CHAPTER ONE

IDEOLOGY OF THE LEFT IN COLONIAL TERRITORIES

Introduction

The potent mix of decolonisation, anti-imperialist indigenous nationalism, and Marxism-Leninism first came to regions under European colonial control in the years immediately following World War I. At the treaty talks at Versailles formally ending World War I and establishing the League of Nations, American President Woodrow Wilson’s calls for a new world order built upon collective security and national self-determination inspired anti-colonial nationalist groups across Asia and the Middle East.¹ The terms of the final treaty, however, deeply disillusioned and embittered these nascent nationalists in the colonies. The new world order limited the right of self-determination to European areas of the former

Austro-Hungarian empire, reaffirmed European colonial interests across the globe, and handed over Germany’s imperial holdings in China to Japan, the most recent arrival among the great powers.

**Marxism-Leninism and Anti-colonial Nationalism**

Marxism-Leninism emerged amid this disillusionment as a radical alternative to the post-Versailles world order. The revolutionary theory offered indigenous nationalist leaders a coherent critique of imperialism as an outgrowth of capitalism, an understanding of capitalism as a flawed, self-destructive phase in human history, together with a vision of post-colonial, anti-Western modernisation. The Marxist component of this ideological mix, enunciated in the mid-19th-century collaborative

writings of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, was a normative theory of history, a radical socialist brand of political economy, and a call for international proletarian struggle against bourgeois capitalism. The Leninist component grew out of the Bolsheviks’ successful revolt against tsarism in Russia in the closing years of World War I. Leninism offered a blueprint for revolutions, calling for a small, highly disciplined party to form the ‘vanguard of revolution,’ forge coalitions of convenience with class enemies, and employ violence to achieve revolutionary ends. This hybrid Marxism-Leninism gained ground internationally when the newly established Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), repudiated tsarist treaties concerning colonial arrangements and nationalised foreign investments and properties in Russia. Bolshevism in power became synonymous with "the theory of the party as a dedicated revolutionary order, the tightening regime of party discipline, the absolutism of the party line, the intolerance of disagreement and
compromise, and the manipulative attitude toward mass organisation.”

Ironically, as Britain and France moved to liberalise their colonial administrations, this loosening opened up avenues of access for Soviet ideological and material influence.

After World War II, decolonisation and independence movements swept through Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Once again, the words of an American president had inspired calls for self-determination, and once again, post-war realities fell far short of wartime rhetoric and promises. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, together with England’s Winston Churchill, had issued the “Atlantic Charter” in 1941, framing the war as a struggle for the principle of universal self-determination and the end of imperialist economic arrangements. While Roosevelt and Churchill had their own agenda, there is no doubt that the echoes of Woodrow Wilson’s promises provided an opening for anti-

colonial nationalist groups; the leading Nigerian nationalist spokesman Nnamdi Azikiwe used a visit in London in 1943 to hand-deliver to the colonial secretary a memorandum entitled, “The Atlantic Charter and British West Africa,” demanding independence within fifteen years.4

In the immediate post-war years, however, both Britain and France refused to relinquish their colonies, and the American commitment to anti-imperialism was compromised by its growing alarm over Soviet territorial gains in Eastern Europe and apparent Soviet ideological gains in the Third World. Seeing colonial resources and markets as essential to Western European postwar recovery, the U.S. muted its opposition to French and British empire-salvaging efforts. At the same time, the Soviet Union’s emergence as a counterweight to Anglo-American power meant that Marxism-Leninism gained force and legitimacy as an ideology and blueprint for

mobilising anti-colonial indigenous nationalist groups.

The decades between the Bolshevik takeover of Russia and the post-World War II push for decolonisation had broadened and complicated Marxism-Leninism. To Lenin’s party dictatorship, his successor Joseph Stalin contributed to the mix and insistence upon the infallibility of party leaders, a single-party system in a totalitarian state, a command economy to achieve ‘socialism in one country,’ the cult of personality, a reign of terror built on institutionalised violence, intrusive Soviet domination over neighbouring communist parties, and Soviet ideological hegemony within the world-wide communist movement.

Communist revolution in China, culminating in the creation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, legitimised Maoism as an alternative road to socialism in non-industrialised, overwhelmingly peasant
societies.\(^5\) Although closely tied to the Soviets, the Chinese Communist Party embraced Maoism as an alternative road to socialism, and China emerged as an ideological rival for leadership in the international communist movement. China’s example made it possible for socialist or communist parties to pursue alternate roads to revolution, acknowledging two types of conflict: the first, so-called “non-antagonistic contradictions” among socialist powers and within communist parties, to be resolved through fraternal discussions and self-criticism; the second, “antagonistic contradictions,” between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie or the ruling elite, resolvable only through revolution.\(^6\) Within the Soviet bloc, Josip Tito demonstrated the utility of communism in uniting a country whose boundaries had been imposed by outside powers. Both Titoism and Maoism came to represent a


\(^6\) Ibid.
socialist road avowedly independent of Soviet domination, a feat made ever more difficult in the hardening bipolarity of the Cold War.

**Leftist Ideology and Anti-Colonialism in British Africa**

In World War I, colonial powers’ reliance upon local African economies and work force, combined with greater prosperity and professionalisation among intermediaries and Western-educated Africans, increased pressures to liberalise colonial administrations. In areas with dense white settlement, such as Southern Rhodesia, British colonial reforms were too slow for black Africans but too radical for white residents. London’s consequent stepping-back from pledges radicalised nationalist groups, leading in turn to greater British rigidity. The rhetoric of self-determination, given a pan-African focus by W.E.B. DuBois and the political sophistication of African students returning from British universities, mobilised elite Western-educated Africans, seen for example in

However, in Africa generally and West Africa more particularly, interwar anti-colonialism was “incipient rather than openly challenging.”\footnote{Ibid.} Three coherent groups emerged in West Africa as players in resistance to colonial rule. Tribal leaders and traditionalists tended to accommodate British authorities in exchange for the status quo; a professional, commercial elite—many with family ties to tribal chieftains—identified with things British and sought to negotiate higher status and some liberalisation of colonial government; a third element comprised a nascent urban-centered activist elite with connections to the British left, sharing a dawning recognition that colonial reform would never go
far enough, and might even be a hindrance to complete independence.⁹

In the late interwar years, and through the early 1940s, the second and third of these three pivotal groups emerged to dominate nationalist and decolonisation movements, often as rivals, but also as powerful pressure groups against British colonial rule. During the war, various political groups representing the second element coalesced to demand self-government—the National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroon, the Nyasaland African Congress, and the Kenya African Union—inspired by the model of the Indian Congress Party. However, changing economic and demographic factors forced such groups to undertake mass mobilisation or be left behind as a vestige of colonialism.

A wartime boom, coming out of the demands on colonial markets to supply British and American troops, and the disruption of British trade routes elsewhere enhanced the economic

---

⁹ Hatch, Ibid.
and political power of native farmers and middlemen. Returning war veterans, overseas African students, and a self-conscious professional class, took hold of nationalist parties, pushed for expanded access to education, and established trade unions. The infrastructure laid down to move troops and supplies in wartime now provided avenues of contact and mobilisation beyond and between cities. Growing urban populations organised against price increases in consumer goods and against colonial rule more generally, as in the 1945 general strike in Nigeria, and the 1948 riots in Accra.¹⁰

In post-World War II Africa, then, the pathways to independence among nationalist movements ranged from western-oriented groups employing Mohandas Gandhi’s non-violent resistance strategy, to national liberation united fronts relying upon guerrilla tactics.

In colonial Nigeria, both external and internal pressures contributed to the growing strength and visibility of the more militant nationalist organisations. The Nigerian Youth Movement (1934) and National Council of Nigeria and the Cameroons (1943) mounted continued criticism of colonial administration and demands for a constitutional roadmap to self-rule – demands for more native participation in a reformed colonial administration.¹¹ These groups were “urban based, led by the educated elite who operated through ethnic unions within the municipalities, trade unions, debating clubs, and old boys’ associations” built upon shared ties to British universities.¹²

Frustration with halting and superficial colonial administrative reforms amid worsening economic conditions soon led to anger and grievances among Nigerians. Young Nigerians


¹² Ibid, p 246.
were dissatisfied with the indigenous intelligentsia’s acceptance of colonial reforms in lieu of full and immediate national independence; many of these young people were persuaded by the anti-colonial rhetoric emanating from the U.S. and the Soviet Union.

Within the British colonial administration, both the Regional and Federal governments stood fast against Marxism-Leninism, enacting laws aimed against radicals, socialists, or leftists of any ilk. Socialism gained ground, however, with the rising tide of militant nationalism.

Leftist ideas were evident both in politics and trade unionism during the period. More important, Nigerian intellectuals and organisers endeavoured to adapt communism to their own colonial situation. Hence, as subsequent chapters take up in greater detail, some of them claimed to be Marxists, while

others declared themselves Stalinists, Titoists or Maoists. These divisions soon created many pseudo-Marxist organisations in the 1950s and beyond. Nationalism, for its part, became militant partly because of support from the Communist International (from September 1947 Cominform) and its satellites in Europe. Records show, however, that attempts to form a centralised Marxist-Leninist movement in Nigeria in the 1940s and 1950s were both episodic and unorganised. Differences in tactics, combined with volatile personality clashes, spawned uncoordinated and pseudo-Marxist organisations mostly in the southern part of the country.

What emerged was a cluster of pseudo-Marxist groups with different tactics for achieving the shared aim of a Nigerian socialist state that would metamorphose into a


15. CP/CENT/INT/24/04: Eze (Lagos) to Dafe (London), December 5, 1951, NMLHA, Warwick, England.
Nigerian communist state. Their common ground was reliance upon directives and support from the Communist Party of Great Britain (CPGB) and World Federation of Trade Union (WFTU), although as the evidence shows, such directives were not strictly followed.\textsuperscript{16} To some, a mass and nation-wide political party such as the National Council of Nigerian Citizens (NCNC) could serve their purpose (Nduka Eze's group). Others were of the opinion that a Marxist party should be formed so that the bourgeoisie would not hijack the revolution (Samuel Ikoku's group). The latter were of the view that a Marxist party would metamorphose into a Communist Party of Nigeria in the near future. These differences partly explain the absence of a nation-wide Marxist movement and the failure of leftist ideology.

**Communism in post-World War II Nigeria**

Leftist ideology made in-roads among Nigerian nationalists because it addressed the plight of

\textsuperscript{16} CP/CENT/INT/20/01: The Nigerian Commission 1950-1953, NMLHA.
the working class and the peasantry under colonialism. There is no denying the fact that those Nigerian nationalists and labour leaders were generally well informed about leftist ideology. Like their British compatriots, they not only understood the tensions involved in adapting it to their own situation but also ultimately created a distinctive meaning and application of the ideology. They understood the role of the working class and the peasants; the inevitability of the class struggle; the need for contingent co-operation with the bourgeoisie; the aim of the socialist state as a transition to a communist state; and the need for tactical adaptation of the process in relation to their colonial situation. As Lenin himself once declared, "all nations will arrive at socialism... but not the same way."  

Agunbiade-Bamishe succinctly highlighted the Nigerian situation when he remarked: "I am

---


a Communist on the conviction that a political ideology which is based on the philosophy of Marx-Lenin-Stalinism is the only political ideology that can best serve the interests of the Nigerian people.”

Samuel Ikoku, in one of his editorials in the Nigerian Socialist Review (successor to Labour Champion, of which he was a co-editor), exemplified the thinking and goal of the Nigerian Marxists during the 1950s when he wrote that: “We must start a Party...the Party of the Working class in alliance with the poor peasantry. It must be guided by the tested theory of the struggles of the working classes the world over—the theory of Marxism-Leninism. It must adopt the road of open and determined revolutionary struggle against imperialism and against all forces of exploitation and oppression.”

According to Anglo-American officials (including bourgeois nationalists) Marxist ideas could not be treated lightly. Thus, in

19. CP/CENT/INT/19/01: Nigeria 1952-1957, NMLHA.

Nigeria as elsewhere, preventing the
development of leftist ideology and
organisations was tied with decolonisation and
the transfer of power. While I have addressed
British anticommunist policies as they relate
to the transfer of power in another study,\textsuperscript{21}
this study is about the various attempts to
develop a nationwide leftist organisation in
Nigeria between 1945 and 1965.

\textbf{Literature Review}

In contemporary world politics, Marxism-
Leninism has provoked an enormous outpouring of
literature ranging from academic to
propagandist. The more academic and historical
works may be classified under country studies,
comparative cases, and critiques of both the
ideology itself and the various revolutionary
movements it inspired in both Europe and the
Third World.\textsuperscript{22} While there are many solid

\begin{footnotesize}

\textsuperscript{22} In this category are: AZ Rubinstein, \textit{Communist Political Systems} (New Jersey, 1966); DW Treadgold, (ed.) \textit{Soviet and Chinese Communism} (Seattle, 1973); GK Bertsch, & TW
country studies and comparative works on nationalism and decolonisation in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, there is no comprehensive study about the development of leftist ideology and organisations in Nigeria itself between 1945 and 1965. The otherwise pioneering works of Coleman, Olusanya, and Sklar offer valuable overviews of political development and nationalist struggles in Nigeria but ascribe little significance to the long history of leftist ideology in the region; as well, they do not fully appreciate the deep inroads radical leftists made into mainstream nationalist organisations.  

The works of Ajala, Esedebe, Langley, Legum, Nkrumah, and Padmore focus on the general Pan-African use of some of the ideals


of communism as the basis of nationalist struggle in Africa. Alade, Ikoku, Madunagu, Osoba, Waterman and Zachernuk discuss the African intelligentsia’s ideological orientation.\textsuperscript{24} Narasingha, on the other hand, compares the role of the Left during the colonial and post-colonial period, concluding that "socialism holds an uncertain prospect for the future of Nigeria."\textsuperscript{25} Frank, in his 1979

\begin{flushleft}

\end{flushleft}
essay "Ideological Competition in Nigeria: Urban Populism versus Elite Nationalism" analyses the nature of ideology in Nigeria and relates ideological competition to conflict between Federal and local interests. In his study Olakunle Lawal identifies the significance of radical nationalism but fails to discuss the Marxist ideological undertones of this radicalism. Abdul Raheem and Olukoshi, Falola and Adebayo, Eze, Okoye, and Uyilawa present a narrative of the left wing and socialist struggle in Nigeria. Their studies are useful tools for a more meaningful analysis. In a separate study, Falola gives an in-depth account of colonial development planning and decolonisation in Nigeria, and his work remains a vital source for understanding


anti-socialist measures in colonial
developmental plans.\textsuperscript{28}

Awa, in his 1964 \textit{Federal Government in}
Nigeria, narrates the political history of the
country by examining various constitutions and
the workings of the government. In another
study, he focuses on the place of ideology in
Nigerian politics, identifying three distinct
strands: nationalism, capitalism and socialism.
On nationalism, Awa concludes, "although the
nationalist movement increased the momentum of
the agitation for independence, it did not
evolve any ideas that could help develop
consensus in the country." According to Awa,
"[m]ost leaders in Nigeria favoured capitalism
to [i.e., over] socialism." To him, "socialism
has not made a great impact on the society in
practical terms because, there are many strands

to the ideology. Its votaries have tended to dissipate energy fighting one another and not the primary adversary, namely, poverty, and those who perpetuate it." Another reason he gives is that the "principal spokesmen for socialism at one time or the other abandoned the cause and either went over to the capitalist camp or remained neutral in the ideological debate."\textsuperscript{29}

In separate studies, Aluko, Kirk-Greene and Phillips offer insights into the evolution and development of the Foreign Service and foreign policy in Nigeria, as well as into the leadership’s ideological leanings. Aluko and Kirk-Greene agree that the evolution of the Foreign Service should be dated back to 1950, when the process of Africanisation was in full throttle. Both, however, fail to identify ideological undertones in the evolution and development of the Nigerian Foreign Service during the period. Phillips narrates the

emergence of a non-neutralist foreign policy on the eve of independence. He discusses the place of ideology and the East-West politics as a campaign issue during the 1959 general elections.30

Writing in the mid-1960s, Apthorpe, Bhambri, Dudley, Omer-Cooper and Post were concerned about the progress and prospects of Marxism in Nigeria. The Nigerian Journal of Economic and Social Studies published various papers from a symposium held in July 1964 at Ibadan, where scholars gathered to discuss Marxian ideas and social progress in Nigeria. In his contribution, "Marxism and Political Change in Nigeria," Dudley concluded that Marxism succeeded only insofar as the Marxists were willing to cooperate with the bourgeoisie. "That is why," according to him, "independent

Nigeria emerged with a ruling governing class recruited mainly from the intelligentsia and the bourgeoisie." Omer-Cooper in his "Nigeria, Marxism and Social Progress," concluded that, "if taken ... as a scheme to be applied dogmatically to circumstances so different from those which inspired its authors - it could only lead to illusion and conceal the real problems of social progress in Nigeria."  

Apthorpe focused on Marxism and law in Nigeria, concluding that Marxian ideas do not fit into Nigerian law, nor were they wholly applicable. Bhambri, in his "Marxist Economic Doctrines and their Relevance to Problems of Economic Development of Nigeria," maintained that Nigeria could not afford to be aligned with the Soviet bloc. As he put it, "dependency on the communist countries is likely to expose the

Nigerian economy to more dangerous forms of instability.”  

More recent studies have examined the extent to which ideology influenced nationalist and labour leaders. An account of the significant role of the Zikist Movement in the nationalist struggle in Nigeria is found in the works of Iweriebor and Tijani. Iweriebor, in particular, claims that, "under Eze and Okoye, the movement's political orientation and discourse had acquired a definite socialist inflection." Tijani goes further, identifying the extent of Marxist influence in the struggle against British officials and conservative nationalists. 

Ananaba, Akpala, Cohen, Cowan, Otobo, Egboh, Melson, Tokunboh and Yesufu have opened new avenues of inquiry in their studies of


Cohen in his *Labour and Politics in Nigeria* discusses the history of labour movements in Nigeria, emphasizing the role of international labour politics in the split of union leaders. Cowan traces the history of trade unionism worldwide, highlighting its role in nationalism. Egboh's studies are mainly about the origin of trade unionism and its problems and prospects during the colonial period. Otobo, in his various studies on labour relations and trade unions in Nigeria, provides valuable information in this regard. In *Foreign Interest and Labour Unions in Nigeria* and *State and Industrial Relations in Nigeria*, he gave a
clear account of the origin and growth of the labour movement in Nigeria but with only passing reference to the Communist International's support for labor movements. As with earlier authorities, he does not adequately address the perceived communist threat as it related to decolonisation; similarly, he does not discuss various anti-Communist measures taken by British officials and leading nationalists in Nigeria as part of an effort to establish pro-Western labour organisations in colonial and post-colonial Nigeria. Melson narrates ideological failure of the 1964 labour strike and its implications on Marxist groups. Tokunboh in Labour Movements in Nigeria: Past and Present also provides a lucid account of the emergence and development of trade unions in Nigeria. To Yesufu, modern industrial relations in Nigeria cannot be divorced from trade union agitation since the colonial period.

Some scholars and government functionaries have carried out research about Communist infiltration of the trade union movements in
the colonies generally. Although some of them might have been influenced by their ideological orientation, they nonetheless provide useful accounts about the role of Communism, Socialism and the Cominform in metropolitan and colonial trade unionism. In this category are the works of Friedland, Gonidec, Laybourn, Lichtblau, Nelkin, Roberts, Zakharia and Magigwana. \(^{34}\) Adi, Callaghan, and Howe have individually analyses the role of the British Left in colonial politics. Stephen Howe in his *Anticolonialism in British Politics: The Left and the End of Empire, 1918-1964*, analyses the role of the Left with emphasis on the Communist Party of Great Britain, the Labour Governments, and the Movement for Colonial Freedom, within the context of colonial politics. Adi in "West

---

Africans and the Communist Party in the 1950s,”
highlight the relationship between Nigerian
students in Britain during the 1950s and the
leadership of the Communist Party of Great
Britain. This is further expanded in his
doctoral thesis "West African Students and West
African Nationalism in Britain, 1900-1960." And
in “The Communist Movement in West Africa,” he
concludes, “clearly the history of communism in
West Africa has still to be written.” To Adi,
“there is much to indicate that it was a
significant ideology which exercised an
important influence on individuals and the
anti-colonial and labour movements.” Callaghan
is concerned with the role of the British
Communists during the World Wars in promoting
pro-Allied efforts with the hope of a socialist
triumphal or at least the Labour Party momentum
after the war.  

Ronald Hyam's documentation of the Labour Governments and the end of the British Empire is another useful lead. He suggests that between August 1945 (after VJ-Day) and September 1951 (before handing over to the Conservative Party) the issue of containing communism was paramount in Labour government international relations policy. Despite some Left-wing ideologues in the Labour Party, the government was not tolerant of Marxist-Leninist ideals in its policy formulation. Thus he concludes that the foundation of an anti-Communist policy in British strategy was the product of the two post-World War II Labour Governments.\(^{36}\)

David Goldsworthy, in his volumes on the Conservative Governments, notes that "Africa South of the Sahara was far from un-important" in Cold War politics. He notes that the

---

Conservative Governments, like their Labour predecessors, were concerned about the growing influence of Nasser's Egypt, and with it, Soviet influence in spreading communism in Africa. He also asserts that the U.S. was concerned about the menace, which led to its floating the idea of a "committee of American, British, French, and perhaps Belgian officials to consider how best to combat Soviet subversion in Africa." The basis for this U.S. initiative is well covered in Oyebade’s “Feeding America’s War Machine.” More generally, the collapse of the Soviet bloc in the final decade of the twentieth century and the opening of Russian archives have confirmed earlier understandings of Soviet interest in Africa south of the Sahara. The exploration of post-independence relations between Nigeria and the USSR, up until the collapse of the


Soviet Union in 1991 is contained in Maxim Matusevich’s recent work.\textsuperscript{39} The classic and still invaluable analyses of Soviet activities among black Africans remains Edward Wilson’s 1974 study, in which he argued that "Russian involvement had begun in Africa long before the Second World War and had strong historical roots." In this pioneering work, he maintained, "Having failed to establish colonies of her own, Russia adopted a policy of preventive imperialism, attempting to deny other powers what she herself could not have."\textsuperscript{40}

Autobiographies and biographies are also useful tools in reconstructing the history of leftist ideology and organisations in Africa, Nigeria in particular, but there are distinct limits to participants’ own understanding of larger events. For example, autobiographical works by Ahmadu Bello, Obafemi Awolowo, Anthony


\textsuperscript{40} ET Wilson, \textit{Russia and Black Africa before World War II} (London, 1974).
Enahoro and Sir Bryan Sharwood Smith mention only in passing the appeal of leftist and Marxism-Leninism in Nigeria. Amechi, Davies, Foot, Mbadiwe, Nzimiro and Osita do not give detailed accounts of the role of the Soviet Union and the Communist International in their memoirs, emphasizing instead the evolution and ideals of Zikism. In a work that does provide a general description of Communism and the state, Nnamdi Azikiwe underscores the role of a few notable communists in post-independence Nigeria, but concludes from a participant’s vantage point that: “communism is suitable for adaptation but not for adoption in Nigeria.”


A review of relevant biographical and autobiographical literature would not be complete without studies about Tafawa Balewa, one of the leading nationalists of the period and of course the person to whom the governance of Nigeria was entrusted on October 1, 1960. Trevor Clark narrates his role first as the Leader of Government Business, and later Prime Minister of the Federation of Nigeria. In relation to this study, Clark and Epelle have separately discussed the role of Balewa in nationalist politics as well as his role in the decolonisation era. Like Nkrumah (1948-1957) in the Gold Coast and Tunku Abdul Rahman in Malaya, Balewa did not hide his distaste for leftist ideologues. This study will elaborate on his significant and unique role in the formulation and execution of anti-leftist policies in the 1950s through 1965.44

Exploring the Sources

The study draws upon official and unofficial materials available in England, Nigeria, and the United States of America. Also important for accurate and lucid analyses of events, issues, and personalities are personal papers and newspaper reports in various archives and libraries in these countries. More particularly, newspaper reports and private memoirs provide useful information for the reconstruction of the Zikists' ideological orientation, activities of the Special Branch, and the colonial police. Records at the CPGB and the Trade Union Congress (TUC) corroborate newspaper reports and some official intelligence reports relating to the presence of some Nigerian Marxists and their orientation towards the CPGB "British Road to Socialism." The CPGB files also confirmed colonial and nationalist government anxieties about the activities of these men who tried to form a nation-wide Marxist-Leninist movement in the 1950s.
In the Public Record Office (PRO) – now National Archives, London, the files of the Cabinet and its committees, Colonial and Foreign Offices remained the main source of information. Records from the U.S. National Archives and Record Administration, Maryland complement this PRO material. In Nigeria, the regional archives in Ibadan and Enugu provided information concerning British administrators and their Nigerian counterparts during the period; especially valuable are the chief secretary's file, divisional records, and intelligence reports by field officers. Various government reports and annual reports of some departments (Labour, Information and Research, and the Police) have been quite useful. Also, government publications such as Notices, Gazettes, Council of Ministers' Minutes and Parliamentary Debates provided useful information. Of the many valuable Government publications in the UK, perhaps the most significant of all was His (later Her) Majesty's Stationery Office Publications entitled Colonial Annual Reports. The series

Lastly, important gaps in these other materials were filled using materials from the Moral Re-armament Archives, Cheshire and Victoria; the British Trade Union Congress (TUC) Collections, University of North London, British TUC Registry Files at the Modern Record Centre, the University of Warwick, as well as the Communist Party of Great Britain Papers at the National Museum of Labour History Archive Centre, Manchester.

**Analysing the Chapters**

There are eight chapters in this study. Chapter one is a general introduction, emphasizing the basis and relevance of studying the development of leftist ideology and organisations in Nigeria. The chapter identifies the significance of a comprehensive study about the development of Marxist ideology and organisations in Nigeria during the colonial and post-colonial periods.
Chapter two is an assessment of the role of Zikist movement in Nigeria with emphasis on the degree of Marxian ideological influence. It analyses why and how radical youths adopted Marxian ideology in their struggle against British colonialism in Nigeria. Their radical ideology marked a departure from the hitherto peaceful demand by nationalists for devolution.

Chapter three is about attempts at regrouping after the colonial government ban on the Zikist movement in 1950. It is an account of leftist reformation, regroup, and future of the ideology and organisations in Nigeria. This study is a comprehensive analysis of "communism within," emphasizing the role of Marxists and their sympathisers in nationalist movements and labour unionism. The chapter reflects upon Nigerian attempts to adopt Marxist-Leninist ideology to a colonial situation. The official CPGB perception of their activities is also detailed.

Both chapters four and five complement one another. Chapter four is a profile of
notable Marxists during the period under study. While the list is selective, the chapter highlights further their roles, goals, aspirations, and disappointments. Chapter five addresses a major initiative on the part of the Macpherson, Balewa, and Robertson administration with regard to the employment of leftist ideologues. It also discusses how the private sector and the main political parties ostracised the Marxists in political and economic affairs. Here detail about British colonialist sanctions, measures, and co-optation as hegemonic responses to the insurgent Marxist groups is provided. Chapter six explains the collaboration between Nigerian government and France as a neighbouring colonial power; sharing of intelligence and general co-operations between Anglo-French officials is discussed with recently declassified materials from the Public Record Office, London. The important role of the United States in combating leftist ideology worldwide, and particularly in the most populated British colony of Nigeria is
discussed. There is now evidence that U.S. officials were deeply concerned with events in British West Africa, and gathered intelligence both covertly and overtly that were used to combat leftist menace. On the other hand, the study queried the sincerity of U.S. (government and non-government projects) development plans for colonial territories after World War II and its economic collaboration with the colonial office.

Chapter seven is a reflection upon embattled leftists and their quest for a place in an independent Nigerian state, emphasizing in particular leftist reactions to the process of British devolution. The role of Marxist groups between 1960 and 1965 in the new nation is also discussed. In chapter eight, which is also the conclusion, I identify plausible reasons for the failure of Marxian ideology and organisations in Nigeria.

In summary, a history of leftist ideology and organisations in Nigeria during the decolonisation era up to 1965 is relevant. An understanding of this aspect of Nigerian
history will illuminate our reflections on how and why the aspirations of the Marxists (and their sympathisers) remained elusive since independence in 1960. This explains why the Nigerian nation is pro-Western in all spheres of life.