

## Kamit and the Will to Power

Oumarou Mazadou, PhD<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

---

The quest for power and will to power is a basic and fundamental value which penetrates all modes of human existence, the evolution of knowledge and truth. All humans desire power and have aspirations to power in order to preserve and enhance their lives. The will to power is the main driving force in humans toward achievement, ambition and the striving to attain the highest position in life. Some philosophers even consider the will to power to be superior to the will to live. However, with the Kamit, the will to power in its striving for survival in the historical progression seem to negate the drive or manifests itself in the lowest degree. Additionally, an authentic discourse on the Kamit's will to power seems to be missing in the collective will or human consciousness, due to oppressive systems with domineering imperialistic ideologies impelled by the will to dominate our existence and structures of power aimed at supplanting the true African ones. Thus, this research critically questions if the will to power pervades all modes of existence and is a legitimate form of engagement, and if it is willed or willing with the Kamit.

---

**Keywords:** Power, Authority, Sovereignty, Ubuntu, Bantu, Kamit.

### The Notion and Conceptualization of Power

Power is a very complex and challenging notion and an issue posing serious problems of conceptual clarity, theoretical and operational analysis. It is a word which is not easily definable but derives from words implying the ability to act or influence the behavior of other people in a strong, compelling way, and guide the course and outcome of events. However, power can also be projected in a very quiet and indirect manner. Power can be conceptualized in many forms, including economic power, political power, military power, ideological power, and intellectual power, that is, knowledge and expertise. Analysis of the various means and ways people effectively control the actions of others is central to the notion of power or domination usually studied from a transdisciplinary perspectives. By what means is power made right, just or legitimate? How is power exercised? Are fundamental questions and topical issues central in political philosophy and political theory? Thinkers and theorists such as Plato and Aristotle through Machiavelli and Hobbes to Pareto and Weber, Hannah Arendt and Foucault have for decades reflected abundantly on the central issues of power and the phenomenon associated with it.

However, power in Africa is a notion that still remains elusive to rational investigation as it is still largely under-theorized and not sufficiently reflected upon by African researchers. Power is a mysterious, autonomous force that exists independently of any human influence, and is all-encompassing as to preclude any resistance to it (Foucault, 1977). Since it is disbursed through the use of silent apparatuses, mechanisms and dispositive as efficiently and silently as possibly, ensuring it agents (African population) do whatever is necessary but remain totally ignorant of the apparatus (machine) that will to power. Those in power use hard power through hard tactics and soft power through soft tactics to exercise their power and influence over the population.

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Philosophy, University of Yaounde I, Cameroon. E-mail: [hadjmazadou@gmail.com](mailto:hadjmazadou@gmail.com), +237699921741

Soft tactics take advantage of the relationship between person and the target. They are more indirect and interpersonal (e.g., collaboration, socializing). Conversely, hard tactics are harsh, forceful, direct, and rely on concrete outcomes. This might be due to the absence of institutions and structures that regulate and check or serve as countervailing force to counterbalance the power of empowered rulers. The biggest challenge is the fact that power pervades and penetrates all modes of existence since it is present everywhere, in everything. Human beings living in a social milieu and are prone to exerting their influence on one another (power-over), and with one another in cooperation (power-with), in order to do things (power-to). Power-over: power is a matter of prevailing in decision-making, about control of the agenda and about 'ideology. For instance, X has power over Y to the extent that he can get Y to do something that Y would not otherwise do. There is the negative sense of power or the notions of 'negative power', and 'the chameleon'. Power-over when taken to an extreme can be evil. As the saying goes, "absolute power corrupts absolutely." We see examples of that throughout history and in the world today. Weber defines as: 'the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance...' (Weber, 1978, 53). Wartenberg writes: "A social agent A has power over another social agent B if and only if A strategically constrains B's action-environment" (Wartenberg, 1990; 85). Michel Foucault (1983, 217) observes that: "if we speak of the structures or the mechanisms of power, it is only insofar as we suppose that certain persons exercise power over others". As Robert A. Dahl (1957) writes:

To specify the actors in a power relation - A has power over R - is not very interesting, informative, or even accurate. Although the statement that the President has (some) power over Congress is not empty, neither is it very useful. A much more complete statement would include references to (a) the source, domain, or *base* of the President's power over Congress; (1) the *means* or instruments used by the President to exert power over Congress; (c) the *amount* or extent of his power over Congress; and (d) the range or *scope* of his power over Congress. The base of an actor's power consists of all the resources--opportunities, acts, objects, etc. that he can exploit in order to effect the behavior of another. Bertrand Russell is one of the best examples writing on power with an examination of the possible bases of power.

Power-to: Power to do; power to achieve; power to accomplish great things; power to make of ourselves what we will. 'I define "power-to" as the ability of an individual actor to attain an end or series of ends' (Allen, 1998; p. 34). According to Hobbes (Hobbes, 1985 (1641); p. 150), power is a person's 'present means...to obtain some future apparent good'. Hannah Arendt (1970; p. 44) conceives power as 'the human ability not just to act but to act in concert'. Furthermore, Arendt distinguishes power sharply from authority, strength, force, and violence, and offers a normative account in which power is understood as an end in itself. Although Arendt (1958, 200) defines power as a capacity, she also maintains that "power springs up between men when they act together and vanishes the moment they disperse"; hence, it is not clear whether she fully accepts a dispositional view of power. Others suggest that both aspects of power are important, but then focus their attention on either power-over (Connolly, 1993) or power-to (Morriss, 2002). Still Allen and Lukes define power-over as a particular type of capacity, namely, the capacity to impose one's will on others; on this view, power-over is a derivative form of power-to (Allen, 1999; Lukes, 2005).

Steven Lukes (1974) argues that power has three dimensions:

(1) Decision-making, which is concerned with the activities of the decision makers, such as government departments; (2) Non-decision making, which is concerned with the way in which power is used to limit the range of decisions that the decision makers can choose from, when people come into contact with an ideology; (3) Shaping desires, which is concerned with the ways in which individuals can have their attitudes and beliefs manipulated so as to accept a decision which is not in their own true interests, as when people have their ideas manipulated by an advertising campaign. However, others have argued power-over and power-to refer to fundamentally different meanings of the word "power" and that it is a mistake to try to develop an account of power that integrates these two concepts (Pitkin, 1972; Wartenberg 1990). Another way of analyzing the philosophical literature on power is to distinguish between action-theoretical conceptions of power — that is, those that define power in terms of either the actions or the dispositional abilities of particular actors — and broader systemic or constitutive conceptions of power — that is, those that view power as systematically structuring possibilities for action, or, more strongly, as constituting actors and the social world in which they act.

The quest for political power is the ability held by individuals and groups in a society that allows them to create and enforce policies for the community and manage public resources. Much work on the issues uses terms such as power, authority, influence, and control interchangeably. Political power includes four key elements: power, authority, legitimacy, and sovereignty. **Authority** means that an individual or group has the right to use power by making decisions, giving orders, and demanding obedience. **Legitimacy** refers to citizens' belief that their leaders have the right to exercise power and authority; it is the acceptance of the government by the governed. **Sovereignty** is the highest exercise of political power; it is supreme and ultimate authority that cannot be overruled by a higher power. Max Weber makes a distinction between power as *authority* and power as *coercion*. According to his analysis, authority is the legitimate use of power. Individuals accept and act upon orders that are given to them because they believe doing so is right. Meanwhile, in coercion, others force people into an action, often by the threat of violence, and this is always regarded as illegitimate.

Furthermore, Weber identifies three different types of legitimate rule: *Charismatic authority* is concerned with how a political order can be maintained by the force of a leader's personality considered as extraordinary, and followers may consider this quality to be endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or exceptional powers or qualities. Weber explains that this form of authority is 'relying on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person and of the normative pattern or order revealed or ordained by him' (Weber, 1978: 215). *Traditional authority* is concerned with how a political order can be maintained by the constant reference to customs, traditions, and conventions. This type of authority is 'relying on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under rule' (Weber, 1978: 215). Kinds of traditional authority are (i) gerontocracy or rule by elders, (ii) patriarchalism where positions are inherited. Patrimonialism, or rule by an administration or military force that are purely personal instruments of the master. Patrimony means "from father or ancestors." *Rational legal authority* is concerned with how a political order is regarded as *legal* in the eyes of the population. This form of authority relies on a belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of that elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands' (Weber 1978: 215). Associated with this are constitutions, written documents, and established offices, regularized modes of representation, regular elections, and political procedures. Rational legal authority is then a structure for making decisions, and the legitimacy of the structure is maintained by reference to a legal code.

The sources of political power are identifiable from: majoritarianism, pluralism, elitism, and bureaucratic rule. **Majoritarianism** claims that the majority of people in any government or organization should have the last word in the decision-making process. Political power should be distributed among the people at large, who have the right to vote directly on issues that affect them. **Pluralism** claims that political power should be held by groups. Citizens join groups like unions, professional associations, lobbies, interest groups, and coalitions to influence policies and laws and to exercise their political power. These groups present their ideas and issues to lawmakers, compete for attention, negotiate and compromise on solutions, and allow the majority of people to remain on the fringe of political life. **Elitism** claims that persons having the most resources, be it wealth or education or social standing, should have the most political power. Those who have money or more specifically, who own income-producing land and businesses, have power. Therefore, only a small group of these elites should make decision for society. The members of the wider community are free to state their opinions but the final decision is relies on those who stand at the top.

The sources of power in Africa: Most Western researchers reflecting on the notion of power in Africa link the source of power to African animism. They claim that many African leaders remain influenced by power assumptions stemming from African animism. Power within this worldview is a finite commodity entrusted to a leader as a particular authority figure. Some traditional Bantu philosophical conceptions of power include *Ubuntu* in South Africa. *Ubuntu* is the African philosophy on human nature, humanness, humanity; virtue, goodness, kindness". *Ubuntu* denotes a kind of socialism or humanism found in blacks" and as political philosophy has aspects of socialism, propagating the redistribution of wealth. *Ubuntu* connects the leader to the followers in an interdependent relationship that identifies the leader with the follower's welfare. *Ubuntu* etymologically originates from the Xhosa phrase, "*Umuntu ngumuntu ngabanu,*" meaning "a person is a person through other persons."

The following values conform with the *Ubuntu* ideal: (1) love, (2) humility, (3) altruism, (4) incorporation of the follower's vision, (5) trust, (6) empowerment, (7) service (Winston and Bekker, 2004) corresponded well with the *Ubuntu* ideal.

The policy of *Ubuntu* is explained in the White Paper, published in August 1997, in Paragraph 24 of Chapter 2. National Developmental Social Welfare Strategy- "The principle of caring for each other's well-being will be promoted and a spirit of mutual support fostered. Each individual's humanity is ideally expressed through his or her relationship with others and theirs in turn through recognition of the individual's humanity. *Ubuntu* means that people are people through other people. It also acknowledges both the rights and the responsibilities of every citizen in promoting individual and societal well-being." *Ubuntu* promotes and reflects on a framework of uplifting humanistic beliefs of personal empowerment that: There exists in every human being an enormous wellspring of potential. Within that wellspring of potential lie five fundamental sources of personal empowerment and social harmony: human consciousness, compassion, creativity, collaboration, and competence (Chaplin, 2014).

Power as means for domination is associated with or is a form of repression. The predominant leadership style is the command and control, the dictatorial paternalistic leadership style. In this form individuals and agencies influence the lives of people and attempt to exercise power over them, making them do things which they want them to do. Africa lack elements and structures which empower individuals by allowing democratic participation in decision making and engagement leading to under development and poverty. People are constrained and powerless as power is used in a secret way to change people. There are no mechanisms to check, measure and control their powers and there are no major institutions with laws capable of excluding the possibility of excesses or that would describe their activities as excesses. There are enlightened dictators (those with capacity to transform the livelihood and existential condition of individuals, usher change and socio-economic development, enhance the living condition of their population) and sadist (despotic) dictators in power (those who use power as means to dominate, manipulate and put their citizens into captivity without prospects of engagement and development) ruling African states.

Most African states and government are under the domination of foreign powers exercising their hegemonic influence on the politics, economic and social and cultural lives of African. The various religions, metaphysical and linguistic media are means to advance their powers (Wiredu, 1980). They use Machiavellian tactics and other philosophical teachings and ideologies to spread their influence, manipulation of mass, domination, and power over the lives of African people. The will to power (potency) the vital force or energy (balkanization of energy or occult reception of energy to increase their hypnotic powers and leadership over the population as form of domination) (Tempels, 1959) manifests itself at its potentiality awaiting actualization. Imposing dictators and sustaining for too long in power. In the sanctuaries, they develop powers to influence and control humans mentally and psychically in order to enslave and fragilize them to their control and dominate them. Weber defines domination "as the probability that certain specific command (or all commands) will be obeyed by a given group of persons" (Weber, p.212). Features associated with domination are obedience, interest, belief, and regularity.

Weber (1978: 212) notes that "every genuine form of domination implies a minimum of voluntary compliance, that is, an *interest* (based on ulterior motives or genuine acceptance) in obedience". That is, a power relation which is one of dominance involves the following:

- Voluntary compliance or obedience. Individuals are not forced to obey, but do so voluntarily.
- Those who obey do so because they have an interest in so doing, or at least believe that they have such an interest.
- Belief in the legitimacy of the actions of the dominant individual or group is likely (although this is defined by Weber as authority). That is, "the particular claim to legitimacy is to a significant degree and according to its type treated as 'valid'" (Weber, p. 214).
- Compliance or obedience is not haphazard or associated with a short-term social relationship, but is a sustained relationship of dominance and subordination so that regular patterns of inequality are established.

According to Foucault, the state is a political structure that emerged in the sixteenth century. The state attempted to safeguard the interests of everybody within the whole community.

Towards this end, the state started to gather information about all forms of human activity: birth rates, death rates, unemployment, public health, epidemic diseases and crime. All of these phenomena could be indicators of a serious threat to the community. Gathering statistics about the population became a major activity of the modern state. Data collection by the state forms an important part of what Foucault (1977) refers to as bio-power (the monitoring of a range of trends that may form a threat to the community). Bio-power, along with a number of new developments in disciplinary technology (new forms of control over the bodies of people), can be viewed as the dark side of the Enlightenment.

### **Configuration and Theories of the Will to Power**

In an evolutionary sense, the *will to power* has been and remains one of the driving forces in human history. Power and the will to power have been some of the central notions and dominant concepts variously conceptualized in the history of the development of ideas and human evolution. The centrality and predominance of the notion is experienced in every sphere of human existence as thinkers of all cultures, climate and environment have theorized and advanced ideas on the meaning and senses of the theory. The will is manifest at both the individual and group levels. That is, each human seeks as part of his or her basic nature to increase his or her personal power, and that human groups seek to increase their collective group power. Yet, it is still a notion whose origins and development in the temporal and spatial locus of history are very difficult to situate. There is no doubt that the notion of power and the theory of the will to power prevail in the recorded history and it can be supposed that it began at the point in the course of evolution when mind emerged and consciousness, rationality or thinking became a defining attribute of man.

The issue is as some authors argue that, the primary nature of will to power is unconscious. That is, the drive to power is always already at work unconsciously, perpetually advancing in the will of an individual person over the other. But I shall not attempt to speculate on the origin of the will to power outside the recorded tradition; instead, I shall analyze the meaning and importance of its theory in philosophy where the concept emerged as the essential driving force in man. The persistent and enduring challenging question is what is power and why is the notion of the will to power so fundamental that some philosophers think the will to power is superior to the will to live. The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche describes the will to power to be the main driving force in humans toward achievement, ambition, and the striving to reach the highest possible position in life. Nietzsche believed the will to power imbues all living things. "Where I found the living, there I found will to power." He sees life as characterized by the will to power or by the seeking to realize goals and to dominate others if necessary to better realise these goals. Accordingly, gaining prestige, honour and reputation is one of the central motives of gaining power in human nature. Being powerful leads one to successful outcome, develop negotiation strategies, and make more self-serving offers.

The influence and framing of Nietzsche's early thinking into the will to power is of Arthur Schopenhauer, whom he first discovered in 1865. Schopenhauer in his 1818 work *The World as Will and Representation* puts a central emphasis on will and in particular the concept of the "will to live". He characterizes the phenomenal world as the product of a blind, insatiable, and malignant metaphysical will (Schopenhauer, 1883-1886). He claims some decades before Nietzsche that the universe and everything in it is driven by a primordial will to live, which results in a desire in all living creatures to avoid death and to procreate. For Schopenhauer, this will is the most fundamental aspect of reality – more fundamental even than being. Schopenhauer's "Will to live" thus became a subsidiary to the will to power, which is the stronger will.

According to Nietzsche, man has a terrible and fundamental wish; he desires power, and this impulse, which is called freedom, must have no constraint. There is a universal need to exercise some kind of power, or to create for one's self the appearance of some power, if only temporarily, in the form of intoxication. There are men who desire power simply for the sake of the happiness it will bring; these belong chiefly to political parties. Other men have the same yearning, even when power means visible disadvantages, the sacrifice of their happiness, and well-being; they are the ambitious. Other men, again, are only like dogs in a manger, and will have power only to prevent its falling into the hands of others on whom they would then be dependent.

Nietzsche's analysis of the will to power begins with the question: Is the "will to power" a kind of will, or is it identical with the concept will? Is it equivalent to desiring or commanding; is it the will which Schopenhauer says is the essence of things? There are three possible interpretations which are metaphysical, organic, and psychological. Metaphysical: that everything that exists is the will to power. Organic: that the will to power is specifically related to all life. Psychological: that it is related to living creatures with a will. The proposition is that the will of psychologists hitherto has been an unjustifiable generalization and there is no such thing as this sort of will, that instead of the development of one will into several forms being taken as a fact, the character of will has been cancelled due to the fact that its content, its "essence" was subtracted from it: in Schopenhauer this is so in the highest degree; what he calls "will" is merely an empty word.

There is even less plausibility in the will to live: for life is simply one of the manifestations of the will to power, it is quite arbitrary and ridiculous to suggest that everything is striving to enter into this particular form of the will to power (Nietzsche, 1968). Nietzsche's earlier works such as *The Wanderer and his Shadow* (1880) and *Daybreak* (1881) talk of the 'Desire for Power'. In the works, emphasis is placed on the pleasure of the feeling of power and the hunger to overpower, that is, an "unexhausted procreative will of life." There is will to power where there is life and even the strongest living things will risk their lives for more power. This suggests that the will to power is stronger than the will to survive. "To will" is not "to desire," to strive, to aspire to; it distinguishes itself from that through the passion of commanding (Nietzsche, 1880, 1881).

There is no such thing as "willing," but only the willing of something, the aim must not be separated from the state as the epistemologists separate it. "Willing," as they understand it, is no more possible than "thinking": it is a pure invention. It is essential to willing that something should; be commanded (but that does not mean that the will is carried into effect). The general state of tension by virtue of which a force seeks to discharge itself, is not "willing." Furthermore, Nietzsche in *Gay Science* (1887) describes "will to power" as the instinct for "expansion of power", fundamental to all life (Nietzsche, 1887). However, a perversion of the will to power might imply a struggle against one's surroundings that culminates in personal growth, self-overcoming, and self-perfection, and assert that the power held over others as a result of this is coincidental. According to Jacques Derrida (1989), the will to power is the underlying life principle inaugurating all aspects of life and behavior, a self-preserving force. The superman is the man who knows that will to power produces all our values and sees also the lie in our "moralities," and aggressively seeks to express his will to power in a creative and novel way, creating something uniquely personal, uniquely human, and which can give value to others.

### **Bantu Nomanclature of Power**

Kamit philosophy is about the organization of African collective life: it is about the analysis, understanding and critique of, as well as the prescription for, ways in which human beings might live together. Kamit denotes black Africans and their efforts towards political ideology and political liberation from oppressive powers. Power is clearly a central concept in Bantu political philosophy but curiously, it is one that is not often explicitly discussed in the works of African scholars. It seems undeniable that much work in the theory of power and the will to power in Africa has been devoted to the tasks of criticizing African people's subordination and domination, analyzing the ways in which broad historical, political, economic, cultural, and social forces enable some nations to exercise power over Africans through colonialism and approaches to decolonization. And other forms of institutional structures or the mechanisms of power for domination, subordination, class oppression, and envisioning the possibilities for both individual and collective resistance to such subordination. However, one can conceptualize the African perspective on the will to power as a form of domination and as empowerment. Africans in this process fully integrated a negative will to power.

During colonialism, Africa was subject to dominion and was economically, culturally, and politically subordinated. The prevailing modes conceptualize and treat African identity inadequately and fail to provide or promote a sound account of African identity that is dynamic and vibrant. Africans were dehumanized, devalued, and racially segregated. They experienced the worst forms of inhumanity, dehumanization, sub-humanity and humiliated. They witnessed the destruction and exploitation of their economy, cultural transformation, and loss of identity, essence, dignity, and origin. D. A Masolo (1994) writes:

Africans have borne witness to sufferings and other forms of humiliation associated with the denial of their human rights. Not only did colonialism strip Africans of their civil and political freedoms, it also tried to obliterate their historical identity by trying to destroy everything they had created in terms of material, intellectual, and religious traditions.

Colonialism and imperialism was an absolute destruction of Africa's traditional institutions, the massive re-organization of its pre-colonial society, and the virtual rape of the continent. Furthermore, it led to the loss and degradation of African cultural values such as the respect for life, the elders, hospitality, communalism, and egalitarianism. It substituted these African values with individualism and other ills that alienated Africans from their selfhood and true authentic ways of communal life. Western education and politics are said to have produced value changes in direct opposition to extended family life since they emphasize individualism over collectivity. In his analysis of the concept of self and place of the individual in African societies, Nyasani (1997) identifies the traditional African family as a setting wherein the vertical power structure of the society is introduced and sustained as predominant over the freedom of the individuals. He says there is a "fundamental difference between the traditional African child and a child in the Western culture. The child in Africa was muzzled right from the outset and was thereby drilled into submission to authority from above". Furthermore, he argues that:

within the communal context Africans exhibit an: endemic and congenital trait of what could be described as a natural benign docility generally brought about by years of blind social submission and unquestioning compliance to the Mystique of higher authority that reigns surreptitiously yet effectively in all black African societies in varying degrees. This benign natural docility is generally regarded as positive, legitimate and virtuous strictly within the context of a traditional social regime.

Politically, the system of leadership in Africa experienced a shift from the traditional chieftaincy rule to a Westernized form of governance. This imposed foreign rule swapped the independent African states, kingdoms, and empires with existing booming civilizations before the advent of colonialism. These foreign rules brought humiliation on traditional rulers who were publicly flogged in front their subjects and families, and replaced by Western styled rulers with different forms of governance. This eroded the true authentic traditional form of power, rule, and governance with huge implications and consequences for African political development. Till date, Africa is in quest for total liberation, political, economic, and cultural emancipation. African critiques of political power and the way it is wielded became particularly vibrant, influential, and prominent around some few years ago, when several scholars developed a cluster of criticisms about the way power was being conceptualized and practiced. It reflects the African history that involves struggles for political freedom, human rights, equality, and socio-economic justice. This part of work reflects on the legacy of these critiques, identifies some core themes of African communitarian political liberatory approaches, and seeks to explore the extent to which such critiques were successful in influencing Western dominant approaches.

This central tendency toward liberation theories and practices aimed at freeing African people in ways similar to the Fanonian approach to decolonization. The philosophical tendencies of Nkrumah, Senghor, Nyerere and Sekou Toure who advocated a strict political struggle instead of a merely theoretical framework constitute the central issue of the liberation of Africa. They advocated a kind of grassroots humanism embedded in traditional society and resort to erect the edifice of African philosophy by systematizing the African cultural world-views through a reconstruction of lost African identity from the raw materials of African culture. They developed compatible political ideologies for Africa from the native political systems of African peoples. Nkrumah noted that Africa's socialism was "more in tune with the original humanist principles underlying African society." "Our philosophy must find its weapons in the environment and living conditions of the African people." In addition, Nyerere said: "*Ujamaa*, then...describes our Socialism." "Our socialism" is the recognition of society as an extension of the basic family unit. It was Nyerere's conception that reaches back to "tribal days." But, he says, "the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further—beyond the tribe, the community, the nation, or even the continent—to embrace the whole society of mankind. This is the only logical conclusion for true Socialism" (Bell, 2002, p.37).

Nkrumah, in his "African Socialism Revisited," said, "The aim is to remold African society in the socialist direction; to reconsider African society in such a manner that the humanism of traditional African life reasserts itself in a modern technical community" (Ibid, p. 40). Kwame Nkrumah postulates and advocates the unity and emancipation of Africa. According to Nkrumah, until the independent states of Africa are united in a single nation, the exploitation of Africa by Europe will never end. If Africa's sixty states are united politically, they will find a way to their own economic emancipation and to an African economic plan for the whole continent. During the Pan-African conference Nkrumah declared that the time for action had come where the Africans had to be masters of their own destinies. Pan-Africanism became the philosophy of social action, self-development, and nation building with some socio-cultural, political, and economic contributions to the decolonization of Africa. Participants of the Pan-African conference agreed to promote understanding and unity amongst the people of African descents; to accelerate the liberation of Africans from imperialism, individualism, capitalism and colonialism; to mobilize world opinions against the denial of political rights and fundamental human rights to Africans; and to develop the feeling of one community among the people of Africa with the object of enhancing the emergence of the United States of Africa. Nkrumah (1962) writes that communalism, socialism, Pan-Africanism, structural social changes and the assertion of African culture, can only be attained through a social revolution. He criticized capitalism as the initiator of private ownership of property distorting the African communalism that existed, bringing in elitism, fascism, liberalism, individualism, imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. Capitalism functions with capital accumulation, the accumulation of profits, in the context of competitive labour and productive markets.

This criticism is very serious and tenable if we consider the issue of the class-domination theory of power elucidated by G. William Domhoff (2013). He writes that: the only power network of any consequence in the history of the United States has been the economic one, which under capitalism generates a business-owning class and a working class, along with small businesses and skilled craft workers who are self-employed, and a relatively small number of highly trained professionals such as architects, lawyers, physicians, and scientists.

He further demonstrates how despite free speech, regular elections, and organized opposition rule by a wealthy few is possible:

"The rich" coalesce into a social upper class that has developed institutions by which the children of its members are socialized into an upper-class worldview, and newly wealthy people are assimilated. Members of this upper class control corporations, which have been the primary mechanisms for generating and holding wealth in the United States for upwards of 150 years now. There exists a network of nonprofit organizations through which members of the upper class and hired corporate leaders not yet in the upper class shape policy debates in the United States; Members of the upper class, with the help of their high-level employees in profit and nonprofit institutions, are able to dominate the federal government in Washington. The rich, and corporate leaders, nonetheless claim to be relatively powerless. Working people have less power than in many other democratic countries.

Capitalism as perceived by Nkrumah is a form of feudalism, an advanced form of slavery that causes class struggle, inequality, and individualism in Africa. The prevailing paradigm is notoriously hostile to everything indigenous. For instance, it spurns the communal tradition of African people presumably because communalism retards the transition to a market society. It is conveniently forgotten that communalism is highly functional as a proxy social security system. Furthermore, primary group loyalty tends to be disliked by the current western development paradigm as it is considered a regressive form of consciousness because it is seen as a hindrance to the development of efficient rational-bureaucratic structures. There is lack of realization that it is the basis of the ethnic associations that have contributed greatly to the development of rural Africa (Masoga & Kaya, 2011, p.155). Nkrumah advocated the liberation of Africa through consciencism aided by a social revolution. Every true revolution is a program; and derived from a new, general, positive, and organic principle. The first thing necessary is to accept that principle. Its development must then be confined to men who are believers in it and emancipated from every tie or connection with any principle of an opposite nature (Nkrumah, 1964, 78). He affirms that: Social revolution must therefore have, standing firmly behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society.

Julius Nyerere of Tanzania is another notable philosopher in the early period of African philosophy. In his books *Uhuru na Ujamaa: Freedom and Socialism* (1964) and *Ujamaa: The Basis of African Socialism* (1968), he sought to retrieve and establish African true identity through economic and political ways. Julius Nyerere distinguished between socialism and African values. He argued that in African socialism, what is important is not socialism, but African. Furthermore, Africans need not convert to socialism or to democracy because the traditional African experience is socialist and democratic. For him, Africans cannot regain their identity unless they are first free and freedom (*Uhuru*) transcends independence (Chimakonam, 2015). Cultural imperialism has to be overcome. And what is the best way to achieve this if not by developing a socio-political and economic ideology from the petals of African native culture, and traditional values of togetherness and brotherliness? Hence, Nyerere proposes *Ujamaa*, meaning familyhood—the “being-with” philosophy or the “we” instead of the “I—spirit” (Okoro, 2004: 96).

In the words of Barry Hallen (2002: 74), “Nyerere argued that there was a form of life and system of values indigenous to the culture of pre-colonial Africa, Tanzania in particular, that was distinctive if not unique, and that had survived the onslaughts of colonialism sufficiently intact to be regenerated as the basis for an African polity”. Thus for Nyerere, the basis of African identity is the African culture, which is communal rather than individualistic. Kymlicka W. (1989) reinforces this claim as he writes that:

(Many) liberals, in a misguided attempt to promote the dignity and autonomy of the individual, have undermined the very communities and associations which alone can nurture human flourishing and freedom. Any theory which hopes to respect these facts about the way in which we are socially constructed and culturally situated will have to abandon ‘atomistic’ and ‘individualistic’ premises and principles of liberal theories of justice.

Nyerere was in agreement with other actors of this period on the path to full recovery of Africa’s lost identity. Ahmed Sekou Toure, the former President of Guinea, is famous for making the claim that it was better for his western African country to live in poverty than to accept what he denounced as “riches in slavery” as part of the French Community. Organizing a referendum in 1958 that rejected close ties with France, he said, “Guinea prefers poverty in freedom to riches in slavery.” Kenneth Kaunda (1976:12) wrote:

Zambia can say with pride that its humanism is originally based very much on the importance of man. In this case the state cares for man, the person. He, in return, as an individual will, or at least is expected to care for his neighbour, thereby caring for the state.

This serves as a reminder to the fact that the Kamit needs to reconstruct the notion of being-with/in-others, which form the central concepts in the African value system and incorporates values of sociality, solidarity, togetherness, the community-being of the person. This entails re-locating into the anthropocentric and socio centric African value system, through which the African Being actualizes total will to power and the freedom of its existence, can be reclaimed. Within this context, the Kamit’s ultimate striving for an optimum combination of favourable conditions which allow them to expend all their energy and achieve their maximum feeling of power is realizable. This environment enables the Kamit to realize its right of self assertion and its prevailing essence of appropriating and overpowering those who are foreign. The Kamit can give an account of consciousness, knowledge, and truth in terms of the preservation and enhancement conditions of constantly changing power constellations.

## Conclusion

The world community seems to be running fast towards its Westernisation. Globalisation follows the process of westernisation from colonisation to industrialisation; that is, economic development, in the Western pattern. The Western world is like a mega machine that destroys the integrity of cultures. In its present form, globalisation is therefore nothing else than a phenomenon of cultural homogenisation, economic marginalisation and planetary destabilisation in the name of neoliberalism and excessive relativism. If nothing is done, future generations will live in a world where human values are neglected and even replaced by financial and material values. Globalisation seems to be a forced acculturation for Africans, so much so that they are running the risk of cultural atrophy.

In most African countries today, much still need to be done in order to achieve the values of human dignity, the achievement of equality, the advancement of human rights and freedoms, non-racialism, non-sexism, supremacy of the rule of law, universal adult suffrage, a national common voters roll, regular elections and a multi-party system of democratic government with the aim to ensure accountability, responsiveness and openness (Waghid, 2003). Low trust and lack of effective empowerment remain fundamental challenge to the concept of power in the Bantu mindset. Human beings can live an acceptable level of human life only if they are accorded moral dignity and respect; they live a life of reasonable social and political freedom under adequate and appropriate social and political protection; they have the necessary means to live a life free of degrading or dehumanizing poverty; and they live a life that allows them free and reasonable cultural expression (Masolo, 2014). To enhance the power dynamics, African states need to introduce moral reform, preservation of health, invigoration of industry, reduction of public burden, lightening of the economy and abolition of the poor laws.

## References

- Allen, A. (1996) "Foucault on Power: A Theory for Feminists," in *Feminist Interpretations of Michel Foucault*, Susan Hekman (ed.). University Park, PA: Penn State Press.
- Arendt, H. (1970) *On Violence*. New York: Harcourt Brace & Co.
- Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bell, R. (2002) *Understanding African Philosophy. A Cross-Cultural Approach to Classical and Contemporary Issues*. New York: Routledge.
- Chaplin, K. (2014) *The Ubuntu spirit in African communities*. [www.ubuntu-spirit.org/africanphilosophyof276](http://www.ubuntu-spirit.org/africanphilosophyof276) being.org. Accessed: November 25, 2015.
- Chimakonam, J. (2015) *History of African Philosophy*. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy.
- Connolly, W. (1993) *The Terms of Political Discourse*. Third Edition. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1957) *The Concept of Power*. Department of Political Science: Yale University.
- Derrida, J. (1989) "Interpreting Signatures (Nietzsche/Heidegger): Two Questions," trans. Diane P. Michelfelder and Richard E. Palmer in *Dialogue and Deconstruction: The Gadamer-Derrida Encounter*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Domhoff, G. W (2013) *Who Rules America? The Triumph of the Corporate Rich*. 7 edition. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1986) *The Foucault Reader*. P. Rabinow (ed.). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hallen, B. (2002) *A Short History of African Philosophy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hobbes, T. (1985) *Leviathan, 1641*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Kaunda, K. (1976) *Humanism in Zambia and a Guide to Its Implementation*. Lusaka: Zambia Information Services.
- Kymlicka, W. (1989) *Liberalism, Community and Culture*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lukes, S. (2005) *Power: A Radical View*, 2nd expanded edition. London: Macmillan.
- Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: A Radical View*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Masoga, MA. and Kaya, H. (2011) Building on the Indigenous: An Appropriate Paradigm for Sustainable Development in Africa in *African Philosophy and the Future of Africa*. Edited by Gerard Walmsley. Washington, DC.: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.
- Masolo, DA. (2014) *Humanity - African Thought – Bibliography*. Accessed 20 December 2015. Available: <http://science.jrank.org/pages/9699/Humanity-African-Thought-BIBLIOGRAPHY.html#ixzz44lgR5bSF>.
- Masolo, DA. (1994) *African Philosophy in Search of Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Morriss, P. (2002) *Power: A Philosophical Analysis*, 2nd edition. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1967) *The Will to Power*. trans. Walter Kaufmann. New York: Random House.
- Nietzsche, F. (1974) *The Gay Science, 1882, 1887*. Trans. Walter Kaufmann. Vintage.
- Nietzsche, F. (1997) *The Dawn, 1881, as 'Daybreak'*, trans. R.J Hollingdale, Cambridge University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1986) *The Wanderer and his Shadow*. In *Human, All Too Human: A Book for Free Spirits*. trans. R. J. Hollingdale. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nkrumah, K. (1962) *Towards Colonial Freedom*. London: Heinemann.
- Nkrumah, K (1964) *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonisation and Development with Particular Reference to the African Revolution*. London: Heinemann.

- Nyasani, JM. (1997) *The african psyche*. Nairobi: University of Nairobi and Theological Printing Press Ltd.
- Nyerere, J. (1968) *Ujamaa—Essays on Socialism*. Dar-es-Salam Tanzania: Oxford University Press.
- Okoro, CM. (2004) *African Philosophy: Question and Debate. A Historical Study*. Enugu: Paqon Press.
- Pitkin, H. F. (1972) *Wittgenstein and Justice: On the Significance of Ludwig Wittgenstein for Social and Political Thought*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Schopenhauer, A. (1883-1886) *The World As Will and Idea*, 3 vols. transl. R. B. Haldane and J. Kemp. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Tempels, P. (1959) *Bantu Philosophy*. Paris: Presence Africaine.
- Waghid, Y. (2003) *Community and Democracy in South Africa: Liberal Versus Communitarian Perspectives*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, Europäischer Verlag der Wissenschaften.
- Wartenberg, T. (1990) *The Forms of Power: From Domination to Transformation*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*. 2 Vols. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Winston, B.E. & Bekker, C. (2004) Similarities between Ubuntu and Servant Leadership: Building Platform for Servant Leadership in South Africa. Unpublished Paper. International Association of Management Conference. Norfolk, VA. April 15-17, 2004.
- Wiredu, K. (1980) *Philosophy and an African Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.