this was not the case. Especially with the Addis Ababa conference around the corner, the situation was gradually gathering momentum, waiting for an appropriate response in Addis Ababa.

At a conference in Lagos, the Moderate group publicly accused Nkrumah of the assassination (Thompson, 1969). As a result of bad blood towards Nkrumah, Guinea went further to declare the late Olympio as a hero (Thompson, 1969). Thompson (1969) reports that, "a revulsion against Nkrumah spread across Africa, at a critical time for Ghanaian diplomacy" (p. 311). These incidents, to a large extent, deeply and permanently affected Nkrumah's credibility even after 1963. In the meantime, they presented an insurmountable constraint for Nkrumah to negotiate. In effect, in the eyes of the audience in Addis Ababa, Nkrumah had very little credibility. They had an entirely different perception about him.

Moreover, the Congo crisis became another source of constraint for Nkrumah. Nkrumah had demonstrated an unflinching support for Patrice Lumumba. The Congo crisis had brought divisions amongst countries in the Central Africa region. The division was marked by those who were on the sides of Lumumba and those who supported Kasavubu (Rooney, 2007). Arguably, Nkrumah provided the strongest voice of defence for Lumumba both within and outside Africa. Nkrumah's rhetoric and actions in the Congo crises naturally attracted the enemies of Lumumba towards him. At this moment, he had lost important rhetorical audiences in almost every part of Africa. It, therefore, becomes apparent that Nkrumah had very few loyal supporters just before the Addis Ababa conference. In argumentation, it is the audience that have the ultimate power to judge the speaker's discourse (Farell, 1993). This would be daunting when the speaker is bound to face seemingly opposing rhetorical audience such as was going to be present at Addis Ababa. To a large extent, Nkrumah's rhetoric at the conference never had a good chance to thrive in view of the constraints which loomed ominously ahead of his invention.

Lastly, the new African leaders whose country had just emerged from colonial rule were not ready for African political unity for politically obvious reasons. By 1963, thirty-two African countries were independent in Africa. As many as twenty-three of these countries had emerged out of colonial rule within a space of three years before the Addis Ababa conference. For most of these leaders, it was politically untenable to relinquish their new found political authority just after their independence to a single united political government of Africa. So far as these new leaders were concerned, Nkrumah's rhetorical position seemed overly ambitious. While Nkrumah pressed on for African political unity, his invention, perhaps, began

generating an internal argument within these new breed of African leaders. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) give insight about a kind of argumentation that ensues whilst the speaker argues. They explain:

While the speaker is arguing, the hearer in turn tends to argue on his own account about the speech in order to take his own stand, to determine the credibility he ought to attach to it. The hearer who listens to the arguments not only understands them in his own way, but also creates new arguments of his own, which are usually unexpressed but which nevertheless intervene to modify the final results of the argumentation (p. 189).

If such a situation was the case, then the new African leaders rationalised their own political situations in the light of Nkrumah's deliberative proposal. Faced with the difficult sacrifice they would certainly have to make, most, if not all, of them might refrain from given their consent to the thesis which had been presented to them. In effect, as new leaders, they were being summoned by Nkrumah, as it were, to sacrifice their political interest on the altar of African unity. This, certainly, seemed a huge price for any new leader to be called upon to pay, given the political circumstances.

At the end of the conference, most of the proposals that were put forward by Nkrumah were unanimously shot down by the delegates (Rooney, 2007). Nkrumah's main proposal of an immediate continental political unity was postponed for discussion in the next OAU conference which was to occur two years later in Accra. His plea for at least, a more effective form of unity only gained the support of President Obote from Uganda and Youlou from Congo Brazzaville (Poe, 2003). This

was not unexpected in the light of the above constraints. Nkrumah's invention had been eclipsed by constraints born out of his own actions and inactions as a political actor. His dream of continental unity had been deferred. Perhaps, this was going to be forever. African unity was finally given birth to in Addis Ababa, but never in the total sense of Nkrumah's rhetorical imagination. Though its formation did not reflect Nkrumah's vision in its entirety, the long deliberation on African unity had been and would continue to be, to a great extent, shaped by Nkrumah's rhetorical invention.

Whilst Nkrumah had argued for a continental unity in Africa, the political atmosphere in Ghana was gradually changing from a nascent democratic culture into an autocratic one. In Chapter Seven, we will examine Nkrumah's rhetorical presentation of a contest between factual versus political reality as he steers Ghana, the new republic, into a One Party State.

Conclusion

In this chapter, Nkrumah's invention was crafted to ensure a sense of unity and purpose of African at the Addis Ababa conference. As a result, he strategically used the speech to establish a sense of urgency through the invocation of fear to create presence among his immediate audience at Addis Ababa. In this respect, Nkrumah succeeded in arousing his audience into action in order to save themselves (audience) from immediate destruction by the colonialist.

Further, the chapter examined Nkrumah's use of the platform provided at Addis Ababa to further enhance and establish his ethos at the continental level in order to

deepen his quest for legitimacy as he seeks to establish a new political trajectory for Africa. Through the speech's creation of presence, Nkrumah provided two differing options on the deliberative table for the consideration of his audience, that is, unity leading to survival vis-a-vis disunity which will lead to imminent disintegration and destruction of Africans.

Again, in this chapter, Nkrumah drew from the quasi logical argument of inclusion of the parts in the whole. By so doing, Nkrumah brought the problem of Africa to the fore whilst placing the political challenges of individual territories in Africa at the background. Through this argumentative strategy, Nkrumah attempted to forcefully bring his vision of Africa to the fore - that the success of Africa as a united political will bring into being the economic freedom which is sought by individual territories in Africa.

In addition, Nkrumah used the speech to address the composite audience which were present in Addis Ababa. In addressing them, Nkrumah used his speech to argue and redirect the differing argumentative stances and positions of the various political groupings. As a *rhetor* he took cognizance of the different interest groups and attempted to persuade them individually on the course of Africa's continental unity.

Lastly, the chapter further examined the rhetorical constraints which posed a challenge to Nkrumah's address in view of the rhetorical situation. Nkrumah's invention at Addis Ababa will remain as a rhetoric exemplar for Africa's deliberation on unity.

CHAPTER SEVEN

RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF KWAME NKRUMAH'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF GHANA ON 3RD FEBRUARY 1964 IN ACCRA

Introduction

By the end of January 1964, there had been about five assassination attempts on President Nkrumah. The series of assassination attempts had brought in their wake nationwide rumours of the involvement of opposition elements, western colonial ideologues albeit with the alleged connivance of Ghanaian government officials. In fact, the suspicions were far-reaching and unending. These developments brought into question the whole apparatus of national security and the direction of governance in Ghana.

In September 1963, the President had given assent to a Parliamentary Bill to change Ghana's Republican Constitution from a Multi-Party Democracy to Single Party System. A nationwide referendum was scheduled to take place the following year during the last week of January 1964. On the evening of New Year's Eve 1963, Nkrumah spoke to the nation via radio and outlined the two key issues that had necessitated the constitutional change thereby requiring a referendum. First, it was about making the CPP "the sole legal political organization" and the constitutional right to Nkrumah "to dismiss any Supreme Court or High Court judge" (Howell, 1972, p. 107). The nationwide referendum was carried out as scheduled between 24th and 28th January, 1964 and the decision to change the national constitution into a

One-Party State was supported. However, on the evening of the 3rd February 1964, three days after the referendum, Nkrumah, the President, delivered a message to Ghanaians which centred on the referendum. In a sense, the speech could be referred to as a State of the Nation's Address since it sought to discuss the 'real state of the nation' at the time. Apart from the speech touching on the overall success of the nationwide referendum, it largely bothered on, once again, the justification for the referendum. This was an issue which had earlier received fair deliberation both within Parliament and through two speeches which were delivered by Nkrumah to the nation before the end of December 1963.

So the questions which cried strongly for answers were as follows: Why was the President deeply concerned about the outcome of the referendum to the extent that he needed to create series of rhetorical justifications for a nationwide exercise which had quickly received parliamentary assent and nationwide support with almost a hundred percent 'yes'? What underlying factors could have provided fair justification for a rhetorical invention whose primary aim (the constitutional change from a multi-party system to a one-party state) had already been achieved? If the purpose of rhetoric is to influence judgment (Farrell, 1993), then which further judgment of Ghanaians did the president seek to influence even after the prime object of the plebiscite had been given assent nationwide? If rhetoric, according to Aristotle (2007), "an ability, in each case [particular] case, to see the available means of persuasion" (p. 37), then Nkrumah was attempting to perform a rhetorical act. In this essay, I discuss Nkrumah's rhetorical replacement of factual truth with rational or political truth (Arendt, 2005) and the extent to which it facilitated his invention in the 3rd February 1964 address to Ghanaians. In doing so, I will analyse Nkrumah's

rational rhetorical justification of the outcome of the referendum in relation to the factual events of the nationwide political exercise. Secondly, I will attempt to examine the speech's framing of the subversive attacks on the President as neo-colonial attacks as a means of giving justification to the government's usurpation of the judiciary and the legislature albeit in a constitutional manner. Thirdly, I will explore the speech's rhetorical strategy of uniting Ghanaians with the CPP. I would conclude by looking at the immediate and remote effects of Nkrumah's rational/political interpretation of events and how they might have served as a precursor to his political demise.

Replacing Reality: Factual versus Rational Interpretation

The 3rd February address by Nkrumah presented a rhetorical context between factual and rational truths in view of his rhetorical interpretation of the referendum and its outcome in relation to the real situation on the ground. This is not to posit that everything about the speech was not grounded in the realm of factual evidence, but, to a large extent, the arguments which the speech presented were deliberately situated in the realm of what Nkrumah considered to be rational truth in view of the rhetorical situation. In this discussion, the dichotomy between factual and rational truths is crucial in so far as it allows for a critical interpretation and appraisal of Nkrumah's rhetorical discourse, rather than an effort to engage in a moral judgment of Nkrumah which is outside the confines of this study.

In her *Truth and Politics*, Hannah Arendt (2005) argues about the potency of rational truth as against factual truth by indicating that:

Since the liar is free to fashion his “facts” to fit the profit and pleasure, or even the mere expectations, of his audience, the chances are that he will be more persuasive than the truth teller. Indeed, he will have plausibility on his side; his exposition will sound more logical, as it were, since the element of unexpectedness – one of the outstanding characteristics of all events – has mercifully disappeared (p. 307).

It is significant to know that in situations involving national crises, presidential rhetoric plays a major role in the way by which the citizens perceive reality (Jordan, 2003). However, this reality which Nkrumah made available through his speech, with respect to the political situation which necessitated the nationwide referendum, was a reality which was based on what Arendt (2005) refers to as rational truth but not a form of reality founded entirely on factual evidence. Arendt further posits that “truthfulness has never been counted among the political virtues, because it has little indeed to contribute to the change of the world and of circumstances which is among the most legitimate political activities” (p. 307). If this argument is legitimate, then Nkrumah’s pursuit of rational truth instead of factual truth had the potency of bringing forth the “change” which he sought with his rhetorical invention in view of the situation.

General reports on the referendum indicated some government’s manipulation of the electoral system in order to influence the outcome of the referendum for a One-Party State. “The government reported that 99.9% of the electorate had favoured... the establishment of the CPP as the sole legal political organization” and granted the president the “right to dismiss any Supreme Court judge ‘at any time and for reasons that appear to him sufficient’” (Howell, 1972, p.

107). How could this be a possibility when Nkrumah's government had faced stiff opposition from the biggest tribal group even right from his days as Prime Minister under the British colonial regime? How could this happen when Nkrumah had been threatened with numerous assassination attempts alleged to have been engineered by the opposition? In the opening words of the nationwide broadcast, Nkrumah noted:

The referendum is now over, and I want to speak to you tonight and to thank you—the chiefs and people of Ghana—for the overwhelming demonstration of your solidarity and determination, and for your faith in the goals we have set before us.¹³⁰

As a matter of fact, if the referendum genuinely resulted in a 99.9 percent 'yes' for the government's proposal, then Ghanaians had shown their "solidarity and determination", as the President asserted in his speech. However, reports all over the country with respect to the voting indicated otherwise. All over the country, there was evidence to support that the voting was characterized by issues of "widespread fraud and intimidation" (Howell, 1972, p. 107) of the electorates. In some regions, it was reported by Howell (1972) that "ballot boxes either were removed in advance by government-appointed polling officials or had their slits sealed" (p. 107) all in the aim of influencing the outcome of the process for the government. Nkrumah, in continuation of his speech remarked:

¹³⁰ One-Party State Speech (OPS) 1. All references to the speech will be in the writer's format and referred to as (OPS).

Let me commend ... supporters and sympathisers who threw themselves so wholeheartedly into the campaign, as well as the officials and election staff whose *honesty* and *sincerity* made the voting so smooth and orderly.¹³¹

Whilst the factual evidence indicated some manipulations, Nkrumah, by his words, was laying the foundation of a differing reality regarding the referendum. His use of the words 'honesty' and 'sincerity' was to give credibility to officials and voters for proper conduct in the election. The government controlled media, before the referendum, had "warned that persons who cast negative ballots would be regarded as 'counter revolutionary and that 'no' votes could not be cast without detection'" (Howell, 1972, p. 107). The seriousness of these threats could be clearly perceived through some threatening defiance of a state-owned paper, *The Ghanaian Times*, which was directed towards Ghanaians. The paper reported:

In this referendum we have mounted our vigilance to find out those who are with us and those who are against us. Those who think they can hide under the so-called 'secrecy' of the polling booth to fool us must know that the days when we could be fooled are gone. And those fence sitters who prefer to stay at home must likewise know that the people's wrath is apt to descend without mercy upon those who are not with us (Howell, 1972, p. 107).

In view of the very low level of formal education in Ghana at the time, it was possible that most Ghanaians would certainly fall for such intimidations. The numerous cases of political incarceration, which had been successfully carried out by Nkrumah's government right after Ghana's independence in 1958 served as enough

¹³¹ OPS 1.

justification for the fears of Ghanaians. The success of the state-owned media in issuing threats about the referendum was aggravated by the absence of an impartial voice which could have highlighted the truth of the situation. *The Ashanti Pioneer*, which was known to provide a firm resistance to Nkrumah's dictatorship, was "censored and then banned" (Omari, 1970, p. 8). As a result, the citizens had no fair means of what was, in reality, happening around the country. In such a state of confusion, what was real, in the truth of the word, becomes a key rhetorical tool. Arendt (2005) further argues by indicating:

The modern political lies are so big that they require a complete rearrangement of the whole factual texture - the making of another reality, as it were, into which they will fit without seam, crack, or fissure, exactly as the facts fitted in their original context (p. 308).

In such a state of quandary, the Ghanaians had very little opportunity to decipher reality from fiction since Nkrumah's rhetorical reality had been corroborated by the state-owned media. In a political environment where dissenting media voices had been eliminated, the joining of forces of Nkrumah's rhetoric and that of the dominant media, in a sense, defined what constituted reality for the masses. But Nkrumah's rhetorical reality cannot be full proof. If Nkrumah had used his nationwide broadcast to justify the outcome of the referendum – a referendum which had been influenced by government's coercion of the citizens, then the impact of such a rhetorical invention was going to be a daunting task to assess, especially when Ghanaians were coerced to act out of fear and not through personal conviction. Probably, it may well be the case that Nkrumah's rhetorical justification of the outcome of the entire election process may not have been targeted to greatly influence the citizens, but

might have been designed to justify the process of the referendum before a watchful international audience (Bretton, 1967).

It should further be noted that by January 1964, Nkrumah had taken full control of the Ghana Police Service. He had power to sack top officers of the Service (Howell, 1972, p. 105) and had gained a direct control over it which hitherto was under the Minister of Interior. The Police Service was also used to carry out the bidding of the government machinery which was bent on ensuring that the referendum concluded in securing a “yes” vote for the onward legislation for a One-Party system.

Nkrumah sought to give credit to the chiefs for their overwhelming support for the referendum. Whilst his statement tried to openly stamp a nationwide support for the outcome of the plebiscite with the backing of the chiefs, it might not have represented the real position of the major chieftaincy institutions within the country. If there had been any single traditional group in Ghana that provided a solid opposition to Nkrumah’s rule, then it had come from the major chieftaincy institutions in Ghana (Rooney, 2007). In fact, the first serious political opposition to Nkrumah’s government was the NLM, which opposed Nkrumah’s political proposals in the Colonial Government right from the 1950’s. This movement had its greatest support from the dominant chieftaincy groups among the Asante and the Akyem people which together formed the biggest ethnic group in Ghana. This opposition from this dominant ethnic group had not changed but had even grown in intensity during the time of the 1964 referendum. Nkrumah knew that if the CPP was to exercise greater political control within the provinces under the traditional jurisdiction of the chiefs, then he needed to reduce their political power. He,

therefore, sought to clamp down the chiefs through legislations by allowing government institutions to take over the chiefs' control of land resources, which was their main source of funding (Omari, 1970).

Largely, there seems to be clear indication that Nkrumah strategically designed a rhetoric that did not seek to provide his Ghanaian audience with a fair account of the realities of the nationwide referendum. By so doing, he tried to, in the words of Medhurst (1988), "regulate the rhetorical environment" (p. 52) to suit his own political interest. That in the absence of a neutral voice through which Ghanaians could perceive what had happened nationwide, Nkrumah filled the rhetoric space with a discourse made to appear as the lone voice that sought to put the record straight about the nationwide decision for a One-Party System in the young Ghanaian Republic. Hahn (1980) notes that "corrupt discourse poisons the possibility of evaluating action" (p. 43), in this case the actions of President Nkrumah. Whilst Nkrumah continued to provide a form of reality for the events on the nationwide elections, he sought to forcefully establish the democratic foundation of the CPP and its CPP's role in securing the country's independence seven years earlier in 1967. This was Nkrumah's strategy of providing legitimacy for his rhetorical stance in order for his factual fabrications to fit into the "factual texture" (Arendt, 2005, p. 308). He reminded the people that:

During the past week, you the people of Ghana – have given the greatest manifestation of your steadfastness and faith in the convention People's Party – the party that led you to freedom; the party that stands for your interest, because its very existence springs from you the people. By giving your mandate once again to the party, you have demonstrated in the most positive

terms our country's determination to establish a socialist society in which every one of us will stand free and with equal opportunities in all respect with his neighbour.¹³²

Moreover, in invoking the credibility of the CPP, Nkrumah consciously reminded his audience of the role the Party had played in securing the very freedom which the people enjoyed. The invocation of Ghana's freedom struggle naturally becomes an emotional appeal which cannot be ignored by the audience in the face of Nkrumah's logical appeal. Thus, in view of Nkrumah and the CPP's role in securing Ghana's independence, the speech further sought to indicate the irony as regards the subversive activities against Nkrumah as a means of justifying the decision of turning Ghana into a One-Party State. Therefore, the next section of the Chapter, presents a discussion on Nkrumah's strategic use of perceived subversion as a means in requesting for a nation's judgment and assent through a referendum.

Framing Subversion as Neo-Colonial influence

As part of Nkrumah's address to the nation, he invented a discourse which sought to highlight subversive activities against himself, thereby giving justification for his establishment of what Bretton (1967) refers to as "the personal political machine" (p. 50). Nkrumah remarked:

In the reconstruction of our country, however, we have found that certain elements in our society maliciously refuse to see eye to eye with us, even

¹³² OPS 3.

though in their heart of hearts they know that the course we have taken is the right one.¹³³

Nkrumah begins with an appeal to the emotion of Ghanaians with respect to the Kulungugu bombings and Flagstaff Staff house assassination attempts on his life. This is a way of associating (Perelman & Obrechts-Tyteca, 1969) opposition elements who challenged him in the elections with acts of terrorism and with external neo-colonialist forces, thereby laying a firm rhetorical justification for their elimination from the political scene in Ghana.

Right from 1957 when Ghana became independent from British colonial rule, the new government had to battle with a myriad of internal crises within the country. One of such crises was the protest of the Ga-Dangbe tribal group which were involved in demonstrations in mid-1957. Nkrumah and his government believed that those raucous protests were being fomented by the Opposition to make his government unpopular (Bretton, 1968). He took advantage of this situation in the country to fulfil his long-time dream: that is, to introduce laws that allowed him to have a greater control of state institutions which the prevailing statutes in the 1957 Independence Constitution did not allow him.

This plan had the support of government and the CPP officials. Cecil Forde, the Secretary General of the CPP “declared on August 13, 1957: ‘Perhaps there may be much to be said for the temporary dictatorship than a democratic state (sic) where the Opposition is violent, wapish and malignant’” (Bretton, 1968, p. 45). This and other situations gave Nkrumah the opportune moment to establish a firm rule

¹³³ OPS 7.

through autocratic legislations that was made rhetorically palatable with respect to public opinion. So, for Nkrumah, the political elements which refused to agree with the CPP government was to be sanctioned through appropriate legislation in Parliament. This led to the introduction of the Prevention Detention Act (PDA) of 1958. The PDA empowered the Prime Minister to keep a person in jail without a formal trial for up to a period of five years (Omari, 1970). During the two months deliberation of the PDA Bill in Parliament in 1958, there was clear indication that it was meant to silence the Opposition. Amoako Atta, a CPP Parliamentarian, had this to say about the PDA Bill in Parliament: “this Bill is introduced purposely for people with diabolical and wicked minds. As far as I am concerned, I do not think that this Bill will affect me” (Omari, 1970, p. 72). W.K. Aduhene, another government Member of Parliament, was reported by Omari to have remarked, “if I were the Prime Minister, I would order people who plan violence to be lined up for the Government Police to shoot them” (p. 72). Without doubt, the debate by government officials in Parliament to some extent had reflected the will and intent of the CPP leader - Nkrumah.

Interestingly, since it was the Prime Minister who had the power under the PDA to determine what action(s) or persons(s) was a security threat to the State, Nkrumah had concluded that “threats to the security of the state-centred on threats to the “leadership of Kwame Nkrumah” (Bretton, 1967, p. 48). This in effect, meant that once the “state” (Nkrumah) was threatened in any form in the estimation of the “state” (Nkrumah), then PDA could be invoked through an arrest and onward detention of the offender. This situation further meant the gradual elimination of all Ghanaian political opposition to Nkrumah. Though some members of the Opposition

in every Parliament can be mischievous sometimes, it is outside the purview of this study to examine such a possibility in the Ghanaian Parliament especially after the nation's Independence. But Nkrumah viewed political opposition to his government differently. He felt political opposition served as an obstacle to what he referred to as the "reconstruction of our country."¹³⁴ The PDA, in effect, was part of Nkrumah's strategy to create an opposition-free government and ultimately to take total control of the new State.

If the political effect of the PDA was to have its full effects in view of the reasons for which it became law, then the political situation ought to be necessarily right for the invocation of the Act. An incident at Kulungugu in northern Ghana gave birth to the perfect situation which served appropriately for Nkrumah's rhetoric.

On 1st August, 1962 there was an assassination attempt on Kwame Nkrumah at Kulungugu, a town close to the Ghana Burkina Faso border. The President, together with his entourage, was returning from a meeting on 31st July with President Maurice Yameogo of Burkina Faso (Howell, 1972). Though Nkrumah escaped with some injuries the incident played a major role in Nkrumah's rhetoric in the 3rd February speech. Tawia Adamafio, the Minister for Information, Ako Adjei, Minister for Foreign Affairs and H. Cofie Crabbe, the Executive Secretary of the CPP, were arrested through Nkrumah's invocation of the PDA. Surprisingly, all three men were not only top ranking members of the government but they were also personally close to the President Nkrumah. The trial, which took a period of three months, started on 9th August, 1963 (almost a year after the detention of the three

¹³⁴ OPS 7.

members of government) under Sir Arku Korsah, the Chief Justice and two other Justices of the Supreme Court, W.B. Van Lare and E. Akuffo-Addo (Howell, 1972).

On 9th December, the three men were acquitted by the court as innocent of the attempted assassination at Kulungugu. However, on 10th December, the next day, the Government announced that the “three shall still remained under detention” (Howell, 1972). On 11th December, the President invoked his powers as stipulated in the constitution and sacked the Chief Justice for acquitting the three members of Government who were on trial for the Kulungugu assassination attempt on Nkrumah (Howell, 1972) and appointment a new Chief Justice to commence a retrial of the case. Interestingly, on 23rd December, 1963, the Government sent a new Bill to Parliament, which sought to give the President “special powers to annul Special Courts decisions when Nkrumah considers them to be ‘in the interest of the state’” (Howell, 1972, pp. 104-105).

Whilst the trial of the three members of Government remained inconclusive, there was yet another assassination attempt on Nkrumah on the 2nd January, 1964, which involved a police security guard at the Flagstaff House (Omari, 1970). This incident resulted in the arrest and detention of Dr. J.B. Danquah, the Parliamentary Opposition Leader (Howell, 1972).

It was clear that by January 1964, Nkrumah had taken control of the Judiciary (Howell, 1972). He had also successfully brought the Police under his direct control (Bretton, 1967) even before the Government publicly announced the decision for a nationwide referendum to change the Constitution of Ghana into a One-Party System. However, in his 3rd February address, Nkrumah rhetorically attempted to

use the assassination attempts on him to justify the decision for a One-Party State. Secondly, through an emotional appeal he pointed fingers to Western governments as the cause of the assassination attempts without providing any palpable evidence to the Ghanaian public. Since the nation had emerged from colonial rule less than a decade ago, it was certainly going to be within the acceptable limits of Ghanaians if Nkrumah decided to lay blame with respect to any subversive activity at the door of Western governments, especially Britain which had lost Ghana as its colony. Nkrumah revealed:

By joining forces with the neo-colonialists, these elements infiltrated into the organs which administer and direct our State, and tried to corrupt our Judiciary and our Police. To some extent they succeeded, and it was the measure of your vigilance that the country rallied quickly from the shock of Kulungugu and the subsequent acts of terrorism which were planned to break your confidence in the national cause, and to bring discord and disharmony into the country.¹³⁵

Who were the “neo-colonialists” which Nkrumah referred to in his 3rd February, 1964 speech since the government had denied this seventeen months earlier before the present address? After the attempted assassination at Kulungugu on 1st August, 1962, the local Nkrumah’s press had blamed the United States, Britain, France and Germany for the assassinations attempt (Howell, 1972). The American Ambassador, William P. Mahony Jr., denied the United States’ involvement by protesting the allegations that had been published by the *Ghanaian Times* on 18th September. The British High Commissioner, Sir Geoffrey de Freitas, also refuted the British’s

¹³⁵ OPS 7.

government involvement in the bombing. By 22nd September, series of press statements had been released from the office of Nkrumah refuting the involvement of these Western countries in the assassination attempt on his life (Howell, 1972).

Since Nkrumah's government had denied the influence of major known western countries that had economic and political interest in Ghana in both the past and present, then upon what rhetorical basis would Nkrumah refer to the "neo-colonialist infiltration" without the provision of clear evidence even if some new evidence had surfaced after the earlier denial? It can be concluded that Nkrumah's conscious reference to "neo-colonialists" in the speech, after his refusal seventeen months earlier to do the same in September 1962, marked a strategic rhetorical attempt to warrant his quest to supposedly protect the state from these strong external forces through the establishment of tight controls over the various institutions of the State. This rhetorical strategy, therefore, became a subtle means of gradually drifting Ghana into a One-Party System which had been his prime aim as far back as 1957 when Ghana became independent under his leadership. In view of this, Nkrumah continued:

The latest sequence of events, from the treason trial to the assassination attempt at Flagstaff House on the 2nd of January this year, has made it imperative that we should uproot completely all the forces of intrigue, subversion and violence designed to deflect us from our chosen goal.¹³⁶

¹³⁶ OPS 8.

Nkrumah's rhetoric of "the reconstruction of our country"¹³⁷ had a metaphorical undertone. It likened Ghana's republic to a garden and the farmer (Nkrumah) whose work has been impeded by weeds and thorns (Neo-colonialist). Nkrumah further argued, "we must dig out the traitors and saboteurs and bring them to answer for their misdeeds."¹³⁸ Thus, by eliminating these "traitors" and "saboteurs", the political health of the Republic could be firmly secured. Looking at the speech's argumentation up to this point, it becomes logically obvious that in view of the neo-colonialists infiltration into the Republic, it is appropriate for Nkrumah as a leader to jealously guard the sovereignty of the new Republic.

A close scrutiny of Nkrumah's argumentation so far demonstrates that the decision for the One-Party State became necessary in view of the presence and negative activities of "traitors and saboteurs" within Ghana. This situation further brings to the fore some critical questions. Which of the two situations necessarily influenced the other? Was it the assassination attempts that influenced the decision to change the constitution of Ghana from Multi-Party System to a One-Party State or was it the introduction of the PDA and the seemingly dictatorial rule of Nkrumah after independence that may have influenced the assassination attempts on the President? Looking at these questions I conclude that Nkrumah's tendencies for dictatorship, especially with the introduction of PDA and the decision for a One-Party State, to a large extent, preceded the assassination attempts, thereby further revealing what Arendt (2005) refers to as the "political lie" (p. 307) in Nkrumah's 3rd February speech.

¹³⁷ OPS 7.

¹³⁸ OPS 9.

Nkrumah's interest in personal rule was clearly exhibited long before he became Prime Minister and later President of the newly independent Ghana. In his draft of the document to govern "The Circle," a secret political group which he formed in Britain in 1947 (Bretton, 1967), members of the core group who were drawn from different parts of Africa were, according to Bretton, to "accept the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah" (p. 36) without any interference. Also, after Ghana attained a republican status in 1960, three years after independence, Nkrumah strategically collapsed the "position of Head of State, until then filled by the Queen, with that of Prime Minister in the new office of President" (Bretton, 1967, p. 50). Therefore, the powers of the Governor allowed him "to veto legislation passed by the Ghanaian Parliament that was unacceptable to him on constitutional grounds" (Bretton, 1967, p. 41). Since the Governor-General represented the Queen, it meant that by 1960 Nkrumah as a President had a greater level of control over Parliament, which represented the voice of the people. Again, just before Ghana's independence in 1957, Nkrumah's (1957) personal reflection in his *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* revealed his aversion for democracy and capitalism which he considered as unhealthy for the young independent state like Ghana. He argued:

Capitalism is too complicated a system for a newly independent nation.

Hence the need for a socialist society. But even a system based on social justice and a democratic constitution may need backing up, during the period following independence, by emergency measures of a totalitarian kind.

Without discipline, true freedom cannot survive (p. x).

Clearly, it was going to be difficult for Nkrumah to argue for this system of governance in Ghana right after Independence. He needed the political situation to

be ripe (Bitzer, 1968) and the opportune time was in 1964. In his reference to the Jan 2, 1964 second assassination attempt at the Flagstaff House, Nkrumah remarked that the incident had “made it imperative that we should uproot completely all the forces of intrigue, subversion and violence.”¹³⁹ The assassination attempt had occurred on the heels of the final decision to conduct the nationwide referendum later that same month. Whilst on the surface, the attempt on Nkrumah’s life might have further increased the tension within the country, it positively affected the prevailing exigencies thereby allowing Nkrumah to give a rhetorical response, which was to positively enhance his political objective. This is supported by the views of critics. For instance, Bretton (1968) came to this conclusion regarding the 2nd Jan incident that “the circumstances surrounding this attempt were obscure. Genuine or not, the incident was used to tighten the security net still further” (Bretton, 1967, p. 60). Apart from this conclusion by Bretton, Omari (1970), a Ghanaian historian notes succinctly that Nkrumah “staged assassination attempts to incriminate the Opposition” (p. 66). Whilst the conclusions arrived at by Bretton and Omari cannot be definite and conclusive, they provide some illumination on Nkrumah’s rhetoric of “uproot[ing] completely all the forces of intrigue, subversion and violence.”¹⁴⁰ Perhaps, Nkrumah sought, through speech, to entrench internally, his “political machine” in Ghana whilst diverting the attention and focus of his immediate audience to a remote and distant enemy – the neo-colonialist. After bringing to the fore the fear of the colonialists and his government’s justification for uprooting their political links within the State, through a process of association (Perelman &

¹³⁹ OPS 8.

¹⁴⁰ OPS 8.

Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969), Nkrumah, rhetorically connects the CPP and Ghana as a nation. The next section focuses on this crucial subject.

Equalizing the Party with the Republic

As it was earlier on indicated, one of the prime proposals which was been considered by the nationwide referendum was the decision to make the CPP the only political party in Ghana. This was Nkrumah's plan to completely erode any opposition elements, which he vehemently opposed as a democratic principle in a new nation undergoing what he called a "reconstruction."¹⁴¹ His interest in building a lifetime political machine brought in the help of President Broz Tito of Yugoslavia in 1960 during his visit to Ghana (Omari, 1970). According to Omari (1970), Nkrumah had plans "to build a monolithic party machine which he could manipulate until his death (p. 144). Since the nationwide referendum in Jan 1964 was fraught with misconducts, it is not surprising why Nkrumah forcefully sought to show the position of the CPP in relation to Ghanaians and the Republic as a whole. He argued, "By your unequivocal 'Yes' vote, you have, in the most emphatic way, expressed your belief not simply in the Convention People's Party, but in yourselves and in the nation."¹⁴²

Nkrumah made no distinction between Ghanaians and the CPP. Rhetorically, he used the 99.9% outcome of the referendum to argue for a seamless relationship that existed between the Ghanaians and the CPP, leaving no space for the opposition

¹⁴¹ OPS 7.

¹⁴² OPS 13.

Party which from thence had become unconstitutional (by February 24, 1964, the Republic had become a One-Party State, thereby making all other political parties unconstitutional). In trying to eliminate any democratic space for the Opposition after Ghana's independence, Nkrumah strategically placed pseudo-government institutions under the CPP. In 1959, at a CPP Delegates' Meeting, this is what Nkrumah said about the CPP:

It is likened to a mighty tree with many branches. The Convention People's Party constitutes the root and the trunk, and its branches include such organizations as the United Ghana Farmers' Council, the Trades' Union Congress, the Cooperative Movement, the Ex-servicemen, Women's Organizations, the Kwame Nkrumah *Kurye Kuw*, the National Associations of Socialist Students Organization, the league of Ghana Patriots and other patriotic organizations which in their various ways are giving support to our Party (Omari, 1970, p. 55).

Undoubtedly, there is every indication that Nkrumah had politically succeeded in joining the CPP and the various Ghanaian institutions for workers both in words and in deeds. In such a situation, citizens cannot be part of the public service in Ghana without being an automatic member of the ruling Party. Nkrumah's rhetoric which marked his political strategy in 1959 was indicative of a subtle pursuit of dictatorship in a budding democratic country. Whilst it may have looked strange and illogical for the citizens within a democratic republic to wholly and willingly submit the last vestiges of their democratic power, so to speak, in the hands of an individual, Nkrumah's 3rd February discourse made it seem the case that the citizens had acted democratically by their decision for a One-Party State. Thus, the citizens had

seemingly lost their democratic power through the 1964 referendum. Nkrumah through his rhetorical appeals, continually made the citizens appear, through his words, as the source of the real political power of the state even when in actual fact that power had eroded before their (citizens) own eyes. Nkrumah continued:

it is because we have faith in ourselves to overcome our enemies at home and abroad, that we have agreed to rest the power of the State in the hands of the people. It is because we recognise that we, the people, can best serve as the watchmen of our interests, that we have voted ourselves as the guardians of the State ... From whom else could power possibly spring but from the people?¹⁴³

Which “people” did Nkrumah refer to as “the guardians of the State”? If we are to go by the arguments which have earlier been made concerning the outcome of the referendum, then the “power” which Nkrumah referred to certainly could not have sprung from the citizens directly. According to Nkrumah, “[t]he Party is the rallying point of our political activities. Without the Party there would be no force through which to focus the needs and the desires of the people.”¹⁴⁴ Since the CPP had been made to encompass all institutions of the State, Nkrumah had positioned the Party to transcend every aspect of Ghanaian national life. In a rhetorical sense, the CPP represented the people. While this logic may not appeal to members of the Opposition who had by this time been driven into political oblivion, Nkrumah’s rhetoric projected the CPP as *sine qua non* to the Ghanaian Republic.

¹⁴³ OPS 14.

¹⁴⁴ OPS 15.

In another sense, if the “people” could refer to the members of the Ghana’s parliament who represented the citizenry, then Nkrumah was right in claiming that “the people [were] the source of political power.”¹⁴⁵ This brings us to the next issue as to whether the constitution of Ghana’s new parliament represented Ghanaian citizens.

After independence, Nkrumah had practically set the state on a journey to dictatorial rule. The legislature, an important arm of public deliberation within a republic, was not free from Nkrumah’s political control. In a paradoxical sense, whilst Nkrumah was stifling public deliberation in Ghana, he continually use his rhetoric to create an impression before the public that he was still operating within acceptable democratic tenets which provided a rhetorical space for public deliberation. Parliament under Nkrumah had become a mere shadow of itself. In effect, public deliberation had been completely curtailed in the face of Nkrumah’s growing dictatorial power. The application of PDA led to the imprisonment of a number of both Members of the Opposition and CPP members of Parliament. This emanated from the National Assembly (Disqualification) Act of 1959, which stipulated that “no person should be qualified for election to Parliament if a Preventive Detention Order was in force against him or had been in force at any time within five years preceding the election” (Bretton, 1967, p. 51). There were many other leading Parliamentarians who either left Ghana through self-imposed exile (Timothy, 1963) for fear of political persecution or imprisonment. Such Parliamentarians were replaced in the House with hand-picked CPP members (Timothy, 1963).

¹⁴⁵ OPS 14.

After Ghana's independence, the last by-elections under Nkrumah's leadership were in August 1960 (Omari, 1970). So even before 1964, when Ghana legally became a One-Party State, Parliament was virtually composed of only members of the CPP, which justifies the unchallenged parliamentary proposal for a One-Party State. Omari (1970) reports that "the President could henceforth legislate, administer, regulate; he could manipulate Parliament as he saw fit, override the 'Standing Orders of the House,' govern the conduct of all but a minute portion of its membership" (p. 69).

If the "the people," according to Nkrumah, "[were] the source of political power and guardians of the state,"¹⁴⁶ then first and foremost, the citizens had no power at all since the Parliamentarians who exercised real power in Ghana's Parliament did not truly represent the citizens. If the Ghanaian Parliament comprised handpicked CPP members, then Parliament was a mere rhetorical mirror of Nkrumah's own personal deliberation. In the end, Nkrumah conceived the proposal for a One-Party State and he finally gave assent to it to become law. In effect, the power, which supposedly emanated from the "people" rather emanated from Nkrumah. In his forward to *Kwame Nkrumah: An Anatomy of an African Dictatorship*, Justice Nii Amaa Ollennu notes that Nkrumah believed in the Marxist doctrine of democracy. Ollennu continues to argue that:

the individual as such has no rights, but that his interest must always be subordinated to a policy of what amounts to a small hierarchy selected not by the free choice of the people, but by a ruling party which itself is not selected by the people (Omari, 1970, p. xv).

¹⁴⁶ OPS 14.

Justice Ollennu's observation of Nkrumah supports the latter's political worldview. However, Nkrumah's rhetorical posture belies his inner political biases, thereby providing a new reality for Ghanaians. Nkrumah observed:

Our Parliament has now become a corporate body made up of Party members voted in by the people as their representatives. As such, it will exercise the rights of the people as a unified body, working for the prosperity of Ghana and the happiness and welfare of the individuals who make up the nation.¹⁴⁷

Whilst Nkrumah continuously struggles to appear democratic, as regards the democratic nature of parliamentary representation, his rhetorical position presented a conflict between his own political thoughts and what he wanted to achieve with his speech among his Ghanaian and international audience. Whilst he did not personally believe in certain democratic tenets, at least, for a young Republic like Ghana, he still needed to achieve a certain level of democratic credibility as he took some major political steps towards dictatorship. Nkrumah's struggle to remain a dictator yet with a democratic rhetorical posture made his entire discourse in the 3rd February 1964 speech to the nation appear as a façade.

Effects of Nkrumah's Address

Nkrumah's earlier rhetoric of liberation, which was based upon the lives of Ghanaians, had by 1964 given way to rational political reality. His rhetoric was based on his own reality - a reality which largely existed as a mirage for Ghanaians who had no means of expressing opposition since Nkrumah had been successful in

¹⁴⁷ OPS 17.

concentrating all powers of the state in himself. How could Ghanaians in their minds have felt genuine about the results of the referendum with the fact that Nkrumah, two months earlier, had trampled upon the judiciary to satisfy his own will? How could the election results be different from that same line of manipulative political behaviour? Could Ghanaians believe that every voter in the Ashanti region – a region which had opposed Nkrumah's leadership for a period of over a decade will unanimously support a decision that made permanent Nkrumah's very government which they vehemently abhorred? Whilst these questions may constantly echo in a critic's mind upon examining the facts of the referendum vis-a-vis Nkrumah 3rd February rhetoric, the events which followed such political manipulation and repression could, perhaps, justly be predicted.

The discourse that Nkrumah launched after the nationwide referendum might have aggravated the tension within Ghana. Since the political events within Ghana under Nkrumah's administration were difficult to morally rationalize, perhaps, a possible communication strategy was rhetorical silence. But Nkrumah was a leader who did not know the eloquence of silence. Harlow (2011) argues that "the absence of public discourse is not the same thing as ignorance or unconcern" (p. 64). Silence, therefore, becomes an option for communication. But, on the other hand, Nkrumah could not have been silent about the undemocratic but legal legislation of his government when hitherto that same government had strongly served as a vanguard of democracy under a colonial parliament in the early 1950's. In a dictatorial cloak, I argue once again that Nkrumah still wanted to appear democratic to both his local and international audience who had witness his gradual transformation from a freedom fighter into a Republican tyrant. Nkrumah, therefore, sought to design a

forceful rhetoric that was geared towards making him appear democratic, when, in words and deeds, he had grown politically to represent the very opposite. Bankole Timothy (1963), the Sierra Leonean Journalist, concluded in his work, *Kwame Nkrumah: His Rise to Power*, with these words:

Freedom or fooldom? Democracy or Ghanocracy? Socialism or Nkrumahism? Or is this the much-vaunted African personality? History will judge and evaluate Kwame Nkrumah's performance and the quality of his leadership. And that chapter cannot be written until Kwame Nkrumah lays down the mantle of leadership voluntarily or through force of circumstances. Which will it be? Heaven alone knows (p. 184).

Clearly, the 3rd February address was meant to prepare the stage for the final legislation of the One-Party System. Nkrumah gave assent to the Bill and so on the 21st February 1964, Ghana constitutionally became a One-Party State. As to whether Nkrumah's rhetoric on One-Party State had been appropriately received by Ghanaians, the coup d'état that overthrew him from political office on 24th February 1966 and the immediate jubilant response of Ghanaians⁶⁴ provide some appropriate answers. Nkrumah's rhetoric on One-Party State had disillusioned his Ghanaian audience. Arendt (2005) argues that "since facts always occur in a context, a particular lie – that is, a falsehood that makes no attempt to change the whole context – tears, as it were, a hole in the fabric of factuality" (p. 308). Nkrumah's rhetorical attempt to alter the facts within the political situation in Ghana, therefore, presented a major challenge to his discourse, even if his rhetoric had any chance of making positive impact among the Ghanaian audience. Nkrumah's manipulation of political reality demonstrated his overall appreciation of his Ghanaian auditors. Omari (1970),

therefore, concludes that “the appeal of his message was intellectual, but was inseparably wedded to non-intellectual forms of persuasion” (p. 65), thereby giving a hint of the vain rhetorical choices he made which was characteristic of his 3rd February speech.

Conclusion

Nkrumah’s 3rd February 1964 address is markedly a deviation from his pre-Independence and Independence rhetoric which sought to project, to a greater extent, what appears to be the political reality of Ghanaians (then Gold Coasters). The discussion has demonstrated Nkrumah’s rational rhetorical invention of the outcome of the nationwide referendum in relation to the factual political situation within the country in 1964. It also sought to reveal the speech’s effort in establishing a democratic foundation of Nkrumah’s actions thereby justifying the very outcome of the nationwide referendum. Further, the chapter attempted a rhetorical view of the speech’s framing of the internal events as neo-colonial attacks. This was a means of giving justification to the government’s usurpation of the judiciary and the legislature albeit in a constitutional manner. In addition, the discussion explored the speech’s strategy of rhetorically associating Ghana and the CPP as a single inseparable entity. Again, Nkrumah’s rhetorical replacement of factual reality with rational/political reality through discourse was a key attempt to provide a new form of reality for Ghanaians as he ushered Ghana’s democracy into a totalitarian regime. He sought not to, borrowing from Arendt (2005), “flatter reality but to offer a full-fledged substitute for it” (p. 308). This brings into question rhetorical invention and

its relationship with reality and appearance. Whilst in 1950, fourteen years earlier, Nkrumah had called for 'Positive Action' seeking to enact freedom through democracy, Nkrumah's 1964 invention, in respect of its features and qualities, sought to diametrically oppose the earlier call for the freedom of Gold Coasters. In view of Nkrumah's rhetorical pursuit, Arendt's position on reality and appearance becomes crucial, especially as it remains unclear as to what legitimately and appropriately constitutes reality for Nkrumah as a political leader on one hand and Gold Coasters on the other hand when both Nkrumah's 1950 'Positive Action' protests and his call for One Party State are placed side by side for rhetorical justification. It may be concluded that the realities or appearances which the *rhetor* create to enact power could never be entirely justified in the face of factual truth since what may constitute truth may only comprise the rhetorical invention of the *rhetor*, in this case Nkrumah.

CHAPTER EIGHT

CONCLUSION

Introduction

The focus of the study was to examine the rhetoric of the political speeches of Kwame Nkrumah. First, what rhetorical strategies does he employ to create identification and solidarity with the masses? Secondly, in what different ways does Nkrumah use his rhetorical inventions to establish his credibility before his audience? Thirdly, what strategies does Nkrumah employ to logically develop his argumentation? Fourthly, how does Nkrumah achieve pathos in his political speeches?

Findings

The study demonstrated that Nkrumah established a systematic rhetorical progression to address the different exigencies which marked his political life. In an effort to break down the formidable walls of colonialism, Nkrumah employed a non-violent protest rhetoric which was a necessary ingredient to break through, if not entirely, the formidable walls of colonialism in the Gold Coast. Whilst protest rhetoric was, perhaps, adequate at the time in pushing for freedom within the Gold Coast, it sooner or later became an inadequate tool in the fight for freedom, especially in the early 1950's when black Gold Coasters finally gained access to the deliberative space within the colonial government.

The study revealed that from the rhetoric of protest, Nkrumah moved further to apply deliberative rhetoric as a means to formally engage the British Colonial Government on the subject of Gold Coast's independence. Again, the study revealed Nkrumah's rhetorical performance of Ghana's independence and how, on the heels of this performance, he launched a comprehensive Pan-African agenda. Thus, the rhetorical progression did not only provide an account for the progress of a nation from a dependent to an independent one; but rather, marked a rhetorical projection whose subject and focus was being shaped to account for the needs of not only a part but a larger whole (Africa).

The study further revealed Nkrumah's coherent rhetorical invention on Africa unity in 1963 – an invention which serves, perhaps, to provide a full rhetorical account of the hint which Nkrumah gives to his African audience about his intention to spearhead Africa's unity. The study demonstrates that Nkrumah's inventions were not only timely to the given rhetorical situations, but they (rhetorical inventions) were, perhaps, calculated to be interconnected within temporal space to give his targeted audience, both immediate and remote, a sustained argument which was purposed to serve a single purpose: the total decolonization of Africa.

The study reveals that the sustenance of Nkrumah's rhetorical message over a period of a decade, did not only make his arguments logically coherent and sustainable but ensured their memorability in the minds of the intended audience.

The research revealed that as part of Nkrumah's logical strategy he constantly employed logical association. With this tool Nkrumah associates two entities either positively or negatively for the purpose of achieving good or bad

publicity for one given entity. The finding demonstrated that Nkrumah employed negative association in his political speeches to tag western colonial powers in order to engender negative public opinion against them, especially within Ghana and in the larger African context. Further, Nkrumah negatively associates political opponents within Ghana and Africa who either serve as political threats or oppose Nkrumah on the ideological front. Through his rhetoric, he either brands them with tags of subversion or as agents of neo-colonialism. With regard to positive association, the research shows that Nkrumah constantly associates his political party, the CPP, with Ghana. In this instance of positive association, Nkrumah rhetorically indicates the absence of an alternative when it comes to Ghana as a motherland. In the same vein, the CPP, in Nkrumah's rhetoric, should become the only viable political entity in Ghana.

The study also showed that Nkrumah employs the argument of inclusion of the part in the whole. This argument becomes central to the subject of Africa's unity as in Addis Ababa Nkrumah argues for continental unity. In this argument, the importance of Africa is brought to the fore whilst minimizing the focus on individual states. Thus, through this argument Nkrumah deepens the continental discussion which seeks to project the debate on Africa's freedom. The use of this logical argumentation presents opportunity to various audiences in considering the big picture within a given rhetorical situation, instead of being overly concerned about the smaller parts which together form the bigger whole.

The study revealed that Nkrumah repeatedly applies symbolism as a strategic means of establishing his ethos as well as creating solidarity with his audience. In other words, the use of different symbols allows Nkrumah to be able to identify with

his audience. One dominant symbolism which features prominently in his discourse is his use of religion. He presents himself indirectly as Jesus preaching to the disciples (audience). In other situations, he re-enacts Moses' travels with the nation of Israel where he (Moses) appears before Pharaoh to demand freedom. In such religious symbolism, Nkrumah presents himself as the liberator (Moses) who carries a divine mandate to free the people of God (Gold Coasters) from bondage. Last but not least, he presents himself symbolically as the high priest who leads the nation to worship. In addition to his use of religious symbols, the study showed that Nkrumah sometimes employ military symbolism in which he calls the liberation army to fight in order to free Africa from the clutches of imperialism. In all the symbols that Nkrumah creates, he seeks to establish a certain communion with the audience for the purpose of causing them to give assent to his messages. Again, through these symbols, Nkrumah seeks to establish his ethos. His sense of leadership, irrespective of the constitution of his audience, is always brought to the fore in his use of symbols.

The study further revealed that Nkrumah employs the collective memory of his audience to create pathos in his address. Thus, the primary tool for Nkrumah's invention of his emotional appeal is the history of the subject under discussion. These histories, especially for Ghana and Africa, usually embody either the painful experiences or the heroic past of the nation and continent. Whether this collective memory of a people embodies a painful or heroic past, he carefully recollects them as shared experiences of his audience to arouse them emotionally for the acceptance of his message.

The study showed that Nkrumah repeatedly used his messages to address composite audiences, both immediate and remote. In such situations, he presented arguments whose various parts sought to address specific groups. A case in point is with respect to the strategy he employed in addressing three differing constituencies in his audience during his declaration of Ghana's independence in 1957. In that invention, first, he addresses Ghanaians and unites them as citizens of a new nation; secondly, he provides hope to fellow Africans in dependent territories by pledging Ghana's support; and lastly, he warns western colonial that Africans are on the move to reclaim their independence. Again, at the formation of the OAU in Addis Ababa, Nkrumah does not ignore the polarized ideological and interest groups which were present. He however, demonstrates his understanding of the audiences and addresses them, taking cognizance of their ideological and argumentation stance.

Lastly, the study demonstrated that presence can be achieved in an audience when a speaker employs epideictic rhetoric. The use of praise rhetoric, therefore, becomes a key strategy for Nkrumah to achieve presence. As he praises the gradual liberation of Africa from colonial rule, Nkrumah creates in the minds of his audience the closeness of a free Africa coming into being within the minds of his audience. At the first gathering of the Independent African territories, Nkrumah celebrates Ghana's freedom before his audience. The effects of the presence he creates through praise, creates a new awakening in Africa for freedom which spirals into national movements as a means of bringing into reality what Nkrumah has brought closer through presence.

Recommendations for Future Study

The study of the rhetoric of Kwame Nkrumah has demonstrated the quintessential role of rhetoric during the independence struggle of Ghana and Africa as a whole. With the establishment of democratic cultures in Africa, the need for a deeper appreciation and application of the fundamental principles of rhetoric has become not only essential but critical. As a result, more scholars should be encouraged to pay a critical attention to the shaping and formation of presidential political discourse in order to meet the communication demands of modern democratic governance in Ghana and Africa.

In addition, rhetoric scholars should pursue a comparative study of the presidential rhetorical discourse of Nkrumah's First Republic, which spanned from 1957 to 1966 and the fourth republic, which commenced from 1992 to date. This study is important to identify whether current presidential rhetoric in Ghana has been largely influenced by dominant liberation rhetoric of Nkrumah and also to identify how current key political exigencies have altered or maintained presidential rhetoric under Ghana's Fourth Republic.

Lastly, a study should be done by scholars to identify the use of African proverbs in Kwame Nkrumah's political rhetoric and the possible effect(s) of these proverbs on his rhetorical invention. Since proverbs highlight a key aspect of Africa's traditional discourse, a study of their use and occurrence in political rhetoric will not only be revealing but will be a tremendous contribution to the study of Africa's rhetoric.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, J.R. (1969). The rhetoric of coercion and persuasion: The reform bill of 1832. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 15(1), 187-195.
- Arendt, H. (2005). Truth and politics in J. Medina & D. Wood (Eds.), *Truth: Engagements across philosophical traditions* (pp. 295-314). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Aristotle. (2007). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse*. (G. A. Kennedy, Trans. & Ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Armah, K. (2004). *Peace without power: Ghana's foreign policy, 1957-1966*. Accra: University Press.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. (J.O. Urmson & M. Sbisá, Eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Biney, A. (2011). *The political and social thought of Kwame Nkrumah*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* (supplementary issue), Pennsylvania State University, 1-15.
- Bretton, H.L. (1967). *The rise and fall of Kwame Nkrumah*. London: Pall Mall Press.
- Brooke, R. (1929). *The collected poems of Rupert Brooke: With a memoir*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson.
- Burke, K. (1973). *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (3rd ed.). London: University of California Press.

- Endres, D. & Senda-Cook, S. (2011). Location matters: The rhetoric of place in protest. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 97(3), 257-282.
- Endres, D. (2011). American Indian activism and audience: Rhetorical analysis of Leonard Peltier's response to denial of clemency. *Communication Reports*, 24(1), 1-11.
- Farrell, T. B. (1993). *Norms of rhetorical culture*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice* (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Fuller, H. (2008). Civitatis Ghanienensis conditor: Kwame Nkrumah, symbolic nationalism and the iconography of Ghanaian money 1957 – the Golden Jubilee. *Nations and Nationalism*, 14(3), 520-541.
- Gandhi, M. (1961). *Non-violent resistance – Satyagraha*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Gregg, R. B. (1971). The ego-function of the rhetoric of protest. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 4(2), 71-91.
- Hadjor, K.B. (1988). *Nkrumah and Ghana: The dilemma of post-colonial power*. London: Kegan Paul International.
- Hahn, D.F. (1980). Corrupt rhetoric: President Ford and the Mayaguez affair. *Communication Quarterly*, 28(2), 38-43.
- Haiman, F.S. (1967) The rhetoric of the streets: Some legal and ethical considerations. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53, 99-113.

- Harlow, W.F. (2011). The triumph of silence: President George H.W. Bush's refusal to denounce apartheid in South Africa. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 14(1), 45-68.
- Hillbruner, A. (1966). *Critical dimensions: The Art of public address criticism*. New York: Random House.
- Howell, T.A. (1972). *Ghana & Nkrumah*. New York: Facts on File, Inc.
- Johnstone, C.L. (1974). Thoreau and civil disobedience: A rhetorical paradox. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 60(3), 313-322.
- Jordan, J.W. (2003). Kennedy's romantic moon and its rhetorical legacy for space exploration. *Rhetoric and Public Affairs*, 6(2), 209-232.
- Lee, S., & Campbell, K. K. (1994). "Korean president Roh Tae-Woo's 1988 inaugural address: Campaigning for investiture. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 80(1), 37-52.
- Lyons, L. (1998). Moral judgment, historical reality, and civil disobedience. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 27(1), 31-9.
- Medhurst, M.J. (1988). "Truman's rhetorical reticence, 1945-1947: An interpretive essay." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 74(1), 52-70.
- Milne, J. (2000). *Kwame Nkrumah: A biography*. (New ed.). London: Panaf Books.
- Monfils, B. (1977). A multifaceted image: Kwame Nkrumah extrinsic rhetorical strategies. *Journal of Black Studies*, 7(3), 313-330.

- Murphy, J.J. (1987). *Quintilian on the teaching of speaking and writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Murphy, J. M. (1997). Intervening authority: Bill Clinton, Martin Luther King, Jr., and the orchestration of rhetorical traditions. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 83(1), 71-89.
- Myers, F. (1999). Political argumentation and the composite audience: A case study. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 85(1), 55-71.
- Nkrumah, K. (1950, January 8). Declaration of positive action speech [cd]. Accra: Ghana Broadcasting Corporation.
- Nkrumah, K. (1953, July 10). Motion of independence speech [cd]. Accra: Ghana Broadcasting Corporation.
- Nkrumah, K. (1957). *The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons.
- Nkrumah, K. (1957, March 6). Independence declaration speech [cd]. Accra: Ghana Broadcasting Corporation.
- Nkrumah, K. (1957, June 20). Why the Queen's head is coming off our coins. *Daily Sketch*, p. 12.
- Nkrumah, K. (1958, December 8). All African people's conference speech [cd]. Accra: Ghana Broadcasting Corporation.
- Nkrumah, K. (1997). A new era. In S. Obeng (Ed.), *Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah Vol. 4* (pp. 12-17). Accra: Afram Publications.
- Nkrumah, K. (1997). Conference of African heads of state and government. In

- S. Obeng (Ed.), *Selected Speeches of Kwame Nkrumah Vol. 5* (pp. 30-46).
Accra: Afram Publications.
- Omari, T.P. (1970). *Kwame Nkrumah: The anatomy of an African dictatorship*.
London: C. Hurst & Company.
- Padmore, G. (1953). *The Gold Coast revolution*. London: Dennis Dobson Ltd.
- Padmore, G. (Ed.). (1947). *Colonial and coloured unity: A programme of action; history of the Pan African congress* (2nd ed.). S.I.: Hammersmith Bookshop.
- Palmer-Mehta, V. (2009). Aung San Suu Kyi and the rhetoric of social protest in Burma. *Women's Studies in Communication*, 32(2), 151-179.
- Parry-Giles, S. J. & Parry-Giles, T. (2000). Collective memory, political nostalgia, and the rhetorical presidency: Bill Clinton's commemoration of the march on Washington, August 28, 1998. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 86(4), 417-437.
- Perelman, C. (1979). *The new rhetoric and the humanities: Essays on rhetoric and its applications*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Perelman, C. (1982). *The realm of rhetoric*. Notre Dame. Translated by Klubark W. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Perelman, C., & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969). *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*, translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame, Ind.: Notre Dame University Press.
- Pierard, R. V. & Linder, R.D. (1988). *Civil religion and the presidency*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Pobee, J. S. (1991). *Religion and politics in Ghana*. Accra: Asempa Publishers.

- Patton, M.Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). London: Sage Publications.
- Powell, E. (1984). *Private secretary (female)/Gold Coast*. London: Hurst.
- Quartey, S. (2007). *Missionary practices on the Gold Coast, 1832-1895: Discourse, gaze and gender in the Basel missions in pre-colonial West Africa*. New York: Cambria Press.
- Rathbone, R. (2000). *Nkrumah & the chiefs: The politics of chieftaincy in Ghana*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Rooney, D. (2007). *Kwame Nkrumah: Vision and tragedy*. (New ed.). Accra, Ghana: Sub-Saharan Publishers.
- Saffu, Y. (2008). The struggle for Ghanaians independence, 1947-1957. In K. Gyekye (Ed.), *Ghana @ 50 Anniversary Lectures* (pp. 35-79). Accra: National Planning Committee of the Golden Jubilee Celebrations.
- Salazar, P.-J. (2011). Patrice Lumumba: The Congo independence speech.” Philippe-Joseph Salazar (Ed.). *African Yearbook of Rhetoric*, 2(3), 41.
- Salazar, P.-J. (2002). *An African Athens: Rhetoric and the shaping of democracy in South Africa*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sherwood, M. (1996). *Kwame Nkrumah: The years abroad 1935-1947*. Accra: Freedom Publications.

- Simms, R. (2003). I am a non-denominational Christian and a Marxist Socialist: A Gramscian analysis of the Convention People's Party and Kwame Nkrumah's use of religion. *Sociology of Religion*, 64(4), 463-477.
- Simms, R. (2006). Christianity is black with a capital 'B': The religion and politics of Kwame Nkrumah. *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 30(2), 118-128.
- Simons, H. W. (1970). Requirements, problems and strategies: A theory of persuasion for social movements. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56(1), 1-8.
- Thompson, W. S. (1969). *Ghana's foreign policy, 1957-1966: Diplomacy, ideology, and the new state*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Timothy, B. (1963). *Kwame Nkrumah: His rise to power*. (new ed.). London: Allen & Unwin.
- Warnick, B. (1996). Argument schemes and the construction of social reality: John F. Kennedy's address to the Houston Ministerial Association. *Communication Quarterly*, 44(2), 183-196.
- White, S.B. (2006). Telling the story: Kansas City Mayor and United Methodist Pastor Emanuel Cleaver's use of storytelling to transcend rhetorical barriers. *Journal of African American Studies*, 9(4), 32-44.

APPENDIX (PA)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S DECLARATION OF 'POSITIVE ACTION' IN THE GOLD COAST ON 8TH JANUARY 1950 IN ACCRA

1 In our present vigorous struggle for Self-government, nothing strikes so much terror into the hearts of the Imperialists and their agents than the term Positive Action. This is especially so because of their fear of the masses responding to the call to apply this final form of resistance in case the British Government failed to grant us our freedom consequent on the publication of the Coussey Committee Report.

2 The term Positive Action has been erroneously and maliciously publicised, no doubt by the Imperialists and their concealed agent-provocateurs and stooges. These political renegades, enemies of the Convention People's Party and for that matter of Ghana's freedom, have diabolically publicised that the C.P.P.'s programme of positive action means riot, looting and disturbances, in a word, violence. Accordingly, some citizens of Accra, including myself, were invited to a meeting of the Ga Native Authority and the Ga State Council on Thursday, October 20, at 1 p.m. "to discuss," as the invitation stated, "the unfortunate lawless elements in the country and any possible solution."

3 At that meeting, I had the unique opportunity of explaining what Positive Action means, to the satisfaction of the Ga Native Authority and the Ga State Council, and the meeting concluded with a recommendation by them that I should call a meeting to explain to the members of the Convention People's Party, as I did to them, what I mean by Positive Action in order to disabuse the minds of those who are going about misinterpreting the Positive Action Programme of the Convention People's Party.

4 Before I proceed to my proper topic, I must take this opportunity to dispel the wild rumour that the Ga Manche said at the meeting that the Convention People's Party should be suppressed and that I should be deported from Accra. Nothing of the sort was ever suggested by the Ga Manche even though some of the speakers tried to convey such an idea, but the Ga Manche promptly over-ruled that.

5 Party Members, imagine the wicked misrepresentation, chicanery, falsehood, the untruths, the lies and deception, in such news. This is the way our struggle is being misrepresented to the outside world; but the truth shall ultimately prevail.

6 It is a comforting fact to observe that we have cleared the major obstacle to the realisation to our national goal in that ideologically the people of this country and their chiefs have accepted the idea of Self-government even now. With that major

ideological victory achieved, what is left now is chiefly a question of strategy and the intensity and earnestness of our demand. The British Government and the people of Britain, with the exception of die-hard Imperialists, acknowledge the legitimacy of our demand for Self-government. However, it is and must be by our own exertion and pressure that the British Government can relinquish its authority and hand over the control of affairs, that is the Government, to the people of this country and their Chiefs.

7 There are two ways to achieve Self-government: either by armed revolution and violent overthrow of the existing regime, or by constitutional and legitimate non-violent methods. In other words: either by armed might or by moral pressure. For instance, Britain prevented the two German attempts to enslave her by armed might, while India liquidated British Imperialism there by moral pressure. We believe that we can achieve Self-government even now by constitutional means without resort to any violence.

8 We live by experience and by intelligent adaptation to our environment. From our knowledge of the history of man, from our knowledge of the Colonial liberation movements, Freedom or Self-government has never been handed over to any Colonial country on a silver platter. The United States, India, Burma, Ceylon and other erstwhile Colonial territories have had to wage a bitter and vigorous struggle to attain their freedom. Hence the decision by the Convention People's Party to adopt a programme of non-violent Positive Action to attain Self-government of the people of this country and their Chiefs.

9 We have talked too much and pined too long over our disabilities – political, social and economic; and it is now time that we embarked on constitutional positive steps to achieve positive results. We must remember that because of the educational backwardness of the Colonial countries, the majority of the people of this country cannot read. There is only one thing they can understand and that is Action.

10 By Positive Action we mean the adoption of all legitimate and constitutional means by which we can cripple the forces of Imperialism in this country. The weapons of Positive Action are: (1) Legitimate political agitation; (2) Newspaper and educational campaigns; and (3) as a last resort, the constitutional application of strikes, boycotts and non-co-operation based on the principle of absolute non-violence.

11 We have been unduly criticised by our political opponents who say that it is wrong for us to tell the Imperialists that we shall resort to non-violent strikes and boycotts as a last resort, if need be, to attain our freedom. Their contention is that we should have kept this secret and spring a surprise on the Government. As for us, our faith in justice and fair play forbids us to adopt such sneaky methods.

12 In the first place, we like to use open methods and to be fair and above board in our dealings. We have nothing to hide from the British Government. Secondly, and what is more important, if the C.P.P. is a democratic organisation, then the members must be taken into its confidence and their approval secured for such an important policy, and they must be given the opportunity to prepare for any eventuality. Even in the case of a declaration of war, notice is first given.

13 Mr. C.V.H. Rao, in his book entitled “Civil Disobedience Movement in India”, has this to say:

“Constitutional agitation without effective sanction behind it of organised national determination to win freedom is generally lost on a country like Britain, which can appreciate only force or its moral equivalent ... An important contributory factor to the satisfactory settlement of a disputed issue is the extent and the nature of the moral force and public sympathy generated by the righteousness of the cause for which the suffering is undergone and the extent of the moral reaction it has produced on the party against which it is directed.”

14 The passive sympathy of the masses must be converted into active participation in the struggle for freedom; there must also be created a widespread political consciousness and a sense of national self-respect. These can only be achieved when the mass of the people understand the issue. These are not the days when people follow leaders blindly.

15 As already explained, Positive Action has already begun, by our political education, by our newspaper agitation and platform speeches and also by the establishment of the Ghana schools and Colleges as well as the fearless and legitimate activities of the C.P.P.

16 But as regards the final stage of Positive Action, namely, Nationwide Non-violent Sit-down-at-home Strikes, Boycotts, and Non-co-operation, we shall not call them into play until all the avenues of our political endeavours of attaining Self-government have been closed. They will constitute the last resort. Accordingly, we shall first carefully study the Report of the Coussey Committee. If we find it favourably, we shall accept it and sing alleluia. But if we find it otherwise, we shall first put forward our own suggestions and proposals and upon refusal to comply with them we shall invoke Positive Action straight away on the lines indicative above.

17 What we all want is Self-government so that we can govern ourselves in our own country. We have the natural, legitimate and inalienable right to decide for ourselves the sort of government we want and we cannot be forced against our will in accepting or perpetuating anything that will be detrimental to the true interests of the people of this country and their Chiefs.

18 Therefore, whilst we are anxiously awaiting the Report of the Coussey Constitution Committee, I implore you all in the name of the Party to be calm and resolute. Let us advance fearlessly and courageously armed with the Party's programme of positive Action based on the principle of absolute non-violence.

19 Long live the Convention People's Party. Long live the forward march of the people of this country. Long live the new Ghana that is to be.

APPENDIX (MOD)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S MOTION OF INDEPENDENCE ON 10TH JULY 1953 IN ACCRA

1 Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this Assembly in adopting the Government's Whitepaper on constitutional reform do authorize the Government to request that Her Majesty's Government as soon as the necessary constitutional and administrative arrangements for independence are made, should introduce an Act of Independence into the United Kingdom Parliament declaring the Gold Coast a sovereign and Independent state within the Commonwealth; and further, that this Assembly do authorize the Government to ask Her Majesty's Government without prejudice to the above request, to amend as a matter of urgency the Gold Coast (Constitution) Order in Council 1950, in such a way as to provide inter alia that the Legislative Assembly shall be composed of members directly elected by the secret ballot, and that all Members of the Cabinet shall be Members of the Assembly and directly responsible to it.

2 Mr. Speaker, it is with great humility that I stand before my countrymen and before the representatives of Britain, to ask this House to give assent to this Motion. In this solemn hour, I am deeply conscious of the grave implications of what we are about to consider and, as the great honour of proposing this Motion has fallen to my lot, I pray God to grant me the wisdom, strength and endurance to do my duty as it should be done. We are called upon to exercise statesmanship of a high order, and I would repeat, if I may, my warning of October, that 'every idle or ill-considered word- will militate against the cause which we all have at heart'. It is, as Edmund Burke said (and I am quoting here):

“our business carefully to cultivate in our minds, to rear to the most perfect vigour and maturity, every sort of generous and honest feeling that belongs to our nature. To bring the dispositions that are lovely in private life into the service and conduct of the commonwealth, so to be patriots as not to forget we are gentlemen”.

3 At the outset, I would like to remind Honourable Members of a passage in the White Paper, that “only after the Legislative Assembly debate will the proposals of this Government take their final shape and be communicated to the United Kingdom Government”. Therefore, let your arguments be cogent and constructive. The range of this debate must be national, not regional; patriotic, not partisan; and I now ask that a spirit of co-operation and goodwill pervade this debate. It was Aristotle, the master who knows, who said:

“in practical matters the end is not mere speculative knowledge of what is to be done, but rather the doing of it. It is not enough to know about virtue, then, be must endeavour to possess it, and to use it...”

As with virtue, so with Self-government: we must endeavour to possess it, and use it. And then the Motion which I have prepared is the means to possess it.

4 In seeking your mandate, I am asking you to give my Government the power to bring to fruition the longing hopes, the ardent dreams, the fervent aspirations of the chiefs and people of our country. Throughout a century of alien rule our people have, with ever increasing tendency, looked forward to that bright and glorious day when they shall regain their ancient heritage, and once more take their place rightly as free men in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have frequent examples to show that there comes a time in the history of all colonial peoples when they must, because of their will to throw off the hampering shackles of colonialism, boldly assert their God – given right to be free of a foreign ruler. Today we are here to claim this right to our independence.

5 Mr. Speaker, the motion is in two parts. The first part not merely states our aim, but poses the question to her Majesty's Government which is more fully set out in the White Paper. There is a general demand in the Gold Coast for self-government within the Commonwealth and the United Kingdom Government should be informed of this demand, and be requested to make a declaration recognizing the existence of this demand, and expressing Her Majesty's Government's readiness to introduce an Act of Independence. This is the question which we are asking Her Majesty's Government in terms which clearly require an answer. That is the first thing we want: a declaration. But, even more important, we want to possess our self-government; we want an Act of Independence. The second half of the Motion sets out in a straight-forward manner to obtain authority of the House for the presentation to Her Majesty's Government of the detailed proposals which we have made for immediate constitutional reform.

6 We asked that these proposals may be considered on their merits and without prejudice to the request which has been made in the first half of the Motion. We request that the composition of our Assembly may be so amended that all its members shall be directly elected by secret ballot. Similarly, we have gone forward to request that the whole Cabinet may be composed of representative ministers. We have also made other proposals of immediate and striking importance, and I am confident that this assembly will give the Motion before it its unanimous endorsement and support. Last year, I brought this house changes in the constitution which were, at the time, regarded as of minor importance. I was accused, indeed, of personal ambition in seeking the title of Prime Minister. We can now, Mr. Speaker, see the result for ourselves. Certainly nobody outside the Gold Coast has regarded my position has regarded the position as anything but what the name implies.

7 The prestige of the Gold Coast Government overseas, has in fact, been enhanced by this change. Even the co-ordination of the functions of my own

colleagues has been made more successful by the increase in status. I believe that there is more decision in our activities as a Cabinet than there was before, and that we are better equipped to get things done. The freedom we demand is for our country as a whole, this freedom we are claiming is for our children, for the generations yet unborn, that they may see the light of day and live as men and women with the right to work out the destiny of their own country.

Mr. Speaker, our demand for self-government is a just demand. It is a demand admitting of no compromise. The right of a people to govern themselves is a fundamental principle, and to compromise on the principle is to betray it. To quote you a great political scientist –

8 “To negotiate with forces that are hostile on matters of principle means to sacrifice principle itself. Principle is indivisible. It is either wholly kept or wholly sacrificed. The slightest concession on matters of principle implies the abandonment of principle.”

The right of a people to decide their own destiny, to make their way in freedom, is not to be measured by the yardstick of colour or degree of social development. It is an inalienable right of peoples which they are powerless to exercise when forces, stronger than they themselves, by whatever means, for whatever reasons, take this right away from them. If there is to be a criterion of a people’s preparedness for self – government, then I say it is their readiness to assume the responsibility of ruling themselves. For who but a people themselves can say when they are prepared? How can others judge when that moment has arrived in the destiny of a subject people? What other gauge can there be?

9 Mr. Speaker, never in history of the world has an alien ruler granted self-rule to a people on a silver platter. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I say that a people’s readiness and willingness to assume the responsibilities of self-rule is the single criterion of their preparedness to undertake those responsibilities. I have described on a previous occasion in this House what were the considerations which led me to agree to the participation of my Party in the General Election of 1951, and hence in the Government of the Gold Coast under the terms of the 1950 Constitution Order in Council. In making that decision, I took on the task of proving to the world that we were prepared to perform our duties with responsibility, to set in motion the many reforms which our people needed, and to work from within the Government and within the Assembly, that is, by constitutional means, for the immediate aim of self-government.

10 We have only been in office, Mr. Speaker, for two and a half years, and we have kept these objectives constantly in mind. Let there be no doubt that we are equally determined not to rest until we have gained them. We are encouraged in our efforts by the thought that in so acting we are showing that we are able to govern

ourselves and thereby we are putting an end to the myth that Africans are unable to manage their own affairs, even when given the opportunity. We can never be satisfied with what we have so far achieved. The Government certainly is not of that mind. Our country has proved that it is more than ready. For despite the legacies of a century of colonial rule, in the short space of time since your Representative Ministers assumed the responsibilities of office, we have addressed ourselves boldly to the task of laying sound economic and social foundations on which this beloved country of ours can raise a solid democratic society.

11 The spirit of responsibility and enterprise which has animated our actions in the past two years will continue to guide us in the future, for we shall always act in the spirit of our Party's motto: "Forward ever, backwards never". For we know notwithstanding that the essence of politics is the realization of what is possible.

Mr. Speaker, we have now come to the most important stage of our constitutional development; we can look back on the stages through which we have passed during these last few years: first, our discussions with the Secretary of State leading to the changes of last year; then the questions posed in the October statement, which were to be answered by all parties, groups and councils interested in this great issue; the consultations with the Territorial Councils, with the political parties, with the Trade Union Congress. We have proceeded logically and carefully, and as I view it, the country has responded fully to my call.

12 Every representation which we received – and there were many – has received my careful consideration. The talks which I had with the political parties and the Trade Union Congress, and the committees of the Asanteman and Joint Provincial Councils, were frank and cordial. I had also received a special invitation to attend a meeting in Tamale with the Territorial Council, the Traditional Rulers and the Members of the Legislative Assembly. Naturally I accepted the invitation, because it was clear that if I had not held the discussions with the Northern Territories, the unity of the Gold Coast might have been endangered and our progress towards self-government might have been delayed. The reverse has been the case. We have adapted some of our proposals to meet Northern Territories wishes, and have been able to set their minds at rest on several issues of the greatest importance to them and to the Gold Coast as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, sir, the days of forgetting about our brothers in the North, and in the Trust Territory, are over.

13 Criticisms have been leveled against the Government for the secrecy with which these talks were surrounded, and I should like to tell the country why this was necessary. When we went to the talks, of course, the Government members had some idea of the way their collective views on the representations were being formulated. We carefully explained, however, that our views were not finally decided and they

would not be until we had had an opportunity of hearing any further views which these bodies might care to express in addition to their memoranda submitted. Having heard these views, we also sought an expression of opinion on specific problems which had occurred to us. But in order that our discussions could be of true value, frank and unreserved, I stated at an early stage that I should be grateful if the conversations could be regarded as strictly confidential. I am glad to place on record the value of the discussions which we held and the extent to which the undertaking which I was given was honoured. I hope that the bodies which were consulted also feel that the discussions were worthwhile.

14 Mr. Speaker, knowing full well, therefore, the will of the chiefs and people whom we represent, I am confident that with the support of this House, Her Majesty's Government will freely accede to our legitimate and righteous demand to become a self-government unit within the Commonwealth. I put my confidence in the willing acceptance of this demand by Her Majesty's Government, because it is consistent with the declared policy of successive United Kingdom Governments. Indeed, the final transition from the stage of responsible government as a colony to the independence of a sovereign state guiding its own policies, is the apotheosis of this same British policy in relation to its dependencies.

Mr. Speaker, pray allow me to quote from Britain's own Ministers. Mr. Creech Jones, as Colonial Secretary in the first post-war Labour Government, stated that "The central purpose of British Colonial policy is simple. It is to guide the Colonial Territories to responsible self-government within the Commonwealth in conditions that ensure to the people concerned both a fair standard of living and freedom from oppression from any quarter."

15 Again, on 12th July, 1950, in the House of Commons, Mr. James Griffiths, Mr. Creech Jones' successor, reiterated this principle: "The aim and purpose," he said, "is to guide the Colonial Territories to responsible self-government within the Commonwealth and, to that end, to assist them to the utmost of our capacity and resources to establish those economic and social conditions upon which alone self-government can be soundly based."

Last, I give you the words of Mr. Oliver Lyttelton, Colonial Secretary in Her Majesty's Conservative Government of today: "We all aim at helping the Colonial Territories to attain self-government within the Commonwealth."

16 Nor is this policy anything new in British Colonial history. The right to self-government of Colonial Dependencies has its origin in the British North America Act of 1867, which conceded to the provinces of Canada, complete rule. The independence of the other white Dominions of Australia and New Zealand was followed by freedom for South Africa. And since the end of the Second World War, our coloured brothers in Asia have achieved independence, and we are proud to be

able to acknowledge the sovereign States of India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Burma. There is no conflict that I can see between our claim and the professed policy of all parties and governments of the United Kingdom. We have here in our country a stable society. Our economy is healthy, as good as any for a country of our size. In many respects, we are much better off than many sovereign states. And our potentials are large.

17 Our people are fundamentally homogeneous, nor are we plagued with religious and tribal problems. In fact, the whole democratic tradition of our society precludes the *herrenvolk* doctrine. The remnants of this doctrine are now an anachronism in our midst, and their days are numbered.

Mr. Speaker, we have travelled long distances from the days when our fathers came under alien subjugation to the present time. We stand at the threshold of self government and do not waver. The paths have been tortuous, and fraught with peril, but the positive and tactical action we have adopted is leading us to the New Jerusalem, the golden city of our hearts' desire! I am confident, therefore, that I express the wishes and feelings of the chiefs and people of this country in hoping that the final transfer of power to your Representative Ministers may be done in a spirit of amity and friendship, so that, having peacefully achieved our freedom, the peoples of both countries – Britain and the Gold Coast – may form a new relationship based upon mutual respect, trust and friendship.

18 Thus may the new partnership implicit in the Statute of Westminster be clothed in a new meaning. For then shall we be one of the “autonomous communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs, though united by a common allegiance to the Crown, freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations”, in accordance with the Balfour Declaration of 1926 which was embodied in the Statute of Westminster in 1931. Today, more even before, Britain needs more “autonomous communities freely associated”. For freely associated communities make better friends than those associated by subjugation we see today, Mr. Speaker, how much easier and friendlier are the bonds between Great Britain and her former dependencies of India, Pakistan and Ceylon.

19 So much of the bitterness that poisoned the relations between these former colonies and the United Kingdom has been absolved by the healing power of a better feeling that a new friendship has been cemented in the free association of autonomous communities. These, and other weighty reasons, allied with the avowed aim of British colonial policy, will, I am confident, inspire Britain to make manifest once more to a sick and weary world her duty to stand by her professed aim. A free and independent Gold Coast, taking its rightful place in the peace and amity by the side of the other Dominions, will provide a valid and effective sign that freedom can

be achieved in a climate of good will and thereby accrue to the intrinsic strength of the Commonwealth. The old concepts of the Empire, of conquest, domination and exploitation are fast dying in an awakening world.

20 Among the colonial peoples, there is a vast, untapped reservoir of peace and goodwill towards Britain, would she but divest herself of the outmoded, moth-eaten trappings of two centuries ago, and present herself to her colonial peoples in a new and shining vestment and hand us the olive branch of peace and love, and give us a guiding hand in working out our own destinies. In the very early days of the Christian era, long before England had assumed any importance, long even before her people had united into a nation, our ancestors had attained a great empire, which lasted until the eleventh century, when it fell before the attacks of the Moors of the North. As its height that empire stretched from Timbuktu to Bamako, and even as far as the Atlantic. It is said that lawyers and scholars were much respected in that empire and that the inhabitants of Ghana wore garments of wool, cotton, silk and velvet. There was trade in copper, gold and textile fabrics, and jewels and weapons of gold and silver were carried.

21 Thus may we take pride in the name of Ghana, not out of romanticism, but as an inspiration for the future. It is right and proper that we should know about our past, for just as the future moves from the present so the present has emerged from the past. Nor need we be ashamed of our past. There was much in it of glory. What our ancestors achieved in the context of their contemporary society gives us confidence that we can create, out of that past, a glorious future, not in terms of war and military pomp, but in terms of social progress and of peace. For we repudiate war and violence. Our battles shall be against the old ideas that keep men trammelled in their own greed; against the crass stupidities that breed hatred, fear and inhumanity. The heroes of our future will be those who can lead our people out of the stifling fog of disintegration through serfdom, into the valley of light and purpose, endeavour and determination will create that brotherhood which Christ proclaimed two thousand years ago, and about which so much is said, but so little done.

22 Mr. Speaker, in calling up our past, it is meet, on an historic occasion like this, to pay tribute to those ancestors of ours who laid our national traditions, and those others who opened the path which made it possible to reach today the great moment at which we stand. As with our enslaved brothers dragged from these shores to the United States and to the West Indies, throughout our tortuous history, we have not been docile under the heels of the conqueror. Having known by our own traditions and experience the essentiality of unity and of government, we constantly formed ourselves into cohesive blocs as a means of resistance against the alien force within our borders. And so today we recall the birth of the Ashanti nation through Okomfo Anokye and Osei Tutu and the symbolism entrenched in the Golden Stool;

the valiant war against the British, the banishment of Nana Prempeh the First to the Seychelle Islands; the temporary disintegration of the nation and its subsequent reunification. And so we come to the Bond of 1844.

23 Following trade with the early merchant adventurers who came to the Gold Coast, the first formal association of Britain with our country was effected by the famous Bond of 1844, which accorded Britain the trade rights in the country. But from these humble beginnings of trade and friendship, Britain assumed political control of this country. But our inalienable right still remains, as my friend George Padmore, puts it in his recent book, *The Gold Coast Revolution*, and I quote, “When the Gold Coast Africans demand self-government today, they are, in consequence, merely asserting their birthright which they never really surrendered to the British who, disregarding their treaty obligation of 1844, gradually usurped full sovereignty over the country”.

Then the Fanti Confederation – the earliest manifestation of Gold Coast nationalism occurred in 1868 when Fanti Chiefs attempted to form the Fanti Confederation in order to defend themselves against the might of the Ashanti and the incipient political encroachment of British merchants.

24 It was also a union of the coastal states for mutual economic and social development. This was declared a dangerous conspiracy with the consequent arrest of its leaders. Then the Aborigines Rights Protection Society was the next nationalist movement to be formed with its excellent aims and objects, and by putting up their titanic fight for which we cannot be sufficiently grateful, they formed an unforgettable bastion for the defence of our God-given land and thus preserved our inherent right to freedom. Such men as Mensah-Sarbah, Atta Ahuma, Sey and Wood have played their role in this great fight. Next came the National Congress of British West Africa. The end of the first Great War brought its strains and stresses and the echoes of the allied slogan, “We fight for freedom” did not pass unheeded in the ears of Casely – Hayford, Hutton – Mills and other national stalwarts who were some of the moving spirits of the National Congress of British West Africa.

25 The machinations of imperialism did not take long to smother the dreams of the people concerned, but today their aims and objects are being more than gratified with the appointment of African judges and other improvement in our national life. As with the case of the National Congress of British West Africa, the United Gold Coast Convention was organized at the end of the Second World War to give expression to the people’s desire for better conditions. The British Government, seeing the threat to its security here, arrested six members of the Convention and detained them for several weeks until the Watson Commission came. The stand taken by the Trade Union Congress, the farmers, students and women of the country, provides one of the most epic stories in our national struggle.

26 In June 1949, the Convention People's Party with its uncompromising principles led the awakened masses to effectively demand their long lost heritage. And today, the country moves steadily forward to its proud goal. Going back over the years to the establishment of constitutional development, we find that the first Legislative Council to govern the country was established in 1850; thirty-eight years later the first African, in the person of John Sarbah, was admitted to the Council. It was not until 1916 that the Clifford constitution increased the number of Africans, which was four in 1910, to six. But these were mainly councils for officials.

The Guggisberg Constitution of 1925 increased the unofficial representation in the council almost to par with the officials. This position was reversed by the Burns Constitution of 1946 which created an unofficial majority. The abortive Colony-Ashanti Collaboration of 1944 was the prelude to this change.

27 The Coussey Constitution of 1951 further democratized the basis of representation; and now, for the first time in our history, this government is proposing the establishment of a fully elected Assembly with Ministers directly responsible to it. We have experienced Indirect Rule, we have had to labour under the yoke of our own destiny, caused by the puffed-up pride of those who were lucky to enjoy better opportunities in life than their less fortunate brothers; we have experienced the slow and painful progress of constitutional changes by which, from councils on which Africans were either absent or merely nominated, this august House has evolved through the exercise by the enfranchised people of their democratic right to a voice in their own affairs and in doing they have shown their confidence in their own countrymen by placing on us the responsibility for our country's affairs.

28 And so through the years, many have been laid to final rest from the stresses and dangers of the national struggle and many like, our illustrious friends of the Opposition, notwithstanding the fact that we may differ on many points, have also contributed a share to the totality of our struggle. And we hope that whatever our differences, we shall today become united in the demand for our country's freedom. As I said earlier, what we ask is not for ourselves on this side of the House, but for the chiefs and people of this country – the right to live as free men in the comity of nations. Were not our ancestors ruling themselves before the white man came to these our shores? I have earlier made reference to the ancient history of our more distant forebears in Ghana. To assert that certain people are capable of ruling themselves whilst others are not yet "ready" as the saying goes, smacks to me more of imperialism than of reason. Biologists of repute maintain that there is no such thing as a "superior" race.

29 Men and women are as much products of their environment – geographic, climatic, ethnic, cultural, social – as of instincts and physical heredity. We are

determined to change our environment, and we shall advance in like manner. According to the motto of the valiant *Accra Evening News* – “We prefer self-government with danger to servitude in tranquility”. Doubtless we shall make mistakes as have all other nations. We are human beings and hence fallible. But we can try also to learn from the mistakes of others so that we may avoid the deepest pitfalls into which they have fallen. Moreover, the mistakes we may make will be our own mistakes, and it will be our responsibility to put them right. As long as we are ruled by others we shall lay our mistakes at their door, and our sense of responsibility will remain dulled. Freedom brings responsibilities and our experience can be enriched only by the acceptance of these responsibilities.

30 In the two years of our representative Government, we have become most deeply conscious of the tasks which will devolve upon us with self-rule. But we do not shrink from them; rather are we more than ever anxious to take on the reins of full self-government. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the mood of the chiefs and people of this country at this time; on the fundamental choice between colonial status and self government, we are unanimous. And the vote that will be taken on the motion before this assembly will proclaim this to the world.

Honorable Members, you are called, here and now, as a result of the relentless tide of history, by Nemesis as it were, to a sacred charge, for you hold the destiny of our country in your hands. The eyes and ears of the world are upon you; yea, our oppressed brothers throughout this vast continent of Africa and the New World are looking to you with desperate hope, as an inspiration to continue their grim fight against cruelties which are a disgrace to humanity, and to the civilization which the white man has set himself to teach us.

31 At this time, history is being made; a colonial people in Africa has put forward the first definite claim for independence. An African colonial proclaim that they are ready to assume the stature of free men and to prove to the world that they are worthy of the trust. I know that you will not fail those who are listening for the mandate that you will give to your Representative Ministers. For we are ripe for freedom, and our people will not be denied. They are conscious that the right is theirs, and they know that freedom is not something that our people can bestow on another as a gift. They claim it as their own and none can keep it from them.

And while yet we are making our claim for self-government I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that self-government is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end, to the building of the good life to the benefit of all, regardless of tribe, creed, color or station in life. Our aim is to make this country a worthy place for all its citizens, a country that will be a shining light throughout the whole continent of Africa, given inspiration far beyond its frontiers.

32 And this we can do by dedicating ourselves to unselfish service to humanity. We must learn from the mistakes of others so that we may, in so far as we can, avoid a repetition of those tragedies which have overtaken other human societies. We must not follow blindly, but must endeavour to create. We must aspire to lead in the arts of peace. The foreign policy of our country must be dedicated to the service of peace and fellowship. We repudiate the evil doctrines of tribal chauvinism, racial prejudice and national hatred. We repudiate these evil ideas because in creating that brotherhood to which we aspire, we hope to make a reality, within the bounds of our small country, of all the grandiose ideologies which are supposed to form the intangible bonds holding together the British Commonwealth of Nations in which we hope to remain. We repudiate racial prejudice and national hatred, because we do not wish to be a disgrace to these high ideals.

33 Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second has just been crowned – barely one month ago – the memory is still fresh in our minds; the Queen herself has not forgotten the emotions called forth as she first felt the weight of the crown upon her head; the decorations in London streets are hardly down; the millions of words written about the Coronation and its meaning will endure for centuries; the prayers from the millions of lips are still fresh; the vows of dedication to duty which the Queen made are a symbol of the duties devolving on the Commonwealth. And so, we repudiate the evil doctrines which we know are promulgated and accepted elsewhere as the truth. To Britain this is the supreme testing moment in her African relations. When we turn our eyes to the sorry events in South, Central and East Africa, when we hear the dismal news about Kenya and Central African Federation, we are cheered by the more cordial relationship that exists between us and Britain.

34 We are now asking her to allow that relationship to ripen into golden bonds of freedom, equality and fraternity, by complying without delay to our request for self-government. We are sure that the British Government will demonstrate its goodwill towards the people of the Gold Coast by granting us the self-government which we now so earnestly desire. We enjoin the people of Britain and all political parties to give our request their ardent support.

The self-government which we demand, therefore, is the means by which we shall create the climate in which our people can develop their attributes and express their potentialities to the full. As long as we remain subject to an alien power, too much of our energy is diverted from constructive enterprise. Oppressive forces breed frustration. Imperialism and colonialism are a two-fold evil. This theme is expressed in the truism that “no nation which oppresses can itself be free”.

35 Thus we see that this evil not only wounds the people which is (sic) subject, but the dominant nation pays the price in the warping of their finer sensibilities through arrogance and greed. Imperialism and colonialism are a barrier to true

friendship. For the short time since we Africans have had a bigger say in our affairs, the improved relations between us and the British have been most remarkable. Today there exists the basis of real friendship between us and His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Arden-Clarke, and the ex-officio Ministers of Defence and External Affairs, of Finance and of Justice. I want to pay tribute to these men for their valuable co-operation in helping us to make a success of our political advance. I feel that they have done this, firstly because as officers in the British Colonial Service, it is their duty to guide the subject territory in the attainment of self-government in accordance with the expressed aim of the British colonial policy and secondly, because we have, by our efforts in managing our own affairs, gained their respect, and they are conscious of the justice of our aspirations.

36 Let me recall the words of the great Casely-Hayford which he spoke in 1925:

It must be recognized that co-operation is the greatest word of the century. With co-operation we can command peace, goodwill and concord. Without: chaos, confusion and ruin. But there can really be no co-operation between inferiors and superiors. Try as they may, there must come a time when the elements of superiority will seek to dictate, and the inferior ones will resent such dictation. It logically follows, therefore, that unless an honest effort is made to raise the inferior up to the prestige of the superior, and the latter can suffer it, all our talk of co-operation is so much empty gas...

Unless, therefore, our claim to independence is met now, the amicable relations which at present exist between us and the British may become strained. Our chiefs and people will brook no delay. But I feel confident that our claim, because of the reasons I have already given, will be accepted and our amity towards Britain will be deepened by our new association.

37 The strands of history have brought our two countries together. We have provided much material benefit to the British people, and they in turn have taught us many good things. We want to continue to learn from the best they can give us and we hope that they will find in us qualities worthy of emulation. In our daily lives, we lack those material comforts regarded as essential by the standards of the modern world, because so much of our wealth is still locked up in our land; but we have the gifts of laughter and joy, a love of music, a lack of malice, an absence of the desire for vengeance for our wrongs, all things of intrinsic worth in a world sick of injustice, revenge, fear and want.

We feel that there is much the world can learn from those of us who belong to what we might term the pre-technological societies. These are values which we must not sacrifice unheedingly in pursuit of material progress. That is why we say that self – government is not an end in itself.

38 We have to work hard to evolve new patterns, new social customs, new attitudes to life, so that while we seek the material, cultural and economic advancement of our country, while we raise their standards of life, we shall not sacrifice their fundamental happiness. That, I should say, Mr. Speaker, has been the greatest tragedy of Western society since the industrial revolution. In harnessing the forces of nature, man has become the slave of the machine, and of his own greed. If we repeat these mistakes and suffer the consequences which have overtaken those that made them, we shall have no excuse. This is a field of exploration for the young men and women now in our schools and colleges, for our sociologists and economics, for our doctors and our social welfare workers, for our engineers and town planners, for our scientists and our philosophers.

39 Mr. Speaker, when we politicians have long passed away and been forgotten, it is upon their shoulders that will fall the responsibility of evolving new forms of social institutions, new economic instruments to help build in our rich and fertile country a society where men and women may live in peace, where hate, strife, envy and greed, shall have no place.

Mr. Speaker, we can only meet the challenge of our age as a free people. Hence our demand for our freedom, for only free men can shape the destinies of their future.

Mr. Speaker, Honourable Members, we have great task before us. I say, with all seriousness, that it is rarely that human beings have such an opportunity for service to their fellows.

40 Mr. Speaker, for my part, I can only re-echo the words of a great man: "Man's dearest possession is life, and since it is given him to live but once, he must so live as not to be besmeared with the shame of a cowardly existence and trivial past, so live that dying he might say: all my life and all my strength were given to the finest cause in the world – the liberation of mankind."

Mr. Speaker, "Now God be thank'd, Who has match'd us with His hour!" I beg to move.

APPENDIX (ID)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S INDEPENDENCE DECLARATION ADDRESS OF 6TH MARCH 1957 IN ACCRA

1 At long last the battle has ended (shouts)... and thus Ghana, your beloved country is free forever (shouts).

2 And here again, I want to take the opportunity to thank the chiefs and people of this country, the youth, the farmers, the women, who have so nobly fought and won this battle. Also, I want to thank the valiant ex-service men who have so cooperated with me in this mighty task of freeing our country from foreign rule and imperialism (shouts)

3 And as I pointed out at our party conference at Saltpond, I made it quite clear that from now on, today, we must change our attitudes and our minds. We must realise that from now on we are no more a colonial but a free and independent people (shouts).

4 But also, as I pointed out, that also entails hard work. I am depending upon the millions of the country, the chiefs and people to help me to reshape the destiny of this country. We are prepared to build it up and make it a nation that will be respected by every other nation in the world. We know we are going to have difficult beginnings, but again, I am relying upon your support, I am relying upon your hard work. Seeing you in these thousands, it doesn't matter how far my eye goes. I can see that you're here in your millions, and my last warning to you is that you ought to stand firm behind us so that we can proof to the world that when the African is given the chance he can show to the world that he is somebody (thunderous shouts)

5 We are not waiting, we shall no more go back to sleep anymore. Today, from now on there is a new African in the world, that new African is ready to fight his own battle and show that after all, the black man is capable of managing his own affairs (shouts) We are going to demonstrate to the world to the other nations, young as we are that we are prepared to lay our own foundations. As I said in the Assembly just a minute ago I made a point that we are going to see that we create our own African personality and identity (shouts) It is the only way in which we can show to the world that we are ... of our own battle.

6 But today, may I call upon you all that at this great day, let us all remember that nothing in the world can be done unless it had the purported support of God. We have done the battle and we again rededicate ourselves not only in the struggle to emancipate other territories in Africa. Our independence is meaningless unless it is linked up with total liberation of the African continent.

7 Let us now ...Fellow Ghanaians, let us now ask for God's blessing and for only two seconds, in your thousands and millions I want to ask you to pause for only for one minute and give thanks to Almighty God for having led us through obstacles, difficulties, imprisonments, hardships and sufferings to have brought us to the end of our troubles today. One minute silence (a pause)

8 Ghana is free forever. And here, I will ask the band to play the Ghana national anthem (the anthem is played). Freedom (the crowd shout back freedom), freedom (crowd repeats), freedom (crowd repeats).

May God bless you.

APPENDIX (AAPC)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S ADDRESS AT THE ALL-AFRICAN PEOPLE'S CONFERENCE ON 8TH DECEMBER 1958 IN ACCRA

1 Fellow African Freedom Fighters, Ladies and Gentlemen: It is my considerable pleasure to welcome here today many, official delegates who have come from all over this vast Continent of ours to confer together in this All-African People's Conference, as well as the fraternal delegates, observers and other visitors to Ghana. My country is once again host to a gathering of Africans speaking for Africa and for Africans, and in welcoming you as Prime Minister of Ghana I am deeply conscious this fact that. Yet my real role here today is that of a Leader of a Political Party, and it is as the Chairman of that Party that I want to address you.

2 As I look round this hall, my pride overflows at the sight of such a large number of African comrades-in arms, who imbued with the fervent desire to see Africa free, unfettered and united, have gathered here together on African soil for the first time in the history of the continent. This assembly marks the opening of a new epoch in our Continent's history and it will be recorded in our annals as illuminations worthy of its significance as the First All-African People's Conference.

3 We have had Pan African Congresses before-in fact, five of them but all of these, by force of circumstances, were carried on outside Africa and under much difficulty. Never before has it been possible for so representative a gathering of African Freedom Fighters not only to come together, but to assemble in a free independent African State for the purpose of planning for a final assault upon Imperialism and Colonialism.

4 Congratulations for making this possible are due in large measure to the organizers, the sponsoring nationalist and trade union bodies but without the ready response and determination of the participants to make their way here, in many instances against great odds, our Conference would certainly not be so fully representative of the African aspiration to freedom and independence. This fact is in itself a wonderful achievement, and I know that it will be written into the records of Africa's chequered history when the last bastion of Colonialism has been raised to the ground.

5 Invitations were sent out to all bona fide political and trade union organisations regardless of their political complexion or the relationships which exist between them in their various countries, for if we are to attain the major objective to which we are all committed - the total liberation of Africa - then it is necessary to bury our political hatchets in the interest of Africa's supreme need.

6 Only eight months ago I had the honour to welcome to our country political delegates on a different level—that is, the official representatives of the Governments of the independent African States. That Conference, unlike this one, was sponsored, organised and confined in its participation to heads of Governments and their representatives. The idea of that Conference arose out of informal talks at the time of Ghana's Independence Celebrations on the 6th March 1957. A preparatory committee composed of the Ambassadors of the participating States held a series of meetings and as a result a provisional agenda was drawn up and a date was fixed for the convening of the conference. The date fixed was April 15th, 1958 and the venue chosen was Accra.

7 There is one point in connection with that Conference which I would particularly like to elucidate for the benefit of the representatives of the non-independent territories who are here today, that is the decision to confine the April Conference to governmental level. We did so with the greatest reluctance, as we were well aware of the desire of our comrades still under the yoke of foreign imperialist domination to be present.

8 I would like to mention here that the matter that concerned us most in connection with the convening of the April conference was the question of inviting representatives of political parties in the dependent territories to participate with the representatives of the independent countries. We were only too conscious of our commitment to helping, by all possible means, the speedy achievement of independence by colonial territories in Africa. That conference was thus sponsored collectively and organised collectively by the eight Independent African States who had decided to call it. The only distinctive role which Ghana played was to as host to the delegates. This present conference is the consummation and affirmation of that decision.

9 You will have to read the declarations and resolutions unanimously reached at the Accra conference, which pledge Ghana, in communion with her fellow African independent states, to support the struggle of the dependent peoples for the speedy determination of Imperialism and Colonialism and the eradication from this continent of Racialism. As I have always declared, even before Ghana attained her present sovereign status – “the independence of Ghana will be meaningless unless it is linked up with the total liberation of Africa”.

10 We have not moved from this promise nor shall we budge one jot from it until the final goal has been reached and the last vestiges of imperialism and colonialism have been wiped off this African Continent. We disdain to hide these aims and objects of ours. We proclaim them freely to the world.

11 We have pride in our determination to support every form of non-violent action which our fellow Africans in Colonial territories may find it fit to use in the

struggle for their legitimate rights and aspirations. We make no apology to anyone, and we will not allow ourselves to be deflected from this just cause, and cause (sic) wholly in consonance with the principles enunciated in the charter of the United Nations.

12 It was in this spirit that I suggested to the representatives of several African nationalist and trade union organisations who happened to be in Accra during the first anniversary celebration of Ghana's Independence in March this year, that they should take the initiative in organising a conference at which they could air as they like their views on Colonialism, Imperialism, Racialism and other subjects on our agenda. I assured them that such a conference would have the full moral support of all the Governments of the Independent African States, an assurance which I am happy to say was fully endorsed by the resolutions unanimously adopted by the Accra conference in April this year.

13 Out of this informal suggestion, there was set up by the representatives of the various political parties and trade unions then present in Accra, a preparatory committee charged with arranging the present conference. That your labours are well rewarded is evident by the presence of this large assembly here today, and you are to be warmly congratulated. The cause we embrace is a noble and irresistible cause. As long as we remain true to that cause – the cause of national freedom and independence – we have nothing to fear but fear itself. as the call sent out by the preparatory committee exhorts, "People of Africa unite! We have nothing to lose but our chains. We have a Continent to regain We have freedom and human dignity to obtain!"

14 As I said earlier on, this Conference opens a new era in our African history and our struggle is to wipe out Imperialism and Colonialism from this Continent and erect in their place a union of free, independent African States.

15 The climax of our earlier Pan African Congresses was the Fifth, which was held in Manchester in 1945, where I had the good luck to be made a joint secretary with Mr. George Padmore, who is now my advisor on African affairs. That Congress was perhaps only less historic than this first All-African People's Conference. For that conference brought together for the first time Africans directly delegated and springing directly from nationalist and trade union organisations in Africa, as well as having Africans among its organisers. All previous Pan African Congresses had been organised and made up largely of those outside Africa who had the cause of African freedom at heart. The moving spirit in those Congresses was Dr. W.E.B. Du Bois, and he played no small part in our 1945 Congress, where we laid down the programme of action for the various territories in Africa for continuing the struggle against Colonialism and Imperialism.

16 Now a situation has arisen in Africa. Some of us have since 1945 thrown off the trammels of Imperialism and set up independent sovereign States. Other territories are drawing near to freedom. Nationalist ferment in Africa is gaining momentum. Therefore this Conference must make a new appraisal of the position which exists in Africa today. We must here work out the new strategy and tactics for gaining our hope-for aspiration and objective, namely the freedom and independence of Africa.

17 Our deliberations must be conducted in accord and our resolutions must flow out of unity. For unity must be the keynote for our actions. Our enemies are many and they stand ready to pounce upon and exploit our every weakness. They play upon our vanities and flatter us in every kind of way. They tell us that this particular person or that particularly country has greater or more favourable potentialities than the other. They do not tell us that we should unite, that we are all as good as we are able to make ourselves once we are free. Remember always that you have four stages to make:-

1. the attainment of freedom and independence,
2. the consolidation of that freedom and independence;
3. the creation of unity and community between the free African States;
4. the economic and social reconstruction of Africa.

18 And here we must stress that the ethical and humanistic side of our people must not be ignored. We do not want a simple materialistic civilization which disregards the spiritual side of the black personality and man's need of something beyond the filling of the stomach and the satisfaction of his outward needs. We want a society in which human beings will have an opportunity of flowering in where the humanistic and creative side of our people can be fostered and their genius allowed to find its full expression. Much has been said and continues to be said about the inability of the African to rise above his low material wants. Frequent reference is made of his non-contribution to civilization. That this is an imperialist fact we all know. There have been great Empires on this African continent, and when we are all free again, our African Personality will once again add its full quota to the sum of man's knowledge and culture.

19 Today most of our people live in serfdom and helotry. For most generations they have been pushed into the limbo of forgotten and unsuccoured mentally and spiritually. How can slaves, denied the right of free expression and free thought, become servants or expose of the arts? Culture and civilization throughout the ages have flowed from a leisured class, an aristocratic class, with the background and material endowments which have made possible the devotion of this side of human

endeavour. I say that once Africa is free and independent we shall see a flowering of the human spirit on the Continent second to none. The African personality in liberty of freedom will have the chance to find its free expression and makes its particular contribution to the totality of culture and civilization.

20 But just now our attention is upon the struggle to see our Continent completely emancipated and free. This struggle must be undivided. We cannot give it half our attention. It is a heavy and many-sided battle and demands everything that we are able to give. Its complexities are manifold, and I see from our agenda that we are alive to them. The official delegates at this Conference are going to be called upon to deliberate on some of the major problems facing our continent today: problems, which, while they receive the considerations of eminent associations of experts, still remain unsolved, simply because these experts, dodge the simple fact that they are incapable of solution within the dividing system of Imperialism and Colonialism. These problems which we are about to deliberate here are of wide dimension. They mar and twist relations through Africa today and will, alas, with independence, leave heavy legacies of Irredentism and Tribalism behind to be solved. Your deliberations are to range over such problems as colonialism, Imperialism and Racialism, the arbitrary divisions on our continent with their resultant frontier perplexities; tribalism and racial laws and practices and religious and separatism; and the position of traditional authorities, particularly in the evolving free democratic society on which our eyes are focused. Let me say a few words to you out of my own experience as the Founder and Leader of a political party which led the struggle for independence in our country. You may not think it amiss for me to offer you some advice on the basis of our experience of the struggle against colonialism. I talk not from books but from life. Nor do I try to fit facts into theory for fear of being misinterpreted.

Our whole struggle was planned to face up to the facts as we found them.

21 My first advice to you who are struggling to be free is to aim for the attainment of the Political Kingdom-that is to say, the complete independence and self-determination of your territories. When you have achieved the Political Kingdom all else will follow. Only with the acquisition of the Political power-real power through the attainment of sovereign independence will you be in a position to reshape the vexations problems which harass our Continent.

22 But this power which you will achieve is not in itself an end. It is the means to an end, and that is why the use to which power is put is so important. Today, African is convulsed with the desire to be free and independent, and coupled with this will to independence is an equal desire for some form of African union or federation. There is a searching after Africa's regeneration, politically, socially and economically, within the milieu of a social system suited to the traditions, history,

environment and communalistic pattern of African society, which, notwithstanding the inroads made by Western influences, still remains to a large degree unchanged. In the vast rural areas of Africa, the people hold land in common and work it on the principle of self- help and co-operation. These are the main features still predominating in African society, and we cannot do better than bend them to the requirements of a more modern socialistic pattern of society.

23 WE must rededicate ourselves to the task of organising our people and leading in the struggle for national independence. African must be free; we must then use the political power which the people vest in us through freely won elections to bring about the speediest economic and social reconstruction of our countries, so as to provide a higher standard of life for all the people.

24 And looking forward, we see that, coupled with the consuming aspiration for freedom spreading like a forest fire across Africa today, there is an equally irresistible current which is rising higher and higher as the final day of liberation advances. And that is the burning desire amongst all the peoples of Africa to establish a community of their own, to give political expression in some form or another to the African personality. It is this desire which animated my Government and the Government of Guinea to initiate recently certain action which we hope will constitute the nucleus of a United West Africa which will gain the adherence of Independent States as well as those yet to come. We further hope that this coming together will evolve eventually into a Union of African States just as the original thirteen American community. We are convinced that it is only in the interdependence of such African unity that we shall be able truly to safeguard our individual national freedom. We have no illusions about this being an easy task. But with the spirit and determination there, and the goodwill and co-operation of our people, we shall I am firmly convinced, reach our objective.

25 It is only within this context of interdependence and co-operation, regardless of the constitutional framework in which it will ultimately find expression, that we shall be able to solve the disastrous legacies of Imperialism, especially the arbitrary division of peoples on our continent, done to satisfy the greed and avarice of Colonial and Imperialist Powers. Their days are now coming to an end.

26 Some of us, I think, need reminding that Africa is a continent on its own. It is not an extension of Europe or any other continent. We want therefore to develop our own community and an African Personality. Others may feel that they have evolved the very best way of life, but we are not bound, like slavish imitators, to accept it as our mould. If we find the methods used by others are suitable to our social environments, we shall adopt or adapt them; if we find them unsuitable, we shall reject them.

27 I hope that we shall not repeat on the African continent the petty squabbles and constant disharmonies, the wars and national disasters which have dogged the history of other continents. It is our belief that with all Africa free, the peace of the world will be better guaranteed, for the elimination of Imperialism and Colonialism will remove those jealousies and antagonisms which have led to two World Wars and are keeping us now in a constant state of tension with the threat of nuclear weapons.

28 The liberation of Africa is the task of Africans. We Africans alone can emancipate ourselves. We welcome the expression of support from others, for it is good to know that we are wished well in our struggle; but we alone can grapple with the monster of Imperialism which has all but devoured us. Already we have made inroads into many imperialist strongholds, and we look forward to the year 1960 as the beginning of the end of colonialism in Africa. In that year our comrades in Nigeria, in Togoland, in the Cameroons and in Somalia will join those of us who are already holding guard over free, independent Africa. With their accretion we shall gather greater inspiration and shall be able to accelerate our offensive against Colonialism.

29 Yet while we believe that Africa belongs to the Africans we are not racists or chauvinists. We welcome into our midst peoples of all other races, other nations, other communities, who desire to live among us in peace and equality. But they must respect us and our rights, our right as the majority to rule. That, as our Western friends have taught us to understand it, is the essence of democracy.

30 We find it quite ironical that we in Africa have to be reminding the European communities on our continent of this fundamental principle to which they give so much lip service but to which they pay so little heed in practice. They use racial doctrines as instruments of political domination. They manipulate the electoral systems to suit their conveniences in a manner which makes a mockery of the whole conception of Parliamentary Democracy.

Invoking the principle of democracy, we say that Africa belongs to Africans!

31 Fighters for African freedom, I appeal to you in the sacred name of Mother Africa to leave this conference resolved to rededicate yourselves to the task of forming among the political parties in your respective countries abroad united front, based upon one common fundamental aim and object: the speedy liberation of your territories.

32 Down with Imperialism, let us say, Down with Colonialism, Down with Racialism and Tribal Division. Do not let the Colonial Powers divide us, for our division is their gain. Let us recall that our Continent was conquered because there were divisions between our own people, tribe pitted against tribe.

33 Do not let us also forget that Colonialism and Imperialism may come to us yet in a different guise – not necessarily from Europe. We must alert ourselves to be able to recognise this when it rears its head and prepare ourselves to fight against it.

34 Friends and Comrades, I enjoin you to let us close our ranks. For the day we stand in serried line, that day Colonialism in Africa is defeated. And we must bury that pernicious system with all the speed. Only with the internment of Imperialism will Africa be free from menace and live and breathe in liberty, where men of colour shall walk with head held high in human dignity.

35 Fellow African Freedom Fighters still carrying the burden of Imperialism, pull together. We who have won our freedom stand uncompromisingly behind you in your struggle. Take heart, Unite your forces. Organisation and discipline shall command your victory. All Africa shall be free in this, our lifetime. For this mid twentieth century is Africa's. This decade is the decade of African independence. Forward then independence. To Independence Now. Tomorrow, the United States of Africa.

I SALUTE YOU

APPENDIX (OAU)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S OAU ADDRESS ON 24TH MAY 1963 IN ADDIS ABABA

1 I am happy to be here in Addis Ababa on this most historic occasion. I bring with me the hopes and fraternal greetings of the Government and people of Ghana to His Imperial Majesty Haile Selassie and to all Heads of African States gathered here in this ancient capital in this momentous period in our history. Our objective is African Union now. There is no time to waste. We must unite now or perish. I am confident that by our concerted effort and determination we shall lay here the foundations for a continental Union of African States.

2 At the first gathering of African Heads of State, to which I had the honour of playing host, there were representatives of eight independent State (sic) only. Today, five years later, here at Addis Ababa, we meet as the representatives of no less than thirty-two States, the guests of His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie the First, and the Government and people of Ethiopia. To His Imperial Majesty, I wish to express, on behalf of the Government and people of Ghana my deep appreciation of a most cordial welcome and generous hospitality.

3 The increase in our number in this short space of time is open testimony to the indomitable and irresistible surge of our peoples for independence. It is also a token of the revolutionary speed of world events in the latter half of this century. In the task which is before us of unifying our continent we must fall in with that pace or be left behind. The task cannot be attacked in the tempo of any other age than our own. To fall behind the unprecedented momentum of actions and events in our time will be to court failure and our own undoing.

4 A whole continent has imposed a mandate upon us to lay the foundation of our Union at this Conference. It is our responsibility to execute this mandate by creating here and now the formula upon which the requisite superstructure may be erected.

5 On this continent it has not taken us long to discover that the struggle against colonialism does not end with the attainment of national independence. Independence is only the prelude to a new and more involved struggle for the right to conduct our own economic and social affairs, to construct our society according to our aspirations, unhampered by crushing and humiliating neo-colonialist controls and interference.

6 From the start we have been threatened with frustration where rapid change is imperative and with instability where sustained effort and ordered rule are indispensable.

7 No sporadic act nor pious resolution can resolve our present problems. Nothing will be of avail, except the united act of a united Africa. We have already reached the stage where we must unite or sink into that condition which has made Latin-America the unwilling and distressed prey of imperialism after one-and-a-half centuries of political independence.

8 As a continent we have emerged into independence in a different age, with imperialism grown stronger, more ruthless and experienced, and more dangerous in international associations. Our economic advancements demands (sic) the end of colonialist and neo-colonialist domination in Africa.

9 But just as we understood that the shaping of our national destinies required of each of us our political independence and bent all our strength to this attainment, so we must recognise that our economic independence resides in our African union and requires the same concentration upon the political achievement.

10 The unity of our continent, no less than our separate independence, will be delayed if, indeed, we do not lose it, by hobnobbing with colonialism. African Unity is, above all, a political kingdom which can only be gained by political means. The social and economic development of Africa will come only within the political kingdom, not the other way round. The United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, were the political decisions of revolutionary peoples before they became mighty realities of social power and material wealth.

11 How, except by our united efforts, will the richest and still enslaved parts of our continent be freed from colonial occupation and become available to us for the total development of our continent? Every step in the decolonisation of our continent has brought greater resistance in those areas where colonial garrisons are available to colonialism and you all here know that.

12 This is the great design of the imperialist interests that buttress colonialism and neo-colonialism, and we would be deceiving ourselves in the most cruel way were we to regard their individual actions as separate and unrelated. When Portugal violates Senegal's border, when Verwoerd allocates one-seventh of South Africa's budget to military and police, when France builds as part of her defence policy an interventionist force that can intervene, more especially in French-speaking Africa, when Welensky talks of, Southern Rhodesia joining South Africa, when Britain sends arms to South Africa, it is all part of a carefully calculated pattern working towards a single end; the continued enslavement of our still dependent brothers and an onslaught upon the independence of our sovereign African states.

13 Do we have any other weapon against this design but our unity? Is not our unity essential to guard our own freedom as well as to win freedom for our oppressed brothers, the Freedom Fighters? Is it not unity alone that can weld us into

an effective force, capable of creating our own progress and Making our valuable contribution to world, peace? Which independent African State, which of you here will claim that its financial structure and banking institutions are fully harnessed to its national development? Which will claim that its material resources and human energies are available for its own national aspirations? Which will disclaim substantial measure of disappointment and disillusionment in its agricultural and urban development?

14 In independent Africa we are already re-experiencing the instability and frustration which existed under colonial rule. We are fast learning that political independence is not enough to rid us of the consequences of colonial rule.

15 The movement of the masses of the people of Africa for freedom, from that kind of rule was not only a revolt against the conditions which it imposed.

16 Our people supported us in our fight for independence because they believed that African Governments could cure the ills of the past in a way which could never be accomplished under colonial rule. If, therefore, now that we are independent we allow the same conditions to exist that existed in colonial days, all the resentment which overthrew colonialism will be mobilised against us.

17 The resources are there. It is for us to marshal them in the active service of our people. Unless we do this by our concerted efforts, within the framework of our combined planning, we shall not progress at the tempo demanded by today's events and the mood of our people. The symptoms of our troubles will grow, and the troubles themselves become chronic. It will then be too late even for Pan African Unity to secure for us stability and tranquillity in our labours for a continent of social justice and material well-being. Unless we establish African Unity now, we who are sitting here today shall tomorrow be the victims and martyrs of neo-colonialism.

18 There is evidence on every side that the imperialists have not withdrawn from our affairs. There are times, as in the Congo, when their interference is manifest. But generally it is covered up under the clothing of many agencies, which meddle in our domestic affairs, to torment dissension within our borders and to create an atmosphere of tension and political instability. As long as we do not do away with the root causes of discontent, we lend aid to these neo-colonialist forces, and shall become our own executioners. We cannot ignore the teachings of history.

19 Our continent is probably the richest in the world for minerals and industrial and agricultural primary materials. From the Congo alone, Western firms exported copper, rubber, cotton, and other goods to the value of 2,773 million dollars in the ten years between 1945 and 1955, and from South Africa, Western gold mining companies have drawn a profit, in the six years between 1947 to 1951, of 814 million dollars.

20 Our continent certainly exceeds all the others in potential hydro-electric power, which some experts assess as 42 per cent of the world's total. What need is there for us to remain hewers of wood and drawers of water for the industrialised areas of the world?

21 It is said, of course, that we have no capital, no industrial skill, no communications and no internal markets, and that we cannot even agree among ourselves how best to utilise our resources for our own social needs. Yet all the stock exchanges in the world are pre-occupied with Africa's gold, diamonds, uranium, platinum, copper and iron ore.

22 Our capital flows out in streams to irrigate the whole system of Western economy. Fifty-two per cent of the gold in Fort Knox at this moment, where the U. S. A. stores its bullion, is believed to have originated from our shores. Africa provides more than 60 per cent of the world's gold. A great deal of the uranium for nuclear power, of copper for electronics, of titanium for supersonic projectiles, of iron and steel for heavy industries, of other minerals and raw materials for lighter industries—the basic economic might of the foreign Powers—come from our continent.

23 Experts have estimated that the Congo basin alone can produce enough food crops to satisfy the requirements of nearly half the population of the whole world and here we sit talking about region-alism, talking about gradualism, talking about step by step. Are you afraid to tackle the bull by the horn?

24 For centuries Africa has been the milk cowl of the Western world. Was it not our continent that helped the Western world to build up its accumulated wealth?

25 It is true that we are now throwing off the yoke of colonialism as fast as we can, but our success in this direction is equally matched by an intense effort on the part of imperialism to continue the exploitation of our resources by creating divisions among us.

26 When the colonies of the American Continent sought to free themselves from imperialism in the 18th century there was no threat of neo-colonialism in the sense on which we know it today in Africa. The American States were therefore free to form and fashion the unity which was best united to their needs and to frame constitution to hold their unity together without any form of interference from external sources. We, however, are having to grapple with outside interventions. How much more, then do we need to come together in the African unity that alone can save us from the clutches of neo-colonialism and imperialism.

27 We have the resources. It was colonialism in the first place that prevented us from accumulating the effective capital; but we ourselves have failed to make full

use of our power in independence to mobilise our resources for the most effective take-off into thorough going economic and social development. We have been too busy nursing our separate states to understand fully the basic need of our union, rooted in common purpose, common planning and common endeavour. A union that ignores these fundamental necessities will be but a sham. It is only by uniting our productive capacity and the resultant production that we can amass capital. And once we start, the momentum will increase. With capital controlled by our own banks, harnessed to our own true industrial and agricultural development, we shall make our advance. We shall accumulate machinery and establish steel works, iron foundries and factories; we shall link the various states of our continent with communications by land, sea and air. We shall cable from one place to another, phone from one place to the other and astound the world with our hydro-electric power; we shall drain marshes and swamps, clear infested areas, feed the under-nourished, and rid our people of parasites and disease. It is within the possibility of science and technology to make even the Sahara bloom into a vast field with verdant vegetation for agricultural and industrial developments. We shall harness the radio, television, giant printing presses to lift our people from the dark recesses of illiteracy.

28 A decade ago, these would have been visionary words, the fantasies of an idle dreamer. But this is the age in which science has transcended the limits of the material world, and technology has invaded the silences of nature. Time and space have been reduced to unimportant abstractions. Giant machines make roads, clear forests, dig dams, lay out aerodromes; mounter trucks and planes distribute goods; huge, laboratories manufacture drugs; complicated geological surveys are made; mighty power stations are built; colossal factories erected - all at an incredible speed. The world is no longer moving through hush paths or on camels and donkeys.

29 We cannot afford to pace our needs, our development, our security, to the gait of camels and donkeys. We cannot afford not to cut down the overgrown bush of outmoded attitudes that obstruct our path to the modem open road of the widest and earliest achievement of economic independence and the raising up of the lives of our people to the highest level.

30 Even for other continents lacking the resources of Africa, this is the age that sees the end of human want. For us it is a simple matter of grasping with certainty our heritage by using the political might of unity: All we need to do is to develop with our united strength the enormous resources of our continent. A United Africa will provide a stable field of foreign investment, which will he encouraged as soon as it does not behave inimically to our African interests. For such investment would add by its enterprises to the development of the continental national economy, employment and training of our people, and will be welcome Africa. In dealing with a united Africa, investors will no longer have to weigh with concern the risks of negotiating with governments in one period which may not exist in the very next

period. Instead of dealing or negotiating with so many separate states at a time, they will be dealing with one united, government pursuing a harmonised continental policy.

31 What is the alternative to this? If we falter at this stage, and let time pass for neo-colonialism to consolidate its position on this continent, what will be the fate of our people who have put their trust in us? What will be the fate of our freedom fighters? What will be the fate of other African territories that are not yet free?

32 Unless we can establish great industrial complexes in Africa—which we can only do in a united Africa—we must leave our peasantry to the mercy of foreign cash crop markets, and face the same unrest which overthrew the colonialists. What use to the farmer is education and mechanisation, what use is even capital for development, unless we can ensure for him a fair price and a ready market? What has the peasant, worker and farmer gained from political independence, unless we can ensure for him a fair return for his labour and higher standard of living?

33 Unless we can establish great industrial complexes in Africa, what have the urban worker, and those peasants on overcrowded land gained from political independence? If they are to remain unemployed or in unskilled occupation, what will avail them the better facilities for education, technical training, energy and ambition which independence enables us to provide?

34 There is hardly any African State without a frontier problem with, its adjacent neighbours. It would be futile for me to enumerate them because they are already so familiar to us all. But let me suggest to Your Excellencies that this fatal relic of colonialism will drive us to war against one another as our unplanned and uncoordinated industrial development expands, just as happened in Europe. Unless we succeed in arresting the danger through mutual understanding on fundamental issues and through African Unity, which will render existing boundaries obsolete and superfluous, we shall have fought in vain for independence. Only African Unity can heal this festering sore of boundary disputes between our various states. Your Excellencies, the remedy for these ills is ready in our hand. It stares us in the face at every customs barrier, it shouts to us from every African heart. By creating a true political union of all the independent states of Africa, with executive powers for political direction we can tackle hopefully every emergency, every enemy, and every complexity. This is not because we are a race of supermen, but because we have emerged in the age of science and technology in, which poverty, ignorance and disease are no longer the masters, but the retreating foes of mankind. We have emerged in the age of socialised planning, when production and distribution are not governed by chaos, greed and self-interest, but by social needs. Together with the rest of mankind, we have awakened from Utopian dreams to pursue practical blueprints for progress and social justice.

35 Above all, we have merged at a time when a continental land mass like Africa with its population approaching three hundred million are necessary to the economic capitalisation and profitability of modern productive methods and techniques. Not one of us working singly and individually can successfully attain the fullest development. Certainly, in the circumstances, it will not be possible to give adequate assistance to sister states trying, against the most difficult conditions, to improve their economic and social structures. Only a united Africa functioning under a Union Government can forcefully mobilise the material and moral resources of our separate countries and apply them efficiently and energetically to bring a rapid change in the conditions of our people.

36 If we do not approach the problems in Africa with a common front and a common purpose, we shall be haggling and wrangling among ourselves until we are colonised again and become the tools of a far greater colonialism than we suffered hitherto.

37 United we must. Without necessarily sacrificing our sovereignties, big or small, we can here and now forge a political union based on Defence, Foreign Affairs and Diplomacy, and a Common Citizenship, an African Currency, an African Monetary Zone and an African Central Bank. We must unite in order to achieve the full liberation of our continent. We need a Common Defence System with an African High Command to ensure the stability and security of Africa.

38 We have been charged with this sacred task by our own people, and we cannot betray their trust by failing them. We will be mocking the hopes of our people if we show the slightest hesitation or delay in tackling realistically this question of African Unity.

39 The supply of arms or other military aid to the colonial oppressors in Africa must be regarded not only as aid in the vanquishment of the freedom fighters battling for their African independence, but as an act of aggression against the whole of Africa. How can we meet this aggression except by the full weight of our united strength?

40 Many of us have made non-alignment an article of faith on this continent. We have no wish, and no intention of being drawn into the Cold War. But with the present weakness and insecurity of our States in the context of world politics, the search for bases and spheres of influence brings the Cold War into Africa with its danger of nuclear warfare. Africa should be declared a nuclear-free zone and freed from cold war exigencies. But we cannot make this demand mandatory unless we support it from a position of strength to be found only in our unity.

41 Instead, many Independent African States are involved in military pacts with the former colonial powers. The stability and security, which such devices seek to

establish are illusory, for the metropolitan Powers seize the opportunity to support their neo-colonialist controls by direct military involvement. We have seen how the neo-colonialists use their bases to entrench themselves and even to attack neighbouring independent states. Such bases are centres of tension and potential danger spots of military conflict. They threaten the security not only of the country in which they are situated but of neighbouring countries as well. How can we hope to make Africa a nuclear-free zone and independent of cold war pressure with such military involvement on our continent? Only by counter-balancing a common defence force with a common desire for an Africa untrammelled by foreign dictation or military and nuclear presence. This will require an all-embracing African High Command, especially if the military pacts with the imperialists are to be renounced. It is the only way we can break these direct links between the colonialism of the past and the neo-colonialism which disrupts us today.

42 We do not want nor do we visualise an African High Command in the terms of the power politics that now rule a great part of the world, but as an essential and indispensable instrument for ensuring stability and security in Africa.

43 We need a unified economic planning for Africa. Until the economic power of Africa is in our hands, the masses can have no real concern and no real interest for safeguarding our security, for ensuring the stability of our regimes, and for bending their strength to the fulfilment of our ends. With our united resources, energies and talents we have the means, as soon as we show the will, to transform the economic structures of our individual states from poverty to that of wealth, from inequality to the satisfaction of popular needs. Only on a continental basis shall we be able to plan the proper utilisation of all our resources for the full development of our continent.

44 How else will we retain our own capital for our development? How else will we establish an internal market for our own industries?

45 By belonging to different economic zones, how will we break down the currency and trading barriers between African States, and how will the economically stronger amongst us be able to assist the weaker and less developed States?

46 It is important to remember that independent financing and independent development cannot take place without an independent currency. A currency system that is backed by the resources of a foreign state is *ipso facto* subject to the trade and financial arrangements of that foreign country.

47 Because we have so many customs and currency barriers as a result of being subject to the different currency systems of foreign powers, this has served to widen the gap between us in Africa. How, for example, can related communities and families trade with, and support one another successfully, if they find themselves divided by national boundaries and currency restriction? The only alternative open to

them in these circumstances is to use smuggled currency and enrich national and international racketeers and crook who prey upon our financial and economic difficulties.

48 No independent African State today by itself has a chance to follow an independent course of economic development, and many of us who have tried to do this have been almost ruined or have had to return to the fold of the former colonial rulers. This position will not change unless we have a unified policy working at the continental level. The first step towards our cohesive economy would be a unified monetary zone, with, initially, an agreed common parity for our currencies. To facilitate this arrangement, Ghana would change to a decimal system. When we find that the arrangement of a fixed common parity is working successfully, there would seem to be no reason for not instituting one common currency and a single bank of issue. With a common currency from one common bank of issue we should be able to stand erect on our own feet because such an arrangement would be fully backed by the combined national products of the states composing the union. After all, the purchasing power of money depends on productivity and the productive exploitation of the natural, human and physical resources of the nation.

49 While we are assuring our stability by a common defence system, and our economy is being orientated beyond foreign control by a Common Currency, Monetary Zone and Central Bank of Issue, we can investigate the resources of our continent. We can begin to ascertain whether in reality we are the richest, and not, as we have been taught to believe, the poorest among the continents. We can determine whether we possess the largest potential in hydroelectric power, and whether we can harness it and other sources of energy to our own industries. We can proceed to plan our industrialisation on a continental scale, and to build up a common market for nearly three hundred million people.

50 Common Continental Planning for the Industrial and Agricultural Development of Africa is a vital necessity.

51 So many blessings must flow from our unity; so many disasters must follow on our continued disunity, that our failure to unite today will not be attributed by posterity only to faulty reasoning and lack of courage, but to our capitulation before the forces of neo-colonialism and imperialism.

52 The hour of history which has brought us to this assembly is a revolutionary hour. It is the hour of decision. For the first time, the economic imperialism which menaces us is itself challenged by the irresistible will of our people.

53 The masses of the people of Africa are crying for unity. The people of Africa call for the breaking down of the boundaries that keep them apart. They demand an end to the border disputes between sister African states—disputes that arise out of

the artificial barrier raised by colonialism. It was colonialism's purpose that divided us. It was colonialism's purpose that left us with our border irredentism, that rejected our ethnic and cultural fusion.

54 Our people call for unity so that they may not lose their patrimony in the perpetual service of neo-colonialism. In their fervent push for unity, they understand that only its realisation will give full meaning to their freedom and our African independence.

55 It is this popular determination that must move us on to a Union of Independent African States. In delay lies danger to our well-being, to our very existence as free states. It has been suggested that our approach to unity should be gradual, that it should be piece-meal. This point of view conceives of Africa as a static entity with "frozen" problems which can be eliminated one by one and when all have been cleared then we can come together and say: "Now all is well. Let us now unite." This view takes no account of the impact of external pressures. Nor does it take cognisance of the danger that delay can deepen our isolations and exclusiveness; that it can enlarge our differences and set us drifting further and further apart into the net of neo-colonialism, so that our union will become nothing but a fading hope, and the great design of Africa's full redemption will be lost, perhaps, forever.

56 The view is also expressed that our difficulties can be resolved simply by a greater collaboration through co-operative association in our inter-territorial relationships. This way of looking at our problems denies a proper conception of their inter-relationship and mutuality. It denies faith in a future for African advancement in African independence. It betrays a sense of solution only in continued reliance upon external sources through bilateral agreements for economic and other forms of aid.

57 The fact is that although we have been co-operating and associating with one another in various fields of common endeavour even before colonial times, this has not given us the continental identity and the political and economic force which would help us to deal effectively with the complicated problems confronting us in Africa today. As far as foreign aid is concerned, a United Africa would be in a more favourable position to attract assistance from foreign sources. There is the far more compelling advantage which this arrangement offers, in that aid will come from anywhere to a united Africa because our bargaining power would become infinitely greater. We shall no longer be dependent upon aid from restricted sources.

58 What are we looking for in Africa? Are we looking for Charters, conceived in the light of the United Nations example? A type of United Nations Organisation whose decisions are framed on the basis of resolutions that in our experience have

sometimes been ignored by member States? Where groupings are formed and pressures develop in accordance with the interests of the groups concerned?

59 Or is it intended that Africa should be turned into a loose organisation of States on the model of the Organisation of American States, in which the weaker States- within it can be at the mercy of the stronger or more powerful ones politically or economically and all at the mercy of some powerful outside nation or group of nations? Is this the kind of association we want for ourselves in the United Africa we all speak of with such feeling and emotion?

60 Your Excellencies, permit me to ask: Is this the kind of framework we desire for our United Africa? An arrangement which in future could permit Ghana or Nigeria or the Sudan, or Liberia, or Egypt or Ethiopia for example, to use pressure, which either superior economic or political influence gives, to dictate the flow and direction of trade from, say, Burundi or Togo or Nyasaland to Mozambique or Madagascar?

61 We all want a united Africa, united not only in our concept of what unity connotes, but united in our common desire to move forward together in dealing with all the problems that can best be solved only on a continental basis.

62 When the first Congress of the United States met many years ago in Philadelphia one of the delegates sounded the first chord of unity by declaring that they had met in "a state of nature." In other words, they were not in Philadelphia as Virginians, or Pennsylvanians, but simply as Americans. This reference to themselves as Americans was in those days a new and strange experience. May I dare to assert equally on this occasion Your Excellencies, that we meet there today not as Ghanaians, Guineans, Egyptians, Algerians, Moroccans, Malians, Liberians, Congolese or Nigerians but as Africans. Africans united in our resolve to remain here until we have agreed on the basic principles of a new compact of unity among ourselves which guarantees for us and our future a new arrangement of continental government.

63 If we succeed in establishing a New Set of Principles as the basis of a New Charter or Statute for the establishment of a continental our people, then, in my view, this conference should mark the end of our various groupings and regional blocs. But if we fail and let this grand and historic opportunity slip by then we shall give way to greater dissension and vision among us for which the people of Africa will never forgive us. And the popular and progressive forces and movements within Africa will condemn us. I am sure therefore that we shall not fail them.

64 I have spoken at some length, Your Excellencies, because it is necessary for us all to explain not only to one another present here but also to our people who have entrusted to us the fate and destiny of Africa. We must therefore not leave this place

until we have set up effective machinery for achieving African Unity. To this end, I now propose for your consideration the following:-

65 As a first step, Your Excellencies, a declaration of principle uniting and binding us together and to which we must all faithfully and loyally adhere, and laying the foundations of unity should be set down. And there should also be a formal declaration that all the Independent African States here and now agree to the establishment of a Union of African States.

66 As a second and urgent step for the realisation of the unification of Africa, an All-Africa Committee of Foreign Ministers be set up now, and that before we rise from this Conference a date should be fixed for them to meet.

67 This Committee should establish on behalf of the Heads of our governments a permanent body of officials and experts to work out a machinery for the Union Government of Africa. This body of officials and experts should be made up of two of the best brains from each independent African State. The various Charters of the existing groupings and other relevant documents could also be submitted to the officials and experts. A Presidium consisting of the heads of Governments of the Independent African States should be called upon to meet and adopt a Constitution and other recommendations which will launch the Union Government of Africa.

68 We must also decide on a location where this body of officials and experts will work as the new Headquarters or Capital of our Union Government. Some central place in Africa might be the fairest suggestion either at Bangui in the Central African Republic or Leopoldville in Congo. My Colleagues may have other proposals. The Committee of Foreign Ministers, officials and experts should be empowered to establish:

(1) a Commission to frame a constitution for a Union Government of African States;

(2) a Commission to work out a continent-wide plan for a unified or common economic and industrial programme for Africa; this plan should include proposals for setting up:

(a) A Common Market for Africa;

(b) An African Currency;

(c) African Monetary Zone;

(d) An African Central Bank, and

(e) A continental Communication system.

(3) a Commission to draw up details for a Common Foreign Policy and Diplomacy.

- (4) a Commission to produce plans for a Common System of Defence.
- (5) a Commission to make proposals for a Common African Citizenship.

69 These Commissions will report to the Committee of Foreign Ministers who should in turn submit within six months of this Conference their recommendations to the Presidium. The Presidium meeting in Conference at the Union Headquarters will consider and approve the recommendations of the Committee of Foreign Ministers.

70 In order to provide funds immediately for the work of the permanent officials and experts of the Headquarters of the Union, I suggest that a special Committee be set up to work out a budget for this.

71 Your Excellencies, with these steps, I submit, we shall be irrevocably committed to the road which will bring us to a Union Government for Africa. Only a United Africa with central political direction can successfully give effective material and moral support to our freedom fighters, in Southern Rhodesia, Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea, etc., and of course South Africa. All Africa must be liberated now. It is therefore imperative for us here and now to establish a liberation bureau for African freedom fighters. The main object of this bureau, to which all governments should subscribe, should be to accelerate the emancipation of the rest of Africa still under colonial and racist domination and oppression. It should be our joint responsibility to finance and support this bureau. On their successful attainment of Independence these territories will automatically join our Union of African States, and thus strengthen the fabric of Mother Africa. We shall leave here, having laid the foundation for our unity.

72 Your Excellencies, nothing could be more fitting than that the unification of Africa should be born on the soil of the State which stood for centuries as the symbol of African Independence.

73 Let us return to our people of Africa not with empty hands and with high-sounding resolutions, but with the firm hope and assurance that at long last African Unity has become a reality. We shall thus begin the triumphant march to the kingdom of the African Personality, and to a continent of prosperity, and progress, of equality and justice and of work and happiness. This shall be our victory—victory within a continental government of a Union of African States. This victory will give our voice greater force in world affairs and enable us to throw our weight more forcibly on the side of peace. The world needs peace in which the greatest advantage can be taken of the benefits of science and technology. Many of the world's present ills are to be found in the insecurity and fear engendered by the threat of nuclear war. Especially do the new nation need peace in order to make their way into a life of economic and social well-being amid an atmosphere of security and stability that will promote moral, cultural and spiritual fulfilment.

74 If we in Africa can achieve the example of a continent knit together in common policy and common purpose, we shall have made the finest possible contribution to that peace for which all men and women thirst today, and which will lift once and forever the deepening shadow of global destruction from mankind. Ethiopia shall **STRETCH** forth her hands unto God.

AFRICA MUST UNITE

APPENDIX (OPS)

KWAME NKRUMAH'S ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF GHANA ON 3RD FEBRUARY 1964 IN ACCRA

MEN AND WOMEN OF GHANA,

1 The referendum is now over, and I want to speak to you tonight and to thank you – the Chiefs and the people of Ghana- for the overwhelming demonstration of your solidarity and determination and for your faith in the goals we have set before us. Let me commend especially all the party activists, functionaries, supporters and sympathizers who threw themselves so wholeheartedly into the campaign, as well as officials and election staff whose honesty and sincerity made the voting so smooth and orderly.

2 I want to tell you what a source of encouragement and invigoration your support had been to me.

3 During the past week, you the people of Ghana – have given the greatest manifestation of your steadfastness and faith in the convention People's Party – the party that led you to freedom; the party that stands for your interest, because its very existence springs from you the people. By giving your mandate once again to the party, you have demonstrated in the most positive terms our country's determination to establish a socialist society in which every one of us will stand free and with equal opportunities in all respect with his neighbor.

4 Very soon, a bill will be presented to parliament in order to amend the constitution in the lines which have been approved by you in this Referendum.

5 I have never hidden from you the fact that our struggle is a hard and complex one. It is a struggle that involves fighting on many fronts, because that struggle is not only political and economic but social, cultural and spiritual as well. I have told you on many occasions that our struggle falls into several stages. Our first stage ended when we took over control of our own affairs as independent Ghana.

6 At that point, our party resolved to pass onto the next stage of our struggle – the construction of a socialist society. We felt then that we should mobilize and employ the energy of all sections of the community, because we took it for granted that everyone, in all walks of life, would consider it a privilege and duty to unite on a national basis in such a noble cause.

7 In the reconstruction of our country, however, we have found that certain elements in our society maliciously refuse to see eye to eye with us, even though in their heart of hearts they know that the course we have taken is the right one.

By joining forces with the neo – colonialists, these elements infiltrated into the organs which administer and direct our State, and tried to corrupt our Judiciary and our Police. To some extent they succeeded and that was the measure of your vigilance that the country rallied quickly from the shock of Kulungugu and the subsequent act of terrorism which were planned to break your confidence in the national cause, and to bring discord and disharmony into the country.

8 The latest sequence of events, from the treason trial to the assassination attempt at the Flagstaff House on 2nd of January this year, has made it imperative that we should uproot completely all the forces of intrigue, subversion and violence designed to deflect us from our chosen goal.

9 It means that out the traitors and saboteurs and bring them to answer for their misdeeds. We must take the firmest measures against those who are bent on undermining our economic and social stability. Bribery, corruption and other social vices are evils that injure our stability and impede our progress. We must therefore make serious efforts to wipe out these evils from our society. At this new stage of our national life, let us put an end to the string of malicious lying and rumour - mongering fomented by evil men and neo – colonialists agents amongst us. By their own deeds they shall be smoked out one by one.

10 Above all, we must entrust the organs of the State to those upon whom we can rely to carry out our purposes and policies in accordance with our aims and aspirations. We shall see to it that the Civil Service, our Public Boards and Corporations and State Enterprises and all other agencies of our Government are operated by honest and dedicated men and women.

11 The state is now set for us to embark upon the next phase of our struggle, to bring about a better way of living. This is the revolutionary stage in which the needs and aspirations of the people shall be supreme. This stage demands that everyone within our society must either accept the spirit and aims of our revolution or expose themselves as the deceivers and betrayers of the people. The way is now clear for us to go forward to create the conditions in which every one of us shall enjoy the benefits of adequate food and protection, education, medical attention, proper housing and all the other amenities which make life worth living.

12 It was in order to mark this revolutionary stage in our struggle that we sought to amend our constitution and bring it in line with the social purpose and social structure upon which it should be based. You have given your consent – overwhelmingly I congratulate you on this massive manifestation of your understanding of our high purpose; and I have confidence in your ability to see that this is carried through.

13 As from to-day, Ghana has entered upon a new era. You have put the party in a new strategic position in relation to yourselves. By your unequivocal “Yes” vote, you have in the most emphatic way, expressed your belief not simply in the Convention People’s Party, but in yourselves and in the nation.

14 It is because we have faith in ourselves to overcome our enemies at home and abroad that we have agreed to rest the power of the State in the hands of the people. It is because we recognize that we, the people, can best serve as the watchmen of our interest, that we have voted ourselves as the guardians of the State. For that is what we are really saying when we say that “the people are the source of power and guardians of the State. “ From whom else could power possibly spring but from the people?

15 The Party is the rallying point of our political activities. Without the Party there would be no force through which to focus the needs and the desires of the people. The Convention People’s Party is this force. The Party, therefore, is the hard core of those who are so dedicated to its ideology and programme, that they take their membership as the most serious business of their lives. The Party is nothing but the political vanguard of the people, the active organ of the people, working at all times in the service of the people.

16 All of us are now one in the acceptance of a One-Party state. Our task is to plan for progress in the interests of the whole people. To carry out this work of service to the people, the Party needs the assistance of everybody, even those who are not members. The assistance the Party asks of all of us-men and women of Ghana- is that we should give of our very best in whatever work we do. If we do this we would be helping the Party and thereby satisfying the people’s needs and hopes. As long as we carry out these obligations, we can be rest assured that we are doing the right thing and that no one can interfere with us. For we shall be interpreting the constitutional rights and duties vested in us as the source of power and the guardians of the State.

17 Our parliament has now become a corporate body made up of party members voted in by the people as their representatives. Thus parliament is a corporate representative of the people. As such it will exercise the rights of the people as a unified body, working for the prosperity of Ghana and the happiness and welfare of individuals who make up our nation. Like the Party itself, we expect parliament to be composed of farmers and workers, artisans, factory workers, teachers, technicians, engineers, managers, intellectuals and university Professors, doctors, members of the civil service, of public boards and corporations and of the judiciary- in short, people from every sector of our public life. Parliamentary service should not be a career, a means of furthering individuals or special interests.

18 To represent the people in parliament is a privilege, a privilege of which we must be worthy. The privilege of representing the people in Parliament and in Government does not endow Parliamentarians with special attributes that should set them above the people. On the contrary, in putting ourselves forward to represent the people in parliament, we accept the most responsible of duties, that of expressing and carrying out the will of the people in the highest forum of their representation. To do this we need to remain close to the people. The greatest sin we can commit is to lose touch with the people or place ourselves in behavior above them. The people's Parliamentarians are the executors of the people's will and will be trusted to perform their function only as long as they are doing so sincerely, honestly and devotedly.

19 There are some of the important ways by which we shall ensure that the wellbeing of the people remains the primary consideration in our plans and their implementation. Steps have already been taken to rid the protective arms of our State of the people's enemies. We shall take over serious and energetic steps to deal with the many evils and vices which are hampering our progress and have tended to open conflicts in our society.

20 From to-day we, the people, must resolve to keep our ranks firmly closed against our enemies, both internal and external, and to assign ourselves the solemn duty of protecting our State. The violence that these enemies have hurled against us has failed utterly. It has in reality recoiled upon the perpetrators themselves. We have now been brought even closer together; our determination has been rekindled and we take up the challenge of forging ahead against all odds towards the goal before us.

21 Vigilance must be our watchword. We must keep a keen eye on all anti-social activities. We are determined that all racketeers shall not profit from the people's needs. All-out efforts are being made to see that essential commodities are available in adequate quantities to meet the ordinary needs of the people.

22 The mainspring of our society in the past has been its community sense, the obligation of one to another. It is around this mainspring that our African Society was organized but it is this mainspring that must continue to motivate our society in the present. For the identification of the wellbeing of one with the wellbeing of all is the animating principle of socialism. The difference is that socialism in the modern world can only establish itself on the basis of plenty. And it is towards the achievement of plenty that the Party has geared itself. It is for the achievement of plenty and its fair distribution among the people that our Seven-Year plan is designed.

23 What the Party has done for the masses since you, the people, voted it into power, is only the beginning of greater things we can expect. But our hopes cannot be realized unless all of us work in the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice.

24 By your vote you have indicated overwhelmingly your readiness to participate and to protect the gains that have already been made.

25 You have shown to the world the unity of purpose and determination that binds us, as Ghanaians, together. United as we are around a common purpose and a common destiny, we shall work steadfastly and harmoniously for a greater Ghana in which the welfare and happiness of each and every one of us shall be the dominating aim.

Goodnight to you all.