The essays in this VISIONS series, The Kwame Nkrumah Legacy Project, are the work of individuals who believe that the Unitary Vision espoused and promoted by Ghana's first President, Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, are the essence of Ghana as Nation, and what Ghana (and Africa) can be. These individuals recognize that the international stature and significance of Dr. Nkrumah are completely secure, a point found in many of the essays. However, within Ghana itself, some people do not have reliable information about the Founder of Ghana, Dr. Nkrumah, due to the wanton destruction of heritage records of all sorts and massive misinformation after the CIA-sponsored coup d'état that toppled Nkrumah’s CPP at the hands of the Dr. Kofi Busia directed NLM and NLC military regime, in 1966. These essays are an attempt to provide more objective Ghana-centered information about all those records.

Some of the essays may have been previously published on other platforms/media. Further, these essays are not the work of reporters and so, readers may find some errors in grammar, diction, spelling. For a Ghana-centered publication where English is not native, we do not fret those imperfections. We believe more in substance, in context, and in the development of the masses and their resources for their own benefit right here on the land, on earth, as Dr. Nkrumah envisioned through his many publications, speeches, and the numerous institutions and physical infrastructure he bequeathed.

Thanks for your interest in VISIONS/The Kwame Nkrumah Legacy Project.

Long Live Kwame Nkrumah’s Ghana!
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Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Thinking 5

But these challenges, those we specifically outlined in Part IV, have not prevented serious scholars from actively studying and rigorously applying his revolutionary ideas to critical questions of human suffering, development economics, political morality, human and race relations, among others. Again, as Hadjor rightly notes in the epigram of the previous essay, Kwame Nkrumah, more than any individual political thinker from Africa, past or present, has come to represent a historiographic/historical cynosure of relatively uninterrupted scholarly and scientific research on Africa anywhere in the world. This is not to imply Nkrumah did not build on or benefit from others’ legacies.

Nkrumah did in fact acknowledge the pioneering role others had played in the liberation struggles, yet his “singular” role in freeing the Gold Coast in particular and Africa in general from the prehensile grip of colonialism remains unquestionable (See Lang T.K.A. Nubour’s essay “On the Question of Who Founded Ghana: Constructing and Executing the Strategy for the Attainment of Sovereign Nation-Statehood”; read that together with Botwe-Asamoah’s “Kwame Nkrumah: The One and Only Founding Father of Ghana, I-III,” “The Fallacies of J.B. Danquah’s Heroic Legacies, I-V,” and “K.A. Busia: His Politics of Demagoguery, National Disintegration and Autocracy”).

On the contrary, it need be pointed out as well that a precedential set of landmark constitutional (legal) frameworks from the West Africa region positively impacted John M. Sarbah, J.P. Brown, J.E. Casely-Hayford, J.W. Sey, founders of the Gold Coast Aborigines’ Rights Protection Society (ARPS), as LaRay Denzer correctly and eloquently maintains: “The ideas behind these organizations rested on a long tradition of constitution-making and protest that can be traced back to the constitutions of Sierra Leone (1787) and Liberia (1847), and the political treatises of James Africanus Beal Hurston (1835-1883), Edward Blyden (1852-1912), and their intellectual circles (See Denzer’s essay “Aborigines’ Rights Protection Society: Building the Foundation of Modern Ghana”).

In other words, proactive legal or constitutional antecedents had existed prior to the activist, political, social, and legal, birth of Sarbah and of others in the turbulent political landscape of the Gold Coast. This technically underscores the radical notion that, activist or nationalist politics in the Gold Coast did neither originate with the Gold Coast Aborigines’ Rights Protection Society nor with their founders, for J.E. Casely-Hayford, particularly, came under the heavy tutelage of the Igbo-British/Sierra Leonian surgeon, scientist, and political thinker, Dr. James A.B. Hurston!

Further, Dr. Hurston’s wardrobe of radical nationalist ideas, among which directly falls the concept of “African independence,” which he had intellectually developed a whole century previous to their actualization in Africa, consequently tricked down from Casely-Hayford to J.B. Danquah and others. In fact, others, again, like J.E. Casely-Hayford, also came under the direct influence, intellectual and political, of W.E.B. Du Bois, for instance, and even indirectly of Marcus Garvey, Booker T. Washington, Martin Delany, etc (See Profs. Hakim Aki’s and Marika Sherwood’s book “Pan-African History: Political Figures from Africa and the Diaspora since 1787”; see courtesy of Dr. Kwame Botwe-Asamoah Kwodwo Pobi-Asamani’s book “W.E.B. Du Bois: His Contributions to Pan-Africanism” and P. Olisanwuche Esedebe’s “Pan-Africanism: The Idea and Movement, 1776-1991”). These snippets of facts should help undo some of the revisionist propaganda being innocently passed around among and to the
intellectually unsuspecting and historically amnesic.

Now, having said all that, it is high time we revisited “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization.” Regarding that, Homer Greene, the American legal and philosophical scholar, has aptly referred to the ethical dimension of “Consciencism” as “ethical consciencism,” after his painstaking study of Nkrumah’s corpus of written works, especially of the latter philosophical text, from which he cautiously developed the “ethical consciencism” system as a natural subtext of “Consciencism” (See “Ethical Consciencism” in “The American Philosophical Association,” 2009). Other scholars have equally developed whole systems of critical thought derived essentially from Nkrumah’s rich writings, recalling that Nkrumah’s depth of appreciation of “traditional” African culture penetrates the philosophical thicket of his controversial text, subterranean and not-so-subterranean ideas of which Dr. Dompere dialectically teases out of Nkrumah’s convoluted forest of science- and mathematics-driven argumentation, with their practical connotations.

Accordingly, Nkrumah was a creative embodiment of theory and praxis, a salient point we have consistently harped on in this series, as recalled here: “The Convention People’s Party is not impressed by the mere acquisition of knowledge. It is only impressed when the knowledge is applied to achieve positive and practical results for the upliftment of the people (See Nkrumah’s June 5, 1960 “Come Down to Death” Speech). Elsewhere, Nkrumah noted: “It is only through this practical union of theory and action that the life of man can attain the highest material, cultural, moral and spiritual fulfillment in the service of his fellow man. This ultimately is the only justification for the pursuit of knowledge and the discoveries of science (See E.A. Haizel’s essay “Education in Ghana, 1951-1966,” Kwame Arhin’s edited volume “The Life and Work of Kwame Nkrumah,” p. 53-82). Put differently, Nkrumah was not so much infatuated with extraterrestrial topical abstractions as he was morally pre-occupied with the immediate material, cultural, and spiritual comfort of man (See Nkrumah’s Nov. 30, 1963 “The Academy of Science Dinner” Speech).

Similarly, these factual reminiscences characterized what Alexander Smith, the 19th-Century Scottish essayist and poet, had pointedly meant when he intratextually contrasted the topical preoccupations of Michel de Montaigne’s and Francis Bacon’s essays, thus writing categorically of the former: “He values obtaining Gascon bread and cheese more than the unobtainable stars. He thinks crying for the moon the foolishest thing in the world… (See Smith’s book “On the Writing of Essays”).” Hence, in these immediate contexts, for instance, Nkrumah had cleverly worked African humanism, a concept familiarly close to Nelson Mandela’s and Desmond Tutu’s Ubuntu, into the dialectical structure of his scientific philosophizing, hoping, as it were, to invoke its internal mechanics of moral chaperonage to resolve the internal contradictions and structural tensions introduced into Africa by foreign influences, cultural imperialism, colonialism, and neocolonialism, particularly.

African humanism is part of the larger moral network which Homer Greene refers to as “ethical consciencism.” On the other hand, Nkrumah even intellectually proposed “philosophical consciencism” as the compromise between the two cultural polarities, those of “traditional” Africa and of the Euro-Christian and Islamic worlds, by, among other things, logically working it into the theoretical crystallizing of “African Personality.” And more particularly so, the junctural comity based on the philosophical theory of “consciencism,” patriotism, industry, capacity development, development economics, community, human and race relations, citizenship, self-autonomy against the backdrop of globalization, industrialization, and self-actualization found intellectual grounding and moral solace in the establishment of the Kwame Nkrumah Ideological Institute. Primarily, the central motivating factor behind the institutionalization of the Institute had to do with indigenizing capacity development in Ghana rather than in America or the United Kingdom, say.
Still, it is Nkrumah’s tactical and strategic cultural borrowing of progressive “traditional” African ideas, dialectically working them into a sophisticated theory of national development, psycho-physical de-colonization, and development economics, which would constitute the hallmark of his true genius (See Dr. Kwame Botwe-Asamoah’s “Kwame Nkrumah’s Politico-Cultural Thought and Politics”). What this also implies is that “traditional” African culture possess(ed) the necessary internal logistics for Africa’s development, a philosophical question whose instrumentalist underpinnings have been epistemologically unraveled by Molefi Kete Asante, Cheikh Anta Diop, Kwame Botwe-Asamoah, Kofi Kissi Dompere, John Mbiti, Ayi Kwei Armah, Bubabinge Bilolo, Kwame Gyekye, Theophile Obenga, and several others, though, as we have eloquently argued elsewhere, Diop and Dompere would raise it to another level, a higher level of rigorous mathematicality and scientificity.

At this stage, it should be clear that employing the tools of science and technology to develop Africa constituted a major factor, a turning point, if you will, in Nkrumah’s general philosophical outlook, as Prof. EA Haizel notes in the following (See Kwame Arhin’s edited volume “The Life and Work of Kwame Nkrumah,” p. 71):

1. Raise the quality of and number of science graduates;

2. Raise the standard of science teaching;

3. Reach out to the mass of the people “who have not the opportunity of formal education… We must use every means of mass communication?the press, the radio, television and films?to carry science to the whole population”;

4. Mount science exhibitions, whilst the National Science Museum was to provide “this kind of exhibition in a permanent form.

Nkrumah’s creation of the University of Science and Technology, the construction of the Akosombo Dam and Agricultural Research Institutes, his 1963 “Academy of Science Dinner” Speech, his Kwabenya Nuclear Reactor Project, his general interest in nuclear science, among other science- and technology-related projects, all point irreversibly to his imaginative prowess and to his holistic intellectual preoccupation with appropriating modern instruments of science and technology for the advancement of Africa. Indeed, the non-doctrinaire Nkrumah was an avid reader, with the compass of his topical interests understandably being eclectic and wide. Political economy, sociology, psychology, historiography, philosophy, science, law, politics, pedagogy/didactics, political morality, and history, to mention but a few, consumed a substantial amount of his perusing schedule.

Furthermore, Abayomi Azikiwe, editor of the Pan-African News Wire (The World’s Only International Daily Pan-African News Source), has this to say about Nkrumah, his reading habits and literary interests, thus writing: “…He had begun to form literary societies in the Axim area, one of which became well known as the Nzima Literature Society (See “Kwame Nkrumah: The Early Years”). In fact, Nkrumah’s intellectual prowess would eventually earn him a three-year professorship stint in the Philosophy Department of Lincoln University, this, prior to his mates’ having voted him the “most interesting senior,” 1939, and “The Lincolonian” having named him the “Most Outstanding Professor-of-The-Year,” 1945, again, all for his combined exceptional leadership skills, force of personality, and intellectual brilliance. Nkrumah was indeed an intellectual and a leader par excellence (See Dr. Zizwe Poe’s book “Kwame Nkrumah’s Contributions To Pan-African Agency”; see Dr. Poe’s lecture “Ancestral Footprints: The Legacy of Kwame Nkrumah” and his essay “Osagyefo Kwame Nkrumah, A Lincoln University Alumnus: His Profound Impact on Pan-African Agency”).

http://www.ghanaweb.com/GhanaHomePage/features/artikel.php?ID=314370&comment=0#com
Consequently, K.B. Asante is right when he too writes of Nkrumah: “He came more and more to believe that action must be guided by a philosophy; but he was no slave to ideology. He was a man of ideas. He had the talent for grasping new ideas and the weakness of giving them form and calling them his own.” How so? “His ideology was tempered with pragmatism” and “enjoyed the company of intellectuals and men of ideas,” Asante again recalls of Nkrumah. Yet, that is hardly surprising given the abysmal range of Nkrumah’s innovative ideas and his consummate legacy, with Asante further maintaining: “He was conversant with the mainstream of the development theories and models in vogue and found natural sympathy with prevalent highly interventionist school (See Asante’s essay “Nkrumah and State Enterprises”).” Meanwhile, Nkrumah’s White and Black professor’s alike, as well as his academic advisors, made similar critical observations about his intellectual brilliance despite his crushing employment schedule and the sweltering recession that witnessed the political dispensation of Franklin D. Roosevelt (See Dr. Ama Biney’s “The Political and Social Thought of Kwame Nkrumah”).

Moreover, Nkrumah and his Lincoln University school- and class-mates, such as Thurgood Marshall, Langston Hughes, Cab Calloway, Nnamdi Azikiwe, Franklin H. Williams, Robert Edward Lee, J. Jeffrey Higgs, Robert T. Freeman, Horace Mann Bond, to name but a few, would become world figures in their chosen bailiwick, an indubitable testament to their excellent Lincoln University education. Thus, Asante’s critical assessment makes Nkrumah a pragmatist, a critical thinker, if you like, not a doctrinaire. Certainly, science, not religion, became a fixture of Nkrumah’s progressive thinking on important matters of development. Obviously, he came to see science principally as the practical response to Africa’s slow growth and development and economic inertia, another practical question Dr. Dompere’s scientific and mathematical re-interpretation of Nkrumah’s “Consciencism” has a lot to say about. That practical response, of science, that is, is theoretically the vehicular impetus behind “philosophical consciencism.”

These philosophical questions are contextually relevant given the rate at which religious dogma has totally taken over the critical-thinking facilities of African leadership. As a matter of fact, “Consciencism” encourages critical thinking in decision-making processes at the individual, community, national, and continental levels, though, sadly, if unfortunately, African leadership has consistently failed to avail itself of the book’s transformative power. Why does African leadership choose religious dogmatism over critical thinking, science, and technology in matters of development, an implicit or hypothetical question posed by “Consciencism”? Why have African leaders refused to see a positive correlation between Research & Development (R &D), innovativeness, enabling environments, and development, if conditionalities of accountability, probity, and transparency can be met by the private sector, researchers, universities, and national governments?

Yet, those relatively successful economies from without which African leadership blindly imitates had and continue to follow radically different paths of national development, of development economics. For instance, the State of Israel, the alleged autochthonous home of Moses and Jesus Christ, no longer relies on “manna from heaven” to feed its population, but rather on science and technology, which she has successfully employed to turn the environmental vicissitudes of nature in her favor, by converting unfriendly deserts into arable lands. Again, the State of Israel uses critical thinking, science and technology, not fasting and prayers, to defend itself against attacks from perceived and real enemies, internal and external. This is why Daasebre Oti Boateng’s call for community prayers and fasting will practically amount to nothing as far as effectively addressing Ghana’s problems go.

It is also why Bishop Duncan Williams’ comic intercession in behalf of the Cedi’s declension has still not abated for obvious reasons, an expectation improbably actualizable in the foreseeable future, if, in principle as is in theory, policy decisions are not laced with the philosophical aroma of critical thinking,
science and technology considerations, and patriotism. Actually, the Bible-driven Pentecostal era of handling poisonous serpents where some Christians are bitten to death in the name of Christological beliefs, as introduced by the American-based Church of God Holliness’ George W. Hensley in 1910, is past and long gone (See Acts 28:1-6, Mark 16:17-18, and Luke 10:19 for additional information).

For one thing, Nkrumah’s “Consciencism” has no legroom for religious dogmatism and stilted allegiance to superstition. Again, soliciting divine intervention, as had happened and continues to happen in Botswana, Ghana, and elsewhere on the African continent, by both Moslems and Christians alike, for rains, for instance, will come to nought if African leaders and the people of Africa continue to neglect the practical needs of the environment and man-driven destruction of the environmental. Rather, the African world needs the revolutionary scientific thinking of women and men, such as Tebello Nyokong, Ave Kludze, Patience Mthunzi, Cheikh Anta Diop, Victor Lawrence, Kwame Nkrumah, Ashitey Trebi-Olennu, Isaiah Blankson, Yaw Nyarko, Thomas Mensah, Francis Allotey, etc., to move the continent forward.

In consequence, “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization” provides a philosophical and scientific roadmap for Africa’s yet-unrealized dream of de-colonization against the political collage of globalization. “Thus, “Consciencism” morally and politically points the way forward for Africa. In that context, Nkrumah’s “categorical conversion,” which can otherwise be likened to political, economic, technological, psychological, cultural, and scientific revolution, a view already noted, has its role in realizing this noble goal! Technically, Nkrumah’s statement, “Revolutions are brought about by men, by men who think as men of action and act as men of thought,” directly speaks to the moral urgency of “categorical conversion” in moving Africa forward, given that Africa today lacks “men of action” and “men of thought.” Most importantly, quality mass education, social justice, ethno-regional integration, ethnocentrism/ethnic nationalism eradication, intra-continental unification, reversing Africa’s dependency complex, promoting internal national cohesion, and raising the people’s material standard of living, are implicit hallmarks of the kind of revolution “Consciencism” advances.

Admittedly, “Consciencism” potentially, namely, theoretically, manufactures such noble men, such progressive leaders, such “men of action” and “men of thought.” Besides, Nkrumah believed so much in the transformative power of science to underwrite the industrialization of a nation’s economy, to modernize a people’s thinking, plus their society, and to improve their material conditions, a theory which almost certainly propelled Nkrumah to elevate materialism above idealism, a positive advancement in his thinking. In theory, Nkrumah’s making materialism the focus of his philosophical scheme unavoidably relegated the political economy of superstition and religion to the psycho-social periphery of society of human psychology. Unfortunately, it still has not dawned on African leaders and policy makers, a sad irony, if you will, that, wealth generation is not necessarily a product of the vast mineral resources a country has, but of the quality of the human mind, which Nkrumah’s “categorical conversion” is fundamentally about. Fortunately, Dr. Dompere’s landmark text “The Theory of Categorical Convention: Analytic Foundations of Nkrumahism” decodes that for us. Africa, it is apparent, has not done enough to expand her manufacturing capacity and to build export-oriented industrial economies.

Instead, multi-party democracy, coupled with political ethnocentrism, greed, political polarization, neocolonialism, ethnocracy, lack of scientific, environmental, and technological consciousness, elitist pedantry, selfishness, Eurocentrism, political corruption, has virtually put Africa’s development in a quagmire. It is against this background that Nkrumah’s tactical inclusion of dialectical materialism (change) into his progressive scheme of scientific philosophizing in respect of national and continental development is technically appropriate. The inescapable truth is that Africa needs the requisite instruments of science and technology to convert her vast mineral resources into real wealth and
improved standard of living, as well as to guarantee equitable distribution of that wealth accruing therefrom among the masses, granted that any decision short of these actualities may necessarily constitute an intellectual exercise in politico-economic futility. Yet again, Nkrumah’s conscientist egalitarian ideas give moral credence to the latter propositions.

Contextually, such series of critical questions of political morality are the major highlights of Dr. Dompere’s pioneering work on Nkrumah and hence Nkrumahism. In that regard, Dr. Dompere’s scientific and mathematical work on Nkrumahism is not so much about theorizing as about his work’s practical ramifications for Africa’s positive growth and development as well as about the psycho-cultural de-colonization of her people. Therefore, we caution readers to peruse Nkrumah’s and Dr. Dompere’s texts closely, because a possible misreading or cursory reading of the foregoing paragraphs may inevitably lead a reader to a path of analytic misconclusion. As a matter of analytic emphasis, Dr. Dompere’s innovative work is not so much about theorizing as about practical, namely, about mathematically and scientifically testable, solutions to problems unique to Africa, what Ali Mazrui has called the “African Condition.” Interestingly, others have taken this path of analysis as well without so much as including analytic simulation of Dr. Dompere’s mathematical and scientific rigor in their work on Nkrumah (See Charles A. Boateng’s “Nkrumah’s Consciencism: Its Relevance to Ghanaian Development”; see also Robert Woode’s “Third World to First World (By One Touch): Economic Repercussions of the Overthrow of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah”).

However, this assembly of facts invites another moral question, that the political economy of Africa cannot ignore the political pertinence of Nkrumah and his revolutionary ideas to her development, as proceedings of the 2010 international conference, “Contemporary Relevance of Kwame Nkrumah’s Contributions to Pan-Africanism and Internationalism,” and those of Canada’s Kwantlen Polytechnic-, Ghana’s Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology-, and America’s Lincoln University-organized “Biennial Kwame Nkrumah International Conference,” have powerfully demonstrated (See Rodney Worrel’s book “History has Vindicated Kwame Nkrumah”). Let us recall here exactly what Eric Walberg, the Canadian international journalist, has written about Nkrumah and the relevance of his ideas to today’s global problems: “So the words and works of Kwame Nkrumah, which inspired a generation, are worth a second glance (See Eric Walberg’s essay “Kwame Nkrumah: The Greatest African”).” Indeed Dr. Dompere’s scientific re-statement of “categorical conversion” is a philosophical cognate of Walberg’s.

That also means the present generation of African leadership cannot afford to overlook Nkrumah’s still-relevant scholarly and scientific ideas to Africa’s development economics. Appropriately, Dr. Dompere theoretically refers to an essential segment of his larger philosophical-scientific project on Nkrumahism as “actual-potential polarity,” with “actual” conceptually standing in for practical “self-autonomy,” which Kwame Nkrumah apparently realized, and “potential” Africa’s continuing psycho-cultural dislocation, dependency complex, neo-colonialism, among others. Then, as it were, Dr. Dompere dialectically offers “polyrhythmics” as part of a radical system of holistic solutions, a concept which we may roughly define as an African-centered methodology for relevant data explication or approach for relevant data “mining” in conjunction with the logical study of and epistemic examination of seeming internal contradictions, which, again, he posits, exist in “relational continuum and unity,” in African societies (See Dr. Dompere’s award-winning book “Polyrhythmicity: Foundations of African Philosophy”; this is another intricate original scholarship on Kwame Nkrumah and Nkrumahism).

In the main, “polyrhythmics” in turn provides the necessary dialectical vista into Nkrumah’s implicit philosophical-mathematical construct, otherwise called “categorical conversion,” and its direct application to a knowledge system conducive to the political, psycho-cultural, and economic actualities
of Africa’s “complete” emancipation, “rebirth,” the Scarab Beetle, if you will. It is from here that the mathematicization or equationization of “categorical conversion” directly follows, with its theoretical, scientific and mathematical, solutions philosophically addressed to the emancipatory concerns of Africa within the rigid context of her neo-colonial entanglement. Elsewhere, Dr. Dompere succinctly describes this phenomenon as “qualitative equations of motion, transient process and transversality conditions…” However, the philosophical internality of “categorical conversion” is such that it underlines a conceptual process termed “self-motion,” a natural requirement for a structurally progressive re-organization of Africa’s ostensible internal contradiction, generally, brought about by Islamic and Euro-Christian influences, as well as by negative connotations of neo-colonialism and of psycho-cultural misalignment.

In fine, Dr. Kofi Kissi Dompere’s dense textbook, “The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Analytical Foundations of Nkrumahism,” is probably the best comprehensive analysis yet, the most thorough scientific and mathematical exegesis of “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization,” as the following chapters practically throw some light on its implicational dimensionalities:

Chpt 1. Abstract Ideas and Practice of Ideas in Social Settings: Extensions and Reflections on Nkrumah

Chpt 2. Restructuring the Mind of Africa and the Oppressed: Defining an Initial Framework for Liberation Thinking

Chpt 3. The Intellectual Task for Africa’s Decolonization and Emancipation

Chpt 4. The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Philosophical Foundations and Extensions of Nkrumahism

Chpt 5. The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Axiomatic Foundations

Chpt 6. The Theory of Categorical Conversion: The Analytic Building Blocks


Chpt 8. The Mathematical Problem and the Solution to the Categorical Conversion of Actual-Potential Polarity

Clearly, “The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Analytical Foundations of Nkrumahism” is a highly technical and sophisticated text, about which he, that is, Dr. Dompere, has written: “The central objective of the monograph is the development of the theory of categorical conversion from its analytical foundations of philosophy and mathematics…The basic objective, here, is to present a foundation and analytical morphology of a general theory of socio-natural transformations as well as to present the conditions that may be extended to a general theory of engineering science.” In fact, Dr. Dompere ten-year scientific and mathematical study of “Consciencism” and the conclusions he derives from it, is, technically, the basis of his assertion, that many Nkrumahists and non-Nkrumahists alike who profess intellectual intimacy with Nkrumah’s text do not actually understand it. That is the consensus within academic circles, Western and African.

That said, we do, however, encourage readers to include “Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah (1957)” in their reading lists, because it provides additional general insights into Nkrumah’s thinking, which, we also believe, may necessary provide insights from Nkrumah’s intellectual progression to his thinking in the analytic consummation of “Consciencism (1964, 1970).” A span of
seven years vis-a-vis the thinking of Nkrumah is the moral equivalence of generational thinking as regards the thinking of today’s African leadership. Once again, we are indeed grateful to Dr. Kwame Botwe-Asamoah for introducing Dr. Kofi Kissi Dompere and his large body of economic, scientific, historical, and mathematical works to us. We shall say more about Dr. Kofi Kissi Dompere in Part VI.

We shall return…

A Question To The Necromancers Bro. Francis, I intend to be quite vociferous about your article today…

1. When you say, “Nkrumah did in fact acknowledge the pioneering role others had played in the liberation struggles, yet his “singular” role in f

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
06-27 00:33

Ignore this circumstantial lawyer, Franci Francis, in your own interest and in the interest of all readers, please ignore this so-called circumstantial or non-evidentiary lawyer. His irrational attitude and his inexplicable hatred for the great Nkrumah makes it impossible

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Joe Mensah
06-27 01:59

THANK YOU, JOE MENSAH! Thank you Joe Mensah, you have painted a true picture of Dr SAS, the confused Texas quack lawyer who does not believe in DIRECT EVIDENCE.

(click to comment on this comment)
Albert Ansah
06-27 05:04
SAS AND AHOOFE ARE MENTALLY SICK Any honest person who has read the writings and comments of Dr SAS and Ahoofe will agree with me that these two IDIOTS need mental treatment. All their rantings are laced with bias, jealousy, hatred and tribalism. The fact that D

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Paul Manu
06-27 11:55

Re: SAS AND AHOOFE ARE MENTALLY SICK And your rantings are not laced with jealousy, hatred and tribalism? Repeat anything I have said or done that makes you ascribe these morbid characteristics of jealousy, hatred and tribalism to me. I consider myself too luck

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
06-27 12:36

Dye in the wool anti-Nkrumahist indeed Dr SAS, you need prayers. I am Nkrumahist but I am not anti-Busia or anti-Danquah. The fact that you are dye in the wool anti-Nkrumah makes you a very peculiar person. Go back and read your comments on June 19, 2014

(click to comment on this comment)
RINGO
06-27 14:20

Ringo what is the scholarship of JB JB danquah and Kofi Busia left no scholarly works. Nkrummah left a lot Upon what do these anti Nkrumahists expect us to judge or measure the two non performers

(click to comment on this comment)
Kojo T
06-27 15:36
To SAS! Dear Brother SAS, Thanks for the questions. Technically, these questions are no different from Albert Einstein's role in the formulation of both "special relativity" and "general theory of relativity" or Jesus Christ's

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
06-27 02:34

francis kwarteng's Mum wasted her womb francis kwarteng is sad that your mother wasted her womb for 9 good months to carry you instead of aborting you. The poor woman !!!

(click to comment on this comment)
GIRLS SP
06-27 02:45

I pity the woman who carried kwarteng GIRLS SP is right, I also pity the woman who had to carry this francis kwarteng for 9 months in her womb because after the poor woman brought Kwarteng out, he (Kwarteng) has not made any progress in life, pertaining to growi

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Obaa Yaa
06-27 03:19

Re: I pity the woman who carried kwarteng Stop stupid ad hominem arguments and engage Prof. Kwarteng intellectually. If you do, you will find that none in your family comes close.

(click to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
06-27 03:30

Totally Disappointed In This SAS Guy You need to search your sole first before you invoke the fallacy
of argumentum ad hominem on others. Your lunatic folly came to the fore just yesterday when you passed the most stupid comment ever on an article of Dr. Bokor

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Mr. Figure-Out
06-27 09:13

My Response To Your Question! Dear Dr. SAS, A friend called me to suggest to me to give you a more pointed response to your question, about Kwame Nkrumah and his alleged "dictatorship." I have addressed this very question elsewhere. You may want to

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
06-27 19:39

Re: To SAS! Can you in all honesty say that you are addressing the salient issues I raised?

(click to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
06-27 03:32

SAS! you see how stupid you are? Author: Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law Date: 2014-06-27 03:32:56
Comment to: To SAS! Can you in all honesty say that you are addressing the salient issues I raised?
NOW! YOU IDIOT IS TURNING ROUND TO ASK YOUR "EQUAL ID

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Obaa Yaa
06-27 03:50

DR SAS U-TURN Controversial and irrational DR SAS is now advising readers to stop stupid ad hominem arguments.
Robert Okine
06-27 04:08

To Dr. SAS Again! Dear Dr. SAS, Please, could it be that I did not understand all your questions, Brother SAS? I still believe you have to take a closer look at the references I gave in this particular essay and those I have mentioned e

Francis Kwarteng
06-27 04:15

Re: To Dr. SAS Again! Dear Francis, Please get in touch with me. CKA +44-740-540-5269 kagbodza@gmail.com kwami_agbodza@yahoo.co.uk

CKA
06-27 14:20

SAS, CPP is not a Necromancer! FK, You have answered Brother SAS' questions from an academic/publicational point of view. I would like to answer them from a political point of view as a member of CPP in remembrance of CPP Odum Hayford Akrofi who was

CKA
06-27 11:03

FOOLS ON THE PLATFORM, KWARTENG & BOKOR THE IDIOTS KWARTENG AND BOKOR WILL POST ANY TRIBAL AND PARTISAN GARBAGE TO GHANAWEB.

G.G. Lawrence
06-27 02:40
No sense in Kwarteng's articles I have go through almost all the articles posted by francis kwarteng, not a single of them contains any sensible paragraph, it is all about copied and pasted tribal and partisan nonsense.

(click to comment on this comment)
Mingle
06-27 02:59

FK Pls Get in Touch with Me Dear Francis, Please get in touch with me. CKA +44-740-540-5269 kagbodza@gmail.com kwami_agbodza@yahoo.co.uk

(click to comment on this comment)
CKA
06-27 10:09

"Economic Consciencism" FK, I note especially that you remind us that: "African humanism is part of the larger moral network which Homer Greene refers to as “ethical consciencism.” On the other hand, Nkrumah even intellectually proposed 

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
CKA
06-27 10:29

To CKA & Readers! Dear CKA, Thanks for your creative response. Yes, it is true Dr. Kofi Kissi Dompere's "The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Analytic Foundations of Nkrumahism" is not yet published. He is nearly done with it and a

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
06-27 15:48

Re: Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Think I wish to share a basic fact on the direction Nkrumah was taking Ghana. In the early 1960s it was the norm in the Government Assisted Secondary schools to have at least 66% of the O'Level students being biased to science and

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kojo Billy Duncan
06-27 10:30
Self-Advertisement: The 3 Musketeers Francis, are you actually touting the philosophy of Nkrumah over the Word of God? If you are, you must be a dwarf indeed. Why waste so much time over Nkrumah who has come and gone after discharging his duties as God permitted

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Whosoever Will, The Promise Is Secure
06-28 07:19

DIRECT RESPONSE TO UR QUESTION, Dr. SAS
Dear Dr. SAS, A friend called me to suggest to me to give you a more pointed response to your question, about Kwame Nkrumah and his alleged "dictatorship." I have addressed this very question elsewhere. You may want to

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
06-27 19:57
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It is only appropriate at this juncture of our intellectual dialogue to take a momentary break from the previous five-part series, of “Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Thinking” specifically, to look at the intellectual profile of Prof. Kofi Kissi Dompere, a dominant force in the American Academy and one of America’s influential thinkers recognized for his signal contributions to bridging the frontiers between science and the humanities/liberal arts. Prof. Dompere is a profound thinker and scholar, not merely a writer. This distinction is important because a running misconception among some ascribes a titular overlap to “writer” and “thinker” or “scholar.”

This fact is not only grossly misplaced but unfortunate as well. Ama Mazama, Wole Soyinka, Ngugi wa Thiong’o, and Noam Chomsky are writers and thinkers (or scholars), James Hadley Chase is not. On the other hand, the criteria for who qualifies as a thinker or a scholar do not always coincide with formal education or acquisition of advanced degrees. Both Wole Soyinka and Charles J. Pedersen, to mention but two Noble Laureates, have impacted the world in ways that could not possibly have derived from their formal education alone. As a matter of serious implication, the concrete skull of the human mind remains as accommodatingly monstrous as the endless possibilities of intellection, so too are life challenges and individuals’ strategic responses to life’s manifold challenges deemed more authoritatively powerful than or superior to the external agency of human pedagogy.

This is acknowledgement is instructive. Simply, man’s environmental externality has more to offer in terms of human psychological evolution than the instructional strictures of the four walls of a classroom. Thus formal education and degrees are merely a means, not necessarily an end, to aspects of the inner sanctum of life’s secrets. This is not to argue against the instrumentalist infrastructure of formal education per se. The point, however, argues in favor of bringing together the positive aspects of formal instruction and informal intellectual development in the progressive crystallization of the constitution of human psychology, principally in the direction of humanism.

The motivation? We raise this protest against those individuals who might be in desperate infatuation, neck-deep as it were, with the lingering cobweb of definitional and philosophical imbrication with the rubrics “writer” and “thinker,” against those individuals who always try seeking psychosocial validation in the culture of formal education and degrees via their referential rhetorical consistency toward the narcissistic scarecrow of topical self-reference. A writer is not necessarily a thinker. Many of our educated folks suffer from this outwardly-imposed neocolonial confusion. Some individuals are even quick to make a direct correlation between the depth of one’s vocabulary inventory and intelligence. Ghanaians generally make too much out of individuals who ostentatiously display profundity with English orthography and Anglicized vocabularization.

Besides, intelligence is not defined by one’s knowledge of English orthography and depth of vocabulary inventory. Intelligence is more that the expression of those two indices. The continuing poor performances of Ghana’s leadership, educated elite, and institutions indicate one thing, that intelligence or wisdom is not necessarily tied to the apron of English orthography or Anglicized vocabularization. That is not to say intimate knowledge of English orthography and Anglicized vocabularization is unnecessary in the scheme of development economics, industrial advancement, economic growth, and
material progress, at least in the case of Ghana, since acquisition of both helps open the floodgates of science, technology, mathematics, information technology, engineering, and so on. This proposition does not, nevertheless, negate the social importance of acquiring the orthographies of linguistic nativism.

Our point is that Ghanaian society should begin to accord more instructional emphasis to the study of science and mathematics and engineering and technology as of language, taking note of the additional fact that science, engineering, mathematics, information technology, and technology, are, in and of themselves, languages too, languages philosophically different from Ewe, Ga, Twi, or French, say. A surprising fact may lead to the idea that, the average Ghanaian is more likely to accord excessive respect to individuals with verbal proficiency in English than to one with technocratic expertise or know-how with passable verbal proficiency in English, where the latter’s technocratic aptitude rather than the former’s verbal proficiency is what Ghana requires for her advancement.

And since we live with nature, are part of nature, and must understand nature to ensure peaceful coexistence, proficiency in language is the way forward, as nature does not speak to man other than through the medium of language, be it science, birth, naming ceremony, religion, culture, music, death, marriage, war, disease, sex, peace, romance, literature, funeral, or ethnicity. What language does a beautiful flower describe itself with? What language does rainbow describe itself with? What language does death describe itself with? What language does hopelessness describe itself with? What language does beautiful language describe itself with? What language does Bob Marley describe “One Love” with? And what language does Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie describe her rich, ornate prose? The central issue for us at this juncture regards our ability to identify which “language” has the most potential to unravel important aspects of nature, to advance a people’s society, to improve their living conditions, and to promote internal and external harmonies in the cause of humanism.

Prof. Dompere has found that powerful “language,” that unique “language” to speak for and on behalf of Kwame Nkrumah, for and on behalf of humanity.

Thus, any disagreeable psychosocial stench emanating from those who disappointingly confuse emotional derangement, intellectual shoddiness, academic laziness, and impulsiveness with the orthography of any “language” for that matter and social overemphasis on vocabularization as a hallmark of intelligence and wisdom, thinking such misguided conceptualizations characterize their intellectual and philosophical slant towards life in general, must be treated as such, as unsung intellectual pariahs on the fringes of creative, productive academization befitting their self-denigrating statuses. We should thus learn not to tolerate weak “languages.” In that regard, Prof. Dompere’s “language” is arguably one of the most powerful methodological arrows in the American Academy, possibly in the world. This genius is a paragon of the metaphysical and the scientific, of the formal and the informal in respect of intellectual consummation, of the methodological and the rigorous, of the profound and the pedestrian, as well as of the insightful and the polymathic.

It explains also, no doubt, why Kwame Nkrumah and Cheikh Anta Diop represent two of the greatest influences on Prof. Dompere’s evolving intellectual landscape.

For one, Diop’s and Nkrumah’s influences on others, importantly coming across variously as African, Asian, and Western, are proverbial, an observation that does not require further elaboration on our part. The intellectual world knows this without the elemental intrusion of moral equivocation!

What is the constitution of Prof. Dompere’s educational profile? Prof. Dompere has a B.A. (Mathematics and Economics), M.A. (Applied Mathematics), M.B.A. (Financial Mathematics), and Ph.D. (Economics), all acquired from Temple University, Philadelphia, USA, the intellectual niche of Ama Mazama and
Molefi Kete Asante, also the home of Pulitzer Prize-winning playwright Charles Fuller.

His impressive degrees aside, Prof. Dompere is a professor in the Economics Department of Howard University. He also serves as the Director of the Graduate Studies.

Among his pedagogical responsibilities, Prof. Dompere teaches Mathematical Economics, Cost-Benefit Analysis, International Commercial Policy, Research Topics in Economics, Operations Research, and Macroeconomic Theory at the graduate level and Micro- and Macroeconomics, Statistics, and Mathematical Economics at the undergraduate level. Nevertheless, the swathe of his pedagogical interests encapsulates the aforementioned. And more. This enviable height of multidisciplinary grasp of human knowledge is amply reflected in the labyrinthine complication and topical diversity of his large choice corpus of academic works, both inside and outside the immediate province of academic officialdom.

The radical sweep of his intellectual sight and analytic depth of extremely difficult subjects, highly technical as they arguably are, is peerless in many a comparative situation with his colleagues. The sharp curvature of his mind also knows no bound, unlike some of his perpetually-sleeping peers whose intellectual tunnel-visions are trapped in the tangled myopia of uncelebrated scholarly infantility. Prof. Dompere, a man of science, mathematics, philosophy, economics, and the like, is a respected public academic known for being allergic to the scheming traps of intellectual frivolity and consequently shies away from them. It is worth stressing that this is not a feeble attempt at lionizing Prof. Dompere as he does not in any way lionize Nkrumah, his critical appraisal of Nkrumah and his body of works being, essentially, exclusively executed through the rigor of science, logic, mathematics, and philosophy, among others.

Those observations clearly prompt a question that needs asking with a view to quelching the licking fire of public curiosity: What do we make of all them?

This important question has been more than adequately answered by the model scholarships of other equally great scholars, such as Patience Mthunzi, Ave Kludze, Victor Lawrence, Yaw Nyarko, Isaiah M. Blankson, Francis Allotey, Tebello Nyokong, Ashitey Trebi-Ollenu, and Cheikh Anta Diop (See Molefi Kete Asante’s “Cheikh Anta Diop: An Intellectual Portrait”; see also Ivan Van Sertima’s “Great African Thinkers: Cheikh Anta Diop” and E. Curtis Alexander’s edited volume “Cheikh Anta Diop: An African Scientist.” Note: The late Dr. Ivan Van Sertima had a special relationship with the Nobel Committee through a four- or five-year advisory capacity on matters related to the Nobel Prize in Literature), to mention but a few. A scrutiny of their collective intellectual and activist profiles reveals an astonishing capacity of the human mind and human spirit to beat the odds in advancing the cause of humanism, of human knowledge.

This anthology of noble names clearly points to exemplification of tenacious matrimony between writership and the epistemology of thinking, of creative scholarship. Unfortunately Diop’s designation as “African scientist” is misleading. But then again, Diop’s non-official affiliation with and official membership in respected international scientific organizations, as well as his intellectual influence on the world, renders that designation characteristically provincial. Moreover, the international readership for his rich corpus of scholarly works attests to the entrenched globalism of his intellectual premiership, the world taking cognizance of the axiology of his thinking prowess. Thus, the example of Diop defines the theoretical delineation between writership and thinking. Yet he represented the attributes of both processes given his facility for French and Wolof orthographies, exquisite authorial calligraphy, multidisciplinary approach to scholarship, and height of reasoning propensity.
Prof. Dompere shares these qualities with Diop.

Inclusive of our sweeping generalizations is another contention which essentially addresses itself to many of our scholars, their annoying infatuation with armchair theorizing and unsung grandstanding via the expressed ornateness of rhetorical extravagance. These fixtures do not epitomize the definitional signatures of their aggregate intellectual practices, of the anthology of noble names we alluded to previously. Rather, they bring intelligence, common sense, seriousness and profundity, analytic rigor, exquisite authorial calligraphy, and intellectual cosmopolitanism to the cultivation of the human mind.

Prof. Dompere represents a prime example of this priceless suite of creative attributes.

For instance, Diop used the concepts of advanced mathematics, physics, biology, and chemistry to make sense out of the methodological boredom of the humanities/liberal arts, including such disciplines as Egyptology, historiography/history, human geography, anthropometry, comparative linguistics, ethnic and racial studies, philosophy, sociology, and so on. We should not forget that Diop, a world-renowned scientific mind, a polymath, and a pillar behind African humanities, sat on prestigious international scientific organizations, a ready example being the International Union of Prehistoric and Protohistoric Sciences (UISPP), an organization part of whose official function was of the nature of methodological corrective, rewriting historiographies and histories and bridging cultural, scientific, and intellectual gaps among nations, races, and ethnicities, among others.

Not only that, Diop transformed his large inventory of scientific and non-scientific ideas into a powerful political philosophy, part of whose scientific formulation directly deals with practical remediation regimina for improving the human condition and race relations across the spectrum of political economy, historiography, development economics, history, and foreign relations. Also, granted, it is not too farfetched to hypothesize that Nkrumah’s influential work, “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization,” perhaps his magnum opus, represents a grand philosophical projection of Diop’s scientific work, not glossing the enormous scientific and mathematical implications of Nkrumah’s brilliant work. Like Diop’s work, Prof. Dompere’s is part corrective, part polemic, and part restorative.

In other words, Prof. Dompere’s own highly technical academic works simultaneously dissolve and expand the concrete frontiers of these two highly gifted thinkers, Nkrumah and Diop, with the former’s unification of African project, the latter’s scientific, philosophical, and historiographic work on the cultural unity of “Black Africa,” and Prof. Dompere’s extensive scholarship on the scientific, mathematical, and philosophical explication of Nkrumah’s works, share a convenient overlap of thematic familiarity. On this point, we specifically have in mind Prof. Dompere’s monumental works, including, but not limited to, “African Union: Pan-African Analytical Foundations,” Polyrhythmicity: Foundations of African Philosophy,” “Africentricity and African Nationalism: Philosophy and Ideology for Africa’s Complete Emancipation,” and the yet-to-be-released “The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Analytic Foundations of Nkrumahism” and “Theory of Philosophical Consciencism.”

None of these titles is easy to peruse, not to talk of those used to casual reading. Critical reading techniques may not even be helpful if a reader lacks the instruments of multidisciplinary knowledge as is so typical of his scholarly works. It is even safer and convenient to keep away from his economics texts, as far as the topical indulgences of this series goes, because they belong to a different meta-universe of conceptual multilayering. This is not an attempt at hagiographic embellishment on our part. Like his non-economic texts, the economics texts are exclusively addressed to specialists, academics, and experts. We bring up these facts to show the striking parallels between Prof. Dompere and Diop.

Of course, the multidisciplinary thinking that went into Diop’s body of works is not as straightforward as
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some of his texts seem to indicate. It requires close, critical, and persistent reading to appreciate the scientific and philosophical depth of his thinking. Asante did his best to simplify some of these complicated Diopian ideas for undergraduate and graduate students in his published intellectual biography on Diop, an award-winning title already alluded to, in which he explores many of the questions students usually encounter. Further, Diop also founded a cutting-edge carbon-14 dating laboratory within the Fundamental Institute of Black Africa (IFAN), Senegal, then became its director working in close partnership with scientists affiliated with the Paris-based French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS) and the French Atomic Energy Commission (CEA). Diop established a close working relationship with Theodore A. Monod, a French scholar and a respected member of the French Academy of Sciences (See “Cheikh Anta Diop Biography” published on the website of IFAN/Université Cheikh Anta Diop de Dakar (UCAN)).

Through his able directorship of the radiocarbon laboratory, the only one of its kind at the time in the whole of Africa south of the so-called Sahara, Diop fastidiously undertook vigorous scientific asseveration of his catalogue of provocative theories, bold yet corrective scientific convictions that would ultimately overthrow many of the profound standing theories and hypotheses supporting the skewed historiography of ethnic, cultural, political, and race socialization, a transforming circumstance captured in the impactful matrix of the expanding historical evolution of human knowledge, of Africa upon the world, in the service of white supremacy and reinforcement of African intellectual and human inferiorization. Diop’s melanin dosage test is well known, a forensic technique adopted in the West to identify the racial identity of badly burnt victims.

As well, very much in the vein of Prof. Dompere’s setting mathematical and scientific tongues of fire to the philosophical soul of Nkrumah’s profound ideas, Diop’s intellectual diligence summoned before the courtly authority of logic, mathematics, and science, the horrifically bias scholarships of his European intellectual predecessors, with their emotional gravitation directed toward the hegemonic deceptions of white supremacy. These epochal events recall a renowned 19th-century Haitian anthropologist Anténor Firmin’s whose influential classic piece of anthropological, scientific, and historical work, “The Equality of Human Races: Positivist Anthropology,” represent a forceful resistance of factual invalidation of Arthur de Gobineau’s landmark work of scientific racism, “Essay on the Inequality of Human Races.” Relatedly, the scientific work of Prof. Dompere subtly aims, among other things, at dismantling any lingering coliseum of white supremacy, African peoples’ continuing internalization of inferiority complex, while overtly carving a rational path for Africa’s long-overdue yet deserving autonomy, autonomy in terms of the growth variables of development economics, science, technology, education, cultural and political institutions, improved standard of life and quality of life, technocratic politics, principles of conflict resolution, and so forth.

Prof. Dompere’s many technical and dense monographs on economic theory and practice, principles of democracy, cultural theory, critical theory, law, critical race theory, etc., directly and indirectly, capture several aspects of these questions.

We do, however, invoke the concept of conflict resolution as an expression of decision-choice theory both in respect of the decisional matrix of human economic behaviors and as a response to the question of conflictual diversity born of the negating disparateness of Africa’s ethnic and cultural superficiality. Prof. Dompere scrupulously examines the latter question as part of his overall methodological investigation of his polyrhythmicity theory. He maintains in that regard: “The methods and techniques of the argument are drawn from the logic of polyrhythms where conflicts in cultural differences as revealed in Africa’s diversity are viewed as strength and beauty in unity within the Africentric mindset.” He adds also: “These cultural conflicts and differences must be concretized in unity for Africa’s emancipation, development and social welfare improvements.” Diop investigated these questions as well.
in two important works: “The Cultural Unity of Black Africa” and “Black Africa: The Economic and Cultural Basis for a Federated State.”

Peradventure, the only difference in the methodological approach to investigating the twin questions of emancipation and development economics vis-à-vis the two scholars’ parallel working hypotheses, we could add, technically stems from the rigor of scientific and mathematical formality with which Prof. Dompere philosophically welcomes those two questions. The subtle difference in their methodological approaches to the radical science of Africa’s emancipation and development economics, nonetheless, does not take anything away from Diop’s technocratic, scientific, and philosophical vision, bearing in mind that these questions preoccupied Nkrumah’s captivating intellect as well.

We may recall that Diop won the admiration and plaudits of some of the most influential thinkers and scholars in the world, during the international scientific colloquium organized under the auspices of UNESCO, in 1974.

It is not for any reason that the late Jean Vercoutter, one of France’s leading archeologists, Egyptologists, and historians, an intellectual who held the directorship of the French Institute for Oriental Archeology (IFAO), from 1977 to 1981, membership in the French National Center for Scientific Research (CNRS), from 1945 to 1955, should go to any extent to secretly recruit Diop, a scholar he had enormous respect for, for one of France’s top universities even after he had demonstrated stiff public opposition to Diop at the 1974 international colloquium. It is for the same reason that one of France’s elite institutions of higher learning, the Sorbonne University, Diop’s alma mater, should erect Diop’s statue on its premises in honor of his signal contributions to human knowledge. The same university has since collected and archived Diop’s scientific papers and books for students, scholars, and researchers alike.

Then, finally, Les Nubians, an award-winning soulful duo and one of the world’s most successful jazz, hip hop, and neo-soul acts from France, should dedicate “Immortel Cheikh Anta Diop,” a memorable track on their 2003-released “One Step Forward” album, to Diop’s humanism, intellectual prowess, Pan-African vision, and lasting scholarly influence on the world. Similarly, Nana Adomako Nyamekye’s monumental “Manyi Wo Ayea,” a puissant highlife track celebrating the greatness, influence, humanism, and long-tunnelled vision of Kwame Nkrumah and other Pan-African leaders, is a fitting tribute. We may then understand why Prof. Dompere privately and publicly identifies with Diop and Nkrumah.

Meanwhile, the colloquium brought together the best minds from Africa, Asia, the so-called Middle East, and the West to debate questions bordering on human evolution, comparative linguistics, historiography, classical antiquity, political economy, archeology, human geography, Egyptology, ancient history, anthropology, and so forth. The breadth of Diop’s scientific knowledge, multidisciplinary expertise, and sheer force of arguments won the day (See the book “The Peopling of Ancient Egypt & The Deciphering of the Meroitic Script” based on the proceedings of the 1974 UNESCO-organized colloquium).

Prof. Theophile Obenga, a former head of San Francisco State University’s Black Studies Program and a major contributor to the authorship of UNESCO’s General History of Africa and the Scientific and Cultural History of Humanity, accompanied Diop to the said colloquium. Obenga, himself a world-class historian, Egyptologist, linguist, and philosopher, Chief Editor and Director of the journal “ANKH, Journal of Egyptology and African Civilizations,” as well as ex-Director General of the Centre International des Civilizations Bantu (CICIBA), has described Nkrumah’s “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization” as a masterpiece.
That is not to miss the point that any of Nkrumah’s other works is just as epochal, polemic, insightful, informative, and provocative. Chinua Achebe made a similar point to an audience at the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., during an auspicious occasion to mark his birthday and the 50th anniversary of the publication of “Things Fall Apart,” telling the audience: “But I should tell you I have written other books.” That remarkable statement was meant to redirect the audience’s attention to the larger corpus of his literary works and also to tell the world that the other literary writings in his corpus are just as equally indispensable and worth paying attention to. It is against this background that we argue for Nkrumah’s literary corpus to be made required reading in schools, read at all levels of society, and thoroughly discussed in the corridors of power.

Having said all that, Prof. Dompere has admitted having Gerald Massey, Yosef Ben-Jochannan, and Theophile Obenga as the other major influences on his intellectual evolution. In a sense, we cannot look at the larger contexts and implications of Prof. Dompere’s scholarly works outside Diop’s and Nkrumah’s intellectual and political achievements, including the aforementioned. Prof. Dompere dialectically brings the productive syntheses of these great minds together as a unitary inquiring backdrop for his scientific and mathematical and philosophical delving into the secret dungeons of other great thinkers and scholars as Nkrumah. Certainly, there are important overlaps and mutual continuities flowing into or out of each other’s ocean of scholarly works, a point too conspicuous to ignore.

Given these facts, we could not, therefore, underestimate Prof. Dompere’s admission that his own intellectual development has benefited enormously from Diop’s multifaceted work and multidisciplinary approach to the study of human knowledge. Similarly, Wole Soyinka has consistently credited Diop, a position he assumes through critical moments of qualified laudation, with dislodging Western illogical discoloration of Africa via the stilted philosophical consciousness of white supremacy. “With these three publications,” continues the website of IFAN/UCAN, adding: “Cheikh Anta Diop founded the scientific history of the African continent and inaugurated, at the same time, a school of African history.” Prof. Dompere expands upon Diop’s legacy.


As a matter of further emphasis, Diop and Nkrumah were uniquely united in their intellectual, philosophical, humanistic, and political enterprise across time and space in bringing Africans together in the interest of cultural, scientific, ethno-racial, geopolitical, and technological homogenization on a par with the West and Asia, this in terms of development economics. Nkrumah would then not only engage the monstrous intellect of Diop but formally extend an invitation to him to join a philosophical movement the former had conceived, to transform Africa from within and without, to make the world a better through the soundness of their scholarships. Profs. Botwe-Asamoah and Dompere revealed this little-known information to us during one of our conversational moments.

And not unlike Diop, Prof. Dompere’s massive academic work, seventeen texts in all as of this writing, charts new radical trajectories of transformational consciousness in human thinking.

Yet, the kind of transformational consciousness we are referring to appears somewhat conceptually similar to Nkrumah’s philosophical consciencism, which Prof. Dompere again explained to us as a conceptual formula that provides a solid philosophical foundation for a regimen of development strategies aimed at Ghana’s (and Africa’s) internal development, growth, and relative stability, and by extension strengthening and enhancing her strategic stature in the structural development of Africa, by,
among other things, negotiating society’s internal contradictions and the huge historical costs Africa has incurred over five centuries through her fortuitous relations with external hegemonizing forces that did not and still do not have Africa’s interest at heart.

Patriotism, an uncompromising sense of nationalism, represents an infrastructural signature of philosophical conscientism, so too are human development, human capital development, industrialization, humanism, public health, universal quality education, self-autonomy, African unity, etc. Alas, the contemporariness of neocolonialism adds to the major challenges philosophical conscientism faces today. Is it not ironic that neocolonialism is a necessary collaboration between the rapacity of Western capitalism and the greed of her willing African androids.

“No nation can hope to develop with an albatross of juvenile delinquency around its neck, of school-going children hawking wares on roadsides during school hours as we see happening in Ghana today,” Prof. Dompere tried explaining to us during one of our fruitful discussions on the theory of philosophical conscientism and its implications for national development. “You need efficiently-running universal public services. You need universal quality education for your citizens. You need a healthy population for development. You need food security. You need infrastructure. You need patriotic citizens and good leadership and unity for development…And yet what do we see happening across Ghana? Kleptocracy and kakistocracy and incompetence everywhere…Politicians coming in and going out through the revolving-door of the state coffers, pillaging in turns. Why must a country as rich as Ghana go begging?”

Prof. Dompere then concludes: “This new crop of post-Nkrumah leadership does not understand Nkrumah, what he stood for, and his great ideas.”

It is clear from the foregoing that Prof. Dompere’s frustrations with Ghanaian leadership in particular and African leadership in general do not substantially, to put it bluntly, deviate from Chinua Achebe’s overall reservations about postcolonial African leadership as candidly laid out in the book “There Was a Country: A Personal History of Biafra,” reservations of which Wole Soyinka has been highly and sharply critical, with “The Guardian” Alison Flood writing thus: “Soyinka said he regretted that he had never had the chance to challenge Achebe’s final book…’It is…a book I wish he had never written?’that is, not in the way it was. There are statements in that book that I wish he had never made (See “Calls for Chinua Achebe Nobel Prize ‘obscene,’ Says Wole Soyinka”).”

What is so objectionable about Achebe’s admissions as to summon Soyinka’s critical ire? Is the literary criticism of such works as Achebe’s final nonfiction no longer subject to the investigational claims of historicity? Aside what we have said about Achebe and Soyinka, Prof. Dompere’s scholarship goes beyond either man’s diagnoses and prognoses of African problems, including Nigeria’s, thus expanding upon and revising previous theories, inventing new ones, and validating them primarily via science, mathematics, and logic. We should, as matter of fact, try to understand Prof. Dompere’s acute demur to Ghana’s and Africa’s political and economic dilemma in the presence of abundant natural wealth and human capital, of the lost of vast opportunities that could have been translated into better conditions for the masses with the right ideas. The discontinuity introduced into Ghanaian politics by Nkrumah’s disappearance from the political scene has a lot to do with it (See Robert Woode’s book “Third World to First World?By One Touch: Economic Repercussions of the Overthrow of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah”).

One of the major reasons for Ghana’s (and Africa’s) continued underdevelopment has everything to do with a lack of creative or innovative ideas for transforming the continent and improving the living conditions of the masses. Nkrumah as a practical answer to Ghana’s (and African’s) myriad problems has been uncritically overlooked by many a post-Nkrumah leadership. Yet it is also not too farfetched when we make a claim of philosophical connectivity between Prof. Dompere’s righteous indignation and the
ideological structure of contemporary Ghanaian politics concerning her negative development economics.

Consequently, we should argue in furtherance of the positive attributes of Prof. Dompere’s ideas that, any given political party that claims to represent the aspirations and interests of the masses and have the nation at heart must surely derive its political philosophy from a genuine philosophy of inclusiveness, the kind of philosophy that provides guidance to development and growth strategies, speaks boldly to the negation of Africa’s neocolonial dependency complex, promotes scientific and technological and engineering and mathematical ideation with a practical capacity for resurrecting Africa’s originality, all of these painted against a social pastiche of patriotism, universal quality education focusing on critical thinking and STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) and information technology, and so on.

Such a practical philosophy requires unity of purpose for fruitful eventuation. More significantly, unity is virtually lacking at all levels of the Ghanaian society, cultural, ethnicity, political, religious, gender, and so on. Philosophical conscientism, a unifying theory of sorts, has no room for such retrogressive tendencies as ethnic nepotism, regrettably a major institutional fixture of post-Nkrumah politics. Yet again, it is clear we have Nkrumah to thank for so many great things, including for the rich legacy he left behind for the world, which Ghana and the rest of Africa, alas, have failed to avail themselves of for all the wrong reasons. This is exactly where Prof. Dompere’s scholarly work comes in. An obvious corollary of Prof. Dompere’s reservations about Ghana’s and Africa’s poor political, scientific, economic, and technological showing points to the palpable absence of Nkrumah’s titanic technocratic and philosophical vision in the atavistic character of either of the leadership of Ghana’s major political parties.

A theoretician of philosophical conscientism may want to find answers to the following questions:

Have we examined our scientists to see why they are not performing on par with international standards? Have we examined our educational institutions and curricula to see whether they meet the standards of STEM education? Have we thought of replacing Ghana’s divisive politics with a more inclusive politics of populist democracy? How hard are we working at “true” independence? What plans have we put in place to add value to our natural wealth? Have we asked ourselves whether we are adequately supporting our scientists through investment in research and development (R & D)? Have we asked ourselves why Ghanaian movie and music industries are behind Nigeria’s and why African movies continue to promote ignorance, rather than scientific and mathematical and technological knowledge, etc?

Have we asked ourselves why bureaucratic bottlenecks and organizational antiquation undermine productivity? How hard are we working towards African unification? What are we doing to address youth unemployment, juvenile delinquency, and child hawkers? What are we doing in terms of reducing disease burdens? What are we doing to resolve ethnic, political, and religious conflicts on the continent? What are we doing to create industrial economies in Africa? What are we doing to make Africa a military power to reckon with?

The moral of philosophical conscientism, essentially then, is getting Africa out of the tangle of neocolonial political ectopy and economic mendicancy against the dehumanizing tendencies of external patronage, largesse, and paternalism, with Ghana’s post-Nkrumah leadership conveniently working so hard to replace philosophical conscientism with neocolonial peonage. Prof. Dompere’s scholarship, then, aims at the radical reversal of these dehumanizing tendencies through close scientific and mathematical and philosophical examination of Nkrumah’s influential “Conscientism: Philosophy and Ideology for
Decolonization” and other such critical works.

This work by Nkrumah is so difficult conceptually and technically ambiguous as to take Prof. Dompere’s nearly a decade of intense closing reading of it to reach the many interesting yet bold conclusions he presents in his two unpublished volumes on Nkrumah which he is still editing and others.

It is clear that our leaders have not picked up anything worthwhile from Diop’s “Pre-colonial Black Africa: A Comparative Study of the Political and Social Systems of Europe and Black Africa (from Antiquity to the Formation of Modern States)” as well as from Walter Rodney’s “How Europe Underdeveloped Africa.” Our leaders’ incompetence and their collusion with Western multinationals to rob the people in broad daylight, economic mismanagement, nepotism, universal corruption, cronyism, witch camps and trokosi and religious dogmatism, social decay, ethnocentrism, irresponsible journalism, declining educational standards, gross misunderstanding of democracy, and the willing participation of the people’s nonchalance are open variables of the neocolonial equation of Ghana’s underdevelopment.

We shall return…
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The world truly knows who great thinkers are and easily gravitate towards them.

The exceedingly tall profile of Prof. Dompere’s academic work has received critical attention from scholars, scientists, experts, researchers, practitioners, and specialists in India, Japan, Russia, among others. Others from high-profile places as America’s Los Alamos National Laboratory, the site of America’s Manhattan Project where the world developed its first atomic bombs through international collaboration, have also benefitted from his work. Social scientists, physicists, mathematicians, economists, logicians, cultural theorists, historians, engineers, operations researchers and management scientists, scientists, diplomats, Egyptologists, statisticians, computer scientists, philosophers of science, political scientists, professional philosophers, policy makers, sociologists, cognitive psychologists, public consultants, and behavior theorists have enormously benefited from and made good use of Prof. Dompere’s vast intellectual resources.

This is more so because the apparently wide disciplinal range of his work cuts across many specialties and expertise and knowledge-areas, thus making a serious effort to provide practical and scientific answers to address several aspects of the human condition.

It may however, alas, seem it is only our Ghanaian-based specialists, researchers, practitioners, experts and policy makers, who are blind to Prof. Dompere’s scholarship and vast professional expertise in the area of technocratic pragmatism, among other specialties, even though he has gifted the University of Ghana, Legon, copies of his books, once again confirming Africans’ undying appetency for foreign ideas, even if intrinsically antagonistic to progressive African values and ideas, otherwise the bane of Africa’s development economics. One wonders why a few Ghanaian parliamentarians such as Dr. Anthony Akoto-Osei, one of Prof. Dompere’s former students and a brilliant one at that according to the latter, behave in a way contrary to the progressive and technocratic tendencies of Prof. Dompere’s rich and expert tutelage once they enter or embrace Ghanaian politics.

It is not clear if the ideological divisiveness of partisan politics is the cause! It is also as though African leadership suffers from what Harold Cruse called “the Crisis of the Negro Intellectual.”

Likewise, no less forceful and visionary thinkers like Kwame Nkrumah, Cheikh Anta Diop, Molefi Kete Asante, Francis Allotey, Yaw Nyarko, Calestous Juma, to mention but three, have given us powerful scientific and technocratic blueprints for modernizing the continent through sound ideas across the fields of political economy, development sociology, and development economics, yet the leadership of Africa, as always, continues to suffocate intellectually for lack of practical, technocratic and scientific ideas (See Diop’s “Black Africa: The Economic and Cultural Basis for a Federated State”; see also Asante’s essay “The Character of Kwame Nkrumah’s United Africa,” published in The Journal of Pan African Studies, Vol. 4, No. 10, 2012).

Then again, like the various arguments made in support of the Nordic Model, the Beijing Consensus, and the Washington Consensus vis-à-vis the evolving particularities of the cultural histories, historical development, and development economics of Scandinavia, China, and America, respectively, these
formidable thinkers, Dompere, Asante, Diop and Nkrumah, have advanced cogent theories whose praxes and possibilities of effectuation have serious implications for energy generation, humanism and egalitarianism, strong cultural ethos, popular democracy, universal quality education, proper management of natural resources, development of human capital, gender equality, fiscal responsibility, global respectability, continental unity, equitable distribution of wealth, and Africa’s mediating presence in global affairs.

Interestingly related to the shameful, and sometimes inexplicable, yet serious question of habitually ignoring and neglecting our own dynamic thinkers, men and women who have done so much for the world and who, equally, can be compared to the best in the world, is Prof. Francis Allotey’s recent pointed suggestion that, such capable thinkers be included in the origination, formulation and implementation of policy matters, especially Africa’s development economics and development sociology and scientific development, not glossing the fact that Prof. Allotey has consistently made a very powerful case establishing connections between research and development, science and technology, on the one hand, and improved standard of living and quality of life on the other hand (See Katepalli R. Sreenivasan’s book “One Hundred Reasons to be A Scientist,” a piece published under the auspices of the European-based International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP)).

On the other hand, following the logical pattern of the preceding paragraph, we could undertake similar reviews of the works of Nigeria’s world-renowned theoretical physicists Profs. Alexander Animalu and Bartholomew Nnaji, of American-based Ghanaian scientists Ave Kludze, Kofi Kissi Dompere, Isaiah Blankson, Kwabena Boahen, Victor Lawrence, Trebi Ashitey-Ollenu, etc (See the Black History Month section of ghscientific.com for additional information; take note of the female scientists). Among other things, our central argument points to the fact that it is high time African institutions found efficient ways to develop these kinds of human capital as well as efficient means to replicate or originate the transforming ideas of these innovative thinkers, strategic and tactical questions occupying Prof. Dompere’s painstaking exploration as part of his larger corpus of theoretical inquiries into Africa’s development sociology and development economics, while doing so through a dynamic scientific re-examination of the broadsheet of Nkrumah’s radical thinking and intellectual innovativeness.

Most significantly, Profs. Allotey and Diop and Obenga share that peculiar commonality of vigorous analytic thinking, depth of understanding of the human condition, critical thinking, and profundity of theoretical formulation and practical evaluation of theoretical constructs associated with social commitment to acquisition of technological and scientific knowledge for the sole purpose of human development, with the likes of Prof. Dompere.

Then also, as one of America’s leading economists, mathematicians, historians, logicians, operation researchers, cultural theorists, philosophers, social scientists, business analysts, statisticians, and scientists, Prof. Dompere has closely read J.B. Danquah, K.A. Busia, and several others, yet it is the monstrous intellect of Nkrumah, his technocratic prescience, his depth of complex issues related to and profound grasp of political economy, development sociology, and development economics, and his sheer analytic power, that stand incomparably tall among Prof. Dompere’s dense corpora of scientific, mathematical, and philosophical works.

Other scholars such as Prof. Zizwe Poe, one of America’s leading authorities on Nkrumah, has examined the body of the latter’s works from the theoretical standpoint of Africology (See his book “Kwame Nkrumah’s Contribution to Pan-Africanism: An Afrocentric Analysis”). Prof. Kwame Botwe-Asamoah on the other hand has made significant contributions to scholarship on Nkrumah, thoroughly examining the cultural dimension of Nkrumahism and Nkrumah’s specific contributions to Ghanaian, African, and global culture (See his book “Kwame Nkrumah’s Politico-Cultural Thought and Politics: An African-

Finally, Emanuel B. Ocran analyzes Nkrumah’s legacy in the broader context of other world leaders from antiquity, such as the Greek statesman Pericles, to great leaders of contemporary dispensation, his peers included (See his book “Kwame Nkrumah: The Greatest African”).

“You have to read Kwame Nkrumah scientifically,” Prof. Dompere explained to us recently. True, one cannot critically read Nkrumah and Soyinka, say, in the same way, by the same standards if you will, more so because readers with strong theoretical grounding in science, mathematics, engineering backgrounds as well as with heavy intellectual and research investments in the humanities/liberal arts, specifically English orthography, etymology, philology, and comparative literature, and who have also closely read both intellectuals, Nkrumah and Soyinka, know for a fact that Prof. Dompere’s remark is not, characteristically, a self-serving understatement, an easily verifiable statement of fact.

Actually the reason for our observation is not illogical or too far-fetched. The sheer array of technical expertise, ideational formulations, knowledge systems, academic disciplines, and theories which Prof. Dompere brings to scholarship dwarfs Soyinka’s by far. Thus, both Nkrumah and Prof. Dompere should be read critically in a unique context radically larger and exegetically quite apart from the perusing sympathies we are wont to invest with our pantheon of Men of Letters and Women of Letters, our bellettrists, as no one can doubt the epistemological tonicity of Nkrumah’s powerful corpus of scholarly works.

Nevertheless, this is not to destabilize the intellectual and philosophical ballast of Soyinka’s profound corpus of masterful writings, prosaic consummation, and poetic elegance, given that he is not a trained scientist, mathematician, or philosopher, although some of his major literary works, notably his corpora of essays and serial memoirs, public lectures, and interviews paint a versatile thinker who is not obviously out of tune with the dialectical rhythm of scientific literacy, technocracy, and philosophy. Notwithstanding all the above, Prof. Dompere is an intellectual giant in his own right. And eloquently so. This is so given the influence of his scholarly works in the American Academy in particular and the larger world.

What is more, his scholarly works, technical expertise, intelligence, and commonsense approach to the human condition and human knowledge have won the hearts of his peers as well as also benefited international organizations, American institutions, specialists, researchers, practitioners, experts, and many other individuals from around the world with various technical expertise in diverse academic disciplines. This is what great minds and formidable thinkers do, working so hard as to pull the world to their side. No, probably the opposite is rather the case. What is the point?

The world tends to gravitate towards great minds to make up for its intellectual lapses. This is the kind of mind Diop, Marie Curie, Poincare, Achebe, Awoonor, and Du Bois bequeathed to the world. It is the same great minds we should expect Mazama, Dompere, Morrison, Asante, Soyinka, Kludze, Trebi-Ollenu, Allotey, Blankson, Thiong’o, Armah, and Obenga, to mention but a few, will leave behind to make up for human inadequacies. Let us add that Prof. Dompere has not ceased taking inspiration from Diop’s intellectual legacy and scholastic militancy.

Diop, possibly the most important of Prof. Dompere’s intellectual mentors, needed the sharp tools of intellectual militancy to engage insidious scholastic purveyors of racism in the international academe, a
salient point Nkrumah also correctly noted, forcefully arguing in favor of shifting the focus of the investigational methodology of African Studies from its anthropological anchorage to sociological scrutiny. “African Studies is not a kind of academic hermitage. It has warm connections with similar studies in other countries of the world. It should change its course from anthropology to sociology,” Nkrumah told a group of international scholars, “for it’s the latter which more than any other aspect creates the firmest basis for social policy.” Toyn Falola and Chrsitian Jennings have attempted answering aspects of Nkrumah’s propositions in their edited volume “Africanizing Knowledge: African Studies Across the Disciplines.”

Moreover, it is for any reason that the First World Black Festival of Arts and Culture (FESMAN), held in Dakar, Senegal, 1966, would honor Diop and Du Bois with the following citation: “As the scholars who exerted the greatest influence on African thought in the 20th century.” Certainly, this is not an excuse to get bogged down under the weight of the tall list of Nkrumah’s international, continental, and local accolades, recognition, and awards. Those are already public knowledge and, furthermore, Prof. Dompere’s scholarly works go beyond the stifling circumference of hagiographic embellishment and mindless infatuation. What we can only say at this point is that Prof. Dompere has hinged his academic career partly on Nkrumah and his great ideas, and thankfully, he is reaping unexpected benefits and enjoying a currency of enviable international recognition today. Nkrumah and his corpus of profound ideas have taken him to places, of course unexpected niches in the four corners of the world. Put simply, the social calculus of Prof. Dompere’s catapult into a forceful global intellectual presence partly derives from his calculated association with great minds as innovative as Nkrumah’s, Diop’s, among others.

The University of Pennsylvania, one of the world’s top universities as well as one of America’s Ivy League, eight of them in all, and Lincoln University, the alma mater of Thurgood Marshall, Nkrumah’s classmate and America’s first African-American Supreme Court Justice, and Nnamdi Azikiwe, Langston Hughes, Melvin B. Tolson, either Nkrumah’s classmates or schoolmates among others, have carefully archived Nkrumah’s works for researchers, students, professors, and the general public. Also, the Moorland­Spingarn Research Center, Howard University, houses Nkrumah’s papers including his little-known correspondences with Diop, arguably one of the world’s best and noted scientists, historians, Egyptologists, and philosophers of the past century (See Dr. Poe’s book for additional details and Asante’s “Cheikh Anta Diop: An Intellectual Portrait”).

We have to bear in mind the existence of another little-known history about Nkrumah in which, prior to shipping himself off to the Gold Coast to assume the secretaryship position with the UGCC, he had traveled to France to educate future leaders like Felix Houphouët-Boigny and Leopold Senghor on Pan-Africanism, Africa’s decolonization, and West African unity in particular and African unity in general with a view to recruiting them for the cause of freeing Africa. Dr. Poe writes: “Nkrumah served as the Vice President and Executive Board Member of WASU while he was the General Secretary of WANS. While serving in the capacity as the latter Nkrumah made two trips to France to consolidate relationships with the African members of the French National Assembly. Nkrumah held audiences with Sourous Apithy, Leopold Senghor, Lamine Gueye, Houphouet-Boigny and other Africans residing in France.” Dr. Poe continues: “WANS threw two West African Conferences which sought to promote nationalism and unity of African students studying in Europe and the USA. Sourous Apithy’s and Leopold Senghor’s participation was a direct result of Nkrumah’s travels. From that point WASU stayed in touch with African student organizations in France…the colonial-lingua barrier was broken…”

Also little discussed in the public domain and which is a matter of historical record is, Nkrumah’s transitioning in Liberia and Sierra Leon on his way to the Gold Coast from England, where, among other things, he discussed his program, plans, and strategies for freeing West Africa (and Africa) with those two countries’ leadership, historical facts pointing to the notion that Nkrumah had it all planned out
before finally disembarking in the Gold Coast to assume the secretaryship of the UGCC. “Circle members had elaborate duties to expand the West African Revolution as an integral step in the African Revolution…Other member of the Circle were not from West Africa. The notable among them were Padmore, Kenyatta, and Makonnen,” write Dr. Poe.

The Circle was an organization Nkrumah had created in England “to safeguard the increasing zealous African masses” and to “protect the masses from demagogues, quislings, traitors, cowards and self-seekers (See Dr. Poe’s book and Marika Sherwood’s ”Kwame Nkrumah: The Years Abroad, 1935-1947”). “During this period,” notes Dr. Poe, “Nkrumah was advocating the ‘eventual’ unity of all of Africa and African descendants abroad.” Therefore, those ill-informed revisionists who claim Nkrumah appropriated these ideas from the leadership of the UGCC, a nominal institution without a program, without institutional branches across the colony, and without a following until Nkrumah’s arrival in the Gold Coast breathed life into it and removed the barrier of institutional lapses, had better look at the historical record closely again, for Nkrumah had kept his ear to the ground, among other things.

“Nkrumah arrived in the Gold Coast and after meeting with his family he assessed the political climate from the ‘ground level,’ Dr. Poe writes further. “He had done investigations from abroad through conversations with Africans and others who had traveled to and from the colony.”

Again, Nkrumah’s enstoolment as a king in Nkroful together with his humility, dedication to the cause of humanism, and intelligence have inspired others to humble themselves before humanity. Such is the enduring power and beauty of great minds. On the other hand, individuals who take great minds serious and steadily apply themselves to the products of great minds’ intellecction, as well as honor the humanity of great minds, cautiously protect their legacies against conscious corruption of unscrupulous and mediocre scholars and by intellectual, political, and ideological ignorance, etc, through sound scholarship ascend great heights collaterally, ultimately assuming greatness themselves in the process. Such is the model case of Prof. Dompere.

In fact we see the dialectic aesthetics of the latter’s great mind in his corpus of scholarly works. This is why Prof. Dompere’s technical and sophisticated monographs, most of which are published by Springer Publishing, the world’s largest publisher and holder of the largest inventory of major scientific works, have a special place in the hearts of the American Academy and the larger academic world, where experts, academics, researchers, and specialists from around the world can avail themselves of useful resources and those of other scientific thinkers for a wealth of information. Further, not unlike many other scholars of global repute, whether Black, White, or Asian, men and women who have meticulously delved into the byzantine psychology of “Ghana’s Founding President,” as the late Ali Mazrui prior to his passing referred to Kwame Nkrumah in his internationally celebrated essays, books, and public lectures, Prof. Dompere’s nonpareil scholarship, sublimely outstanding, profound, and formidable by every conceivable standard, correctly situates Kwame Nkrumah and his powerful battery of ideas, once again, on a pedestal of international scrutiny and studious valuation.

As well, it is worth noting that Prof. Dompere’s vigorous scientific re-evaluation and theoretical extension of Nkrumah’s long concatenation of theories, ideas, and general thinking lacks a tinge of hagiographic nostalgia, a point already conceded. Perhaps, no postcolonial leader of Africa has had his ideas subjected to the rigor of mathematical, scientific, and philosophical evidentiation as Nkrumah’s. In that regard, Prof. Dompere et al.’s thorough examination of Nkrumah’s legacy and contributions to human civilization represents an apotheosis of intellectual brilliance and methodological firmness. We cannot, however, exclude the research findings of Prof. Botwe-Asamoah, a close friend of Prof. Dompere’s, the same man who had introduced the latter and his body of works to us, from any discourse having to do with critical scholarship on Nkrumah (See Prof. Botwe-Asamoah’s five-part essay “The Fallacies of J.B. Danquah’s Heroic Legacy,” K.A. Busia: His Politics of Demagoguery, National
Disintegration and Autocracy,” and three-part essay “Kwame Nkrumah: The One and Only Founding Father of Ghana”.

As we said before, Prof. Dompere’s scholarly works on Nkrumah clearly demonstrate a great mind of scientific, mathematical, and philosophical profundity. The next question we may want to ask is this: Thus far, what has been some of his outstanding achievements as far as his academic work and professional life go? Readers may have to bear with as this question is inevitable, recalling that we did the same with Ama Mazama, Victor Lawrence, Molefi Kete Asante, and Yaw Nyarko. Ideally this is the part we want the Ghanaian and African youth to pay close attention to and possibly learn something useful therefrom.


Prof. Dompere has many authored scientific and technical papers to his credit. As well as several unpublished papers yet to be published. We emphasize here again that Prof. Dompere writes exclusively for experts, specialist thinkers, and scholars. Ironically and this is a verifiable fact, there are even PhD holders who are understandably, if irrecoverably, clueless about the wide topical scope and labyrinthine mathematical-scientific multilayering of his corpus of scholarly works, aside from the sweeping and analytic rigor of his methodological crossdisciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. This is no mere understatement. As well, the idiosyncratic and nomothetic aspect to his methodology cannot be overlooked. As a matter of fact, we have given several reasons, on the other hand, explaining why this, purportedly the difficulty level and labyrinthine constitution of his scholarly works, is essentially so and, accordingly, will not volunteer any further rationalization to account for the prohibitive complexity and cross-disciplinary sophistication readers are most likely to encounter as they attempt to grasp the elaborate articulation of his scholarly works.

Let us make it quite clear here again that Prof. Dompere does not write for the average scholar or reader. In fact, his works relatively make the literary corpora of Wole Soyinka, James Joyce, or Wilson Harris easy read. We make this verifiable assertion on authority. Putting everything aside, however, Prof. Dompere’s high-profile academic standing in the American Academy is exemplified by his respected membership in the American Society for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), the world’s largest scientific organization; the New York Academy of Sciences; the Econometric Society, a global society of academic economists; the Golden Key National Honor Society; the American Economic Association (AEA); the Diopian Institute for Scholarly Advancement (DISA; with Prof. Kwame Botwe-Asamoah); and the Institute for Operations Research and Management Science (INFORMS). He is also associated with Scientific American; Fuzzy Sets and Systems; International Journal of Development Economics; Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing, Theory and Decision; and Journal of Intelligent and Fuzzy Systems.

Furthermore, Prof. Dompere has also served as Chairman of the Appointments, Promotions and Tenure Committee (APT) of Howard University’s Economics Committee, as well as of the Curriculum Committee and the Macroeconomic Examination Committee. And he has also been a member of the Gradual School’s Task Force on Environment Science, Howard University. These rich membership
schemata are ample testimony to his public certification as a redoubtable presence in the American Academy. On the other hand his membership in international scientific organizations brings his body of works under the evaluative glare of global scrutiny!

Thus, Nkrumah comes across as both a corollary and an intrinsic infrastructure of Prof. Dompere’s global intellectual stature. Could we then ascribe this phenomenon to an exemplar of collateral benefit? No doubt both thinkers’ works can stand, however severally, on the merit of their own internal logic and demonstrable power of scientific evidentiation. This is no idle exaggeration.

We may also want to add that all the intellectuals we have mentioned thus far in the preceding paragraphs are technically scholar-activists, so-called. Scholar-activists are intellectuals who do serious thinking about improving the human condition, always trying to establish a linear correlation between armchair theorizing and the praxis of solving human problems. Scholar-activists develop and promote creative ideas that impact institutions and human thinking for the betterment of society. Scholar-activists also deploy the uncompromising sledgehammer of truth-laced provocative and advocacy writings, public expressions of righteous anger, nonviolent agitations, and public speaking, to name but four strategic and tactical tools, to engage institutions and human psychology in underwriting the progressive enterprise of societal transformation. In other words, scholar-activists exert direct impact upon the lives of individuals and institutions and themselves as a functional corrective for institutional and human aberrations.

Prof. Botwe-Asamoah, a brilliant and thoughtful activist-scholar, has sat on committees tasked to look into Affirmative Action and corrective recommendations as they relate to gender and racial disparities, among others. In addition, he had engaged Americans in the 1980s through a program he hosted on WBAI (part of the Pacifica Radio Network) on important subjects of importance to his general listenership. Finally, he and Kwame Anthony Appiah and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and others, now representing a collection of enviable academic heavyweights in the American Academy, formed a study group to explore methodological inquiries and intellectual strategies aimed at improving the human condition via sustained investigational appraisal of the dynamics of history, development economics, race relations, political economy, literature, postcolonial theories, American Civil Rights Movement, and so on.

Indeed, improving the dynamics of race relations, questioning Western historiography on Africa, and giving voice to the African world in the Western Academy and the larger world assumed precedence over other strategic and tactical concerns. What is more, Prof. Botwe-Asamoah has been a formidable political strategist and tactical theoretical behind the political philosophy of the Convention People’s Party (CPP) as well as behind other progressive political currents in Ghana, in addition to publicly collaborating with a prominent figure in the leadership of the African National Congress (ANC) and others, particularly African-American intellectuals both inside and outside the Civil Rights Movement, in fighting racism and social injustice. For these scholars constructive intellectualism means more than high-flown scholarship and writing. Malarkey is not part of their intellectual DNA.

Nkrumah had much to say about this, writing: “Social revolution must therefore have, standing behind it, an intellectual revolution, a revolution in which our thinking and philosophy are directed towards the redemption of our society. Speaking of impractical and unproductive intellectuals who are merely engaged in intellectualism for its sake, Nkrumah notes pointedly: “They live in an ivory tower in a world of their own, escaping from reality and cutting themselves off from the practical life of the people. By so doing they miss the glorious opportunity of identifying themselves with the political and economic aspirations of the people and deprive themselves of the ability to link their lives with the life of Ghana… The University of Ghana has a great future provided it can shed the Don Quixote armor of unreality which has ruined so many modern institutions which have tried to live a life of self-deceit with both their
Higher education, Nkrumah once opined, should pay “respect or allegiance to the community or to the country in which it exists and purports to serve.” However, these remarks do not say Nkrumah was averse to theoretical reformations, quite the contrary. His rich body of scholarly works, particularly “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization,” attests to this observation! These facts and others may possibly explain why Profs. Botwe-Asamoah and Dompere click so well, with both accommodating the political philosophy of Nkrumahism as a scientific window into Africa’s development sociology and development economics, notwithstanding the fact that Nkrumahism expresses itself most eloquently through the theoretical and practical implications of “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization.”

Then also, it is of paramount interest to note that the connection between Profs. Botwe-Asamoah and Dompere, personal and professorial, brings up the latter’s scholar-activist profile, which is partly exemplified by his active engagement with his general American listenership through a program he has been hosting on WPFW Radio (89.3 fm) since 1987, an exciting program covering African news, commentaries, politico-economic issues, and so on. The program is called African Rhythms and Extensions. This last descriptive piece joins the long catena of scholar-activists, summing up their social, political, ideological, and educational functions in society. Like Nkrumah, scholar-activists view the practical side to a theory as important as theory itself!

Last word before closing the chapter: It is important that we critique our leaders no less an important and influential personality as Nkrumah and his government, not on revisionist distortions, selective amnesia, shoddy scholarship, intellectual dishonesty, sentimentality, and the like, but rather on well-structured arguments premised on a regimen of historicity, intellectual honesty, sound scholarship, evidence-based analysis, and rational thinking. A typical exemplar is Nkrumah and his economic policies. What is the moral of our proposition? K.B. Asante and several thinkers have cogently argued in favor of Nkrumah’s economic policies, stressing that the latter pursued development trends popular at the time and vigorously pursued across the world, with Western economists notably endorsing his economic policies (See Asante’s essay “Nkrumah and State Enterprises.” In other words, Nkrumah’s progressive economic ideas were not anatopistic or anachronistic!

Asante further quotes Tony Killick, author of “Development Economics in Action: A Study of Economic Policies in Ghana,” on this matter:

“This school [interventionist school] established powerful theoretical and practical arguments against reliance upon the market mechanism and advocated a strategy of development which placed the state in the center of the stage. A central planning agency was to provide inducements of commands superior to the price signals of the market. There was much less agreement on whether the instrumentalities of the state should be largely indirect i.e. modifying but working through the market mechanism by such means as tariff policy and the provision of tax incentives for investments, or direct, i.e. replacing the market by administrative controls and the establishment of state-owned industries. It is not possible, in my view, to identify a consensus on this issue. But there was virtual unanimity on the large role of the state? a unanimity which extended to Ghana.”

Thus, critiques of Nkrumah’s political and economic choices should be formulated in or based upon the context Killick so unambiguously defines. We should also add that scholars generally refer to the situation Killick describes as state (or government) interventionism, statism, or state capitalism. Nonetheless, whatever the merits of the intellectual or ideological enemies of Nkrumah are with regard to Nkrumah’s economic policies, one thing is certain and salient: He had the support of Ghanaians and
international economists, mostly Western. However, we should also want to point out that those on the ideological right in the United States are doing the same thing to President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s legacy, his economic policies (See Jim Powell’s book “FDR’s Folly: How Roosevelt and His New Deal Prolonged the Great Depression” and Burton W. Folsom, Jr.’s “New Deal or Raw Deal?: How FDR’s Economic Legacy has Damaged America”).

We are talking about the Republicans and their ring-wing think tanks and research institutions, more like Ghana’s New Patriotic Party (NPP) and the Danquah Institute and IMANI! This observation is a fascinating one. Indeed, there are strong as well as interesting parallels between the criticisms leveled against Roosevelt and Nkrumah, and we hope readers pay close attention to them.

Part of the criticism has been centered on FDR’s economic policies, the so-called New Deal, as being influenced by socialism/communism. In fact, those who cite socialism/communism argue that the threat of socialism/communism spreading to America, worker agitations, and the near-universal appeal of socialism/communism to the world may have played an indispensable role, however distant, in the policy formulation of the New Deal, which, in turn, undid American socialism. This theory is not out of the realm of public knowledge. On the other hand, others like Milton Friedman took FDR to task for adopting Keynesian economics, especially Keynes’ theoretical positions on deficit spending and state intervention, to address America’s Great Depression.

Most significantly, these critics argue that FDR’s policy and ideological slant towards economic interventionism or state capitalism succeeded in destroying America. In other words FDR’s economic policies were generally a stark failure, like Nkrumah’s, even as FDR ruled America for four consecutive terms from 1933 to 1945, his tenure representing the longest such in America’s entire political history.

Furthermore, they also claim, among other things, that the welfare state FDR’s policies engendered did little to sustain the general welfare in the long run. Finally, others also criticize FDR for scheming his manipulation of the constitution of the Supreme Court with a view to having his favorites, those who favored his New Deal policies, elected to the Court. Ironically, the New Deal gave birth to the Social Security Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the Federal Housing Administration (FHA), the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC), all public institutions, and abolition of child labor, minimum hourly wage, forty-hour worksheet, etc. Why have those on the ideological right, including right-wing American presidents, not dissolve these viable public institutions since they are part of the failures of FDR’s New Deal? The preceding question, nevertheless, remains an intimidating desert, to wit, unanswered in the popular literature of right-wing writers whose corpus of writings have fallen under our perusing microscope.

Evidently, intellectual or ideological identification with cherry-picking, selective evidence or confirmation bias is their stocks in trade. Another neglected yet crucial question is: If indeed FDR’s economic policies destroyed America as it has been argued, how come America’s economy still remains the largest and possibly most buoyant in the world though China’s has been predicted or tipped to overtake the former’s in the near future?

Also, the controversial issue of the Preventive Detention Act (PDA) is another ideological weapon that has been used against Nkrumah, his government and legacy, comes to mind. Once again the argument has been self-servingly skewed to favor the real terrorists and nation-wreckers, members of the National Liberation Movement (NLM), as the Nkrumah government fought hard to keep the new nation from tearing apart along regional, ideological, religious, and ethnic fault lines. Authentic reasons justifying implementation of the PDA are usually skipped over for ideological and political justifications instead,
swept under the carpet for obvious reasons.

Conversely, implementation of the Avoidance of Discrimination Act (1957) was timely and appropriate, eventually contributing to and strengthening the moral umbilical-cord of Ghana’s birth and collaterally producing a major opposition party, the United Party (UP), in the process. Yet critics of the PDA do not tell the world the new nation owed its enactment to the colonial government, not to Nkrumah, the then-Prime Minister (See K.A. Asante’s “Preventive Detention Act was a Painful Necessity” and Ekow Nelson and Dr. Michael Gyamerah “The Origins of Preventive Detention in Ghana”).

What is also not broached in public discourse is that successive regimes after Nkrumah had used the PDA under different names or labels. The National Liberation Council (NLC) called its own version of the PDA the Protective Custody Decree (PCD), while conveniently refusing to credit the prior regime for passage of the PDA. Here is the disparity: The PCD led to the incarceration of 1850 political prisoners, as opposed to 1377 under the PDA. Yet the PDA had been in existence longer than the PCD, since 1958! What is also strange about the whole affair is the calculating tendency of Nkrumah’s ideological enemies and political critics to invoke Western democracy and cultural ethos as liberal systems Nkrumah should have learnt from, taken sustained interest in, rather than invoking the PDA in the interest of national integrity and national peace.

Hindsight can, indeed, sometimes make history a liar, truth a liar, and black white. Regrettably as it already is, there is always something important amiss when comparative assessment of topical questions is invoked as an effective tool for plumbing irritant controversies confronting Africa and the West. Some of these Nkrumah critics are not even aware that the modern versions of preventive detention are not even African but Western in origin, going all the way back to the era of the Magna Carta.

“Preventive detention is not prohibited by U.S. law or especially frowned upon in tradition or practice,” Benjamin Wittes and Adam Klein argue in the Harvard National Security Journal, adding that the circumstances in which it arises are relatively frequent. “The federal government,” they conclude, “and all 50 states together posses a wide range of state detention regimes that are frequently used, many of which provoke little social or legal controversy” (See “Preventive Detention in American Theory and Practice,” Vol. 2, 2011; See also Stephanie Blum’s “Preventive Detention in the War on Terror: A Comparison of How the United States, Britain, and Israel Detain and Incapacitate Terrorist Suspects,” Homeland Security Affairs, Vol IV, No 2, Oct. 2008; and Andrew Harding’s “Preventive Detention and Security Law: A comparative Study”). No country on the planet had had it perfect with preventive detention of any sort. This is not to justify its abuses under the Nkrumah administration and the National Liberation Council. Magnus George, E.A. Maclean, and M.O. Kwatiah, three CPP members died under the Protective Custody Decree of the National Liberation Council!

What is more, taking everything together in one exegetical capsule, however, it does seem the underlying assumptions and reasons undergirding the codification of the Avoidance of Discrimination Act are not philosophically and morally distinct from the one-party system. This is not a defense or denunciation of the practice, we should point out. On the other hand some excellent arguments and convincing reasons have been adduced to justify the practice (See George P. Hagan’s “Nkrumah’s Leadership Style?An Assessment from a Cultural Perspective”), “Yet Nkrumah reached the same conclusions as his contemporaries Sekou Toure, Houphouët-Boigny, Leopold Senghor, Modibo Keita, Julius Nyerere, and Jomo Kenyatta,” Dr. Ama Biney writes of the controversial one-party system. “While the Ivory Coast and Senegal purported to be multiparty states, they were de facto one-party states in which other parties had no chance of winning state power.”

“In other words, they were one-party states by another name,” Dr. Biney writes particularly of the Ivory
Coast and Senegal. “In short, these various African states were all grappling with the same issues as Nkrumah: How does a nation-state prevent descent into a religious and ethnic fragmentation of society?” These are some of the general questions Nkrumah’s highly theoretical and dialectically sophisticated work “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization” attempts to resolve. More importantly, we bring up these examples as an attempt to put the ideological enemies of Nkrumah in direct acquaintance with how relatively widespread the one-party system was across Africa and other parts of the world, as well as putting their selective criticism of Nkrumah and the one-party system in its proper historical and cultural perspective.

Ironically, it is not even acknowledged by Nkrumah’s ideological enemies in public discourse that the colonial government of the Gold Coast ran a de facto one-party system prior to its dethronement by the Convention People’s Party (CPP) or, that the Britain introduced preventive detention in India for obvious reasons. In addition, there are also those in Britain, Canada (Quebec), and Australia who perceive Britain’s constitutional monarchy as a dictatorship, a one-party system if you will, and thus have consistently argued for its abolition. In fact the reasons Kenyatta, Houphouët-Boigny, Nkrumah, Toure, Keita, and Senghor adduced for the institutionalization of the one-party system can be likened to Abraham Lincoln’s insidious rationalization for the Civil War.

It has been cogently argued by various influential writers, historians, and scholars that the real pretext for the Civil War was not the aggregate assumptions and implications of Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation, but rather of his intentions to build a rival empire as great as Great Britain’s by nipping the secession of the American South in the bud (See Thomas DiLorenzo’s “The Real Lincoln: A New Look at Abraham Lincoln, His Agenda, and an Unnecessary War” and “Lincoln What You’re Not Supposed to Know About Dishonest Abe”; see also Lerone Bennett, Jr.’s “Forced into Glory: Abraham Lincoln’s White Dream”). Why are Lincoln’s insidious excuses for waging war to keep the geopolitical integrity of the United States intact morally acceptable, this according to Nkrumah’s ideological enemies, but Nkrumah’s morally unacceptable?

Then also, others are quick to cite the so-called Rwanda Miracle as a model for Ghana’s and other African countries’ development economics, yet the same people conveniently overlook Paul Kagame’s one-party regime. Kagame’s arbitrary deployment of “genocide ideology” to stifle opposition to his Tutsi-dominated government is well known. Has Kagame not ruthlessly used Kafkaesque “genocide ideology” to maneuver his opponents out of political office? It may be recalled that Kagame made a Hutu president of his government while he shared the vice presidency with another Hutu, a tactical arrangement designed to give his Western supporters an inkling of a representative government, not a khakistocracy. He chased them out before long under the flimsiest of alibis and has assumed the presidency since.

Yet these undemocratic strategic maneuvers have not prevented Kagame from courting the high-profile friendships of Bill Gates, Tony Blair, Barack Obama, Bill Clinton, and owner of Starbuks. That is not all, however. Meles Zenawi, the late Ethiopian Prime Minister, also ran a one-party government, same of Yoweri Museveni. All three, Kagame, Zenawi, and Museveni, have received their strongest support, namely financial, military, moral, and intelligence, from the West (See Milton Allimad’s “Will Obama Side with Africa’s Enemies, the Corrupt Leaders?”). We also know the American constitution does not look favorably upon third-party formation (See Duverger’s law, Jeffrey Sach’s First-Past-The-Post Principle, and William Domhoff’s “Who Rules America? Power, Politics, and Social Change”).

Thus, in one sense America’s two-party system is merely a corporatocracy, a one-party system! Here, as elsewhere, we invoke Dambisa Moyo’s keen observations to buttress our arguments. We advanced the following last year: Dambisa Moyo capitalizes on the sharp contrasts between the West and China to
make her case, pointing out that private capitalism, liberal democracy, prioritized political rights, sociopolitical qualities we readily associate with the West, the “Western Model,” she calls it, are not necessarily ironclad ingredients for economic success. Alternatively, her observations are bolstered by the fact that state capitalism, de-emphasized democracy, prioritized economic rights over political rights, in other words, what she refers to as the “Chinese Model or Beijing Consensus,” equally promises better standard of living in the shortest possible time. In short, Dambisa believes democracy is not a prerequisite for economic growth. We may add the Nordic Model to Moyo’s!

These facts raise a number of troubling questions: Why did Nkrumah and his government do the things we associate with him and his legacy? Was he justified in coming up and implementing those ideas we associate with him and his legacy? Why is it acceptable for America to support Germany’s industrialization under Adolf Hitler, for America and Britain to team up with their staunchest enemy Joseph Stalin against Nazi Germany, for France to aid America in her war of independence against Britain, and for America to provide Saddam Hussein intelligence to locate Kurds and Iraqis and gas them to death during the eight-year Iran-Iraq war, among other historical and contemporary wrongs, but wrong for Nkrumah to strike strategic and tactical alliances or get into a political marriage of convenience with the East, on the part of the West and its local supporters? Why is FDR’s state capitalism justifiable in the reckoning of an ideological enemy of Nkrumah, yet the latter’s state capitalism deemed unjustifiable under any circumstance?

Could Nkrumah’s socialist rhetoric have blinded some to the actual facts? Could Nkrumah’s socialist rhetoric have blinded some to the actual facts? Is Marxism and its theoretical cognates, socialism and communism, not Western in origin? Why was Nkrumah’s support for Black South Africa deemed morally unjustified by the West, yet at the same time Western support for Apartheid South Africa seen as a high mark of moral inevitability? Why are the West’s Euro, NATO, European Union, Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA), and AFRICOM excellent ideas, but Nkrumah’s proposals for continental unification based on the following four-set plan: 1) A common foreign policy and diplomacy, 2) A common continental planning for economic and industrial development of Africa, 3) A common currency, central bank, and military zone, and 5) A common defense system (African High Command), problematic? Was Nkrumah always wrong, everyone else always right?

What is our primary reason for raising these examples? The reason is simple. Prof. Dompere subjects the underlying assumptions and reasons behind Nkrumah’s manifold ideas to a vigorous analysis of scientific attestation via mathematical modeling, optimization, and simulation, a means to demonstrate or establish their viability, or otherwise, in a real world setting. This approach is a familiar methodology in marketing, game theory, operations research, warfare, game theory, analytics, management science, industrial engineering, advertising, artificial intelligence, computational biology, stochastic systems, etc. Technically the hardest part of mathematical modeling may, perhaps, be a question of formulation and of correctly solving it to obtain optimal solution(s). The next step involves confirming the feasibility of the optimal solution(s) in a qualitative or experimental context. Prof. Dompere’s work has done both. The rest is for policy makers, think tanks, experts, specialists, practitioners, etc., to implement them.

This goes to show how mathematics can be used to solve human problems, to improve the human condition, and to unearth the scientific and mathematical implications of Nkrumah’s creative ideas. In other words, Prof. Dompere looks past politics and allows advanced mathematics, science, and logic to speak on behalf of Nkrumah’s profound ideas and Nkrumahism!

On the other hand, as a point of comparison, the closest theoretical approximation we can cite to explain or give readers an inkling of Prof. Dompere’s important work on Nkrumah is that done by the African-American scholar Dr. Jonathan Farley, notably one of the world’s brightest, youngest, celebrated, and
accomplished mathematicians, who has used his expertise in the theory of ordered sets, graph theory, and lattice theory to develop software for fighting terrorism (See his paper “Toward a Mathematical Theory of Counterterrorism,” The Proteus Monograph Series, Vol. 1, Issue 2, Dec. 2007, and “How Al Qaeda Can Use Order Theory to Evade or Defeat U.S. Forces: The Case of Binary Posets,” Advances in Network Analysis and Its Applications (2012). In fact, he has published a number of scientific papers on using mathematics to fight counterterrorism!

We shall return…

Re: Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Think Bro. Francis, Instead of subordinating your fine intellect to other intellectuals, don't you think the time has come for you to originate your original "praxis" of principles and thereby contribute to human progress? As I ha

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

DR. SAS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
01-09 01:19

That is a work of a sycophant. To Kwarteng, Nkrumah is the greatest politician in the black world and everything he did is justifiable. This includes the PDA, One party state and declaring himself President for life. He finds support from some obscure aut

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

Kwadwo
01-09 04:04

Correction. Last sentence should read….but we are not moved. He had to go.

(Click to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-09 04:17

Kwadwo u are a simpleton Has Africa developed? Has Africa become a world power? Nkrumah offered SOLUTIONS and we threw them away. Let us follow the principles he laid down and see the difference.
Kwarteng follows science and its rules or laws never

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kojo T
01-09 09:03

Kojo T I know this though. I am a simpleton but I know that when Nkrumah asked Frimpong Ansah how much Ghana had in our foreign reserves, the answer was £500,000. Remember that he started with £250,000,000. This is what scientific socialism left us

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-09 20:27

A KID INDEED! You can be forgiven for being a kid when Dr. Nkrumah was overthrown, but not for being naive and stupid. Yes, sources said Nkrumah cried when he found out there was 500,000 pounds left in Ghana's foreign reserves, but do you

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwabena Yeboah
01-09 21:44

Re: A KID INDEED! Kwabena Yeboah, Kwadwo is a joke. Russia had this and that in Ghana and so
what? Did America not collaborate with Stalin? Did America not have an office (CIA) in Mobuto's Zaire that masterminded Lumuba's assassination?

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
 francis kwarteng
 01-09 22:39

Re: A KID INDEED! Address the issue of Nkrumah's tyranny and explain its impact on the society. We will concede Nkrumah's infrastructural achievements, but those are ephemeral; what did he give us in terms of the freedom and independence he pr

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
 Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
 01-09 22:52

Kwabena Yeboah Nigerians did not have Nkrumah's scientific socialism but they were equally educated like Ghanaians. You should rather thank the cocoa farmers who provided the capital for these projects not Nkrumah and his dictatorial regime

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
 Kwadwo
 01-10 05:29

IGNORANT AND CLUELESS KWADWO Nkrumah's scientific Socialism was the key. How were Nigerians equally educated like Ghanaians? How old were you when hundreds, if not thousands of Ghanaians went to teach in Nigerian schools in the seventies. Do you know why Ny

(Click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
NONE SO DEAF Krobo Adusei's sister did appreciate being killed prior to the PDA. Water Boding and Guantanamo are the true virtues of democracy.

(click to comment on this comment)
GUESS
01-09 09:38

Kwarteng, Asante Aduman idiot Good to know that, Kwarteng is an Asante Aduman idiotic "Kokoase Krakye." GOOD NEWS!

(click to comment on this comment)
ADJOA WANGARA
01-09 16:41

Re: That is a work of a sycophant. Dear Kwadwo, What's up? Kwawdwo, if you have no idea how Jewish leaders and scholars contributed to making Adolf Hitler, please read what the following leading Jewish scholars have to say (take note of the primary source

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-09 19:34

Francis, Francis, Francis. Thanks for my reading assignment. I dont need to go that far to know that through out history, others have worked against the interest of their own kind. Clarence Thomas is a typical example over here. But know that he is wr

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-09 20:46
IGNORANCE IS BLISS The bible says, for lack of knowledge my people perish. Ignorance has become the bane of the black man as he is wont to stop at nothing to destroy his fellow black man because of partisan politics or sheer stupidity. Why a

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwabena Yeboah
01-09 21:12

You sound Very Insulting? Only Kwarteng, the Asante Aduman Kookoase Krakye, would accept this unruly advise from you. What exactly do you mean by "......originate your original "praxis" of principles and thereby contribute to HUMAN progress"? And wha

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Mr. Figure-Out
01-09 16:22

Re: You sound Very Insulting? Solomon's stupid judgment amounts to attempted infanticide...I could do better today by simply requesting for a DNA testing. You should ask me what I have done for my country with my knowledge and education, and when I begi

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
01-09 20:15

NARCISSISTIC FOOL It is only the empty barrels that make the most noise, and I am 100% sure that you are an empty barrel. I am an intellectual myself, but do not parade my credentials on a forum like this as you do. You are so cognitively ad

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwabena Yeboah
01-09 22:11
Re: NARCISSISTIC FOOL If Solomon did not have the luxury of DNA testing, why didn't he display his wisdom by inventing one instead of threatening murder upon a poor child? And then again, what is the relevance of quoting something that happened at

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
01-09 22:40

ADDENDUM: STUPID SOLOMON Let stupid Solomon take his judging nonsense on to an American courtroom, asking that a child be cut into two and find whether the bailiffs will not arrest him or the government will not dismiss him! You nincompoops just swa

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
DR. SAS, ATTORNEY AT LAW
01-10 02:53

ADJOA WANGARA aka SARPONG I hope the year 2015 will be a year of intellectual transformation for SARPONG, Dr SAS, AHOOFE and the band of quasi-intellectuals on this forum. Have a nice day.

(click to comment on this comment)
Paul Manu
01-10 09:54

Paul Manu, as stupid as Bokor & Kwarteng Paul Kwarteng you are as stupid as Bokor, Pryce, C.Y. Andy and Kwarteng. Get it in your smashed flat head that Sarpong is in Texas-USA and I, Adjoa Wangara is not in the American Continent.

(click to comment on this comment)
ADJOA WANGARA
01-10 11:18
DR SAS, THE NON-EVIDENTIARY LAWYER AGAIN? Dr SAS, the Texas-based tribal bigot who is imbued with hatred and animosity, and who has been described on this forum as a NON-EVIDENTIARY LAWYER (meaning a lawyer who does not believe in EVIDENCE), in spite of Nkrumah's laudable

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Frank Appiah
01-09 17:00

DR SAS, THE QUASI INTELLECTUAL Lack of objectivity, lack of candour and failure to appreciate the achievements of others, are some of the characteristics of quasi-intellectuals such as Dr SAS. No doubt, paper qualification is sometimes misleading.

(click to comment on this comment)
Oheneba Asare
01-09 17:16

Re: Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Thinking Dear Dr. SAS, Good day. I can understand your position sometimes. But what Dr. Dompere is doing with Nkrumah’s ideas (plus his ideas and texts on economics) is benefiting the present world in so many ways. I mentio

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-09 18:11

Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant If your intent was to educate us on the application of Nkrumah’s ideas in advancing progress in Ghana, then you failed for lack of abstractness, lack of clarity and sheer obscurity. You may want to rewrite to show clearly wha

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
01-09 20:05
Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant

Dear Brother SAS,

Let us refresh our memories. I wrote:
"Ironically, the New Deal gave birth to the Social Security Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), th

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

francis kwarteng
01-09 22:01

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant

What have all these got to do with the specific problems we face today? Use our lack of town and city planning to provide a model answer. Just focus on the issue inspired by the question. Don't write about the ideas and ho

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

Dr. SAS, Attorney at Law
01-09 22:14

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant

Dr. SAS, Understood. Why don't you get Dr. Dompere's works, read them yourself, and get to know about the practical specifics and how they directly apply to town or urban planning, say! My job is to provide readers.

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

francis kwarteng
01-09 22:59

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant

Namesake Yaw, Typos or not, those of us who are sensible and educated can fathom them out and understood every bit of what you intended to write. You couldn't be clearer! You take DR SAS too seriously as someone who wan
DR SAS IS LIKE AHOOFE Dr SAS and AHOOFE have the same mindset. Please ignore these half-baked intellectuals on this forum. They can't make any objective analysis on this forum.

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant Efo Yao, Good day. I hope you have recovered or still recovering. Get well if you not already well! Thanks for your insightful and pointed remarks. As for Dr. SAS, I will whip him. Don't worry, Efo Yao, I have a big ca

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant Nyebro Yaw, I am getting well and recovering my energy by and by. As for Dr SAS, he is just misguided when it comes to Nkrumah. I won't put him in the same
strait-jacket as his unholiness Ahoofe though, as Paul had jus

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
C.Y. ANDY-K
01-10 03:39

Re: Braying Praises for a Defunct Tyrant Nyebro Yao, I am glad you are getting well. I look forward to reading your pieces (one-party systems, PDA, etc). Thanks.

(click to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-10 03:56

To: francis Kwarteng francis, you sometimes create an impression, your biggest critique, Adjoa Wangara is right that you just use to copy and paste because most of your response to commentators does not usually reflect your own written and posted

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Joe Frank
01-10 04:24
Francis, don't get me wrong. I know where you are coming from ideologically and I believe you know where I also stand on Nkrumah and his rule. I am not just a stubborn critic. That only means you are being dismissive of my comments and that is rather unfair.

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-10 06:59

Re: Francis, don't get me wrong. Dear Kwadwo, Mind you, I did not use the phrase "stubborn critic" in any negative sense. I appreciate you all. Besides, I have said there is no one on Ghanaweb I cannot stand up to. I mean it! That said, the Heritag

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-10 08:05

KWARTENG, THE FAKE COPY & PASTE FOOL Now! Francis Kwarteng, apart from the fact that you have copied and pasted pure "weed" for readers, explains to how you came by the following words which has nothing to do with English: * appetency * ghscientific * bene

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
ADJOA WANGARA
01-09 02:55

Is That Not Too Long? Articles on Ghanaweb are normally read within 15 mins or so break time!

(click to comment on this comment)
JB Mann
01-09 10:12
DR SAS NEEDS HELP Dr SAS definitley needs some lessons on Ghana's post-independence political history, with special reference to the period 6th March, 1957-24th February, 1966. I doubt if he knew how many assassination attempts were made on Nkruma

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
James Ababio
01-09 17:36

CORRECTION DEFINETELY not DEFINETLEY DEFINITELY not DEFINITLEY

(click to comment on this comment)
Paul Manu
01-10 02:48
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On a more serious note, it is Prof. Dompere’s consultancy work with and for international and American institutions that arrests our utmost attention and underscores our critical valuation of his work. Among other things, he had served the World Bank in a capacity as a resource person and as a referee in a major study looking at African economic policy and trade negotiations. He had also been actively involved in the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) Training Program. Admittedly UNITAR personnel work in every corner of the world. What is more, Prof. Dompere has extended the reach of his consultancy profile to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as a Senior Technical Research Consultant.

What is the role of the FHWA in America’s political economy? The FHWA provides oversight of America’s physical structures, namely bridges, tunnels, and highways, including such concomitant functions as maintenance, construction, and preservation of these structures across federal, state, and local jurisdictions (See the website of the U.S. Department of Transportation: Federal Highway Administration). Moreover, FHWA also carries out research aimed at improving mobility, traffic, safety, and so on, across the geopolitical expanse of America. We mention these to underscore a pressing need for social and political emphasis to be imposed on maintenance technocracy in Ghana.

That aside, Operations Research, one of his many professional portfolios of expertise, provides the necessary technical tools for federal institutions such as the FHWA and the American military. The American military, corporations (energy, supply chain management, and retail sectors), transportation, oil and gas and mining industries, Wall Street, especially, are the biggest users of Operations Research techniques. The story is the same in emerging economies represented by Brazil, India, China, Singapore, Malaysia, South Korea, and Russia. Even across Europe and Japan, too. Finally, Prof. Dompere’s consultancy work with the US-based Basic Technologies International adds to his rich intellectual and professional profile.

Still, it is his active involvement with consultancies carried out on behalf of Africa’s development economics that we think captures his string of crowning professional achievements. This rich portfolio of consultancy experiences includes stints with USAID in connection with the National Accounts and Macroeconomic Policy/Industrial Systems Design of the Government of Botswana. Here he served the Government of Botswana in a capacity as a Technical Consultant. Last but not least, Prof. Dompere served as an Economic Consultant to the World Bank, where he assisted the international institution in assessing the social implications and economic impact of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs) on Ghana, as well as a consultant to the International Development Research Center (IDRC), a federal arm of the Canadian government. There, his consultancy expertise focused on the strategic conglomeration of Southern African and Eastern African regional bodies into a common market, recalling Nkrumah’s call for a common market for Africa, etc.

Finally, his consultancy profile has included work he did on economic planning and cost-benefit analysis for the Organization of American States (OAS). That such a great scholar and a great mind would turn down a lucrative job offer from the World Bank in order to concentrate his energies on his research work, teaching and writing responsibilities, doing consultancy work for American and international
organizations, and offering training sessions for personnel on behalf of international bodies such as the World Bank and the United Nations, men and women dispatched to the four corners of the world in the service of humanity, is hardly surprising. No doubt he is as hardworking and enterprising as Mazama, Nkrumah, Diop, Asante, Soyinka, and several other influential intellectuals, scientists, and thinkers across the world. It is also not in question that Nkrumah’s profound ideas about practical intellectualism and those on egalitarianism, patriotism, collectivism, selflessness, and humanism constitute the driving forces behind Prof. Dompere’s scientific scholarship and intellectual activism.

As it stands, Prof. Dompere’s activist intellectualism has a fine replica in the person of Prof. Yaw Nyarko and of other impressive minds. And the parallels between them are striking, to say the least. Prof. Yaw Nyarko, acknowledged as “one of the world’s most ranked African academic economists” according to the website of the New York University-based Development Research Institute (DRI), created DRI and the New York University Africa House to deal with questions of the human condition. On the other hand, Prof. Asante also created the Molefi Kete Asante Institute for Afrocentric Studies and the Diopian Institute for Scholarly Advancement (DISA) with similar motivational focus in mind, which are: To advance the intellectual engagement of the African world with the rest of the world, scientific and technological research, African-centered methodology of historiography and of pedagogy, race relations, social justice, African unity and Africa’s economic empowerment, Africa’s voice in global affairs, and so on.

Also, Prof. Victor Lawrence’s founding of the Stevens Institute of Technology-based Center for Intelligence Networked Systems (iNETs) and Bahricom Development Corporation are driven by the same impetus to improve the human condition and to make the world a better place. Accordingly Prof. Dompere’s scientific work and thinking signature, manifestly, coincide with the aggregate philosophical thrusts of the afore-cited thinkers and scholars. This anthology of innovative thinkers has proven track records of accomplishments to back its armchair speculations and conjectures, as well as the latter’s immediate positive correlation to the praxis of human satisfaction.

What is more, their research institutions are more results-oriented, thorough, competitive, relatively “independent,” analytic, and scientific in their philosophical approach to human problems than the vacuous noise-making rickety wheelbarrow or partisan virago some commentators misleadingly label “think tank” in Ghana. Thus Ghanaian institutions can learn a lot from these “scientific” institutions, including, but not limited to, such concepts as practical criticism, social criticism, critical rationalism, scientific criticism, objective knowledge, professional criticism, moral criticism, theoretical criticism, without the adulterations of political, class, ethnic, and intellectual biases.

Thus it is also within reason, then, to assert without stochastic equivocation that, given our intimate knowledge of Prof. Dompere’s scholarly activism, vast body of work, intelligence, scientific and mathematical grasp of the external conditionalities of human consciousness as well as of the autogenic dynamics of human psychology, inclusive of the enabling dynamics of humanism, and last of all, of his profound appreciation of Nkrumah’s deep, labyrinthine, and sophisticated ideas, evaluated from the holistic standpoint of advanced mathematics, logic, and science, one is more than compelled to conclude that Prof. Dompere is driven to do what he does best by the creative encouragement of the factorial accommodation of all of the above interacting variables. We should do well not to gloss over the other salient driving variables we mentioned previously. Most significantly, great minds are also activated, egged on, and motivated by interacting quanta of intuitions and imaginations which “lesser” minds take for granted. Given all the above, it is therefore pointless to belabor the skyline height of originality Prof. Dompere brings to bear on his multifaceted rational scholarship.

This quality of originality is rare among many of our scholars. In other words, Prof. Dompere is known
for fashioning his own vigorous scaffoldings of mathematical models to explain phenomena where there seems to be a total lack of ready formulaic examples to underwrite serious attestations of his ideational extrapolations. Mathematical modeling, one of his many areas of expertise, is an interesting but quite a complicated, challenging, and oftentimes unpredictable, subject matter for many.

What is the point? Mathematical modeling and analytics are not analytic tools appreciated for their predictive power or rather are deployed on a smaller scale in less developed political economies like Ghana’s, perhaps, because the narrowness of the industrial and technological base of Ghana’s economy, her largely uncompetitive economy in the scheme of global finance, her weak supply chain networks and the technological tenuousness of her local markets, all put together render such relatively modern techniques less useful. Then again, analytics plays more than an important role in driving the engines of emerging economies as those of China’s and India’s and Brazil’s and South Africa’s, even as of the industrialized West. Thus, the theory and underlying assumptions of analytics are somewhat synonymous with Dr. Dompere’s scientific investigation of ideas and knowledge.

Interestingly, though, unlike Albert Einstein who had his major important Special Relativity and General Relativity mathematical equations either framed or solved by others, among whom we could readily mention Henri Poincare, David Hilbert, Karl Schwarzschild, Marcel Grossman (See Chandra Kant Raju’s paper “Einstein: From Icon to Con-Man” and Hans C. Ohanian’s book “Einstein’s Mistakes: The Human Failings of Genius”), Prof. Dompere on the other hand formulates his mathematical modeling problems largely by himself and also works out the solutions largely by himself.

This is not to say there is anything wrong with others solving Einstein’s mathematical problems for him. It is merely to stress his intellectual deficits. Again, Einstein’s intuitive penetration and grasp of the physical world and of the natural ordering of things is commendable. Besides, Einstein had not been known to be a good mathematician, not after his consistent failures to provide a concrete, or satisfactory, mathematical proof for his mass-energy relationship. Neither was he the first to even propose the so-called mass-energy relationship. These facts have come to light because scholars, mathematicians, and scientists across the world have thoroughly examined his published papers (and the entire collection of his unpublished papers) to come to this conclusion (See Hans C. Ohanian; the French polymath Henri Poincare proposed the mass-energy relationship before Einstein’s papers on general relativity appeared on the scene). Yet he brought his own uniqueness to theoretical physics.

That aside, mathematical modeling is what bio-mathematicians, operation researchers, social scientists, string theorists, engineers, chaos theorists, computational neuroscientists, management scientists, financial engineers, economists, scientists, actuaries, and analytics professionals primarily do. Unfortunately, the problem we face in Ghana and across Africa today is certainly not one of orthographic, or possibly of intellectual, confusion per se, but rather of a lack of clear policy choices based on the strength of moral and technocratic foresightedness or of clear scientific articulation of strategic choices for priority formulation of practical and technocratic answers deemed sufficiently responsive to the social tsunami of challenges posed by the human condition.

This calls for scientific, intellectual, moral, and technological revolutions across the continent! We should recall that Nkrumah began these transformative revolutions but the enemies of Africa and Africans, native and foreign, curtailed them for reasons of greed, intellectual myopia, spiritual vanity, political misdirection, inferiority complex, and self-aggrandizement. Yet, neither Ghana nor Africa lacks resources in the area of human capital across the spheres of science, mathematics, technocracy, professional and academic economics, medicine, biomathematics and bioengineering, actuarial science, management science and operations research, engineering, and so on, capable, intelligent, and prescient men and women who could transform the continent as Nkrumah envisaged it.
The presence of this cadre of men and women in and their impact on the world is public knowledge. Nkrumah and Nkrumahism laid the foundation for this, and the latter’s impact continues to reverberate today even in the lives of those who passionately hate Nkrumah. As a matter of fact, Nkrumah’s pursuit and subsequent actualization of independence for the Gold Coast echoed its own manifold benefits, some subtle and nuanced, others brazenly patent. Talking about the referential typology of “independence,” Prof. Dompere’s intellectual independence has come to represent a hallmark of his ingenuity, feeding his theoretical breakthroughs, an existential quality that has served him so well over the years. Thus, it is not surprising when he advised some students and university professors at the University of Ghana, Legon, sometime last year while in Ghana on vacation, to originate their own theories and ideas on the basis that those systems of ideas and theories are imbued with an actuality, not a potentiality, of transformative power, a necessary power to improve the human condition.

Prof. Dompere felt those systems of theories and ideas he implored the students and professors to undertake could potentially replace those imported into Ghana and Africa, purportedly lifeless, impractical, and fruitless theories and ideas, the latter about which the said students and professors bitterly complained, saying they were inimical to the forward tendencies of Ghana and Africa. Nkrumahism theoretically invalidates these negative tendencies. Nevertheless, Prof. Dompere could not have been more forward and forthright with his audience. Similarily, Mazama, Asante, Diop, and Nkrumah championed parallel ideas.

It is public knowledge that the absence of methodological independence as it pertains to the caliber of research required to transform Africa and to intellectual originality probably constitutes the bane of Africa’s development economics. There is enough evidence on the ground to substantiate this!

Merely copying foreign ideas without realistic considerations given to their adaptive applicability in local conditions or by failing to test their viability against the contextual praxis of localistic conditionalities, is, inevitably, not the best of strategic options for development economics. Context, philosophical location, history, perspective, intimate knowledge of one’s enemy (game theory), and worldview are all important in the formulation of the equational politics of strategic and tactical planning (See James M. Blaut’s “The Colonizer’s Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History”). It is not to say constructive collaboration with researchers from without is a necessary anathema to the creative enterprise of origination. That is far from our position. The political economy of constructive collaboration, as we want to describe it, can be likened to the nature of chameleonic tendencies whereby it takes on the form and substance of critical socialization between a people’s collective psychology and their cultural history, social ethos, cultural pathos, among others.

Prof. Dompere’s “Polyrhythmicity: Foundations of African Philosophy” and “African Union: Pan-African Analytic Foundations” examine the logos of the preceding statement on the merit and technical strength of mathematical, philosophical, and scientific actuation. Then again, constructive collaboration, we should point out, negates a not-so-widely acknowledged piece of information told to Prof. Botwe-Asamoah by Prof. Awoonor, with the former writing: “the first thing the makers and the foreign co-conspirators [CIA] did after the coup of 1966 was to destroy the Atomic Energy Program.” Is this kind of collaboration innovative? Could it be that the technophobic Ghanaian coup makers did not understand the political economy of the energy needs of the country, the Program’s larger implications for underwriting an industrial economy, or giving Ghana and Africa a competitive negotiation edge, a bargaining chip if you like, in the praxis of global politics?

Alas, we destroy our technocratic, research and scientific institutions, much like the Luddites did during the Industrial Revolution, and then go to China and India, two emerging economies whose leaderships...
began exactly as the visionary Nkrumah did, to beg for technical assistance to rebuild them. We destroy ourselves and then blame our lack of technocratic prescience on self-serving phantom reasons! We forget to make assessment of the comparative impact of self-destruction on society, on ourselves, on our future.

Ironically, America executed the Rosenbergs, husband and wife Ethel Greenglass and Julius, on suspicions they had turned over atomic secrets to the Soviets, what, in other words, gave jolts of assistance to the Soviets, helping them to perfect the technical aspects of the processes of building atomic bombs, speeding up the processes, and eventually putting them in a strategic position to build their own atomic and nuclear arsenal before stipulated forecasts. Further, America and the rest of the West also ensured any nuclear or atomic arsenals (or stockpiles) Apartheid South Africa had in her possession were quickly destroyed once power changed hands between Black South Africa and White South Africa?

Are these facts not sufficient proof that Americans in particular and Westerners in general love themselves and their countries better than we probably do of ourselves, of our nations, of our continent, of our future? This naturally leads to the subject of patriotism and selflessness, two indispensable questions Prof. Dompere’s takes up in his scientific and mathematical treatment of Nkrumahism. Nkrumahism, we may add, has, according to Dr. Poe’s exhaustive survey of Nkrumah’s extensive body of works, critical dimensions of “ontological, epistemological, and ethical theories” to it. To wit, Nkrumahism is not an idle philosophy in other words, but a profound system of thought based on a verifiability of sound scientific, logical, and mathematical imprimatur.

Relatedly, Prof. Dompere confirms the former’s cautious conclusions but then goes further than his qualitative and exegetical valuation of Nkrumahism to, as a matter of fact, discursively establish Nkrumahism as a serious scientific thought worthy of mathematical exploitation. It is also clear from the insights gleaned from the corpus of research denouements reached by Prof. Dompere cement the ties between theory and praxis. Of course, oftentimes it takes great leaps of intellectual exertion and emotional drain to blend the frontiers between theory and praxis beyond a point of qualitative or concrete disparateness, although this feat can also be achieved sporadically via serendipity, other times too via conscious scientific or empirical methodology. It entails more than the mere fabrication of conditions and enabling environments to make the transition from theory and praxis through the mediating potentiality of reification a concrete reality.

Notwithstanding that, it is important we do not misconstrue theory as an end in itself. It is not. Neither is praxis. Both theory and praxis have imposed untold hardships on humanity and civilizations. Nazism, Apartheid, scientific racism, and eugenics constitute a few examples. Alfred Nobel’s invention of dynamite and his Nobel Prizes are another set of good examples. Did he intend dynamite, one of his inventions, to be used in wars? And did he create the Nobel Peace Prize? This glaring contradiction between Nobel’s legacy explains why proponents of neuro-linguistic programming believe good intentions are not always or necessarily compatible with their outcomes. The question then is, should we judge Nobel’s legacy by the millions who had and continue to lose their lives as a result of his dynamite invention or by the millions whose lives have been saved or qualitatively improved as a result of the Nobel Prizes, innovative discoveries made in the sciences and economics and the signal contributions made to the quality of human lives by peace activists? This question and its answer(s) are at the heart of the contestation between theory and praxis.

Nkrumah, it should be stressed, acknowledged the mutual superiority of theory and praxis to armchair guesstimation as a standalone inquiry into the vicissitudes of man’s existential conditionalities. The verifiable parameters, qualitative and tangible, of his amaranthine legacy lend credence to this contention. Nkrumah’s view that philosophy should constitute itself into systemic chaperonage or oversight of development economics, and his actually doing so through his profound theoretical
constructs such as “categorical conversion” and “consciencism” and through his provision of capable leadership for the institutionalization of international, regional, national, and continental bodies tasked to improve human lives, eloquently speaks to his unquestionable grasp of the marriage between theory and praxis.

It appears those after him, unfortunately, have not taken this noble idea to new heights of circumstantial pragmatism, of technocratic consummation. Dotting the geopolitical countenance of Ghana with fancy, meretricious physical infrastructures, for instance, without injecting maintenance considerations into their structural DNA makes no engineering or policy strategy sense, a point clearly not tantamount to the philosophic durability of Nkrumahism and the political economy of maintenance technocracy. Prof. Dompere’s constant reversion to Nkrumah’s ideas in the wake of new mathematical models and scientific discoveries parallels our argument for public institutionalization of maintenance technocracy as part of the broader scope of policy strategies of reversing the declining health of Ghana’s aging infrastructure, of her collective psychology.

Again, the idea that Prof. Dompere took nearly a decade of close reading to capture the mathematical, philosophical, and scientific essence of Nkrumah’s “Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonization” speaks to a determined mind hoping to make a difference in human thinking and knowledge. It is always essential and prudent that we interrogate history, ideas, and theories in every sphere of human life, whether that given inquiry is a standing challenge of natural science or of social science, as physicists have not given up on trying to understand the physical world of particle behavior. As a point of illustration, the illusory property of the particle tachyon that it travels faster than the speed of light, an idea developed in the 1960s by Gerald Feinberg and others, has pushed theoretical and experimental physicists of the European Organization for Nuclear Research (CERN) to continue to search for and to ascertain the properties of this illusory particle in the 21st century.

The story is not necessarily so in our part of the world. We on the other hand take history to be static. But it is not. History has dimensions of causality and effect. History is also dynamic, and can be corrective and therapeutic, even a haunting prospect. History provides opportunities for man to sanitize his checkered past, among other things getting rid of the cobwebs of doubts, debilitating inconsistencies, and the like, while carrying over history’s positives and achievements into the future. Prof. Dompere’s untiring efforts are highly commendable in this regard. His body of works provides practical answers to many of the troubling questions of political economy that have evaded our leaders. It is not in doubt that the divisiveness of Ghanaian politics, the so-called winner-takes-all capitalism, kleptomania, vacuous pedantry, sneaking suspicion, leadership incompetence, political Balkanization, and kakistocracy are partly to blame for Ghana’s developmental inertia, for refusing to listen to a great mind like Prof. Dompere’s. In Ghana today and other parts of Africa, however, concern for social justice and human dignity seems to have lost its place to the greedy calculus of partisan politics, of fruitless pedantry, and of the politics of equalization.

It is not in question that mainstream Ghanaian politics has eventually morphed into the bunga-bunga dilemma of Berlusconian political travesty. Simply put, post-Nkrumah Ghanaian politics is nothing more a comical replica of the so-called Dreadnought hoax, with useful idiots usurping the sickly soul of Ghana’s logocracy for the prize of political capital. Unfortunately in Ghana today, unlike the creative, thoughtful era of the Nkrumah dispensation, too much premium is placed on the comical strength of social, intellectual, and emotional trivialities, as represented by political sentimentalism, schadenfreude politics, malarkey, vindictiveness, newspeak, and so on, rather than to the variables of technocracy, science, technology, science literacy, and their correlative possibilities to development economics. Arguably, a videocracy and logocracy like Ghana’s political system evidently lack the Nkrumahist seriousness of political innovation and scientific pragmatism. These negative tendencies contribute to the
On the other hand, it bears emphasizing that constructive collaboration in the realm of scientific research duly take local conditions into consideration, a concession already alluded to. The so-called Nordic Model, the Washington Consensus, and the Beijing Consensus are derived from this simple truism. The political economies of these three disparate cultures partly derive from their unique sense and conditionalties of historical and geopolitical independence, of social particularities. Nkrumah realized some of the major hindrances to originality, calling the lack of intellectual independence and Eurocentric cultural conditioning of the psychology of Africans, both inherited from the colonial and imperialist enterprise, in fact any learning in Africa outside its African-centered underpinnings, “dead learning.”

Thus, Africa cannot cut to the quick of development and growth so long as she is habituated to the ghost of “dead learning.” We on our part see ethnic prejudice or ethnic chauvinism as a debilitating symptomatology of “dead learning,” and national unity, constructive collaboration, self-empowerment, and peaceful co-existence as moral negation of “dead learning,” with Nkrumah writing to that effect: “in the highest reaches of national life, there should be no reference to Fantes, Asantes, Ewes, Gas, Dagombas, ‘Strangers’ and so forth…We should call ourselves Ghanaians?the brothers and sisters, members of the same community?the state of Ghana.” This powerful statement marks one of the high points or epochal moments of Nkrumah’s political career. To put it simply and more bluntly, ethnic nationalism (or ethnic supremacy), ethnocracy, ethnic nationalism, jingoism, ethnic democracy, and irredentist politics have no place in the philosophy of Nkrumahism, salient connotations of Prof. Dompere’s methodological empiricism.

These hard facts constitute some of the priceless or enduring gifts Nkrumah gave to the world of political tribalism, of cultural grandiosity. In that regard, constructive collaboration as a philosophy of intellectual socialization also rejects ethnic balkanization as a component of national unity or of national identity. Nkrumah demonstrated this when, for instance, he dispatched civil servants, doctors, and engineers to Congo upon the latter’s attainment of political independence. On a more serious note, our idea of constructive collaboration need not be necessarily or entirely physical. What do we exactly mean? We mean to say that constructive collaborative can equally be spatial, as in reading, self-communication, or introspection. Imagination, intuition, curiosity, and rational thinking are integral to these natural processes.

Significantly, great and influential leaders are known avatars of the pedigree of constructive collaboration we are talking about, men and women whom we can usefully identify as avid readers. Nelson Mandela, Mahatma Gandhi, Bill Clinton, and Kwame Nkrumah come to mind.

It has been acknowledged in one particular instance that Clinton, for instance, read Robert D. Kaplan’s book “Balkan Ghosts” and, thereafter, was so impressed with and moved by Kaplan’s powerful arguments that he had no choice but to allow his administration to intervene in the Balkan conflict. One’s inquiring eyes pan Africa and one wonders the inferior caliber, or lack thereof, of books the new crop of African leadership reads! Nkrumah’s reading habits on the other hand pushed him to greater heights and helped him scale the heights of statecraft, guiding his meanderings through the coppice of East-West antipodean proclivities with relative ease while simultaneously disallowing the latter to translate into mutual antagonism and rivalry between and among Africa’s emerging nation-states. Nkrumah called this foreign policy strategy positive neutrality. “He came more and more to believe that action must be guided by a philosophy; but he was no slave to ideology,” K.B. Asante writes of Nkrumah. “He was a man of ideas. He had the talent for grasping new ideas and the weakness of giving them form and calling them his own. He was conversant with the mainstream of the development theories and models in vogue and found natural sympathy with the prevalent highly interventionist school.”
Intellectual honesty is the hallmark of great minds, and Nkrumah was courageous enough to let the world in on that aspect of his enviable intellectual profile, as his textually and philosophically rich autobiography, speeches, and corpus of scholarly eloquently demonstrate. Acknowledging one’s intellectual or ideological mentors for appropriating their ideas to advance the cause of humanism simply represents the height of moral refinement, yet not like Nkrumah’s unabashed ideological enemies who still go about passing their usual revisionist distortions that Nkrumah wanted to be the president of Africa, though the latter’s public and private intentions contradicted any such embellished public lie.

“Some of them feared Nkrumah’s intentions and suspected that his ulterior motive was to usurp their positions of power,” Dr. Poe writes of the suspicion a select group of African leaders who had met with Nkrumah to iron out their differences in respect of their political philosophies while putting the framework for African unification, African Union that is, in place. According to Dr. Poe, Nkrumah assured his peers at that august conference that: “Ghana did not seek to be the headquarters or Secretary-Generalship of the OAU.”

Prof. Poe then adds almost as an afterthought: “Nkrumah was a shrewd politician and knew the fears of his peers.” It turned Nkrumah had brought these leaders of independent African polities together into a political coalition, the Conference of Independent African States (CIAS), whose members went on to elect him to the chairmanship of CIAS. It also turned out that Nkrumah’s artful leadership of CIAS would lead to the establishment of the African Group at the United Nations. Regrettably also, his contributions to the Algerian Revolution are less widely known. All these facts are meant to cement Nkrumah’s influence in the turbulent world of yesteryear and to point to his relevance today, as the new cadre of African leaders goes wayward. Indeed Nkrumah’s ideas are more relevant today than yesteryear, for, among other things, the revolution he started to transform Africa into an economic, scientific, and technological powerhouse is not finished yet.

Let us take a brief trip to history. In 1997, for instance, Nkrumah’s ideological opponent Julius Nyerere at the founding of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) apologized to the world for his generation’s failure to implement Nkrumah’s ideas. Nyerere’s dolorific public statement to that effect came during Ghana’s 40th Independence Anniversary Celebration. “The OAU did not resolve the fundamental question of the primacy of an indivisible ‘African People’ versus ‘African Peoples,’” writes Dr. Poe. “J. Nyerere, the first president of Tanzania once debated Nkrumah over regional versus continental unity of Pan-Africanism. In his book, ‘Uhuru Na Ujoma,’ Freedom and Socialism, (1968), Nyerere regretted to the error of ossifying state entities at the expense of Pan-African identity in his article titles, ‘The Dilemma of the Pan-Africanist.’” Nyerere was a true student and follower of Nkrumah indeed. Dr. Poe concludes: “As a result, as Nkrumah predicted, the OAU remained as weak as the states that comprised.”

The preceding statement points to a concession we made in one of our earlier essays claiming that the African Union we have today is not what Nkrumah intended and that it is a mere shadow of Nkrumah’s actual intentions. Prof. Dompere’s text “African Union: Pan African Analytic Foundation” shows why the African Union is institutionally weak and thus how it could be institutionally strengthened, thanks to his interacting smorgasbord of advanced mathematics and science and logic, Nkrumahism, Diopian African-centered methodology, and the like. It also points to our entrenched position that Nkrumahism and the revolution Nkrumah initiated are as relevant today as of yesterday, “Time has shown that Nkrumah’s dream of African unity was not an ideally romantic idea. Since then Europe via the EU has adopted his [Nkrumah] entire proposal apart from the one on a union government. The current AU structure was modeled on his proposal,” said Nyerere. “Kwame Nkrumah was Ghana’s leader but he was our leader, for he was an African leader.”

Nyerere respectfully addressed Nkrumah his public presentation as “our leader” even as Nkrumah’s
ideological enemies unabashedly continue to perpetrate the noble lie that Nyerere wanted nothing to do with Nkrumah. Regrettably, Nkrumah’s ideological enemies who are wont to praise Nyerere are also quick to criticize Nkrumah harshly for the Preventive Detention Act (PDA), although Nkrumah’s ideological enemies conveniently, or out of ignorance, gloss over Nyerere’s use of the PDA. It is always about selective amnesia and loss of both sanity and rationality when it comes Nkrumah. It is the same ideological blinkers that prevent his enemies from impartially assessing his legacy. Nyerere actually admired Nkrumah and had great respect for his intellect, views, and vision for Africa (See Ebou Faye’s essay “Dr. Kwame Nkrumah: Remembering Africa’s Most Influential and Greatest in the 21st Century”).

It should be noted that Nyerere was not contesting the foresight of Nkrumah when he made his public apology, an apology that was tactically framed as an appeal to Africa to resurrect Nkrumahism to serve as a riposte to Africa’s contemporary challenges. The manifold recurring problems Africa faces today and their concomitant solutions are the centerpiece of Nkrumahism. Prof. Dompere painstakingly teases them out of the mountains and forests of Nkrumah’s ideas. Fortunately for us, Nyerere and Mazrui lived long enough to confirm the rightness of Nkrumah’s vision for Africa!

Even Dr. Issa G. Shivji, a professor of law and arguably one of the top Nyerere scholars, has written: “Nyerere is no doubt vindicating Nkrumah’s position…Is Nyerere also critiquing his own position of step by step, any unity?” (See his July 27, 2005 Second Billy Dudley Memorial Lecture presentation “Pan-Africanism or Imperialism? Unity and Struggle Towards a New Democratic Africa,” University of Nigeria; see also Chambi Chachage’s “African Unity: Feeling with Nkrumah, Thinking with Nyerere,” Pambazuka News). At this moment, it is only appropriate that we put it on the record that Dr. Shivji, an internationally acclaimed scholar, author, activist, development and legal authority, holds the Mwalimu Julius Nyerere Research Chair at the University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

These declarative recollections aside, the generalized subtext of the views expressed herein, once again, points to the contemporary relevance of Nkrumah’s ideas. Peradventure the subtitle of Prof. Botwe-Asamoah’s book “An African-Centered Paradigm for the Second Phase of the African Revolution” is a direct reference to the preceding sentential denotation. Now, turning our attention to K.B. Asante’s reminiscences on Nkrumah’s reading habits, we argue that it appears the latter’s extensive knowledgeability, indeed, stems from his voracious reading and tactical association with intelligent, wise cadre of well-informed, well-accomplished men and women, of different races and ethnicities and nationalities, and of different religions and class and ideological persuasions. Asante could not have put it better! The power of discernment, which can partly be acquired through extensive high-quality reading and strategically focused observing, came easily to Nkrumah in the thick of decisional doldrums and political cyclones.

In fact, it is discernment that separates visionary, tactical, and prescient leaders like Nkrumah and Gandhi and Lumumba from others, from say George W. Bush or Chief Mangosutho Buthelezi or Mobuto. Now back to the question of leadership, reading habits, constructive collaboration, and development economics. The list is, indeed, endless if we should do an exhaustive study of the question. Yet another good example of a hardworking leader known for his sustained, habitual, and voracious reading habit is Rwanda’s anorexic-framed Paul Kagame, Rwandan’s strong man and authoritarian leader. “He started devouring books about Singapore, South Africa, China and the other ‘Asian Tigers,’ which had managed to leap out of poverty in less than a generation by means of disciplined, authoritarian leadership and entrepreneurial capitalism,” writes Richard Grant (See Paul Kagame: Rwandan’s Redeemer or Ruthless Dictator,” The Telegraph, July 22, 2010).

Quoting Kagame however, Grant also makes it clear that the former, who has “very little formal schooling,” spends three to four hours every night devouring books about economics, business
management, development issues, politics, and international affairs after “having put in a 12-hour day dealing with affairs of state, taken his exercise (gym or tennis), spent time with his wife and children and said goodbye to them.” In fact, Kagame admitted to receiving “newspapers from Britain and other countries twice a week, and read them almost page to page. Sometimes I find I’m reading things I don’t even need to read, because my mind is hungry. I don’t need much sleep. Four hours is enough.” Once again, the quality of reading habits ostensibly delineates the qualitative difference between the leadership styles of Kagame and Idi Amin, say, clearly marking out the decisional shorelines of their disparate psychological political cartographies and strategies of development economics and general attitudes toward inclusive democracy.

Prof. Dompere is an avid peruser himself. And there is always a qualitative difference between a reader and a peruser. Nkrumah was a peruser, not a reader! On the other hand, Kagame’s sometimes progressive policies have made Rwanda’s parliament women-friendly, a place where more women representatives serve the nation than any legislature in the world. Likewise, Nkrumah’s progressive government made women the backbone of CPP’s populist democracy even while he also expanded the social circumference of girl enrolment in schools, a throwback to Kwegyir Aggrey’s vision and progressive philosophy on gender equality. Nkrumah’s views on humanism, self-actualization, and egalitarianism were integral to his philosophical equation of gender equality. Indeed, societies grow and develop and move in the direction of positive development economics when gender equality is made a staple of priority national considerations.

One of the central pillars of Nkrumahism, to wit, what Nkrumah referred to as “egalitarianism” and which he dialectically tackled in his philosophical work “Consciencism,” is also explored fully in Prof. Dompere’s scientific works on Nkrumahism! Lest we are not misunderstood, we are not referring to “egalitarianism” in a sense with utopian or storybook implications, far from it. Thus, we deploy the concept in a sense where conditions and enabling environments make it possible for individuals to take full advantage of equal opportunities these conditions and enabling environments create for self-actualization, for developing, realizing, or fulfilling their full potentialities in society, without the intrusive encumbrances of partisan politics, political ethnocentrism, culture and religions sentiments, kleptomania, weak institutions, poor leadership and political deceptions, neocolonialism, superstition, declining educational standard, social decay and anomie, and universal corruption. This is how Nkrumah meant it, the concept “egalitarianism.” Accordingly that is not a dreamer’s pretensions to utopianism or definitional abstractionism.

We offer this corrective definitional appraisal because Nkrumah never for once had his head secreted away in reified clouds, but rather in the practical concreteness of human existence, of human experience. “African Genius,” one of his classic speeches, makes him a pragmatic, objective character and influential player in world affairs and human history, not a doctrinaire or a fawning android, in retrospect. He also was a man of the planet, not of the moon. Among other things, therefore, Nkrumah’s useful pragmatism detached him from the Elysian Fields of Orwellian unrealism, thus alternatively forcing him into a perspective that held meliorism as the philosophical centerpiece of his political identity and intellectual refinement. Yet, it also does not mean his pragmatism was a negation of the place theory had in human socialization, intellectual evolution, and development economics. We have belabored this point elsewhere.

Everything aside, egalitarianism constitutes one of the central atavistic infrastructures of Prof. Dompere’s scientific works on Nkrumahism, namely “The Theory of Categorical Conversion: Analytic Foundations of Nkrumahism” and “Theory of Categorical Consiciencism.” Take note! In the end we should only say it is high time readers, particularly Nkrumah’s ideological enemies, got to understand that Nkrumah was never the Cesar Augusto Viana of Allen Kurzweil’s poignant essay “Whipping Boy: A Writer Spends
Years Looking for his Bully. Why? (The New Yorker, Nov. 17, 2014).” Who was Nkrumah then, one may ask? An avatar of ingenuity, selflessness, intellectual profundity, prescience, moral force, foresight, and sheer human goodness, also a master and creative embodiment of Africa’s destiny and hope!

Need we say more? Perhaps. African should get herself entangled in the baptismal fire of Nkrumahism!

We shall return…
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On a serious note Kwarteng is MAD On a very serious note this MAD guy Kwarteng is wasting with his silly copy and paste nonsense, containing taurusds of grammatical mistakes.

(click to comment on this comment)

ADJOA WANGARA
01-17 00:44

ADJOA WANGARA aka SARPONG aka MAHMOUD On a more serious note, ADJOA WANGARA aka SARPONG aka MAHMOUD needs psychiatric evaluation.

(click to comment on this comment)

Franco
01-17 03:29

SARPONG CANNOT COMPREHEND THIS This little mind (aka Catalyst, Cardinal, Houdini, Sam, Teacher, Adjoa Wangara and Mahmoud) needs more than a shrink - he needs to be lobotomized. PEACE

(click to comment on this comment)
GOLD COAST
01-17 03:49

Re: SARPONG CANNOT COMPREHEND THIS Dear GOLD COAST, Good day. Please don't bother yourself about ADJOA WANGARA. I have SINCE ceased reading his comments and therefore have no clue what he talks about. However, readers who chose to can read his commen

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-17 20:21

Kwarteng must be chained if we... Before even I talk to a phsyiatric Kwarteng must already be in chains. And get it in the coconut that you carry on your short ugly neck, that I am still Adjoa Wangara living miles upon miles away from Texas in the USA whe

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
ADJOA WANGARA
01-17 08:15

ADJOA, KWARTENG IS NOT FROM ADUMAN Adwoa, Kwarteng is not from Aduman. Aduman is not that far from my hometown of Buoho near Kodie. Kwarteng when he said his father is from Aduman and General Yaw Boakye who Rawlings murdered is his uncle don't even know how

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
SARPONG
01-17 08:38

Fact: Kwarteng Is From Aduman I can say on authority that Kwarteng is an Asante-Fanti half-caste. His paternal lineage is unambiguously trace to Aduman and yours truly know this for a fact. What is also a fact is that he allowed himself to be corrupted by
Mr. Figure-Out
01-17 14:20

Figure-out, despite, Kwateng is a fool! Mr. Figure-Out, well, no matter what, Kwarteng is not that clever, judging from his educational background.

ADJOA WANGARA
01-17 17:14

Mr. Figure-Out, Who Are You? Mr. Figure-Out, Let us not use disparaging (or ethnic slurs) labels for our sisters and brothers, nor throwing insults at those we disagree with. For instance, Dr. SAS and I have healthy disagreements over Nkrumah but w

Re: ADJOA, KWARTENG IS NOT FROM ADUMAN OOL

thA
01-17 17:32
SARPONG, no matter what is an idiot SARPONG, it can be that the stupid fool, Kwarteng is from Techiman, as you opine, he is still a full idiot. And that is crystal clearly an undisputable fact.

(click to comment on this comment)
ADJOA WANGARA
01-17 17:44

Re: Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Think
Francis, if Dompere in 2010 urged Legon students to "originate their own theories and ideas on the basis that those ideas ... are necessary to improve the human condition", will Dompere agree with children reciting a pledge.

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-17 02:16

Re: Dr. Kofi Dompere On Nkrumah’s Scientific Think
Dear Kwadwo, How are you? How is the family? I hope you are all doing great! Kwadwo, do you really think it is mostly democratic societies that produce meaningful ideas, right? Have you read Jacques Barzun’s “

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-17 03:52

My assertion was with a qualifier, most. How are you doing Francis? I thought I asserted that MOST of the ideas on the contribution to the human condition have come from the West with democratic ideals and freedom. Of course even Nazi Germany and communist societies

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Kwadwo
01-17 06:02

Re: My assertion was with a qualifier, most. Further, I will concede that whereas various interventionist policies in certain parts of the world (i.e., South Africa and Chile) were counter productive and immoral, I believe in total, western democracies can still hold t
Putin, Ukraine, and My Take

Kwadwo
01-17 06:32

Good morning from my end. How are you? I went to bed after responding to your questions, and woke up this morning to read your next question. Your question about Putin is a dicey one, I should say. I shall, h

Francis Kwarteng
01-17 19:20

Backyard ism I suppose. You are correct that Putin deems Ukraine as falling under Russia's sphere of influence hence his justification for meddling in the affairs of Ukraine. I only used example to illustrate my point that interventionism was not re

Kwadwo
01-18 00:33

Pardon the numerous errors. Did not proof read this comment so pardon the errors. You catch my drift anyway. Lol

Kwadwo
01-18 00:39
My Take On Interventionism Dear Kwadwo, I agree with you. But you will also agree with me that the Soviet annexation of those countries that later became part of the general body of the USSR, took that precedent of hegemony and colonization from

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

francis kwarteng
01-18 02:11

Points well taken But I always believed Nkrumah could have toned down his rhetoric and avoided the wrath of the US. In my opinion, he stuck his neck too much in the Cold War and got bitten. You and know from our professional experience that so

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

Kwadwo
01-19 07:07

Re: Points well taken Dear Kwadwo, I remember Major Okyere well (I never knew him personally, though). I recall reading somewhere that Major Okyere once slapped Rawlings after the latter's abortive coup! And the enmity between the two start

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)

francis kwarteng
01-19 19:05
Dr Dompre's books on Nkrumah. Can Dr Dompre list all his books on Nkrumah. I very much would like to read all his books on Nkrumah. Will Dr Dompre list all his books on Nkrumah. I very much would like to read them. Nkrumah is undoubte

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
kwabena ohemeng, london.
01-17 17:25

Re: Dr Dompre's books on Nkrumah. And for those on this Ghanaweb forum who do not have a lot of resources, could we get a short list of some of Dr. Dompre's "practical answers to many of the troubling questions of political economy that have evaded our leade

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Prof Lungu
01-17 18:04

Prof. Lungu/Kwabena Ohemang, London A List of Some of Dr. Kofi Kissi Dompare’s Books: Dear Brothers, I hope you can find some of the answers you are looking for here (see below). This is not the entire collection of his books, though. On the other

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
francis kwarteng
01-17 20:15

FREE PSYCHIATRIC TREATMENT FOR ADJOA WA Adjoa Wangara, please contact me on 718 344 7271 for free psychiatric treatment. I have detected from your senseless and idiotic effusions that you have a serious mental problem. I am also prepared to bear the cost of your trans

(click to read full comment or to comment on this comment)
Peter Ahenkora Osei.
01-17 19:07
foolish article as usual Dig up nkrumah's bones and worship it

(click to comment on this comment)
warren
01-17 20:51