HOW THE PAST IS POLITICALLY INSPECTED AND HISTORICALLY PRODUCED: REVIEW OF W. RODNEY'S A HISTORY OF THE GUYANESE WORKING PEOPLE 1888—1905

Bonaventure Swai
Department of History
Ahmadu Bello University
Zaria Nigeria.

How we look at our yesterday has important bearings on how we look at today and how we see possibilities for tomorrow. The sort of past we look back to for inspiration in our struggles affects the vision of the future we want to build.

What's fought out at penpoint is often revolsed at gunpoint with the possible overthrow of one class by the other, or the overturning of the existing and apparently fixed status quo.[1]

Summary

This article is primarily aimed to review Walter Rodney's *A History of the Guyanese Working people 1881 — 1905* which was published posthumously by the Johns Hopkins University Press in 1981 and which, given its historical significance, particularly in the West Indies, saw an early reprint the following year.[2] But the article also attempts to place the idea of 'inspecting the past' and 'producing history' politically, within a wider theoretical context, especially in view of the growing popularity of this approach of writing/history among committed intellectuals within dominated social formations;[3] and given the confused belief among some of such intellectuals of the existence of a kind of 'mental space' between the 'world of politics on the one hand,

and the economic processes of capitalist transformation' on the other. The approach, supposedly implies the possibility for 'forms of existence and social consciousness of the people' to have a life of their own, unencumbered by the production and reproduction of hegemonic politics, and thus giving the false impression that emancipation of oppressed peoples can be realized without serious organization on the part of those committed to the social liberation of such social categories.[4]

The Agenda.

To learn from history, Mao Tse-tung once urged his fellow Chinese revolutionaries, 'is to be historical and materialist'. This, for him, was regarded as the more necessary because it is a stand which would enable people 'to learn that they are capable of transforming and changing themselves; that they have the resources to accomplish this'. But such a realization, Mao also warned, 'only comes from a political inspection of history which reveals the myriad suppressions of alternative social forms and social development "buried" within historical experience'. This, he argued, is the only way that people can be made to understand that they could be 'more than what they seem,' if they are not to go on enduring in a state of equivocation and helplessness.[5]

This position acknowledges the fact that the production of knowledge, and for our purpose here — historical knowledge, is a social and political act aimed to either mystify and reproduce the existing material relations of production or expose and historicize them with the intent to overthrow and bury them once and for all. Knowledge becomes either hegemonic and dominating or oppositional and potentially liberatory — according to that very central question: 'By whom and for whom is it produced?'

It is necessary to understand that knowledge does not come about through the process of mere assertions and refutations, scholastic or empirically based. Rather, such theses, false, or logically true . are given sustenance by material relations of domination and opposition and have their form or substance changed in accordance with the contradictions arising from such relations.[6]

These statements are of special importance to professional historians who are most prone to the malaise of abstracted empiricism, given the fact that their object of study, the past, is accor-

ding to the dictates of commonsense removed from the present and can therefore be studied clinically, without much influence from prevailing social and political conjunctures. Yet, it has to be pointed out that it is through the study of the anatomy of man that we can get a clue of the anatomy of the monkey. Historians, after all, have to live in the present with all its strifes and contradictions besides thinking about and delving into the past! What makes them conscious of the past is not the discipline of history, which is itself nonetheless historical, but conditions, social and political, prevailing here and now! For how else can we explain the changing interpretations of the past historically rather than dogmatically and idealistically? Can history change because of history or the past? I pose this tautological question since many practising historians seem not to be bothered about it.

Socially informed historians, foremost among which Rodney's works — and especially the one under review — have always attempted not to reduce history to a footnote of the hegemonic culture of domination, but rather to see it as constituting a dialectical relationship with contemporary social reality; as a reflection of such reality and as representing 'a political intervention which contributes to the forces determining the movement of a particular present towards a particular future'.[7] This means that, the writing of history is turned into a 'focal theoretical base through which to critically analyze and clarify the social conditions of oppression, exploitation and domination our people have been struggling to live in'. The production of history therefore becomes an enterprise, not just pursued for its own sake, but one which is guided by the very important question. 'How does the undertaking transform me and my oppressed people?'[8]

Such a question attempts to inspect the past and tries to produce and organize historical knowledge politically, with the possibility of correctly placing it in the hands of the people to be turned into a liberating force. This kind of organization of historical knowledge, rather than sheer academic refutations, poses a threat to the neo-colonial set-up[9] because as Ngugi wa Thiong'o aptly observes: 'What's fought at penpoint is often resolved at gunpoint'.[10]

Reviewing a book like Rodney's *A History of the Guyanese Working People* presupposes a thorough understanding of its contents and also, a detailed comprehension of the political con-

juncture, the social context or the conditions under which it was produced.

Guyana of the 1970s.

Walter Rodney returned to Guyana, the West Indies, in 1974.[11] He was confronted with a country in total crisis. Unlike the legendary King Midas, everything the Guyana dictator Forbes Burnham, touched, turned into 'shit'.[12] The country was witnessing the neo-colonial politics of what Fanon once aptly described as the 'process of retrogression'.

Rodney singled out the following as the main features of the neo-colonial syndrome obtaining in Guyana:

1. the concentration of power in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie;
2. the destruction of popular political expression and participation;
3. the manipulation of race and other divisions among the people;
4. the institutionalization of corruption;
5. the extension of political repression and victimization;
6. the vulgarization of 'national culture' as a tool for class rule and,
7. the deliberate distortion of revolutionary concepts.[14]

Rodney observed in Guyana what he had seen elsewhere in the West Indies and Africa: a bankrupt economy run by an incompetent petty bourgeois olicharchy schooled in parasitism, rather than production; a class held under the firm hand of multinational corporations, including the imperialist arm of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. This criminal cabal of compradore and imperialist forces against the people of Guyana was turning the country into a desert. Production of material goods was declining markedly. The Guyanese dictatorship responded to this situation by employing all kinds of socialist rhetoric, through nationalizations which were objectively aimed to reproduce its own corrupt ilk on an even wider scale, and by appealing to the International Monetary Fund for loans to help it weather the economic crisis. The Fund condescended, but at a price: a 'virtual surrender of national sovereignty—including cuts in pu-

blic spending, a wage freeze, a freeze in social service spending, removal of subsidies on basic items, and increased prices and taxes'.[15]

In other words, the people of Guyana were being forced to pay for the incompetence of that country's petty bourgeois oligarchy and imperialist parasitism. Resistances against this affront followed, or rather, got intensified. The Guyanese dictatorship replied with violence and murders. It attempted to deepen the race question between the Indo and Afro-Guyanese so as to fractionalize the force of a popular upheaval. In 1974, Guyana was therefore a political knot frought with seeds of the future, it was beleaguered by state terror condoned by imperialist forces, and a corrupt hegemonic culture bandied around as if it were natural and ahistorical.

It has been argued that Rodney maintained no separation between his professional practice and his political commitments, since he saw no particular difference between the two engagements,[16] and that, in the course of producing history, uppermost in his mind was the question: 'How, for whom and by whom is this enterprise practiced?' Thus a leading Zairean social scientist, E. Wamba-dia-Wamba, has remarked with regard to his *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa:*

> In Rodney's historical work, one has the feeling that the ultimate criterion of validity of historical knowledge is not just its conformity to the theoretical and technical requirements of the community of historians, their scientific ideology — so to speak — but more than that its liberating impact. An historian who does not grasp the social conditions of production and reproduction of his/her profession resting on the basis of a separation of intellectual labour from manual labour for example — fails even to know himself/herself honestly and correctly. He/she does not then practice the epistemologico-historical guidelines of his/her work. It is the masses who make history and class struggle is the motive force of history. And science *'sans conscience n'est que ruine de l'ame'*. The historian must know with clarity his/her own history, his/her present as history. Rodney insists on this 'historical consciousness' and it is almost this 'consciousness' that he calls 'being concrete' [17]

But while viewing the present as historical, Rodney was also conscious of the fact that the present cannot be reduced to

the past and vice versa, since the two constitute a dialectical entity. For Rodney, as a revolutionary historian, there was a sense in which the concern with changing the present helped sharpen his understanding of the past, and similarly a comprehension of the past helped sharpen his grip of the present, and in that manner equipped him with the possibility of having a glimpse of the future.[18]

True to Rodneys commitment to the cause of the suffering masses, and knowing, as Fanon before him had commented, that, 'we are nothing on earth if we are not, first of all, slaves of our cause, the cause of the people, the cause of justice, the cause of liberty'. Rodney sought to contribute his own share towards making his country a better place to live in. Fanon, at another point said: 'I do not carry innocence to the point of believing that appeals to reason or to respect of human dignity can alter reality', and that for 'the Negro who works on the sugar plantation in Le Robert, there is only one solution: to fight'.[19] So Rodney decided to organize this fight against the Guyanese dictatorial leadership, and thus, in 1974, was born the Working People's Alliance, 'a combination of parties opposed to the government of Guyana.'[20]

One problem constantly bedeviled the coalition: the racial question in Guyana. The neo-colonial ruling oligarchy had time and again orchestrated the racial situation aiming to divide and so weaken the struggles of the working people. Rodney presented the racial situation as a natural phenomenon, and sought to situate it historically so as to clarify the strategy and tactics of the Working Peoples Alliance. C.L.R. James, once observed in his famous book, *The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L'Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution*, which although 'historically in form . . . drew its contemporaneousness . . . from the living struggles(s)' of Black Pan-Africanists in Britain and those of the working peoples of Africa against imperialist ravages in the continent:[21] 'The race question is subsidiary to the class question in politics, and to think of imperialism in terms of race is disastrous. But to neglect the racial factor as merely incidental is an error only less grave than to make it fundamental'.[22] Rodney therefore, concentrated his study on the struggles of the working people of African and Indian ancestry in Guyana to show how this racial question was treated in practical politics, and to demonstrate

the shortcomings of this history so that the Working People's Alliance could draw some lessons from it.[23]

The Book.

Lucidly written and extensively researched, from archival sources in Guyana and Great Britain, oral history of plantation workers and urban dwellers undertaken between 1975 and 1977, Rodney's *A History of the Guyanese Working People* sets out its limits as the years of what the working people of Guyana called the 'hard times', between 1881 when the Guyanese were still predominantly prone to the politics of mendicancy and 'appeared as supplicants before the Poor Law Enquiry Commission petitioning for their depressed conditions to be alleviated through the mediation of the colonial state'; and 1905 during the 'Ruinveldt Riots' when 'three-fourths of the population of Georgetown seemed to have gone stark staring mad', took to the streets invading, among other things, the Public Buildings and 'forcing His Excellency the governor to take refuge behind locked doors in the Court of Policy hall'.[24] But the book also offers an admirable background to these years, availing an extremely useful sources of information concerning nineteenth century Guyanese economy, class structure, power relations and the dynamics of societal change.

Guyana comprised of a predominantly plantation economy located on the coast, based on the production of sugar undertaken under the most severe local environmental and international contraints. The heavy waterlogged clay soils and the constant threats of drought and flooding which 'jostled each other within each year' demanded unusual efforts to tame and humanize nature. The labour for such a task came from black slaves imported from Africa, they toiled under the supervision of the Guyanese planter class which controlled the economy and dominated political power in the country ensuring a smooth process of their own reproduction and accumulation.

Humanizing nature in coastal Guyana was a herculian undertaking. It has been estimated that the system of dams, dikes and canals required for drainage to prevent waterlogging, irrigation during droughts, and defence from 'direct inundation from the sea' as well as the overflow of fresh water from behind the back

dams' meant that to polder one square mile of land entailed the moving of at least one million tons of soil by the working people of Guyana 'with shovels in hand, while enduring conditions of perpetual mud and water'.

Initially, slaves did the work, but with their emancipation, in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, notwithstanding the planters' invention of the strategy of 'apprenticeship' the Guyanese plantation economy was faced with what amounted to a crisis of labour. The ex-slave Afro-Guyanese, in order to extract as higher wages as possible from the planters, began organizing themselves into 'mobile task gangs, visiting different plantations and checking out the conditions of work before cmmitting themselves to any agreement with an employer.' Moreover, 'women and children started withdrawing from the fields creating general reduction of labour at times when it was most needed.' Thus ex-slaves in Guyana lay down terms and conditions of their 'naked' and 'free' labour.

Worse still, 'sugar cane was the kind of crop that had to be gotten from the field to the factory within a very short time' as 'excessive delay could mean ruination'. Ex-slaves as well as Planters understood this urgency; the latter panicked: the former watched with pleasure. Planters, with the colonial state behind them, resorted to intimidation: ex-slaves became more adamant. Thus, Planters turned to indentured labour, starting with Portuguese, then Chinese and eventually Indians from South Asia.[25] Consequently plantation labour in Guyana acquired the following compsotion: indentured labourers who were predominantly Indian, 'free estate residents who were usually time-expired immigrants and their Creole descendants', and 'Creole villagers who were mainly Afican' [26]

Each section had its own role to play in the plantation economy. Generally there was a tendency for Creole Africans to move 'away from the fields because most of the skilled and better—paid jobs were available in the factory.'[27] Indians were left to perform the more laborious and less paid jobs in the fields, a condition which made many of them believe that indentured labour, notwithstanding the sophistry, was not any better than slavery, its precedent in Guyana.

Indeed words such as 'overseer' and 'driver' which were used under slavery found their way into the systemn of indentu-

reship. Indentured labourers' wives were abused just as in the days of slavery. Indentured labour, like slavery before it, needed to be 'seasoned'. But what is strange is the manner in which planters racially justified the hierarchy of labour in the plantations, arguing that Indians who performed the most exhausting tasks were more hardworking than Africans who in view of their 'independence' were more prone to withdrawing from the estates to assert their demand for higher wages.[28]

Race and culture were utilized emensely by planters, and subsequently the Guyanese petty bourgeoisie sought to escape the enslavement of estate labour, to fractionalize the common efforts of the working people of the country. Work specialization, which was imposed on the Afro and Indo-Guyanese by capital, tended to reinforce this racial separation. Indeed the 'hard times' of the latter part of the nineteenth century brought about by the capitalist crisis of that time demonstrates at a local level, the second constraint bedevilling plantation agriculture[29] in Guyana.

In the years 1870 to 1905, the capitalist world system was disrupted by five depressions whose 'impact extended outward from the capitalist centres to zones of production such as the Caribbean'.[30] For Planters in Guyana, this meant a shrinking and an unfavourable market for their sugar. They resorted to technological innovations to try and cut costs of production, but without much success. Thus, they began reducing wages of plantation labour, threw Afro-Guyanese skilled labour out of work and resorted to the importation of more indentured labourers from India with increased state subsidy. The racial myth that 'Negroes' were lazy and 'Indian coolies' hardworking, was re-orchestrated more than ever before.

Afro-Guyanese protested against the continued importation of Indian labour during such hard times. Planters persevered with their 'ideological confusion and psychological oppression' which was 'crucial to the maintenance of the plantation system' by continuously repeating the old shibboleths of the 'lazy nigger' and the 'hardworking Sammy'. But this Eurocentric arrogance was put to a stop by the riots of 1905 when planters were forced to run for their lives because 'Sammy' and 'Quashie' sought violently to abolish their conditions of exploitation and oppression.

Rodney sees the riots as a culmination of localized protests

and rebellions which punctuated the history of struggle of the working people of Guyana since the beginning of the nineteenth century. 'Quashie' and 'Sammy' had both been struggling against the intolerable conditions of the plantation system, albeit 'semi-autonomously', given the nature of domination of capital and the peculiarities of the politics of fetishism in Guyana.[31] The 'hard times' and the social consequences of this period offered a broader context within which the riots were precipitated. 'Hard times' meant 'unemployment, poor wages, atrocious living conditions.

The riots, started by the dockworkers of Georgetown, spread to the Ruimveldt estate and the downtrodden of Georgetown city, and eventually to the other estates of the coastal strip of Guyana and beyond, among workers of the mines in the interior of the country. The composition of the crowd in Georgetown comprised of 'dockworkers, bakers, artisans, clerks, housewives, hucksters, and the lumpen, who were generally referred to as *centipedes*'. The demonstrators 'even included some respectable middle-class citizens', some posing as people who could be relied upon 'to serve as mediators or negotiators on behalf of the workers'. These, Rodney considers to be 'middle-class allies of the workers' as they 'remained loyal to populist ideals'.[32]

The grievances of the 1905 riots burst to the fore spontaneously'.[33] Not that there was no leadership. Rodney, paraphrasing Trotsky, observes: 'there are always such leaders, even when there is no overt organization and even when the *personae* are left nameless as far as historians are concerned.'[34] Indeed the state, through its coercive machinery of the police, concentrated on arresting and shooting what were considered strike leaders. Such victims of terror and violence comprised what Rodney calls 'vanguard workers'. Nevertheless, Rodney emphasizes that the riots showed more spontaneity than organization, and there the weakness of the movement rested.[35] Thus then he concludes:

> What is beyond dispute is that Guyanese workers in 1905 lacked any organization equal to the conduct of uncompromizing struggle. The embryonic working class organizations of the late 1880s had not survived. The People's Association had called for the formation of a trade union, but this had not materialized. The result is that grievances burst to the fore spontaneously in November 1905, and

there were no structures to plan or guide the worker movement either at the place of work or in the streets. At best ad hoc committees of workers sought audience with employers and with the colonial authorities. Alternatively middle-class spokesmen presented themselves as negotiators.[36]

Fallacy of the People's 'Autonomous Domain'.

The emergence of neo-colonial states in the post-world war helped produce material conditions which made it possible for historians to start refuting eruditely, the ideological moorings of Eurocentrism which had been elaborated so efficiently, during the era of classical colonialism. Eurocentric ideologies were articulated and elaborated under material conditions of colonial parasitism with the view to subverting the cultural resistance of colonial peoples. The post world war period made it possible for ideological struggles to be waged against this tendency in order to 'restore' the 'cultural autonomy' of the hitherto classically colonized and imperialized peoples.

Historically such ideological struggles implied locking horns with the elitist colonial historiography whose material conditions were undergoing dramatic changes and the neo-colonial historiography which was being elaborated in the centres of the imperialist world. The struggle against this elitist historiography, in the African context, produced, in the first instance, a tradition which was a 'mirror image' of the colonial orthodoxy it was opposed to, given particularly, the 'cult of erudition and intellectualism' coupled with the method of 'counter-factualization', in which it was mired. And secondly, it produced a populist tradition which aimed to recover the so-called people's initiatives to assert their own will on the making of history especially during the era of classical colonialism.[37]

The former tradition sought to discover the 'underlying sedimentary . . . African substructures' of the pre-capitalist era, so as to show African social dynamism and the possibilities that Africa could have acquired the same dignified international status like Europe, had it not been for colonialism. The later attempted, largely, to oppose the elitist 'goodwill', interpretation of African nationalism, showed the treachery of the petty bourgeoisie in the struggle for independence, and asserted the people's

contribution to this struggle which it considered to be of paramount importance in the process of decolonization.[38] Emphasis was placed upon the study of 'marginal classes' which, it was believed, uncontaminated by colonial capitalism, had a greater tradition of radicalism and resistance than, say, the petty bourgeoisie who had much to lose if the imperial equation extant in Africa was radically revised.[39]

At the bottom of it all is the populist belief in the 'people' and their 'unity', as well as the understanding that colonial history did not merely comprise of some mechanical process of external stimulus and internal response, but rather, an autonomous domain or mental and intermediate space which implied that 'however much the ruling classes, controlled 'the themes and content of politics or the sources of history', the people could always manage to make themselves heard. This, on the part of the people, could be demonstrated by their constant 'tendency towards resistance and a propensity to rebellion', something which enabled them to always outstrip the limits, political and ideological, set by the ruling classes.[40]

Indeed, exploitation and oppression have been a perennial source of revolts among the poor. But it needs also to be pointed out that this process has always been mystified and fetishized by the domination classes through the practice of hegemonic politics. Not that such hegemony has ever been total. But this, by itself, cannot provide the justification for indulging in a search for the people's 'uncontaminated autonomous domain', an enterprise which is akin to classical anthropology and which has 'always looked to the unconquered, the "exotic' to find the autonomy and specificity of subjectivity' [41]

Moverover, as the Italian revolutionary, Antonio Gramisci, once observed:

> The history of subaltern groups is necessarily fragmented and *episodic*. There undoubtedly does exist a tendency to . . . unification in the history of these groups, but this tendency is continually *interrupted* by the activity of ruling groups. Subaltern groups are always subject to the activity of ruling groups, even when they rebel and rise up; only 'permanent' victory breaks their subordination.[42]

The subjectivity of the oppressed is not a closed mental space. Undue emphasis on the 'autonomous domain' of the peo-

ple coupled with their capacity for spontaneity has the danger of foreclosing the 'possibilities of education, propaganda and agitation', and thus making the 'unity of theory and practice an impossibility'. True revolutionary change will only come about if attention is paid not merely to the peoples' ability to make history but also to the importance of vanguard functions in this process.[43]

Conclusion.

This article has attemped to place Rodney's *A History of the Guyanese Working People* within the broader perspective of the use and functions of history in society and tried to show what can be learnt from the past in the course of making history. The years 1881 to 1905 had for a long time been neglected or deliberately distorted in the history of Guyana. With the background of the contemporary Guyanese political conjucture, Rodney sought to study this period with the aim of showing how the people of Guyana have attempted to put to a stop the crudity of exploitation, oppression and its mystification, so as to build a better future.

In doing so, Rodney tried to give back to the Guyanese working people their own real history, a history of strife. He attempted to make the past a living memory of the current generation. This is very much in line with his own belief that the writing of history must be 'a way of ordering knowlege', which should act as 'an active part of the consciousness of an uncertified mass of ordinary people, which could be used by all as an instrument of social change'.[44] As an historian, Rodney was painfully aware that the working people of Guyana must be made to understand the historical origins of their oppression, and how, from time to time they have struggled against it so as to have it overthrown. This, he had also done with regard to the history of Africa, particularly in his famous book, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa.*[45]

For Rodney, the production of history had to contribute to the ideological struggles of the day. This had to be undertaken in a manner which did not unduly glorify the past, as has normally been the case with neo-colonial historiography. The past comprises not just victories of the oppressed, but also failures, from which a good deal can be learnt.

Much as Rodney praised the 'spontaneity' and 'autonomous

domain' of the working people of Guyana, he also saw something wrong with this kind of glorification. Thus, in concluding his study of the working people of Guyana, Rodney underlined the fact that notwithstanding their 'enormous potential . . . the weaknesses of the working people were most evident on the sugar estates' where 'racial and cultural distinctions . . . increasingly came to coincide with job specialization and residential separation'. Rodney argued that racial conflict was far less pronounced than might have been expected from the manner in which the two main races were thrown into competition'; but this 'crucial aspect of historical reality' cannot be minimized, the more so because 'it held back the development of a plantation workers' movement until long after the period in question'.[46]

This observation had influenced Rodney greatly when the Working people's Alliance was being formed in 1974. He was aware of the fact that the 'race question' in Guyana 'was much more a historical and social question rather than a biological problem' and in 'an effort to get to the minds of the youth, his last project was the completion of a children's story book on the history of races in Guyana'.[47] On the level of practical politics, he addressed himself to the working people of Guyana as Guyanese, rather than Afro — and Indo-Guyanese. He emphasized the need for 'vanguard functions' through the Working Peoples Alliance rather than relying purely on people's subjectivity and spontaneity, the major weakness of the 1905 riots.

NOTES

1. Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 'Mau mau is coming back,' *Journal of African Marxists*, 4, 1983, pp. 20-21.
2. W. Rodney, *A History of the Guyanese Working People 1881-1905*, Battimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981 (Reprint, 1982).
3. I will in this case wish to cite only three examples: R. Constantino, *Neo-Colonia Identity and Counter-Consciousness*, London 1978; H.G. Slater, 'Shaka Zulu, apartheid and the politics of the liberationist historiography of South Africa', Dar es Salaam 1982, mimeo; and E. Wamba, 'Towards an introduction to the critique of Cheikh Anta Diop's School of African Historiography', Dar es Salaam 1983, mimeo.
4. J. Alam, 'Peasantry, politics and historiography: critique of new trend in relation to Marxism', *Social Scientist*, 11, 1983, p. 43.
5. F. Corrigan and others, *For Mao*, London 1979, pp. 3-4.
6. Wamba, *op.cit.*, pp. 2-3. See also H.G. Slater, 'The production of historical knowledge at Dar es Salaam,' Dare Es Salaam, 1982, mimeo, pp. 1-3.
7. Slater, *Ibid.*, p. 1.
8. E. Wamba, 'Water Rodney and the role of the revolutionary intellectual in the neo-colonial countries,' *Maji Maji*, 43, 1980, pp. 50-51.
9. Wamba, 'Towards an introduction to the critique of the Cheikh Anta Diop's school of African historiography', *op.cit.*, p. 7.
10. See Ngugi wa Thiog'o., *op. cit.*
11. For the activities of Walter Rodney before his return to Guyana see my 'Rodney on scholarship and activism', *Journal of African Marxists*, 1/2, 1981/82.
12. W. Rodney, 'People's power: on dictator' Georgetown 1980, mimeo, p. 12.
13. E. Kwayana, 'Walter Rodney lives', in Walter Rodney Memorial Committee *Sign of the Times: A Memorial Booklet to Commemorate our Fallen Teacher on the First Anniversary of his Death, June, 13, 1981*, London 1981.
15. WPA support Group (UK), 'Crisis in Guyana,' in *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.
16. Swai, *op.cit.*, and A.J. Temu and B. Swai, *Africa and her intellectuals: A Tribute to Comrade Walter Rodney*, London: Bogle L'Ouverture, forthcoming.
17. Wamba, 'Walter Rodney and the role of the revolutionary intellectual in the neo-colonial countries,' *op.cit.*, p. 51.
18. Swai, *op.cit.*
19. In E. Hansen, 'Frantz Fanon: portrait of a revolutionary intellectual', *Transition*, 46, 1974, p. 36.
20. F.W. Knight and R. Price, 'Editors' note', in Rodney, *A History of the Guyanese Working People, op.cit.*, p. xiii.
21. C.L.R. James, *Nkrumah and the Ghana Revolution*, London 1977, p. 66-68.
22. C.L.R. James, *The Black Jacobins*, New York 1963, p. 283.
23. G. Lamming, 'Foreword', in Rodney, *A History of the Guyanese Working people, op.cit.* p. xix.
24. Rodney, *ibid.*, pp. 191, 219.
25. *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33, but the whole of chapter 2, is very useful. This piece can also be found in his 'Guyana: the making of the labour force', *Race and Class*, XXII, 1981, pp. 331-52.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 34.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
28. *Ibid.*, p. 176.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 19-30.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 19.
31. *Ibid.*, pp. 179-198.

32. *Ibid.*, pp. 200-10.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 198.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 221.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 198-99.
37. E. Stokes, 'Traditional resistance movements and Afro-Asian nationalism: the context of the 1857 mutiny rebellion in India', *Past and Present*, 48, 1970. W. Rodney, 'The British colonialist School of African historiography and the question of African independence', Dar es Salaam, mimeo, n.d.
38. Rodney, *ibid.* M.M. Tukur, 'A critical evaluation of Professor Ayandele's book, *The Educated Elite in the Nigerian Society'*, Zaria 1981, mimeo. S. Osoba 'Considerations on some conceptual and ideological aspects of Nigeria underdevelopment in historical perspective,' Ile-Ife 1980, mimeo.
39. A 'Agh, *The Recent State of Imperialism and Non-Alignment*, Dar es Salaam 1980, ch. 3.
40. Alam, *op.cit.*, p. 45. But see also S. Bhattacharya, 'History from below' *Social Scientist*, 11, 1983, pp. 3-20, and P. Chitterjee, 'Peasants', politics and historiography: a response', *Ibid.*, pp. 58-65.
41. Alam, *Ibid.*, p. 47.
42. A. Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, New York 1971, pp. 54-55.
43. Alam, *op.cit.*, p. xvii.
44. Lamming, *op. cit.*, pxvii
45. H. Campbell, 'Walter Rodney: Peoples' historian', in Walter Rodney Memorial Committee, *op. cit.*, pp. 29-35.
46. Rodney, *A History of the Guanese Working People, op. cit.*, p. 219.
47. Campbell, *op. cit.*, p. 34.