

REFLECTIONS ON OBAFEMI AWOLOWO AND KARL MARX'S SOCIO-POLITICAL PHILOSOPHIES TOWARDS AN EGALITARIAN SOCIETY IN AFRICA

Adetunji Sunday Oni, PhD

Department of Philosophy,
College of Humanities and Culture, Osun State University,
Osun State, Nigeria

E-mail: adetunji.oni@uniosun.edu.ng, tunjioni2@yahoo.com

Abstract

The question regarding the plausibility of practicing an egalitarian society has been one of the crucial issues in the field of socio-political philosophy in Africa. There is no doubt that clamouring for an egalitarian society is the cry of majority people in our contemporary period as the ideal form of society in Africa. Going by the rights of man as recorded in the National Assembly of France during the French Revolution and the America Declaration which affirm that man is born free and more so creates equality in respect of their rights, but there is a need to ask what an unrestricted society is like. Considering the inequality of men in terms of their bodily proportion, physical strength, and intellectual abilities, and so on, can there ever be a classless society as required by the populace most especially in this era that the Africans are divided into two classes: the rich and the poor class? Is the assertion that all men ought to be equalled not as absurd as that earth ought to be one vast plain? Taking cognizance of the uniqueness of man being rational and conscious of his environment, which separates him from the lower animals, is a man not meant to be treated equally?, why is there a class distinction in the society? On this premise, the work takes a philosophical look into what egalitarian theory asserts in accordance with African experience. Using a philosophical comparison approach, the paper critically and systematically compares two prominent philosophers; Awolowo and Karl Marx whose socio-political philosophies focus on the principle of egalitarianism with an attempt to analyze their areas of convergence and divergence and therefore synthesize their concept of egalitarian systems for a synthetic common goal of African society.

Keywords: Egalitarianism, Karl Marx, Awolowo, cross-cultural, socio-political, Society

Introduction

Cross-cultural philosophy otherwise referred to as comparative philosophy is a subfield of philosophy in which two or more philosophers' work on tradition, problems, and issues relating to human and societal matters are critically investigated and discussed in line with their philosophical views. It is a sub-branch field of study where an intellectual philosophy of two or more is explored in an attempt to compare or synthesis their philosophy. However, Cross-cultural philosophy implies that race, ethnicity, and sex have an inescapable effect on the way people think and or the values they hold or are capable of holding. The ambition and focus of this field of study are to include all the philosophies of global humanity in its vision of what is constituted by philosophy. While in the area of political philosophy, a comparative philosophy examines the ways in which societies choose to formulate and implement official policies, it further considers ideas among thinkers within a particular tradition. Thus, Cross-cultural philosophy intentionally compares the ideas of thinkers of very different traditions, especially culturally distinct traditions because comparison is fundamental to the constructivist task just for the sake of gaining clarity on some specific issue.

Going down the memories of most African countries, many gained independence during the 1960s, and immediately after these most African countries indirectly entered another era of imperialism, some scholars refer to this as "black imperialism" which is defined as the process of exploitation of Africa by the Africans. Some of the newly formed governments rejected the ideas of capitalism which their colonial masters see as the suitable form of government in favour of a more Afrocentric economic model. For instance, socialism is viewed as a plausible form of government based on the opinion that it is similar to the communal system of Africa prior to colonialism. The advocates of African socialism claimed that it was neither the opposite of capitalism nor a response to it, but something completely different from all forms of existing political theories. Common principles of various versions of African socialism were based on social development guided by a large public sector, incorporating the African identity and what it means to be African, also the avoidance of the development of social classes within society (Friedland 1964:34). Senghor however claimed that Africa's social background of tribal community life not only makes socialism natural to Africa but excludes the validity of the theory of class

struggle, thus making African socialism in all of its variations different from Marxism and European socialist theory.

Perhaps the question is raised for the reason why is there a need for the political model in Africa today. The simple answer is that Africa is our real experience, our actual view, and our mind, based on our cultural, political, and social system, as well as the level of development the Africans have attained. It is also due to our achievement in our constant search to cognize the cause of all things existing in our environment. One of the aims of every political thinker is to reflect on the existential political reality of his or her environment and come up with a political ideology that can be used in solving societal problems. The quest for an appropriate political model becomes pertinent in most continents and in particular Africa today because the existing socio-political structures are ineffective for the organization of daily human activities.

Many ancient philosophers have been able to formulate one political ideology or the other based on the problems of their societies. Plato's socio-political philosophy, for instance, cannot be relegated when it comes to the issue of an ideal society. Neither will Thomas Hobbes's political philosophy be categorized as irrelevant. Hobbes propounded the doctrine of political absolutism or despotism as a necessary antidote to the prevailing chaos, fear, and insecurity of his time (Oni:2019:8). Nor will Rousseau's doctrine on socio-political philosophy be condemned in his society. Rousseau in his work asserts that "My purpose is to consider if, in political society, there can be a legitimate and sure principle of the government taking men as they are and laws as they might be" (Schumpeter 2003:2).

Based on his doctrine, Rousseau's socio-political philosophy aims at reconstructing and reforming the society considered to be artificial, corrupt, unjust, sick, and decadent all through. Rousseau's political philosophy is centered on a concern for man's dignity and well-being. Likewise, can any economic situation of a given society be discussed without making reference to Marxist philosophy whose socio-political philosophy centers on classes and class struggle? From his own perspective, Karl Marx believes that socialism which is seen as the ultimate is in fact a scientific approach to a community's problems. Thus, Marx interprets man in scientific form but in a familiar way which later poses some difficulties. It is on these premises that we

need to observe that the natural equality of man has been asserted to be a self-evident truth, but in what sense are men by nature equal? The most striking fact about human life is the inequality of men. Men are unequal in the bodily proportion which springs from two sources; nature and nurture. Hence, is the assertion that men ought to be equalled not absurd? The idea of equality has thus grown out of the idea of privilege

The notion of Political Ideology

Basically speaking, in the realm of political theory, the term “Ideology” is applied in two contexts: it is either described as a set of ideas that are accepted to be true by a particular group, party, or nation without any further examination or it is seen as a science of ideas which examines as to how different ideas are formed.

The concept of “ideology” originated during the late eighteenth century as a protest against religious superstition and monarchical authority. The word “ideology” was first used by a French scholar called Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836). He defined ideology as a study of the process of forming ideas- a science of ideas. The philosopher De Tracy as quoted by Gauba(2007:15) views ideology as a science of ideas based on the objective knowledge gained from the physical senses, not from abstract metaphysics or principles of religious faith and sacred political authority. Through reason, logical education, and empirical investigation, social scientists could not only understand political reality but also control and change the social environment. According to De Tracy in Gauba (2007:15), intellectuals must play a critical role in forging socio-political change. Because government authorities often distort, conceal information, and communicate falsehoods, social scientists had the responsibility to unmask these distortions and illusions.

In the mid-nineteenth century, Karl Marx perceived ideology as an agent of change and an instrument for maintaining the status quo. For him, intellectuals upheld a critical function when they illuminated capitalist realities, unmasked illusions, and articulated a “socialist consciousness” that would help obtain a new economic system. From another perspective, Marx contrasts scientific socialism with unscientific ideologies based on false consciousness. In this view, ideology constitutes both a rationalization for actions taken on non-ideological grounds “ the struggle for capital

accumulation, political power, and status, and a subjective blinder that distorts an accurate understanding of the socio-political situation (Adrain and David 1995:85).

Political analysts today interpret ideology in more detached terms. For them, it represents a systematic set of principles linking perceptions of the world's explicit moral values. An ideology not only interprets the meaning of events but also posits the need to change or maintain the existing situation. By merging the empirical with the evaluative dimensions, ideology stirs individuals to take political actions that will realize a program for upholding or reconstructing society (ibid.).

Philosophical and ideological principles guide political activities, specify the scope of political authority, highlight policy priorities, and motivate leaders to view some policy options as more desirable and feasible than others. As Adrain and David (1995:87) indicated as quoted in John Maynard (1963:53) during the great depression of the 1930s:

The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood, indeed the world is ruled by little else.. the power of vested interests is vastly exaggerated compared with the gradual encroachment of ideas...it is ideas, not vested interests, which are dangerous for good or evil (1995)

In his view, Momoh (1991:31) classifies ideology into two categories; namely, sectional ideology and personal ideology. For him, for an ideology to be grounded it must be based on a theory of human nature, which must profess a belief as well as prescribe an action for any society or individuals. Momoh further observes that:

We need an ideology, that is both systematic and comprehensive, systematic in the sense that, it will oil the system and keep it going, but comprehensive in the sense that it is applicable in non-official because it is designed to promote the interest of freeman, it is an ideology that will commit individual group and the state itself to the system. (ibid)

If an ideology or philosophy regards changes as desirable and feasible, leaders who hold these dynamic beliefs will more likely realize social change. Revolutionary, reformist, conservative, and reactionary belief systems sketch divergent goals. Revolutionaries express the greatest commitment to a fundamental transformation of the existing society. They support increased economic and cultural equality, expanded opportunities for group mobility, the exchange of group positions, and a change in the value bases of ranking people.

In contrast, reformist favours more evolutionary individualistic changes. They want to narrow the gap between the rich and the poor, enlarge individual opportunities for upward mobility, reward people for their personal achievements, and promote greater representation of diverse individuals in government decision-making.

On this note, one can conceive ideology, which we live by in our day-to-day engagements, which also guides all other aspects of human endeavour. It implies that individual ways of thinking or sourcing information that will regulate nature and their lives will be different and we require various ideologies to regulate our lives. This perhaps is the origin of the multiplicity of ideology that flourishes in the world today.

So when we talk about egalitarianism, as an ideology we do not intend to place it high and above every other existing ideology that might have existed before and those that come after it only that it is an inherited ideology from the inequalities of ancient societies. According to Bryce (1998:12), it is an attempt to expunge all differences in wealth, allocating to every man an equal share in worldly goods. Thus egalitarianism is the doctrine of equal rights, benefits, and opportunities for all citizens, while an egalitarian society is one where there is the absence of special privilege, that is the exclusion of any man or body of men from access to the avenue of authority is a denial of rights. Thus adequate opportunities are laid open to all in an egalitarian society. The equalization of society is a necessary step to take in any society that strives toward egalitarianism. It must be noted that socialism as an economic and political ideology originated as a protest against the inequalities in capitalism

Karl Marx is essentially a humanist whose main concern is the liberation of man from exploitation, alienation, and slavery to which the capitalist system has condemned man, this is the central theme of Marx's activity. His deplorable condition of workers is the total destruction of the capitalist system and the inauguration of communism

which will bring an egalitarian society. On the other hand, Awolowo favoured democracy as the best system of government under which we can attain equality for men. Awolowo asserts that there can be no alternative to the democratic way of life if the aim of government is the physical, moral, and spiritual welfare of the people(Awolowo:1960:270). Trying to reiterate human nature as the ontological foundation of democracy, but this time around he intended to focus on the principle of equality of men. On this note, it is pertinent to consider Awolowo and Karl Marx's egalitarianism as a political ideology.

On Awolowo's Principle of Egalitarianism

Awolowo's policies are formulated to suit Nigerian society. Being a humanist, his ideology is centered on man's well-being and development. Awolowo was of the view that man is composed of physical intellectual, moral and spiritual entities. His dignity is evident from his creation according to God's own image and likeness, and as the only free, creative, and purposeful dynamics in the world. There is sorrow, and suffering from a shortage in man's life in the world. It is at this shortage that the humanistic and welfarist posture of his political philosophy emerged. The purpose of governance is nothing but to improve, organize and implement good policies. Man according to Awolowo cannot live alone but associate himself with others in society (Awolowo1981a:60).

It is not only in a society that man realizes himself, but it is in the state that man does so fully. He was of the view that the state is like an extended family. It is the creation of man and it emerges from a number of natural and economic administrative factors. Since the state is created by man, its purpose is to ensure that man is able to realize his natural desires and aspiration. The principle is, therefore, that the state is for man, and not man for the state.

However, this does not imply by any means that an individual or group is above the state as a whole. It is important that the state should carry out some goals in order to make it. The goals of the state are the realization of the common good and the well-being of all. All socio-economic services must be distributed according to the principle of justice and equality. (Awolowo1978:5). Also, the political rights of men must be respected; otherwise, the unity and integrity of the state may be at stake. On

this basis, Awolowo despite his respect for Marxism rejects the Marxist interpretation of history and revolutionary approach to problem-solving (Fafowora, 1997:14). Inspired and impressed by Marx and Hegel's concerns for social welfare, Awolowo's conviction is that the people's welfare could be achieved through rationality and enlightened leadership rather than violence. It is in this respect that Gandhi's doctrine of non-violence as a means of effecting social change is of major impact on Awolowo's political thought.

There is no doubt that Awolowo's policy of the state has the economic prosperity of citizens as goal, and the spiritual needs are also taken care of. This is to ensure the successful implementation of the normative social objective for the benefit of the people. Awolowo was of the view that the introduction of socialism and the rejection of capitalism is inevitable if the state wants to fulfill its aims. His ideal state is that which is sovereign, autonomous, constitutional, democratic, socialistic, and moral in character. It can be deduced from Awolowo's philosophy of the state, and his political philosophy that he sees the state as an association of human beings, consciously brought together, by means of a social contract, to achieve certain ends which include the provision of basic human needs for the benefits of all.

Going by his view, society is hierarchical in nature and based on the principle of innate differentials. Awolowo recognized individual differences in men in relation to their inborn power and abilities. To him, some are more intelligent, while others are more suited to certain jobs. The differences in individuals extend to national groups, which differ in their achievements and development (Ogunmodede1985: 32)

However, Awolowo was of the view that it is wrong for any government to imagine that individuals in a group have the same capacities. At the same time, the government should avoid any policy of even development that might have negative effects on the more ambitious and progressive elements and the groups in society.

Essentially, Awolowo divided social classes into two: the rich and the poor with a geographical distinction. The urban dwellers are rich and they enjoy a comparatively higher standard of living and are able to add comfort to necessities. The poor, on the other hand, are people who have the means to satisfy only the necessities of life and live in rural areas. The poor class constituted the majority in society, while the rich men are few and exploitative (Ogunmodede1985:36). The fact is that there would not

have been any problem if many are rich and only a few are poor in society, but the other is the case, and as a result of this the masses are been exploited.

Awolowo was very optimistic that the best form of government is democracy. He was of the view that it is this form of government that can lead to peaceful co-existence among all the people. He stated that from all available historical evidence, it is clear that the best form of government is a democracy (Ogunmodede1985:146). It is a system where all the people control their own destinies. Awolowo believed that it is only in a democratic society that all the people can influence the decisions of the state equally without any form of discrimination or crises. He further characterized his view of democracy based on principles derived from human nature. Equality of men, individual rights, and majority rule are the tripods upon which Awolowo's democracy stands.

a. **Equality of men:** The most fundamental tenet of democracy and that which distinguishes it from all other political ideologies is the concept of equality of men. Awolowo emphasized this concept when he states that "all human beings are born equal because we are the image of God". Awolowo recognized that there are individual differences in the physical and mental capabilities of people. In the light of differences in individuals, equality is then the equal political opportunity for all and the rejection of inherited political privileges, elitism, and classes. All citizens have equal rights to aspire to any office in the land

b. **Individual rights:** democracy holds the dignity and worth of each individual sacred and inviolable. Human dignity can only be realized when freedom and rights, which are fundamental and inalienable are upheld, and not sacrificed on the altar of any political power. Freedom of expression, freedom of thought, and freedom of religion must be guaranteed to all citizens without any form of discrimination. The right to education, health service, and just and favourable conditions of work must be followed strictly and guaranteed by the government to all.

c. **Majority rule:** the central principle of government based on democracy, as observed by Awolowo, is rule by consultation and consent of the vast majority of the people.

Awolowo insists that the law is no respecter of person, status, or class. There is no discrimination of any sort, the rule of law is allowed to take its place, all have to

behave within the framework of law, and the use of power in society is to be subjected and controlled by the regulations and laws established by the people. It is the rule of law that ensures that the human rights and freedom of the people are not discriminated against and distorted.

In case of any crisis, on the right of all individuals, the judiciary is there to settle it according to the laid down rules and regulations without any discrimination. It is the judiciary that people rely on whenever they are being discriminated.

Karl Marx's philosophical Conception of Egalitarianism

An identical notion is a Marxian theory on the nature of man. Here, man is also seen as just a natural phenomenon – homo sapiens – but Karl Marx says further that “the real nature of man is the totality of social relations”.(Marx 1942:116).

Karl Marx's philosophical doctrine is traceable to his foreknowledge of history and philosophy, which assisted him alongside Engel to work out the theory and tactics of revolutionary proletarian socialism. His theory of class struggle and of the world's historic revolutionary role of the proletariats, the creator of a new communist state cannot be underestimated in his work. Marx by his nature is known as a radical economist and modern scientist, whose idea forms the foundation of socialist and communist movements throughout the world.(Eggenberger 1973:228).

The basis of his philosophical doctrine is the conviction that socialism is inevitable; it is the way to achieve a better life for all. Thus Marxism is described as a response to the economic and social hardship or inequalities accompanying the growth of western industrial capitalism. In his view, Sabirow (1987:124) asserts that Marxism did not arise in isolation, from the proceeding trends in social thought; it was the legal heir of all that was best in mankind's understanding of nature and society. This implies that it is the science of communism, since each of its component parts substantiates each within the framework of its own subject, the unavoidable mankind's development into a communist society.

In his historical dialectics, Marx described capitalism as the peak of human development, and this has created more so amassed unprecedented wealth which if used rationally, could guarantee the material well-being of all the people. But by virtue of its own law of operation, it can not utilize its means of production rationally but creates

misery and chaos. Again, while capitalism has promoted constitutional government and the rights of man, the formal rights and equalities of liberal regimes are destroyed by actual inequalities and ultimate dehumanization, however, Sobirow(1987: 211) asserts that formerly freeman has been turned into a commodity, whose labour power, talents and personality are for sale in the free market. In buttressing this assertion Marx claims that the capitalist system presupposes the complete separation of labourers from all property in the means by which they can realize their labour (1987:212). In similar to Engel's view where they both assert that “the bourgeoisie has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and has concentrated property in few hands”(Kernig 1972:209). In this case, a socialist economic system founded on collective ownership of the means of production and distribution is necessary in order to correct the flaws in capitalism.

For Marx, a socialist society is a just society in which each of its members would work freely and lives by the fruits of his labour, this is not the case in the capitalist state. This is because the workforce is being exploited by capitalists. Whereas for the socialist society, exploitation of man by man will be a thing of history

The convergence between Awolowo and Marx's Egalitarian principle

Having taken a critical analysis of the nature of both Awolowo and Marx's political philosophy, it is important for us in this paper to discuss the similarities in their socio-political philosophy. Karl Marx and Obafemi Awolowo were of the view that capitalism leads to inequality in society, and it must be eradicated. In their view, the evil of capitalism is immense. Karl Marx and Fredrick Engel assert that capitalism has agglomerated population and has concentrated property in a few hands (1971:40). Awolowo on the other hand maintains that:

Since greed, selfishness, or naked self-interest is the essence and predominant motivation of capitalism true system is bound to generate secular social disequilibrium, in the society in which it is operative, and to diminish and degenerate through time until it suffers total extinction (Awolowo, 1968:189).

It is a result of these and other flaws in capitalism that made both Marx and Awolowo reject capitalism's entirety and thus replaced it with a new system that is based on the equality of all men in society. From this, we infer that their philosophies rest on the assumption of the equality of men. It is the basis on which life in society can be organized without justice.

Equality to the duo means the provision of adequate opportunities for all. It does not mean that all men should be on the same level, it means rather the provision of adequate opportunities and the abolition of classes as reflected in capitalism.

More so, both believed that equality does not connote equality in terms of personal needs. On the one hand, individuals will always be different from others. In other words, natural variety remains, but should not be used as justification for inequality. Quoting Kernig in his words,

Communist equality presupposes the eradication not of all distinctions between people, but only of such distinctions and conditions as would give rise to a difference in the social position of people (Kernig 1972:209).

Awolowo buttresses this point further by asserting that the principle of innate differentials differentiates individuals among themselves according to inborn power and abilities. (Awolowo 1981:43) it is obvious that both reject the possibility of establishing equality between men in the sense of equality of their physical and mental capabilities. It must however be admitted that Marx and Awolowo were of the view that equality of men is possible. This equality to them is the provision of equal chance for all, there should be no discrimination of any sort. All are equal before the law, and the basic things of life should be provided by all for the benefit of all. their vision of an egalitarian society is that all the people must have equal say in the running of governance, as a society that is devoid of injustice is their ideal society

The Divergence point between Awolowo and Marx's Egalitarian principle

In his book, *Voice of Reason*, Awolowo plainly states that “I am not a Marxist myself.” I want to state that Marx and Awolowo search for a just society where everyone is taken care of adequately, without any form of discrimination. The core difference between them is when it comes to the means and methods of achieving equality in society. The differences are due to the peculiarity of the cultural and historical experiences of both. Perfect equality is attained in communism and it can only come through the use of force. (revolutionary means). To Marx, force is inevitable in order to bring an egalitarian society into reality. However, Awolowo favored the use of democratic and peaceful means to bring about an egalitarian society. According to Marx and Engels in the *Communist manifesto*:

...revolutions are not made deliberately and
arbitrarily, but that everywhere and at all
times they have been the necessary outcome
of circumstances (Marx 1971:20)

On the opposite side, Awolowo said that violence never settles anything apart from injuring your own soul. He did not believe in any form of violence, this is because it does not lead to the expected goal. He shared the same ideology with Mahatma Gandhi and the American civil right leader; Martin Luther King Jr.

Another difference identify in their philosophy on the conception of equality is the role of the state; Marx was of the view that the state is an organ of the exploiters to oppress the common people. In other words, the state is the instrument of oppression. The state will wither after the proletariat class attains power. Some scholars among which we have Proudhon also supported the view of Marx, though; they differed to a large extent. On the other hand, Awolowo was of the opinion that the state is necessary in order to achieve the desired equality in society. It is only within the state that the individual can realize himself to the fullest. Furthermore, there is a difference between Marx and Awolowo when it comes to the issue of the well-being of the individual. Awolowo's democratic socialism preaches a state of individual freedom and rights, a state where the rights of ownership of private property and economic enterprises co-exist with those of the state. Awolowo advocates a constitutional state in which the rule of law is held

supreme and everybody is equal before it. In his book, *people's republic* Awolowo wrote:

It is my earnest contention then that all productive activities indeed all earthly human activities if they are to be meaningful, equitable, just and human should be geared to one and only one goal; the welfare of the individuals (Ogunmodede 1985:209).

He supported the view that the individual rights and freedoms of all citizens must be guaranteed by the government. Freedom and rights are fundamental and inalienable. On the other hand, Marx professed the welfare of the whole society instead of a few individuals. Awolowo's view is a departure from that of Marx, which emphasizes so much the whole, the mass, and the society that it often forgets the person of the individual.

Furthermore, Awolowo supports an individual person as inconceivable without rights and especially the rights of property and belongings, freedom of thought and expression, family life, choice of religious belief and practice, etc. in his view Marx reduced men to the economic level. He was of the view that it is the economy that determines all other aspects of life. That is why he did not foresee any need for the political and individual rights of the citizens.

Awolowo more so, against any form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, was of the view that all individuals in the society would have equal rights to decide the manner in which they want to be governed. He did not discriminate as to who should hold the mantle of power. It is the fundamental human right of all citizens to be able to influence the government. This is not in line with Marx's dictatorship of the proletariat.

Conclusion

Awolowo and Marx were both socialists whose goal is to bring an end to class distinction, which is the goal of the socialist. Nyerere (1968:13) in his assertion claims that:

For socialism, the basic purpose
is for the well-being of the
people, and the basic assumption
is an acceptance of human
equality (1968:13)

The duo agreed that the equality of men is inevitable if a man's life is to be worth living. However, they differed markedly in means and methods of achieving equality for men. There are also differences in the types and forms of equality. History has shown that the concept of egalitarianism never went much beyond the stage of preaching, it is mere political rhetoric and it has failed whenever and wherever it is adopted. Our politicians only make propaganda of an egalitarian society; this is yet to materialize since many crusaders of egalitarianism started their campaigns in the early twentieth century.

Human being are generally egoistic says Thomas Hobbes, but modernity and the fear of bad repercussions permit men to be civil to one another, yet human beings are never satisfied. Thus, there is no way one can practice equality as posited by Marx and Awolowo successfully because of the nature of man. Human nature has made it difficult, if not impossible, to realize the concept of equality. There may still be people clamouring for a bigger share due to their insatiable nature. The concept of equality has proved to be operationally defective in many countries such as Cuba, and North Korea, and even in African countries of our like Nigeria.

Equality of both sexes is not in line with African culture, traditional African culture, for instance, recognize the fact that man is superior to woman; basically, it is un-African to equate both sexes in Africa. If not for the feminist that is championing equality in contemporary society, the truth be told that regardless of all their argument, equality of all sex is yet to see the light of day. African culture and religion made it clear that individual beings are made in unique ways. The equation of both sexes is antithetical to our social milieu in Africa. However, the answer in relation to the problem of the practicability of equality as Marx and Awolowo made us believe is that we have to make life better for the common people, the fact that it is difficult to practice the principle of equality as seen by the duo does not mean that we should allow the gap between the rich and the common people extend every day, the thing that makes life

meaningful should be given to the common people. Likewise, opportunities should be allowed in order to give room for development.

References

- Adrain, C. and Apter, D. (1995). *Political Protest and Social Change*, London: Macmillan press, Ltd.
- Appadorai A.(1975). *The Substance of Politics*, Madras: Oxford University Press
- Awolowo Obafemi,(1960). *Awo: Authobiography of Chief Obafemi Awolowo*, London: Cambridge University press
- _____ (1968). *The People's Republic*, Ibadan: Oxford University Press
- _____ (1978). *The Problems of Africa. The Need for Ideological Reappraisal*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Bryce, J. (1998). *Modern Democracies*, London: The Penguin Press
- Eggenberger, D (ed) (1973). *The McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of world Biography*, vol. 4, New York, McGraw Hill Book
- Fafowora,O.O (1997). *Awo's Philosophy: Its Relevance Today*, Ikeja: Olusola Adeyekun Publishing Company
- Freidland, R. (1964). *African Socialism*, California: Stanford University press,
- Gaubu O.P (2007). *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New Dehli: Macmillan Publisher Ltd.
- Kernig. C. D (1972), *Marxism Communism and Western Society: A Comparative Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, New York: Herder and Herder
- Marx, K. (1859). *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Middlesex:Pengiun publication
- Marx, K and Engels. F(1971). *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, Moscow: progress publishers
- Momoh, C.S (1991). *Philosophy of New, Past and Future*, Lagos: University of Lagos printing press.
- Nyerere, Julius (1968). *Freedom and Socialism*, London: Oxford University press
- Ogunmodede, I. (1986). *Obafemi Awolowo's Socio-Political Philosophy: A Critical Interpretation*, Ibadan: Intec Printers Ltd.

Oni, Adetunji. (2019). "Reflecting on Obafemi Awolowo's leadership policy for effective co-existence", In *The LEAJON; An Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies, Journal of Philosophy*, Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Vol 9, (2) :7-19

Sobirow, K (1987). *What is Communism*, in *Abc of Social and political Knowledge*, Moscow:progress publishers, 211

Schumpeter, J.A. (2003). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*, London: Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2