Bule Hora University

College of Social Sciences and Humanities

Department of Civics and Ethical Studies

Course Tittle: Survey of African Socio-Political Systems and Dynamics

Course Code: CESt3063

Credit Hour: 3/ ECTS: 5

Prepared by: Debela Fituma

Galchu Jarso

Kefelegn Tesfaye

Edited by: Abdisa Olkeba

June 2018

Bule Hora, Ethiopia

Table of Contents

Contents **Pages**

CHAPTER ONE

Pre-colonial African Society and Political System .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.1. Brief Introduction to the Pre-Colonial African Society ..**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.2. Pre-Colonial African Political System .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.3. The Concept of State and State Formation in Africa .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.4. Missionaries and Religious Expansion.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.5. Antecedents of Colonialism in Africa .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.6. Why were European Powers able to Conquer Africa?....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.7. Why Did Europe Colonize Africa? .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.8. The Berlin Conference (1884-5) : *Actors, Contents and Outcomes* ....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.9. Treaty-Making 1885-1902 .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

1.11. Legacies of Precolonial Empires and the Colonial State in Africa ....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER TWO

2. Colonialism and Its Legacies .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.1. Major European Colonial Powers and their Colonial Policies..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.1.1.The British Mission.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.1.3.The Portuguese Mission.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.1.4.The Belgian Mission.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.2. Colonial Administrative Styles .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.2.1.Indirect Rule.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.2.2.Direct Rule .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.3. The Outcome (Consequences) of Colonialism.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.3.1 Psychological Consequences of Colonialism.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.3.2 The Class Effects of Colonialism in Africa.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

2.3.3. Political Consequences of Colonialism……**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER THREE:

3. African Struggle Against Colonialism…….…..49

3.1 Early African Reactions and Resistance Movements Against Colonialism……50

3.1.1 Missionary Church and School……. ……52

3.1.2 The Significance of the Two World Wars…… ……53

3.1.3 The Pan-Africanism: Historical and Philosophical Overview…….. …..54

3.1.3.1 Prominent Figures and Founders of Pan-Africanism, and It's Major Conferences……54

3.1.4 The League of Nation and the UN……58

3. 2 Colonial Struggle for Liberation /Independence/……...60

3.2.1 Key Resistances Movements and Uprisings for Independence…….**Error! Bookmark not defined.**3

3.2.1.1 Mau-Mau Rebellion……..63

3.2.1.2 Apartheid System in South Africa ……...66

3.2.1.3 Institutionalisation of Apartheid*: Apartheid* Laws after 1948…….……66

3.2.1.4 Anti-Apartheid Movement /AAM/……..…67

3.2.1.5 Nelson Mandela and Anti- Apartheid Hero: His Contribution for Independence of South Africa……..……...68

3.2.1.6 The Role of United Nation to ban Apartheid in South Africa……..70

3.3 Africa's Mainland Nationalists……....71

3.4 The Philosophy of African Socialism and its Contribution for Continental Unity……..73

3.**5** All African Peoples Conferences at the Wave of Independence ……76

3.5.1 The Accra Conference 1958 (First African Independent States)…….. ……76

3.5.2 Tunis Conference in 1960 (Second All African Conference)……...76

3.5.3 The Cairo Conference: Third All African Conference and its Major Events……77

3.6 Pan-Africanism and the Road for African Unity ……78

3.7 The 1963 Addis Ababa Summit Conference……... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**….83

3.9 From OAU to AU…….86

Error! Bookmark not defined.

CHAPTER FOUR:

POST-INDEPENDENCE NATION BUILDING IN AFRICAN

4.1 Understanding Concepts**……..**89

4.1.1 State Failure and State-Building……...**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

4.1.2 Nation Failure and Nation-Building…….90

4.2 Approaches of Nation building……92

4.3 The Nature of Post-colonial African States……. ……93

4.4 Post-Colonial African States and the challenges of Nation Building…… ……95

4.4.1 The Colonial State and Its Postcolonial Legacy……97

4.4.2 Multiple Disconnectedness……...98

4.4.3 Approaches Expound the Crisis of Post-colonial African States……..100

4.4.4 Ethnicity and the Nature of Political Parties in Post-colonial Africa……102

4.4.5 Foreign Intervention and the Resilience of the Post-colonial African States…….... …104

CHAPTER FIVE

Political Process and Political Change.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.1. Regimes Defined..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.2. Regime Evolution in Post-Colonial Africa ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3. Regime Types and Their Variations ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3. 1. Authoritarian Regime .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.2. Authoritarian Regime Based on Personal Rule.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.2. Polyarchic Regime .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.3. Socialist Regime.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.4. Afro-Marxism Regime .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.5. Military Regimes.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.6. Populist Regime .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.7. Pluralist Regime .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.3.8 Democracy.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4. Regime Types and Political Change ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.1. Democratization.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.2. Autocratization.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.3. Democratic Regression .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.4. Political Liberalization.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.5. Authoritarian progression .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.6. Democratic Deepening.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.4.6. Democratic Consolidation .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.5. Political Transitions and Patterns of Change ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6. Mode of Political Change ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6. 1. Violent Changes.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6. 2. Peaceful Change.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6. 3. Internal Political Change.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

5.6. 4 External Political Change .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

CHAPTER SIX

The Cold War and After: It's Impact on the African Socio-Political Systems...**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.1. The Cold War and Africa..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.1.1 The Communist versus the Western Power in Africa .... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.1.2. Superpower Rivalry in the Horn of Africa: Ethiopia Versus Somalia.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.The Impact of the Cold War on African Socio-Political Systems ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.1. Political Impacts .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.2. Socio-economic Impacts: Underdevelopment of Social Sectors .. **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.3. Security Impacts .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.4. Creation of Non- aligned Movement (NAM).....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.5 . Creation of African Union (OAU) .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.2.6. Organization of African Union (AU) Transition to AU..**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.3. The End of Cold War..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.4. The Emergence of Neo-Colonialism in Africa ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.4.1. Controlling the Incumbent Government.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.4.2. Controlling the Troops .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.4.3. Controlling Foreign Trade.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.5 Features of a Neo-Colonial State of Africa..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.5.1. Lacks Essential Attribute of Sovereignty State.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.5.2. Problem of Internal Contradictions .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.5.3. Insensitive to the Interest of African People .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.5.4. Exploitation, Fragmentation and Penetration of Poor by Rich ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.6 The African Debt Crisis..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.6.1. The Era of Structural Adjustment (SAP)..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.6.2 Objectives of Structural Adjustment Program.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.7. Democracy and the Continuation of Neo-Liberalism..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.8 Democracy and Emergence of Developmental State in Africa . **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.9. The Obstacles to Democratic Consolidation in Africa ..... **Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.9.1. Ethnic Fragmentations .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.9.2. Legitimacy Deficit / Weak States .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.9. 3. Lack of Economic Development .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

6.10. Revolutions and the Quest for Democratic Rights in North African Countries.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

References……161

CHAPTER ONE

PRE-COLONIAL AFRICAN SOCIETY AND POLITICAL SYSTEM

Introduction

Dear Students! Welcome to the first chapter of the module. In this chapter, you will discuss about the pre-colonial African society and their aspects of life including politics, socio-economic, and cultural values. As a result, it helps you to develop a broad understanding of how various African societies evolved before the mid-1800s; discover the important position of precolonial Africa within local and global historical processes; interpret primary sources for major themes and episodes in African history within their own particular social, cultural, political, and economic contexts; and demonstrate the ability to analyze and discuss material dealing with Africa's past in writing, with sensitivity to those African historical contexts.

Objectives of the Chapter

At the end of the chapter, you will able to:

- ✓ Describe pre African society
- ✓ Explain pre-African political system
- ✓ Discuss why Europeans colonize Africa
- ✓ Explain facts about the 1884-85 Berlin conference

Brainstorming: Dear students! What are the possible reasons for which Europeans had colonized Africa?----------

---

1.1. Brief Introduction to the Pre-Colonial African Society

Africa is central to human history. It is the continent where our species arose, where some of the greatest ancient civilizations throve, and where dynamic, complex, and innovative cultures confronted a variety of social, political, and environmental challenges. Many African states and

societies were materially wealthier than their European counterparts until the 1700s; and Africa has always been connected to the wider world. Yet in the popular, Eurocentric historical imagination in the U.S. and Europe, there is sparse knowledge of Africa's own history, and it was rarely even considered a subject for historical study until the 1950s.

Also, there has been a long debate about whether Africa had the economic or political institutions which are necessary for growth in the pre-colonial period. Even in the late colonial period, most Africans were engaged in subsistence activities outside of the formal economy. Technology was backward and lavery was endemic. In the 19th century, various estimates suggest that in West Africa, the proportion of slaves in the population was between 1/3 and ½. States tended to heavily limit the extent of private enterprise, and ownership structure and allocation of land by chiefs not conducive to development. Politically, the foundation of governance in pre-colonial Africa was based on the African conception that the King [or Queen] ruled but at the pleasure of the people, for a King without subjects is no King [or Queen]. In terms of the form of governance that was practiced then in Africa, the people set the standards by which the actions of the ruler or leader were judged. The leader could not rule if the people did not sanction his leadership. In some cases and in certain societies, the will and desire of the people was expressed through the Chiefs who were considered to be the voice of the people, and who constituted some sort of checks and balance for the authority and power of the Chief or King/Queen, as the case may be. This in many ways resembles the western democracy whereby leaders are elected and can be removed by the people. Structures of political governance in pre-colonial African societies resulted from the interplay of mutual support between the people and the rulers.

Honor and respect for the people by the rulers, and vice versa, was the basis of political authority in traditional African societies. The people and rulers were bound by a common heritage, culture and mythology (belief in the supernatural). Within the pre-colonial African societies, there were checks and balances on the powers of the rulers. These were evidenced in some of the practices, traditions and beliefs of the different societies. The allegiance of the subjects could, for example, easily be transferred from one ruler to another if the ruler turned out to be despotic, cruel or a tyrant. The ruler is also expected to earn the respect of his people, and this was not based on force or intimidation. If unsatisfied, the people might decide to stop visiting the rulers' court,

thereby isolating him, or they could move to another grouping or settlement and transfer their allegiance to the ruler of that grouping.

Religion played very important role in pre-colonial African society. There was hardly any aspect of societal life in which religion did not play its part, such as warfare, the first-fruit ceremonies, and the different stages in the life of the individual. Traditional African societies' ideas on religion are extremely vague, since it is largely metaphysical, magical and naturalistic. This is in line with the belief systems in other traditional African societies. The spirit is believed to live on in the spirit world of magic and supernatural powers. Religion in these societies was communal although the well-being of the individual depended largely on his/her daily actions, most of the ritual actions were performed by the community or kin groups as a whole. Belief in the gods and ancestors was communal and absolute, and never questioned. Things happened as the gods had designed them to happen. It was the duty of the individual and community to be devout and pious in order to ensure prosperity, health and happiness during life. In these societies, the chiefs and kings had their powers circumscribed by the will of the gods and ancestral spirits. The king was the embodiment or spiritual live wire of the society, and calamities and natural disasters were mostly blamed on his failure to obtain the blessings of the gods and ancestors. Also in many societies or kingdoms, the rulers depended on the assistance of the priests, as their ritual powers derived from sources beyond his own control.

Moreover, the organizational structure of indigenous political systems were generally based upon kinship, ancestry and survival. These formed the bases upon which groups and societies built and evolved into what we now refer to as ethnic groups. The affiliation of these groups is what now referred to ethnicity. Ethnicity provides a rallying point around which political systems were organized. The law within each ethnic group was homogenous, the cultural, religious and linguistic traditions are the same and binding on the members of the group. Each ethnic group devised its own system of government based on its customs and traditions. The multitude of ethnic groups gave rise to much diversity in these political systems. However, in spite of these diversities, an underlying principle existed namely that all of the diverse political organizations were based upon the validity of public means of resolving disputes and conflicts, that is, upon the rule of law. This does not necessarily mean that they had formal statutes to regulate behavior; but rather members of the societies accepted that there was a moral basis to public order, and they

also accepted that publicly sanctioned resolutions of disputes and conflicts were necessary for the continuance of social life beyond the family or clan.

Generally, indigenous African societies had varying forms of social, political and legal institutions, which included many different patterns of philosophy and culture. They may be classified into two broad groups: those that have centralized / chiefly political systems (also referred to as acephalous societies in some quarters), and those that have non-centralized/chief less political systems (also referred to as stateless/ non-acephalous societies').

A. Chiefly or Centralized Societies

Under this type of social grouping in the pre-colonial period, societies existed as separate political entities and governed themselves independently. They had centralized authority; administrative machinery and judicial institutions; they had their own courts and their indigenes were subject to the courts. For example, Fanti of Ghana, Yoruba of Nigeria, Zulus and Pedi of South Africa, the Bayankole of Uganda and the Bemba of Zimbabwe. Changes in the level of centralization and development of hierarchy led to transitions from a small polity to a state polity. These usually differed from nomadic bands to intermediate forms, to complex, hierarchical kingdoms. A high level of advanced political consciousness and a sense of racial or even national identity distinguished these societies. These societies had chiefs or rulers who acted as the source of centralized authority**.** They had authority in every area of the community life, and were usually assisted by a well-established council of elders, called the inner council, as seen in some cases. This council of elders were the advisors to the chiefs, and worked in tandem with the chiefs in governing the societies. A chief could not and was not customarily allowed to take unilateral decisions; he needed to consult and seek his advisers' opinions first before taking any action related to the administration of the village. He could also not impose his own opinion on the council. He could attempt to make them see things from his own point of view, but if they did not agree with him, he could do nothing but to adopt the general opinion.

B. Chiefless or Non-centralized Societies

This type of society was non-centralized; meaning that ruling or governing power was not vested in any particular person or group of people. In these societies, governing power was vested in all and majority ruled. This mode of governance prevailed and was found in descent societies. Descent societies are formed having derived from an ancestor or ancestral group or lineage. They have evolved in such a way that they had no chiefs or centralized authority. The people in these societies were often homogeneous, and their political awareness is often much more limited to the requirements and social attitude of a closely-knit group. The tie of kinship is stronger and more pervasive in these societies than in the chiefly ones. The families form and supply the bonds of social cohesion. In some instances, in order to guard against autocracy, they have institutionalized methods of deriding centralized political authority through any means, including the use of oral narratives. Their way of life and nature of livelihood (most often pastoralists) at times played an important role in the evolution of political systems. This is why for some societies it was impossible to have a centralized system of government. Examples of these societies are the Ibos of Nigeria, the Degaaba of North-western Ghana, the Masai of Kenya and the Nuer of Sudan.

Activity

- **What is the basic difference among chiefless or non-centralized societies and chiefly or centralized societies?**

1.2. Pre-Colonial African Political System

African traditional institutions of governance are diverses. They have evolved significantly from their pre-colonial forms in tandem with transformation of the continent's political systems, during the colonial and post-colonial eras. Despite their complex diversity, much of the post-independence literature classifies African traditional institutions of governance into two types, based on their pre-colonial forms: (a) the consensus-based systems of the decentralized pre-colonial political systems; and (b) chieftaincy of the centralized political systems.

- **Decentralized Systems:** In large parts of Africa, pre-colonial political systems were highly decentralized with law-making, social control, and allocation of resources carried out by local entities, such as lineage groupings, village communities, and age-sets. These systems

were largely based on consensual decision-making arrangements that varied from one place to another. The fundamental principles that guide the consensus based (decentralized authority) systems include curbing the concentration of power in an institution or a person and averting the emergence of a rigid hierarchy. The settlement of conflicts and disputes in such consensual systems involves narrowing of differences through negotiations rather than through adversarial procedures that produce winners and losers. Decentralized authority systems are based on respect for the rights and views of the individual, as individuals can veto the opinions of the majority. However, individuals are also expected to respect the wishes and interests of the community by accepting compromises, as they can face various forms of community censure, including social isolation, if they fail to do so. The extent to which minority views are accommodated enables these systems to prevent conflicts between minority and majority segments of a community. Another important aspect of the system is that it avoids the existence of political and social gaps between the governed and those who govern, as all eligible members of the community participate in both the creation and enforcement of rules. When the appointment of individuals for specific tasks is necessary, the duration of the appointment is rather short, often not exceeding a year. In many other cases, task assignments are based on age cohorts. One drawback of the decentralized authority systems is that decision-making is generally slow, since consensus-building is a time-consuming process. The Ibo village assembly in eastern Nigeria, the Eritrean village *baito* (assembly), the *Gadaa system* of the Oromo in Ethiopia and Kenya, as well as the council of elders *(kiama)* of the Kikuyu in Kenya are among well-known examples where decisions are largely made in a consensual manner of one kind or another.

- **Centralized Systems:** Other parts of Africa established centralized systems of governance with kings and monarchs. The level of centralization and concentration of power in the hands of the leaders varied from place to place. In some cases, such as Abyssinia (Ethiopia) and Rwanda, the rulers enjoyed absolute power. In most other cases, the power of the rulers was restrained by various arrangements, including the institution of councils. The level of development of the mechanisms of checks and balances, however, differed widely from place to place. In some cases, such as the Buganda of Uganda and the Nupe in Nigeria, the formal

institutions of checks and balances and accountability of leaders to the population were rather weak. In other cases, such as the Ashanti of Ghana, Lesotho, the Tswana of Botswana, and the Busoga of Uganda, the systems of checks and balances were relatively better defined with constitutional provisions and customary laws authorizing a council of elders, religious leaders, and administrative staff of the chiefs to check the power of the leaders and keep them accountable.

1.3. The Concept of State and State Formation in Africa

Brainstorming: Dear students! What is the impact of economic activities, cultural values, and religious point of view of the pre African society on the state formation in Africa?

Africa has experienced various forms of social organization, ranging from segmented societies to centralized models. The distinction between societies without a State and centralized systems postulates that the former are based upon groups organized around the extended patriarchal family, with common heritage, i.e., clans, with common ethnic ties, under the authority of an elder. For their part, centralized systems also preserve social stratifications, configured as casts or orders, and range from sultanates to kingdoms and States. The great West African empires, such as Ghana in the 8th Century, Mali in the 14th Century, and Songai and Bornu in the 16th Century, were organized politically on the basis of trade with the Arab world. Their towns were built on the banks of rivers and dominated vast expanses of hinterland. They were characterized by religious and political ties, by personalized power, by lack of a written language, and by decentralized organization. The central authority held a monopoly on material goods and lived off tribute paid in goods and men, and revenues from taxes on harvests and cattle, levies on metals, customs duties, and booty from warfare. Tribute provided the economic bases of some empires, such as those of the Wolof of Senegal and the Hausa cities of Nigeria.

Exchanges took place in the local market, and medium and long-distance trade depended upon the safety of trade routes. Exports consisted of gold, slaves, kola nuts, gum, ivory and hides; and imports of iron and copper bars, pearls, and cloth. Despite their economic power, comparable to

that of the Arabs and Genovese and Venetian merchants, these States never achieved overseas conquest nor established strong local economies. Although currencies had long circulated in certain African regions, they were not used for purchases, but rather, for payment of debts in parallel to the merchant economy. This was the case of cowries, pearls, bars of salt or of gold, which were equivalent to goods and chattel, as were women in matrimonial alliances or men in times of war.

Currency in circulation thus reached only a part of society. Monetized mercantile, fiscal and tributary networks did not constitute a monetized society, with debits and credits, enabling transfers of possessions or property of real or symbolic value. Thus, money did not penetrate the interior of the African continent. It did not assume all the functions it has in a capitalist economy: general equivalence, means of exchange and of payment, store of value and deferred payment, or basis for accumulation. In gift economies of segmented, little-stratified societies, the giver affirms superiority in relation to the receiver. The receiver is obliged to reciprocate with a counter gift at a later time, i.e., he becomes indebted. Differently, in hierarchical societies, tribute delivered is the mark of one's submission to the sovereign who receives it. The circulation of prestige goods displays ties between wealth and power, as power is an accumulation of social ties and of symbolic goods, and not merely of material goods.

If we were to make a fair distinction between one type and another, the number of African societies that have a separate political organization (the empires, kingdoms, city-states, chieftainships or sultanates) would certainly be greater than that of societies considered without a State in the classical sense, thus contradicting the view of traditional Africa as a mosaic of clans and tribes or of societies recently emerging from prehistoric humanity. And this is taking into consideration that affiliation to groups and lineages constitutes one of the essential vectors of these States (especially at the level of dynastic organization) and that population movements make borders movable and uncertain.

Pre-colonial African States ensured unity, order and the defense of territories they had conquered and, upon installing administrative, judicial and military bodies, they overturned the previous social organization; i.e., they were dynamic structures in constant transformation. They were societies that acknowledged social divisions, had aristocrats, priests and field workers, both

freemen and slaves and, furthermore, various closed casts subject to prohibitions, such as blacksmiths, musicians and sculptors. These societies' possessed longstanding traditions and state culture, even if, as a whole, they did not last very long or possess great capacity to control their territories. They were societies in which clear divisions existed, between oppressors and oppressed, exploiters and exploited, i.e., they were aware of the mechanisms of domination and of exploitation. A number of African kingdoms remain to this day. Kings legitimately ascend to the throne and exercise their obligations, and the aristocracies and casts display their status, even when such manifestations are officially forbidden in today's States.

Aside from political systems, Sub-Saharan Africa has myriad beliefs, rites and representations of both the living and the dead, which are also viewed with prejudice by westerners. The "religion of fetishism" invented in the 18th Century has been presented as magic and is despised and looked down upon as the work of the devil up to the present day. Traditional religions revere mythological entities, ancestors and spirits, organized into symbolic and cultural systems that have a place within political and social organizations. Thus, lineages were collectively upheld by genealogical ties, but also by the myth of the founder and by common legend, placing before them the same obligations and interdictions. Kings were accompanied by priests and identified with supernatural powers, blending divine power and earthly power, in this sense no different to western monarchies.

Symbolic and cultural systems, however, were ruled by historical movements and underwent changes in response to events. In situations of extreme poverty or epidemics, whole populations would change their territories and abandon their goods; the same would occur in response to conflicts and institutional crises. Groups would abandon their cults and appropriate the cults of neighbors, thereby demonstrating great flexibility in molding themselves to circumstances.

This capacity to adapt also applied to contact with Islam and Christianity. The Islamic theurgist and divination arts were accommodated into local systems. With Christianity, symbols such as the cross were incorporated, taking on new meanings and giving rise to syncretic cults. For these reasons, the words spell (*feitiç*o), fetishism and animism fail to do justice to African paganism.

The presence of Christianity in northern and eastern regions of Africa harks back to the first centuries AD. Beginning in the 15th Century, along the Atlantic seaboard, Europeans evangelized fugitives from slavery, the banished, and traders hooked up to the economy of merchant trading posts. The major Christian missionary thrust, however, was contemporary to the European colonization which advanced upon Sub- Saharan Africa throughout the 19th Century and took part in the establishment of new territories and the formation of States. Its participation in colonial activities was of greatest relevance in Central, Southern and Eastern Africa, having lesser influence in Western Africa where it was blocked by the presence of Islam.

The "invention of Africa" was a form whereby colonizers appropriated African paganism and classified it in accordance with their interests. They identified the pagan gods, and those deemed compatible with Christianity were classified as civilized; those that were not, were demonized. This activity relied upon participation of Africans, especially through religious syncretism that blended components of local cults and cultures with aspects of Christianity in the struggle against fetishism and witchcraft of the local cults. In this contact, the African custom of changing rites and gods was based upon the notion that their gods were no longer protecting them from the penury brought on by colonialism. The modern "strong men", prophets or "modern sovereigns" ended up replacing the "strong objects" that comprised the magical world. This phenomenon proliferated also into Muslim territories, with messianic movements proclaiming adherence to the Koran against the colonizers.

1.4. Missionaries and Religious Expansion

Evangelical Christianity, in whose eyes the *Origin of Species* was damnable heresy, had no qualms, nevertheless, in accepting its racial implications. The racial content of evangelical Christianity was, however, tempered with a generous dose of humanitarian and philanthropic zeal - sentiments widespread among European policy-makers during the conquest of Africa. It has been argued, therefore, that the partition of Africa was due, in no small measure, to a 'broader missionary' and humanitarian impulse which aimed at the regeneration of African peoples. It has been asserted, moreover, that it was the missionaries who prepared the ground for the imposition of colonialism in East and Central Africa as well as in Madagascar. Although it is

true that missionaries did not resist the conquest of Africa, and that they did, in some areas, actively pursue that conquest, the missionary factor cannot be sustained as a general theory of imperialism because of its limited application.

1.5. Antecedents of Colonialism in Africa

Always there are three main antecedents of the adversarial and exploitative violence of colonialism for succeeding generations.

i. **Crusades:** The material greed, cultural domination, and self-aggrandizement characteristic of European colonization *(as well as the use of religion and racism to justify the pillage and massacre of non-Europeans)* are evident in the Crusades. The Crusades started in 1095 when Pope Urban II appealed to all Christians to defend the Eastern Orthodox Christians against Muslims, liberate Jerusalem, and enable Christian pilgrims' safe passage. This was the stated goal; an unstated goal was that the Catholic Church, then the most powerful and wealthiest institution in Europe, faced pressure from competing kings and warlords who threatened the Church's hegemonic authority and land monopoly in Europe. Similarly, European kings sought to unify their people and enlarge their power by joining the Crusades against Muslims. The European public too found opportunity for personal wealth and glory in the pillage of Muslims. They believed the Pope's promise of forgiving their sins if they killed Muslims. They thought that they would return to Europe with a clean slate from sin, wealthy and glorious. In short, the diverse motives for the Crusades included desires for power, wealth, spiritual salvation, personal glory, and especially a need to construct coherent European identities against an external and convenient enemy. *The massacre and pillage of Muslims and Jews alike during the Crusades unified Europeans with the myth of superior race waging a "just war" on behalf of God.*

ii. **Colonization of the Americas:** The colonization of the Americas subsequently offered Europeans new opportunities for material exploitation, cultural domination, and self-aggrandizement through claims of religious and racial superiority. Not only did the distinction between Europeans and Non-Europeans become more concrete in the Americas, but also the distinction of *races* became a convenient justification for exploitation. This distinction of races and associated claim of natural superiority enabled Europeans to carry out three cataclysmic assaults by use of maximum violence (including genocide) that later

became global. The first assault was on *the world of things*, particularly the land of conquered non-European peoples to exploit gold, silver, and other commodities. The second assault was on *the world of people* for obtaining free labor and carrying out sexual exploitation. The third assault was *the world of meaning* by changing indigenous religions, knowledge, and identities.

iii. **African Slave Trade:** The colonization of America subsequently fueled the capture, transport, and enslavement of Africans in the Americas and the Caribbean. The Atlantic Slave Trade represents the largest importation of slaves in the history of the world. This trade not only caused immense suffering for persons forced into slavery, but also enabled Europeans to expand their settlement in the New World and earn substantial capital for Europeans to finance the industrial revolution. At least three outcomes of slavery seem certain. Firstly, slavery pauperized and depopulated the African continent, stealing its young and productive members and derailing the political history and economic development of its people. Secondly, this system of slavery consolidated the dominant-dominated relations between Europeans and non-Europeans, making racism the primary justification for colonial exploitation that continues to the present in different guises. Thirdly, Europeans and their descendants reaped more than economic benefits from slavery. Fed better, their population increased. With new wealth and industry, they developed better technology with which to further conquer and exploit others. The Atlantic Slave Trade therefore intensified the mix of different motives (greed for material possession and consumption, combined with racism and self-aggrandizement) that began with the Crusades. Slavery ended when it no longer was economically productive because the burgeoning Industrial Revolution made it inefficient and dispensable. Yet the European pursuit of profit, racism, and self-aggrandizement did not end. Instead, it grew more with the development of industries that required more raw materials, more cheap or free labor, and more markets for manufactured goods. Classical colonialism provided a convenient alternative to satisfy these needs.

Generally, the imposition of colonialism on Africa altered its history forever. African nodes of thought, patterns of cultural development, and ways of life were forever impacted by the change in political structure brought about by colonialism. The African economy was significantly changed by the Atlantic slave trade through the process of imperialism and the economic policies

that accompanied colonization. Prior to the "Scramble for Africa," or the official partition of Africa by the major European nations, African economies were advancing in every area, particularly in the area of trade. The aim of colonialism is to exploit the physical, human, and economic resources of an area to benefit the colonizing nation. European powers pursued this goal by encouraging the development of a commodity based trading system, a cash crop agriculture system, and by building a trade network linking the total economic output of a region to the demands of the colonizing state. The development of colonializing and the partition of Africa by the European colonial powers arrested the natural development of the African economic system.

Africa prior to colonialism was not economical1y isolated from the rest of the world. Indeed, African states had engaged in international trade from the time of the pharaohs of ancient Egypt, and West Africa specifically had developed extensive international trading systems during the eras of Ghana, Mali, and Songhai. These huge empires relied heavily on the taxing of foreign trade to finance goveffill1ent expenditures. The wealth of these nations was dependent largely on the trade in gold, but also on the levying of customs, taxes, booty from foreign expeditions, and fees associated with administrative offices.

The Atlantic slave trade existed in Africa for over three hundred years and introduced to the continent sophisticated systems of credit and exchange. Although these markets existed prior to the trade, the great increase in trading brought about by European demand for slaves stimulated their further development. Credit, debt in currency, and interest all developed apace with the trade. One result of the increase in international trade was that indigenous African economy was subordinated to the interests of Europe. The slave trading system did this by substituting European manufactured products for those products which normally would have been made locally. Thus we see early developing a pattern of Africa as a source of raw materials, in this case labor, and as only a consumer of goods. The result of such uneven trade is evident. Even innocuous imports such as textiles, competed damagingly with local products, with the result that the technological gap between Africa and Europe, confined in the 15th century to shipping and firemans, widened to such an extent that African technology failed to progress.

1.6. Why were European Powers able to Conquer Africa?

European powers were able to conquer Africa with such relative ease because in virtually every respect the dice was so heavily loaded in their favor. In the first place, thanks to the activities of European explorers and missionaries, Europeans were by 1880 far more knowledgeable about Africa and its interior—its physical appearance, terrain, economy and other resources and the strength and weakness of its states and societies –than Africans were about Europe.

Secondly, owing to the revolutionary changes in medical technology and in particular the discovery of the prophylactic use of quinine against malaria, Europeans became far less fearful of Africa than they had been before the middle of the nineteenth century. Thirdly, as a result of the uneven nature of the trade between Europe and Africa up to the 1870s, and even after, as well as the increasing pace of the industrial revolution, the material and financial resources available to Europe were overwhelming in comparison with those of Africa. Thus while European powers could afford to spend millions of pounds on overseas campaigns, African states were unable to sustain any protracted military confrontation against them.

Fourthly, while the period after the Russo-Turkish war of 1877-8 was marked, according to J. Holland Rose, by a state of political equilibrium which made for peace and stagnation in Europe, the same period in Africa was marked by inter-state and intra-state conflict and rivalry – the Mandingo against the Tukulor, the Asante against the Fante, the Baganda against the Banyoro, the Batoro against the Banyoro, the Mashona against the Ndebele, etc. Thus, while Europe could focus her attention militarily almost exclusively on her imperial activities overseas without any distraction at home, African states and countries had divided their attention.

Moreover, in addition to enjoying peace at home, however divided the European powers were on imperial and colonial issues throughout the era of partition and up to 1914 they always managed to resolve these questions without resort to war. Thus, in spite of the intense competition and the numerous crises in Africa, the European powers involved in the partition displayed a remarkable spirit of solidarity which not only eliminated wars among them but also prevented the African rulers and communities from effectively playing one European power against the other.

Throughout the period under review, various European powers took on the African states one at a time, and on no occasion was an African state assisted by one European power against another. By contrast, the behavior of the African states was not only marked by lack of solidarity, unity or co-operation but some of them did not hesitate to ally with the invading European forces against their neighbors, only to be vanquished later themselves. The Baganda allied with the British against the Banyoro, and the Barotse with the British against the Ndebele, while the Bambara teamed up with the French against the Tukulor. As a result of all this, the heroic and memorable stands which the Africans took against the European invaders were more often than not, isolated forms of uncoordinated resistance, even at the regional level.

The final and easily the most decisive factor was, of course, the overwhelming logistic and military superiority that Europe enjoyed over Africa. While Europe was using professional and well-drilled armies, very few African states had established standing armies and fewer still had professional armies. Most African states recruited and mobilized individuals on an *ad hoc* basis for either defense or offence. Besides, in addition to their o w n armies, the European powers could always, as A . Isaacman and J. Vansina have contended, rely on African mercenaries and levies which gave them the numerical superiority they needed. In fact, as A. Laroui puts it, most of the armies were African in recruitment and only European in command. Above all, by the terms of the Brussels Convention of 1890, the imperial powers agreed not to sell arms to Africans. This meant that most African armies were armed with completely outmoded, old and often unserviceable guns, mainly flint-locks or muzzle-loading muskets, and had no heavy artillery or naval power whatsoever. The European armies, on the other hand, were armed with the most up-to-date heavy artillery, and guns such as the repeater rifle, and above all the Gatling and the Maxim guns. They also used the heavy artillery of naval forces. As Laroui has pointed out, even motor vehicles and aeroplanes were used in the later campaigns. It is significant that the two African leaders who were able to inflict some defeats on the Europeans, Samori and Menelik, managed to obtain some of these up-to-date weapons. But in the end even Samori too was overpowered by the French. The overwhelming superiority that Europe enjoyed over Africa is summed up succinctly in Hilaire Belloc's famous couplet. In view of these economic, political and above all military and technological advantages enjoyed by European powers over African polities, the contest was a most uneven one and it is not at all surprising that the former could

vanquish the latter with such relative ease. Indeed, for Europe, the timing of the conquest could not have been better; for Africa it could not have been worse.

1.7. Why Did Europe Colonize Africa?

Brainstorming: Dear Students! What is the main reasons for which Europeans want to colonize Africa?----------

---

The 1880s mark the beginning of the colonial period in African history. While Europeans and Africans had established relationships in a variety of settings for centuries, the 1880s mark a major turning point in European attitudes toward Africa. Three primary developments explain increased European involvement in Africa. To recapture the primary developments that account for Europe's increased involvement in Africa, we review the role of Christianity, medicinal and technological advances, and the lure of capitalist gains.

First, Europe experienced a Christian revival in the 19th century. Missionaries began to focus on the large working class with the goal of bringing spiritual salvation to the workers and their families. The bible was made available to workers. Due to their large successes, missionaries began to look beyond Europe. Missions were established all over Africa. Missionaries did not serve as direct agents of European imperialism, yet they drew European governments deeper into Africa. In their efforts to preach Christianity, to bring western-style education to Africa and to ingrain monogamy in African societies, missionaries often felt threatened by warfare within Africa. Hence, missionaries called on European governments for protection and intervention. In Malawi, for example, missionaries encouraged the British government, through a series of letters, to put down the slave trade. The British government intervened in the 1880s. Yet the motivation for Great Britain to send troops and become involved in the region was not really the lingering slave trade in Malawi. Great Britain was concerned with the presence of the Portuguese in Mozambique. The letters of the missionaries merely served as a convenient excuse to enter the region and establish British interests.

Second, European medicinal discoveries and technological advances paved the way for Europeans to penetrate the African continent much more deeply and effectively. The discovery of quinine as a prophylactic drastically reduced the number of Europeans succumbing to malaria in Africa. For centuries, malaria, and to a lesser degree yellow fever, had thwarted European attempts at exploring the continent and establishing a firmer foothold in Africa. With quinine as an explicit part of each European's travel kit, considerations of life and death due to disease no longer impeded European intentions vis-à-vis Africa. Such medicinal developments were complemented by technological advances. Specifically, advances in metallurgy and weapons technology provided Europe with advantages that proved crucial in European imperial ventures in Africa and Asia. Superior weapons technology certainly did not forestall opposition, but it clearly provided Europe with an edge that facilitated the realization of Europe's objectives. Both medicinal discoveries and technological advances reflect the novelties in manufacturing and engineering so characteristic of the industrial revolution.

Third, the relationship between expeditions of exploration and capitalism cannot be overlooked. For centuries, European explorers have traveled throughout the African continent in their attempts to discover new things and to chart the African continent. To find the source of the Nile River was for decades the goal of many adventurers; John Henning Speke became the first European to correctly identify Lake Victoria as the source of the Nile. From 1788 to 1877, an explosion of such exploration tours took place. Great Britain's Royal Geographic Society sponsored many expeditions and became a focal point for discussing the findings of the explorers through discourse, publications, and lectures. Upon the explorers' return to Europe, they described to European audiences what they saw and experienced and, most importantly, talked of great riches. It is important to realize that these explorers had immense freedom in relating their travel accounts. After all, they were the first to travel through Africa. Their travel accounts, consequently, tended to stretch the truth and exaggerate. Nonetheless, their stories greatly stimulated European interest in Africa as they implied great trade opportunities.

1.8. The Berlin Conference (1884-5) : *Actors, Contents and Outcomes*

The idea of an international conference to settle the territorial disputes arising from European activities in the Congo region, first suggested by Portugal, was later taken up by Bismarck who,

after sounding the opinions of the other powers, was encouraged to bring it about. The conference was held at Berlin between 15 November 1884 and 26 November 1885. The news that such a conference was to be held increased the intensity of the scramble. The conference did not discuss seriously either the slave trade or the lofty humanitarian idealism that was supposed to have inspired it. It nevertheless passed empty resolutions regarding the abolition of the slave trade and the welfare of Africans. It was not, ostensibly, the initial intention of the conference to attempt a general partition of Africa. It nevertheless ended up disposing of territory, passing resolutions pertaining to the free navigation of the Niger, the Benue, and their affluent; and laying down the rules to be observed in future with regard to the occupation of territory on the coasts of Africa.

According to Article 34 of the Berlin Act, the document signed by the participants in the conference, any European nation which, in the future, took possession of an African coast or declared a 'protectorate' there, had to notify such action to the signatory powers of the Berlin Act in order to have its claims ratified. This was the so-called doctrine of *spheres of influence* to which was linked the absurd concept of the hinterland, which came to be interpreted to mean that possession of a coast also implied ownership of its hinterland to an almost unlimited distance. Article 35 stipulated that an occupier of any such coastal possessions had also to demonstrate that it possessed sufficient 'authority' there 'to protect existing rights, and, as the case may be, freedom of trade and of transit under the conditions agreed upon'. This was the so-called doctrine *of effective occupation* that was to make the conquest of Africa such a murderous business. In recognizing the Congo Free State, permitting territorial negotiations, and by laying down rules and regulations for the 'legal' appropriation of African territory, the European powers had arrogated to themselves the right of sanctioning the principle of sharing out and conquering another continent.

There is no precedent in world history where a group of states in one continent felt justified in talking about the sharing and occupation of the territory of another continent in such a bold manner. This is the major significance of the conference for African history. The argument that the conference, contrary to popular opinion, did not partition Africa is correct only in the most technical sense. To all intents and purposes the appropriation of territory did take place at the

conference and the question of future appropriation is clearly implied in its decisions. By 1885, in fact, the broad lines of the final partition of Africa had already been drawn.

Generally, Berlin Conference of 1884–1885 was held when all the European powers met and partitioned Africa, recognizing each other's share of the continent. The conference was called to reach agreement on imperial boundaries so as to avoid any future conflict among European powers. Following World War I, Germany, as a defeated power, was deprived of all her colonial possessions, which were parceled out to the victorious allies as trust territories under the League of Nations' mandate system. Tanganyika (which is the mainland portion of Tanzania) went to Britain. Rwanda and Burundi, which together with Tanganyika formed what was then called German East Africa, went to Belgium. Cameroon was split into two, a small southwestern portion going to Britain and the remainder to France. Namibia, then known as South West Africa, was assigned to South Africa as a sort of trophy for South Africa having fought in the war on the side of the Allied powers. Togo, then called Togoland, became a French trust territory, but a small sliver along its western border went to Britain, which governed it together with Ghana.

1.9. Treaty-Making 1885-1902

Prior to the Berlin Act, European powers had acquired spheres of influence in Africa in a variety of ways through settlement, exploration, the establishment of commercial posts, missionary settlements, the occupation of strategic areas, and by making treaties with African rulers. Following the conference, influence by means of treaty became the most important method of effecting the paper partition of the continent. These treaties took two forms- those between Africans and Europeans, and bilateral agreements between the Europeans themselves. The African-European treaties were basically of two kinds.

- Firstly, there were the slave trade and the commercial treaties; these had generated friction, which in turn led to European political interference in African affairs.
- Secondly, there were the political treaties by which African rulers either purportedly surrendered sovereignty in return for protection, or undertook not to enter into treaty obligations with other European nations.

These political treaties were in vogue during that period. They were made either by representatives of European governments or by those of private organizations who later transferred them to their respective governments. If a metropolitan government accepted them, the territories in question were usually annexed or declared a protectorate; if, on the other hand, it suspected their authenticity, or if it felt constrained by the vicissitudes of *Weltpolitik* to exercise caution, these treaties were used for bargaining purposes during the bilateral European negotiations. Africans, on the other hand, entered into these arrangements for a variety of motives, but particularly because of the interests of their people. In some cases, they desired treaty relations with Europeans because they hoped that the prestige of such a relationship would endow them with certain political advantages in dealing with their neighbors.

There was also bilateral European partition treaties through which **t**he acquisition of a sphere of influence by treaty was usually the first stage in the occupation of an African state by a European power. If such a treaty was not contested by any other European power, the incumbent power gradually turned its treaty rights into sovereign rights. A sphere of influence arose, therefore, in the first instance, by a unilateral declaration; it became a reality only when it was accepted or not contested by other European powers. Often spheres of influences were contested, but these territorial difficulties and boundary disputes were eventually settled and ratified as a result of mutual agreements between two or more imperialist powers operating in the same region.

- The Anglo-German Treaty of 29 April (and 7 May) 1885 which defined the 'spheres of action' of the two countries in certain parts of Africa is regarded as perhaps the first serious application of the spheres of influence theory in modern times. By a series of similar treaties, agreements and conventions, the paper partition of Africa was virtually concluded by the end of the century.
- The Anglo-German delimitation treaty of 1 November 1886, to take one example, is particularly significant. It placed Zanzibar and most of its dependencies within Britain's sphere of influence; on the other hand, it assured Germany's political influence in East Africa, thereby providing official recognition of the breach of Britain's monopoly in the area. In effect the treaty thus partitioned the Omani empire.

- By the terms of the subsequent clarificatory agreement of 1887, Britain undertook to discourage British annexations in the rear of the German Sphere of Influence, on the understanding that the German Government will equally discourage German annexations in the rear of the British Sphere. It was further agreed that if either country occupied the coast, the other could not, without consent, occupy unclaimed regions in the rear.
- The vagueness of these hinterland arrangements regarding the westward sphere of influence of both countries led to the famous Heligoland Treaty of 1890 which concluded comprehensively the partition of East Africa. Most significantly, it reserved Uganda for Britain; but it also destroyed Britain's grand illusion of a Cape-to-Cairo route, surrendered Heligoland to Germany and put an end to the independence of Zanzibar.
- The Anglo-German Treaties of 1890 and 1893 and the Anglo-Italian Treaty of 1891, taken together, recognized the Upper Nile as falling within the British sphere of influence. To the south, the Franco-Portuguese Treaty (1886), the German-Portuguese Treaty (1886), and the Anglo-Portuguese Treaty (1891) both recognized Portugal's influence in Angola and Mozambique as well as delimiting the British sphere in Central Africa.
- The Anglo-Congo Free State Treaty (1894) is equally significant because it settled the limits of the Congo Free State in such a way that it acted as a buffer between French territories and the Nile valley and provided for the British a Cape-to-Cairo corridor from Uganda via Lake Tanganyika (withdrawn in June because of German protest).
- In West Africa, the most important arrangements were the Say-Barruwa Agreement (1890) and the Niger Convention (1898) by which Britain and France concluded the partition of that region. Finally, the Anglo-French Convention of 21 March 1899 settled the Egyptian question while the Peace of Vereeniging (1902) which ended the Anglo-Boer war confirmed, temporarily, at any rate, British supremacy in South Africa.

Activity

A. **What happened during colonial imperialism in Africa?**
B. **What major figures or countries were involved with the Scramble for Africa?**
C. **Were the indigenous people in Africa treated fairly? Why or why not?**
D. **What reasons initiated Europeans to come into Africa?**

1.11. Legacies of Precolonial Empires and the Colonial State in Africa

A number of developments and socioeconomic arrangements and inter-identity power relations left behind by precolonial empires and the colonial state have become critical sources of conflict in the postcolonial era. Two notable precolonial empires in the region were the Abyssinian Empire and the Mahdiyya state in the Sudan. Both empires left behind imprints that still contribute to conflicts in the region. The Abyssinian Empire is credited with creating the modern Ethiopian state through expansionist conquests during the second half of the 19th century and defense against European colonialism. However, it also left behind inter-state boundary problems and deep disparities in citizenship rights within the country. The populations in the newly incorporated southern parts of the country were ravaged by slave raids, looting and, in many cases, large-scale land expropriations during and in the aftermath of their incorporation into the empire. Those who lost their land were reduced to landless tenants, who tilled the land for northern landlords. The Empire also established a hierarchy of cultures, non-Abyssinian cultures in the newly incorporated territories being placed in a subordinate position. Some of the legacies of the Empire, like the landlessness created by land expropriation, have largely been reversed by the 1975 land reform. The cultural inequalities have also been mitigated with the institution of a federal system in the country's 1994 constitution. However, disparities in access to political and economic power remain important sources of conflict, as is evident from the activities of the Oromo Liberation Front and the Ogaden National Liberation Front in Ethiopia. Similarly, Sudan's Mahdiyya state, which professed Arab identity and was supported by slave-raiding communities, left behind complex scars in inter-identity relations, particularly between northern and southern identity groups, which have led the country to the brink of disintegration.

The conflict-fostering legacies of precolonial empires were compounded by the structural and institutional mechanisms established by the colonial state. Four critical conflict-fomenting legacies of the latter can be identified.

One is the division of various ethnic groups among a number of states. State boundaries often are arbitrary and few states in the world are made up of single ethnic groups. The degree of arbitrariness of boundaries and the resulting fragmentation of ethnic groups, however, seems disproportionately high in Africa, where states are mostly colonial creations. Often, the fragmentation of ethnic groups involves not only disruption of social and cultural ties but also of economic process, by hindering the movement of communities, which rely on regional ecosystems for survival. While the fragmentation of the Somali people, which led to three major wars between Ethiopia and Somalia, is the most conspicuous problem, many of the other fragmented ethnic groups have had problems with their states. Fragmentation of ethnic groups raises citizenship and identity problems and in many cases has also led to the marginalization of those groups.

A second legacy of colonialism is the problem of boundaries and in some cases territories. In many instances colonial boundaries are not demarcated on the ground or even clearly delineated. This vagueness has caused a number of border disputes. The Eritrea-Ethiopia border war was the greatest of these, but border disputes are rampant. As noted in the preceding section, every country in the region has border disputes with at least two of its neighbors. A border problem is likely to arise between north and South Sudan. Although the British kept South Sudan apart from the north for most of the colonial period, the boundaries between the two remain unclear and are likely to be challenging. Border conflicts are mostly inter-state conflicts, but also have serious implications for state-identity and inter-identity relations, as they entail various hardships for border communities, especially when their loyalty to their states is questioned. The Misseriya and Dinka Ngok identities in Sudan's Abyei region, for example, are likely to have conflicting positions on South Sudan's independence and on whether Abyei forms part of the north or the south.

A third legacy of colonialism is the uneven development among regions and ethnic groups within countries. One of the key objectives of colonialism was the extraction of resources. Areas rich in

mineral resources and those with fertile land in accessible locations were targets for investment, while areas deemed not profitable were generally marginalized. The Buganda areas of southern Uganda were privileged relative to the rest of the country. In Kenya also the British identified central Kenya and the Rift Valley area as profitable, while the western and northeastern regions, viewed as unprofitable and troublesome, were marginalized. Southern Sudan and northern Uganda were among other areas relatively marginalized by the colonial state. All these areas remain marginalized and they have become centers of conflict.

A fourth legacy of colonialism, largely absent from the literature but difficult to overcome, is the fragmentation of modes of production and the corresponding institutions of governance. The colonial state created a small modern capitalist economic sector and introduced its own institutions of governance without replacing indigenous institutions. It also did not create organic links between the two sectors such that the new sector facilitates the transformation of the traditional. Instead, it established an incoherent political economy with parallel if largely incompatible systems. As noted already, the parallel modes of production and institutional systems represent different socioeconomic spaces, and making policy that advances the interests of both has become extremely challenging. Policy is, thus, generally geared towards the modern system, marginalizing the traditional sector and the population that operates under it. The economic marginalization of rural inhabitants, along with the institutional detachment of the state from this large segment of the population, has in many cases adversely affected the legitimacy of the state and state-society relations. Often, the marginalization of rural inhabitants affects some ethnic (and other identity) groups more than others. Geography seems to play some role in this regard. The further an ethnic group is from urban centers, the more it relies on traditional institutions and the more limited its access to public services. In any case, inequalities frequently lead to problems of diversity management and ethnic conflict, which often exacerbate the inequalities and undermine the process of nation-building.

CHAPTER TWO

COLONIALISM AND ITS LEGACIES

Introduction

Dear Students! Welcome to the second chapter of the module. In this module you will come across colonialism and its legacies in Africa. Specially, you will able to know about the main European colonial powers and their respective policies to colonize Africa.

Objectives of the chapter

At the end of this chapter, students will able to answer the following questions:

1. What were the early colonial powers and their colonial policies and influences in Africa?
2. What were the major colonial powers in Africa their colonial policies and spheres of influence? Specifically with the British and French colonial policy and why?
3. Who were considered the latecomers colonial powers in Africa? Their sphere of influence and their colonial legacies?
4. What can we conclude the overall European colonial legacies on African socio- political systems?

2.1. Major European Colonial Powers and their Colonial Policies

Brainstorming: Dear Students! Who are the main actors of colonial power and what are their respective policies?----------

---

---

1. The British Mission

In most of the British colonies, the indigenous people and the British were segregated. Social institutions like schools, recreational facilities, and hospitals were maintained for different racial groups. In places like East Africa, principally Kenya, where significant Asian, Arabic (Islamic), and European communities settled, there were separate facilities for each of those groups, the

best facilities, of course, being reserved for Europeans. There were Asian schools, European schools, African schools, and at the coast, Arab or Muslim schools. Transportation was often broken down into first class, second class, and third class. The separate schools were often racially designated and hospitals and bathrooms in public buildings. Transportation, for example, buses and trains, were not racially designated, but the use of higher fares and local custom made sure that Africans kept their place—in third-class coaches. Residences were segregated with Africans in the cities confined in "African locations" with conspicuously crowded and inferior housing. As is well known, attempts were made to codify into law racial segregation in areas with substantial British settlers such as in Kenya, Zimbabwe, and South Africa.

Grudgingly, the British would allow a well-to-do African to purchase a house in a predominantly white area or to ride a first-class compartment if he did not share it with a European, but in general, they did not envisage a situation in which an African might be "uplifted" to the level that he or she might be considered the social equal of a British. It can be conceded that in a very general sort of way, the British tried to convert Africans into British ladies and gentlemen. Indeed, the British were very pleased to point to an "uplifted African" who affected British manners, but they did not consider such an African a social equal in the same way that the French did. It was obvious that an African who could read or use mechanical tools was more productive than one who could not, but it was unthinkable that an African could be educated to a level of social equality with a British person. Governors in British colonies often spoke of Africans eventually exercising political power in their countries, but clearly not as political partners with the British. Political power could be exercised by the Africans only over other Africans. In Kenya, Zimbabwe, and South Africa, where the whites constituted, respectively, 1 percent, 5 percent, and 15 percent of the population, the British granted a great deal of political responsibility to colonial governments, and the whites in the colonies insisted on dominating the Africans, not sharing power with them proportionately or even equally.

In the course of British colonialism, not a single thought was given to the Africans (or other Third World people colonized by the British, for that matter) ever being represented in the British legislature. To have African representation in the British parliament (even under the pretext of training them in parliamentary government) would have suggested political and

perhaps racial equality, an idea whose time would not come. Clearly, the only way someone could be as good as a British person was to have been born one. An African could acquire British culture, and many did, but never the ancestry to go with it. The British notion of what constituted "Britishness," therefore, was based *both* on ancestry and on culture.

2. The French Mission

Similarly, the French looked down on the Africans and on African culture. They had a social policy to buttress their colonial rule in Africa, known as "the assimilation policy." This policy was based on the very laudable revolutionary ideal of human equality, but only under French suzerainty.

Thus the French, when confronted with people they considered barbarians, believed it their mission to convert them into Frenchmen. This implied a fundamental acceptance of their potential human equality, but a total dismissal of African culture as of any value. Africans were considered to be a people without any history, without any civilization worthy of the name, constantly at war with one another and fortunate to have been put in touch with the fruits of French civilization.

Obviously, the French were in Africa to "civilize" and to remake the African in their own image. The policy of assimilation required an educational system that would transform Africans into French people. A lieutenant governor of Senegal in 1902 was quoted as telling African students at a local school, *The French language is the language of the entire world, and you are not an educated or distinguished person, whatever your race, unless you know how to speak French … To speak French, my young friends, is to think in French … it is to be something more than an ordinary man, it is to be associated with the nobility and destiny of our country … Love France with all your strength because she loves you well*.

Since educational opportunities were extremely limited in French colonies, only a few Africans actually qualified for full rights as French citizens. Nevertheless, after World War II, following reforms that conferred French citizenship on Africans, the acculturated Africans, living in cities in Senegal, Ivory Coast, Guinea, and elsewhere in the French empire do not recall having to use separate bathrooms, being sent to separate schools, having to sit on the opposite side of the aisle in the church, being forced to ride in separate train compartments, having to drink from separate

fountains, or even having to endure the humiliation of signs reading: "Africans Only," "Europeans Only," or "Africans and Dogs Not Allowed." This is not to say that racial indignities were completely absent in French colonies. It is merely to say that when Africans became acculturated into French culture, they were included in the French community in a manner that the British in their own colonies would not have considered doing. It is this degree of acceptance of acculturated Africans that gave rise to the view that the French were "color-blind," not racist. Moreover, after 1946, Africans could participate in French political affairs at three levels: in their own countries (such as Senegal, Guinea, and Cameroon), in their federated regions (such as French West Africa or Equatorial Africa), or in the metropolitan French political system. French social practice with respect to the Africans suggests that the French considered culture rather than racial ancestry as the fundamental ingredient of "Frankness".

3. The Portuguese Mission

The Portuguese were ethnocentric, some would say racist, toward Africans. They too had a "civilizing mission" in Africa. However, their concept of what constituted a Portuguese was a combination of the ideas of both the French and the English. It included both ancestry and culture. A key element of the Portuguese social policy in Africa (as elsewhere in their empire such as in Brazil) was the condoning and promotion of the mingling of cultures and races through marriage and cohabitation. This process was mostly one-way, involving Portuguese men and African women. There was much abuse in this system, especially as far as African women were concerned. Most of the unions were never made legal. Without the force of law, most Portuguese fathers refused to accept responsibility for their biracial children.

The consequence was that these children of interracial liaisons did not have the strong identification with Portuguese society that this practice was supposed to instill. As one would imagine, marriages between African men and Portuguese women were rare and, indeed, very much frowned upon. This image of "racial toleration" was carefully cultivated and elevated to a philosophy of "lusotropicalism" whose main themes are summarized by Gerald Bender as follows: Portuguese non-racism is also evidenced by the absence in Portuguese law of the racist legislation in South Africa and until recently in the United States barring non-whites from specific occupations, facilities, etc. Finally, any prejudice or discrimination in territories

formerly or presently governed by Portugal can be traced to class but never color, prejudice. This was the ideology of Portuguese colonialism on paper as espoused by those who favored it. Historical evidence, however, suggests that the Portuguese saw themselves clearly as being superior to Africans. A Portuguese colonial administrator in the 1890s is reported to have referred to an African, whom he called the Negro, as "this big child—instinctively bad like all children—though docile and sincere," while the same colonial official argued in favor of Portugal instituting forced labor in its far-flung worldwide empire by saying that it was right for the state to force "these rude Negroes in Africa, these ignorant Pariahs in Asia, these half-witted savages from Oceania to work.

The consequence of this Portuguese social policy, over a period of time, was the emergence of a highly stratified social pyramid consisting of full- blooded Portuguese at the top, enjoying all the privileges and rights of Portuguese citizenship; a very tiny stratum of mestizos (mixed-race people) in the middle, who were entitled to only a few rights; and full-blooded African people at the bottom, who were extensively exploited and were subjected to all kinds of indignities and abuses. In Portuguese colonies, an African could be considered civilized only if he "could speak Portuguese, had divested himself of all tribal customs, and was regularly and gainfully employed. Moreover, the African population was divided into two subgroups: *assimilados* (assimilated ones), who had basically adopted a Portuguese way of life as defined by Portuguese law, and *indigenas* (natives), the vast majority who had not given up all their culture, language, and way of life. If you happened to be an *indigena*, you were required to carry a pass at all times, you were likely to be drafted into labor camps either in the colonies or in South African mines, you or your children were excluded from attending government schools, you were subject to curfew hours after dark in certain towns and areas of the country, and you were segregated in many social facilities such as theaters and comfort amenities.

In some parts of colonial Mozambique, the indigenes could open accounts in post office banks (government banks) but they could not withdraw their money without the permission of the local Portuguese colonial administrator. As more Portuguese immigrants arrived to take up residence in the colonies, the authorities found it harder and harder to distinguish between assimilados and

Africans. Full- blown segregation became the order of the day. The assimilados found themselves subjected to the same indignities as the Africans.

4. The Belgian Mission

The king of tiny Belgium, Leopold II, managed to outmaneuver Portugal, France, Britain, and Germany (as well as the United States) into recognizing his claim to a huge chunk of Africa nearly ninety times the size of his own kingdom. His mission was to "civilize" the Africans. Patrice Lumumba, the first prime minister of the Democratic Republic of Congo, summarizes Belgium's colonial code number 29 as follows: Belgium's mission in the Congo is essentially a civilizing one. It has a twofold aim. On the moral plane, it is to ensure the well-being of the native population and their development by the broadening of individual liberty, the steady relinquishment of polygamy, the development of private property and the support of institutions and undertakings promoting native education and giving the natives an understanding and appreciation of the advantages of civilization. On the economic plane, Belgium's mission is to achieve the development of the colony for the benefit of the natives and, to this end, to work towards an increasingly complete organization of the country which will strengthen order and peace and guarantee the protection and expansion of the various branches of economic activity: agriculture, commerce and industry. Indeed, those Africans in the Congo who had been educated in the mission schools were referred to as the *évolués*—"those who had 'evolved' from savagery to civilization." To qualify as an évolué, an African had to have gone to school, exhibit good behavior, and be firmly opposed to such uncivilized practices as polygamy and witchcraft. These conditions were so vague and so indeterminate that when the scheme was introduced between 1948 and 1953, only 500 Congolese could be deemed to have risen to Belgian cultural standards. Despite the small number of Africans qualifying, the resident whites were still furiously opposed to any possibility of social equality with the Africans.

The Belgian authorities then introduced yet another system, this time calling it *immatriculation.* Patrice Lumumba says that this second system entailed even more rigorous "standards" than the first one. An applicant for the civilized status had to be sufficiently educated and penetrated with European civilization and conform to it. To ascertain this, relatives and friends had to be

interviewed and the applicant's house inspected. Lumumba says, "Every room in the house, from the living room, bedroom and kitchen to the bathroom, are explored from top to bottom, in order to uncover anything which is incompatible with the requirements of civilized life." Civilizing the African was just a pretext and a subterfuge. The real motive was profits and wealth.

2.2. Colonial Administrative Styles

To compare and contrast the styles of administration employed by colonial authorities in Africa makes it possible to see how each European power tried to tailor their style to their overall objectives in the colony. We have already discussed, broadly speaking, the political, cultural, and economic reasons for colonization. We now know that the French intended to turn Africans into French people once the process of colonization was completed. The acculturated Africans would then become part of the larger French community. The British wanted to "civilize" the African, but not to the point where the African might claim equality with the British (since that was impossible). The Portuguese envisioned a new society that would include assimilated Africans who preferably had Portuguese ancestry. Therefore, it would appear that the end product of these colonial experiences would be that Africans under French and Portuguese rule would become an integral part of the European communities. The Africans in the British areas would ultimately be left alone to run their own governments using ideas learned from the British. The Belgians really did not have a vision of what they wanted the Africans to look like, or what type of relationship they expected to have with them. The promise of integration made to the évolués, meaning the acculturated Africans, was never fulfilled. The Belgians seem to have counted on an indefinite stay.

When the Congolese people began to demand independence, the Belgians had no exit plan. Things disintegrated rather quickly. The handover to the Africans was done in haste. Within thirty days, the new government collapsed following an army mutiny, in which the soldiers were demanding better wages and to be led (commanded) by Congolese officers instead of Belgian officers. The U.S. involvement in the political chaos and Lumumba's murder are widely considered to have been based on American belief that Lumumba was a communist. The United States, therefore, provided extensive support to Lumumba's successor, General Mobutu Sese-Seko, who turned out to be one of Africa's most brutal and corrupt autocrats. There is yet another vision for the colonized people, which was to see Africans as permanently inferior

requiring the long-term tutelage of the European powers. This is the vision concretized by the white settlers of South Africa under the system of *apartheid.* Perhaps if the Germans had been in Africa longer, given what they did to others in Europe during the Third Reich, and considering the brutal manner in which they responded to anticolonial uprisings in South West Africa (now Namibia) and Tanganyika (now Tanzania), it is reasonable to surmise that they may have elected to confine Africans to permanent subjugation. In any event, one can identify four administrative styles or approaches that were used by the colonial powers in Africa: indirect rule, long associated with the British; direct rule associated with France, Germany, and Portugal; company rule, closely linked to the Belgians; and finally, a hybrid approach which is called, indirect company rule, linked to Cecil John Rhodes' imperial efforts in southern Africa.

1. Indirect Rule

The British have always boasted that they went into Africa not to create black Britons, but rather to share their skills, their values, and their culture with a hope that someday African people would be able to run their own communities using the tools learned and acquired from the British. The

British administrative style was more systematically formulated by an eminent colonial governor named Lord Frederick Lugard, who implemented it when he was governor-general of Nigeria at the turn of the century. Lugard called this style "indirect rule." Succinctly put, the approach involved identifying the local power structure: the kings, chiefs, or headmen so identified would then be invited, coerced, or bribed to become part of the colonial administrative structure while retaining considerable political power over the people in their own areas. In areas where "tribes" and "tribal" chiefs did not exist, the British created them. In fact in Tanganyika, where the Germans preceded the British, entirely new "chiefs" and "tribes" were created where none existed before. This is how "warrant chiefs" came to exist among the Ibos of Nigeria. In exchange for becoming part of the colonial structure, a chief was often given protection, a salary, a house, and numerous gifts. The chief was expected to enforce local ordinances, to collect taxes, to provide cheap labor if required, and to be accountable directly to the white (British) district officer or commissioner. The colony was governed by a governor who was appointed by the British government and reported to the British Colonial Office (headed by the colonial secretary, a member of the British Cabinet).

The British always maintained that indirect rule was designed to protect and preserve African political systems, traditions, and cultures. But colonial powers found out rather early in the colonial game that the areas they seized were simply too large to be governed directly without the assistance of the indigenous people themselves. An African chief or king was certainly an important link between the African people and the colonial authorities. He understood his people's language and culture and could be counted on to transmit orders and directives. He was told that he could protect his own people's interests better by cooperating in this restricted power relationship.

Moreover, in a place like Nigeria where there were powerful local rulers such as the emirs of the Muslim north, some accommodation had to be made to avoid protracted conflicts. Also by recognizing and offering to work with local leaders, not only did the cost of running the colonies remain low, it also became possible to raise revenue locally. It has been suggested that "indirect rule" was simply a necessity that the British somehow managed to turn into a virtue.

One significant political consequence of indirect rule was that it reinforced separate ethnic identities and stunted the development of a national or colony wide political consciousness. Indeed, the style served British colonial interests very well, permitting them to play ethnic groups against each other. Interethnic interaction through traditional trade unions or political organizations was severely restricted and discouraged. The British feared that national activities might lead to countrywide resistance against colonial rule. For obvious reasons, ethnic welfare societies were allowed and in some cases actively encouraged in urban areas. Welfare societies provided social services that colonial authorities were either unable or unwilling to provide. For example, these organizations helped settle down country folks who had migrated into cities to look for work and provided critical support networks for them. Social clubs also existed to provide opportunities for low-level African civil servants to meet, have (English) tea, and establish contacts and talk about things affecting them in a nice civil manner as the British would want. The Tanganyika African Association, the precursor of the nationalist movement the Tanganyika African National Union, began in this way. Meaningful political participation was not allowed; political discourse, so vital in any system but perhaps more so in one that was

evolving, was not nurtured. It was, therefore, unrealistic for anyone to expect ethnic groups that had been played one against the other for so long to know suddenly how to forge one nation overnight when independence came.

Incidences of interethnic political violence in former British colonies can be partly traced to indirect rule. Belgium occupied Rwanda and Burundi in 1916. After World War I, the two colonies became a trust territory named Rwanda–Urundi under the League of Nations' mandate system. The Belgians found a strong kingdom politically dominated by the Tutsi people but consisting of the Hutu, who were a numerical majority, and the tiny community of the Twa people.

Tutsi and the Hutu shared the same culture and language. The arrangement was such that it was possible for the Hutu to rise within this society even to leadership positions. The Belgians coopted the Tutsi, convincing them that they were not only superior to the Hutus but actually different. This was an application of indirect rule at its worst. This cooptation led to the Hutus being openly discriminated against and created the animosity and hatred which manifested itself in horrific massacres in 1959, 1972, and 1984, and in the infamous genocide of 1994.

2. Direct Rule

The French, the Portuguese, the Germans, and the Belgians (in the Congo) exercised a highly centralized type of administration called "direct rule." This meant that European rule was imposed on the Africans regardless of the existing political relationships among the African people. The French empire was governed directly from Paris through the governor. The French did use African chiefs but, unlike in the British empire, these chiefs were appointed by French authorities, in large measure because of their support for French rule. They did not come from ruling families and, upon appointment, were not posted to their native regions. They did not hold power over any unit of the government; their powers were greatly diminished. The French, with few exceptions, did not attempt to preserve the uniqueness of the various African political institutions. Therefore, Africans were not Balkanized into "tribal" chiefdoms as those in the British areas had been.

At the turn of the twentieth century, the French federalized their empire, not politically but structurally. There were two federations: French West Africa and Equatorial Africa, each administered by a governor-general. French West Africa, based at Dakar (Senegal), consisted of eight colonies, officially called territories. These were Dahomey (now Benin), Mauritania, French Soudan (now Mali), Senegal, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Upper Volta (now Burkina Faso), and Niger. Each territory had a territorial assembly and was under the responsibility of a governor. Each territory was further divided into *cercles* (circles), each one being under an administrator, also called *Commandant de Cercle.* Some cercles were further broken down into subdivisions under a *Chef de Subdivision.* Equatorial Africa had four territories: Gabon, Middle Congo (now The Republic of Congo), Oubangi Chari (now Central African Republic), and Chad. The two federations had parallel structures except that in Equatorial Africa the territories became regions and the circles became districts. After World War I, Togo and Cameroon had separate identities as (League of Nations) trust territories governed by French High Commissioners. All these officials were civil servants appointed by the French government. All laws emanated from Paris; measures enacted by the territorial assemblies had to be approved by the French national legislature in Paris. French direct rule had the effect of giving Africans from the empire the opportunity to work together across regions and ethnic groups. The long view was that the colonies would eventually become integral parts of France. Indeed, beginning from 1848, for a period of about eight years, one commune in Senegal was given the right to elect a representative to the French National Assembly. In the late 1880s, this "qualified franchise" was extended to another three communes. Few Africans elsewhere in the French empire enjoyed these many rights, and the serious implementation of the French assimilation policy flowed with the vagaries of French politics, with national debates raging as to whether this was the right thing to do. In fact the right to vote was always restricted to those Africans who were considered assimilated into French culture.

Direct rule was not implemented uniformly across the empire. In the regions governed by more powerful rulers, like in Upper Volta where the Mossi people had strong chiefs or in northern Cameroon where the Moslem emirs were quite powerful, the French had to make serious political concessions and govern through the traditional rulers. Interestingly, the result of this centralized administration was that the Africans were governed without any regard to existing

ethnic stratification. The French imposed forced interaction and equal subjugation. Reinforcement of ethnic fragmentation did not occur. This is not to say that ethnic conflict did not or does not exist in French or Portuguese Africa. It is simply to suggest that it is less pronounced in former French colonies, but quite salient in former Portuguese-ruled ones.

A. Company Rule

The Belgians are associated with probably the most brutal kind of colonial rule. Initially, the Congo Free State was established as a personal and private fief of King Leopold II of Belgium and not as an official colony. It had the glamorous name of the Congo Free State, but it was neither free nor a state in the real sense of the world. The king gave free rein to the Belgium businessmen to go in and exploit it. They had wide latitude in running the colony, with no accountability to anyone except the king, whose only interest seems to have been timely royalty payments. Exploitation was extensive and brutal; forced labor was rampant. Virtual slavery existed, as Africans who resisted being drafted to work or who did not work hard enough were flogged in public or had their hands and ears cut off.

The treatment of Africans was so harsh that imperial powers themselves were forced to appeal to King Leopold to do something about the situation. As Lord Hailey put it, "If Belgium was to avoid further international pressure and the possibility of intervention by more powerful neighboring powers, then clearly it was necessary for her to establish an administrative and judicial regime in the Congo which would obviate occurrences such as those which had brought the Free State under such hostile criticism." African Americans, under the leadership of W. E. B. DuBois, also responded to reports of this brutality by raising the issue at the first Pan-African conference in 1919 and submitting petitions to Belgium urging that Africans be treated humanely. A commission was appointed in 1904 to investigate conditions in the Congo and as a result of its findings, the Congo was annexed as a formal colony in 1908. Even then, the Belgians did not appear to have a coherent colonial policy. This lack of colonial vision, if you will, is attributable to the fact that the Belgians had not had the experience of governing colonies that the British or the French had. By 1919, the other colonial powers appeared to have been sufficiently impressed by what Belgium was doing to add Rwanda and Burundi to the Belgian empire as the League of Nations trust territories. What seems to have been put together was an administrative

system involving a coalition of Belgian businessmen, administrators, and the clergy from the Catholic Church.

The church ran the school system, which put major emphasis on religious education, rather than the kind of education that would have permitted Africans to play a greater role in the political affairs of their country in the future. The businessmen held sway in the administration of the colony even as they continued to mine Congo's plentiful minerals. This is the kind of rule that was given the term "company rule." Belgian colonial rule saw massive transfers of wealth from the Democratic Republic of Congo to Belgium. Africans received only limited education, which would allow them to read the Bible, take orders efficiently from the missionaries, and function, at best, as clerks in the colonial bureaucracy. The Congolese were not prepared to assume control of their country once the Belgians left. When independence was granted in 1960, the Democratic Republic of Congo represented an interesting irony: it had a high literacy rate (in terms of the ability to read and write) due to missionary education, and yet the country had only one college graduate.

B. Indirect Company Rule

Cecil John Rhodes, a British entrepreneur, after whom the famous scholarships to Oxford University are named, went to South Africa in the late 1800s. He had a long list of different personal and public goals to accomplish, the most ambitious of which was to extend British colonial rule from Cape Town to Cairo. He just about succeeded. Besides making a fortune by acquiring control over most of the world's diamonds and gold, Rhodes, in a period of just ten years from 1885 to 1895, had acquired two countries, Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) and Northern Rhodesia (now Zambia), that bore his name. He gave British protection to Botswana and Malawi, almost took Mozambique from the Portuguese and Shaba [a province of the Democratic Republic of Congo] from King Leopold of the Belgians, kept Lesotho independent, and prevented Paul Kruger's Afrikaner-dominated Transvaal from expanding far beyond its traditional borders.

On arrival in southern Africa, after a brief and less-rewarding dalliance with growing cotton as a commercial crop, Rhodes got into mining, becoming extremely wealthy and acquiring enormous political power as prime minister of the Cape Province. In 1888, he decided to expand the British empire with hopes of duplicating the economic success that he had just had in South Africa. He

sent several aides, led by his business partner, Charles Rudd, north to negotiate for some mineral rights with an African king by the name of Lobengula of the Ndebele people. There was a sense of urgency to this trip. There were other mining concession seekers in the area. Lobengula was a very powerful king. Rhodes felt that if he could get there first and obtain the mineral rights, the rest of that region would be easy to add to the British Empire. Through trickery—by assuring the king that Rhodes and his associates were not interested in land but only in digging for gold against an African king who could neither read nor write and who decided to trust his advisers, who included a prominent missionary, Rhodes' aides obtained an agreement, the Rudd Concession, granting him the right to mine in present-day Zimbabwe.

2.4. The Outcome (Consequences) of Colonialism

1. Economic Consequences: The specific economic policies and practices of the colonial powers lend strong credence to the economic theory of imperialism, namely, that colonization had everything to do with greed and very little, if at all, to do with race or religion. What we have tried to show is that there were other important dimensions to the phenomenon of colonialism, and that, moreover, there was a dynamic inter-correlation among the factors involved. The seven specific economic policies and practices that we are going to discuss are the following:

a. expropriation of land
b. exploitation of labor
c. the introduction of cash crops and the one-crop economy
d. unfair taxation
e. the introduction of immigrant labor from India
f. transfer of mineral wealth from Africa to Europe, and
g. the lack of industrialization

a) Expropriation of Land: No one said it better than Lord Hailey when describing the importance of land to African people: It is not easy for those who know only the industrialized countries of the Western world to realize the significance of the position occupied by the land in the eyes of most of the peoples of Africa. Anthropologists have described the mystic bond which unites the African to the home of those ancestral spirits who continue, as he believes, to play an active part in his daily life. Jurists point out that the tribal

Chief derives his authority largely from the fact that he is in war the traditional defender of the lands of the tribe and in peace the arbiter of the differences which arise regarding their use. Land was communally owned. People exercised the right to use it and *not* to own it or dispose of it as they saw fit. It is this custom of communal ownership of land and the belief that land was not a commodity, or simply an economic factor of production that could be bought and sold, which made African people extremely sensitive to what the Europeans did once they gained control. What colonizers did was to determine the choicest land available and take it. The rationalization for taking the land was often based on the Western juridical idea that government has the right to take any land it wishes in the public interest. The government was not representative of the Africans and had not been set up by them; the colonial government simply took it upon itself that it was acting in the best interests of the "natives," whether the Africans knew it or not. Another reason given for taking African land was that the Africans had given it away through agreements or treaties. The interpretation of such treaties was the prerogative of the colonial government, regardless of what the African chiefs thought. In most of these cases, the chief thought he was granting the newcomers the right to use the land, *not* to own it or dispose of it. The third reason for grabbing African land was that it belonged to no one because when the colonizers arrived, no one was occupying it at the time.

b) **Exploitation of Labor:** It soon became clear that the settlers did not have adequate manpower to work the land and would have to decide on measures to generate the needed labor. Some Africans, realizing that they could not live off their land anymore, signed up to work for the white farmers; others moved into the burgeoning towns and trading centers to look for other types of work; yet others migrated elsewhere. Working conditions were horrendous. A publication in 1931 in Kenya reported that it was "accepted as a matter of course that farmers, planters and estate managers shall on occasion inflict corporal punishment, usually with a whip made of rhino hide … for insolence, theft, desertion, laziness, breakages, or what not." It was not uncommon for white farmers to guard their workers with rifles, firing in the air occasionally or at the workers' feet to terrorize them into working harder. Wages were extremely low, insufficient to make much difference in the lives of the Africans. Wages were determined exclusively by the farmers, later by the colonial

governments completely dominated by the settlers themselves, and were based on the amount of work done. In patterns repeated by farm laborers everywhere, it often took a male worker, his wife, and children to complete the day's allotment of work. Only the male worker got paid. The payment was partly in cash and partly in food rations. Farm work was not that attractive and shortages of labor persisted. Something had to be done.

c) **Hut and Poll Tax:** There were actually two reasons for introducing taxes in colonial Africa. One was to raise revenue to pay for the cost of running a government in the colonies and also for rudimentary services for the small settler communities. It was the policy of colonial powers that the colonies should shoulder an increasing share of the financial burden of running colonies, instead of having to rely on appropriations from the metro pole. The need to generate local revenue grew even stronger following World War II, when European countries were nearly bankrupt from the war. The second reason was to coerce more Africans into the labor market. Even though colonial authorities argued that the imposition of taxes had nothing to do with trying to exploit African labor, that it was only for raising revenue, and that Africans had ample opportunity to refuse to work, the relationship between tax and the demands for labor cannot be denied. The tax had to be paid in European currency, and the only way one could obtain the currency was by joining the colonial labor force, either as a laborer on a European farm or as a worker for a business in town. The first type of tax to be introduced was the hut tax, levied on each hut found in a typical African homestead. In Kenya, the hut tax was introduced in 1901, about the same time in other parts of Africa. The hut tax yielded more workers, but not enough. There was quite a bit of resistance to the tax. It inflicted hardship on the Africans and was disruptive to their traditional way of life, depleting their traditional means of livelihood. The Maasai people in East Africa, who had a tremendous amount of wealth in their cattle, were forced to sell their livestock to obtain the cash to pay their taxes. Since the Africans knew that the money collected was not being used for their own

d) **Labor Conscription:** The labor shortage continued to plague the colonies from the turn of the century onward and especially between the two world wars. In East Africa, the end of World War I coincided with an increase in European immigrants. Many of the new arrivals were war veterans encouraged to settle in the colonies and awarded choice land for their

sacrifices in the war. The new immigrants needed farm laborers. Existing industries and businesses needed workers to restart their operations after the war. The colonial government also wanted laborers to work on railroads, harbors, and other capital projects. Forced labor conscription, therefore, was initiated as government policy. Africans would be signed up by government labor bureaus that would send trucks into villages and towns. Labor recruits would then be transported many miles from their homes for periods ranging from a few months to a couple of years. Moreover, African chiefs and village headmen were enlisted to produce assigned quotas of workers. Thousands upon thousands of laborers were recruited in this way. For instance, every year between the 1920s and the 1950s, over 40,000 workers were forcibly recruited to work in Rhodesian mines. Conditions of work, as already described, were terrible, the pay was extremely poor, and many of the workers died from either work-related accidents or diseases contracted in the work camps. Davidson estimates that in the space of thirty three years between 1900 and 1933, about 30,000 African workers died in the Rhodesian mines. All the European colonial powers employed forced labor, although there were laws on the books prohibiting it and from time to time questions would be raised about the issue of forcing Africans to work against their will. In the French empire, forced labor did not stop until after World War II. In the Portuguese empire, it continued right up to the time the Africans began to fight for their independence in the early 1960s.

e) **Cash Crops and One-Crop Economies:** Because the whites were mainly interested in commercial crops to meet the industrial needs of their home countries, they introduced cash crops such as cocoa, coffee, sisal, tea, and cotton. West African countries like Ghana, Ivory Coast, Nigeria, and Cameroon, which were suitable for growing coffee and cocoa, specialized in those crops. Uganda and Kenya grew coffee and cotton; Tanzania grew sisal and cotton. Countries like Ghana, Zaire, and the Rhodesias (i.e., Zambia and Zimbabwe) that had minerals were mined extensively. Vast amounts of land were devoted to cash crops. Two main points are worth noting here. First, cash crops were not food crops and food crops were neglected, with the result that famine began to occur in areas that had been previously self-sufficient in food production. Second, the specialization in cash crops meant that the colonial economy came to be based on a single crop or two crops, with serious consequences for the economy of Africa after colonization formally ended. To accentuate the exploitation, the

Africans who wanted to join in the growing of the cash crops to benefit themselves found that they could not because they were not allowed to compete against the colonial settlers. Africans in Kenya, for instance, were not allowed to grow tea or coffee until the 1950s, when it had become obvious that the days of colonial rule were numbered. In West Africa, African farmers grew cash crops. Some prospered, especially those able to use laborers from the weaker and more fragmented ethnic groups.

f) **Prohibition of Inter-African Trade and Communications:** Before colonization, Africans had been trading and bartering with each other. All inter-African trade came to an abrupt stop with the advent of the colonial era. Any trade was to be carried out only with the European powers. French colonies traded with France. British colonies with Britain; Portuguese colonies with Portugal, and so on. As we have already seen, African countries became producers of cash crops or minerals destined for European markets and factories. The skeletal infrastructure that was set up to service this trade was oriented toward Europe. All communications and banking facilities were integrated into those of the colonial power. It was impossible for two Africans who lived in two African towns separated by a colonial border to speak with each other directly on the phone. A phone call from Kilembe, Uganda, would have to go to London, England, then to Brussels, Belgium, and then to Kilembe in the Democratic Republic of Congo. And it would be prohibitively expensive. Money used was in European currencies and therefore not easily obtainable or exchangeable. The long-term consequence of this arrangement was that African countries and communities were cut off from each other. Even today, it is still easier to fly from Africa to Europe than between African countries. African economies were so intertwined with the economies of European colonial powers that, after independence, African states could not really trade with each other. All were producing primary products and not what other African countries needed. They could not trade with one another when they were producing the same agricultural products or mining minerals that they did not have the technology or the knowledge to process. It has taken more than thirty years for African states to begin to diversify their economies as well as their trading partners and to begin to change the communication facilities so that they can communicate directly with each other.

g) **Immigrant Labor:** As was alluded to earlier, European colonial powers continued to experience difficulties with African labor. Europeans thought that Africans were averse to hard work and that they were unable to adapt to the new social and economic order being introduced by the colonial powers. The British and the French did not fully realize the political significance of the African resistance to colonial labor policies. African behavior had nothing to do with sheer laziness. Indeed African people who were given opportunities to benefit significantly from the colonial economy, such as West African cocoa farmers, coffee growers in northern Tanzania, or cotton producers in Uganda, worked very hard and prospered. At any rate, the British, who controlled such a vast worldwide empire, decided to alleviate their labor problems in Africa by inviting contract laborers from the Asian subcontinent.

h) **Lack of Industrialization:** Finally, of the many plans that the colonial powers had for civilizing and modernizing Africa, none of them seem to have included modernization. Indeed, in light of our discussion of colonial practice, it would have been a contradiction in terms if industrialization had been actively pursued by the Europeans in Africa. Raw materials like coffee, cotton, and cocoa were badly needed for processing in the factories of Europe. This pattern of Africa producing raw materials to be processed in Europe, and then re-exporting finished products to Africa at prices that Africans could ill afford, has continued to characterize a substantial proportion of economic relations between Africa and Europe to this very day. However, when it became clear following the end of World War II that colonial rule might be nearing its end, colonial powers began to think of ways to revitalize the economies of the colonies. Some African scholars have argued that this limited economic development was undertaken to persuade the new emerging leaders that colonization had benefited Africans and somehow to allow an amicable departure from Africa that would preserve colonial interests. This point will be discussed at some length in the subsequent chapter on decolonization and the struggle for independence.

2. Psychological Consequences of Colonialism

The emergence and growth of psychology as a discipline took place not only at a time of social change and conflict in Europe but also while Europeans and their descendants carried out violence in search for profit and self-aggrandizement of a cultural, social, and psychological character. As Europeans conquered much of the world, imposing themselves in action and ideology as the only honorable model of humanity, the discipline of psychology emerged as a specialty and arbiter of human experience. Never emerging in a social vacuum, psychology (and its medical counterpart, psychiatry) played their part in the history of European colonialism serving as its agents in its different stages. They also benefited funds and prestige from the conquest and exploitation of the rest of us. They justified slavery, as did missionaries, journalists, biologists, and anthropologists. For instance, some declared severe psychopathology in slaves who ran away from plantations. Soon after emancipation, others declared that emancipation of slaves would bring their extinction with "unerring certainty". Still others insisted that emancipation already brought former slaves severe and manifest deterioration in mind and body because they were innately incapable of living freely. During classical colonialism, psychologists and psychiatrists embarked on racial comparisons of the size of the brain, concluding from biased measurements that Africans belong to a lower evolutionary phase. Studying Africans "in health and disease," Carothers (1953) concluded from a small sample of patients in a Kenyan psychiatric hospital that Africans were akin to "lobotomized Europeans" or at least to neurotic Europeans. Other researchers measured IQ pegged to their culture and affirmed that Africans and their descendants show lower intelligence in comparison to Europeans. Taken together, these works justified colonialism and perhaps assuaged the troubled conscience of Europeans about colonial violence. The contribution of psychologists and psychiatrists in justifying colonialism did not end with classical colonialism.

After 1960 when Africans attained formal independence, the Eurocentric psychological and psychiatric literature shifted from affirming the innately incompetent Africans to asserting alarming rates of mass depression and other psychiatric disorders. This recalls earlier claims that Black slaves were innately incapable of living free or sane without a White master. In the era of metacolonialism, the psychological and psychiatric literature is more subtle and refined, as is the

case with its other covert applications. Actively incorporated into control of the mind and the market are new 'technologies'—subliminal programming of TV broadcasts, psychological techniques of interrogation and torture, and a wide range of potent psychiatric medications with little discussion of the social causes of distress or disorders caused by the ravages of colonialism.

In spite of this sordid history, psychologists and psychiatrists often show a convenient social amnesia, ignoring their complicity with colonialism both in its crude and subtle forms. For two disciplines that claim commitment to study and unmask repressed psychological experience, such neglect and avoidance about evidence of service to colonialism is curious indeed. In moments of idealistic reverie, a person sharing professional affinity might hope that psychologists and psychiatrists would be different from colonial soldiers and administrators. Yet studies of the history of colonialism, as well as knowledge of psychologists' and psychiatrists' role in colonialism, lead to this conclusion: Economic self-interest, political allegiance, defense of delusional superiority in race, and wish for self-aggrandizement take precedence over commitment to reason, objectivity, and justice in scientific thought and behavior.

3. The Class Effects of Colonialism in Africa

In most African territories, the arriving colonialists found multiple, different class structures. Because they had no conception of class in terms of surplus labour, they did not recognize those structures. Instead they utilized concepts like 'race' or 'primitive civilization' or 'tribe' or 'agriculture' to formulate their analyses of African societies and their colonial policies. However, this did not prevent their colonial policies from affecting the African class structures that the colonialists could not see. In general, African societies displayed mixtures of all or most of the five class structures identified by Marxists. To know, for each society at the moment of colonization, what its exact mixture of class structures was, would require a class analytical history that largely remains to be written. What is clear to us is that colonial policy destroyed, established, weakened, or strengthened the different African class structures--depending on the objectives of the colonists, the resistances of the colonized, and the broader social contexts of each colonial situation. The transformation of the African class structures was a byproduct of colonial policies aimed to extract wealth from Africa. But that is no reason for presuming that

colonialism's wealth transfers had more lasting effects on African societies than those of its class transformations.

4. Political Consequences of Colonialism

Colonialism has far reaching influence in the political aspect of the continent. The present political system of the continent is the direct reflection of the colonial system. Colonialism greatly influenced the politics of the continent by replacing indigenous institutions by strange administration. Africa had had democratic culture in the pre-colonial era which later dismantled through the influence of slavery, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. Wyk (2007:3) interestingly noted that the "contemporary state in Africa is a remnant of a colonially imposed system". African states adopt the colonialists' centralized state system which produced ethnic and authoritarian based political culture. Colonialists neither interested to flourish democratic system in Africa nor prepared African states to administer themselves effectively in the post-independence era, instead, they used and threw them. Besides, it is clearly noted that "the colonial state in Africa was an authoritarian bureaucratic apparatus of control and not intended to be a school of democracy". This shows the fact that state was used as instrument of exploitation throughout the colonial era. During the colonial era, there was no such concept of African popular participation (ibid). This malpractice inherited by the post-independence African leaders. It is due to this fact that Africa has suffered from, *inter alia*, evils of corruption and authoritarianism since the time of independence. Hence, what African states inherited from their colonizers is their undemocratic and authoritarian rule. Since the very purpose of Europeans was to exploit the resources of Africa, they employed undemocratic system of administration which is something forcefully imposed from the above. Putting it differently, they failed to take into account the interest as well as realities of African people. What Europeans planted in Africa or African leaders familiarized with is, therefore, the cruel administration used for utilizing the continent. The colonial experience of post-independence African leaders greatly impacted their way of administration, which is highly autocratic. Brutality of the colonialists' system of administration was inculcated in the mind of anti-colonial leaders of the time which later become leaders of the independent African states. Moreover, the notion of ethnicity left behind by the colonial powers has posed adverse impact on the overall political system of African states. Ethnic division which was multiplied by colonial system left persistent rivalry and conflict in the

continent and thereby resulted in exclusion and marginalization in African political societies also asserted that the fragmentation of ethnic identities into several states and the uneven socio-economic development among several ethnic groups become an obstacle to manage diversity. Instead of being rectified, this unholy colonial legacy has been exacerbated in the postcolonial period. It is common practice to favor one ethnic group over the other and blurred inter-ethnic relations in the post-independence ear. By doing so, post-independence leaders exacerbated inter-ethnic conflicts.

Colonialism has also its own contribution in the present Africa's political party system. The colonial administrators and political elites made decisions on behalf of the indigenous population without taking into account their idea or consulting them. Inheriting from this monopolized system, African political parties become a top-down organizational structure and therefore tend to be autocratic. Salih *et al* (2007) argued that "African political parties originated in the non-democratic setting of colonial rule which was neither democratic nor legitimate". This shows that African party system has inherited the undemocratic colonial tradition. Even though multi-party system is introduced in Africa it is not genuinely exercised. Though parties are allowed to emerge, the environment has not been conducive to compete and hold the power of the government. Even it is common to see many opposition political parties in Africa banned, criminalized their activities or undermined their contribution to national policy. Most post-independent governments perverted into one-party states or military dictatorships characterized by corruption and inefficiency. Any form of opposition to the state faces ruthless oppression and imprisonment. Hence, democratizing Africa becomes very challenging in this contemporary era. The African rulers are also known to be highly corrupted, which could be traced back to the legacy of colonialism. Colonial powers' evil socio-political culture produced the habit of corruption in public service of the contemporary Africa. From this, therefore, one can deduce that the existing corrupt behavior of the contemporary leaders of Africa is the continuation of the policies and administration of imperialists. It is obvious that corruption is one of the most attributing factors for poverty and poverty in turn leads for corruption creating vicious cycle. This situation is true in Africa and it is attributed to the far reaching effect of colonialism. In many of African countries leaders enjoy political power as a means of accumulating wealth.

Thus, state has got its instrumental value for the wealth of the few, leaders. Thus, the greedy, selfish, and rent-seeking nature of contemporary African rulers is also traced back to the deed of colonizers.

CHAPTER THREE

AFRICAN STRUGGLE AGAINST COLONIALISM

Introduction

Dear learners welcome to the third chapter of this module. This chapter has discussed issues regarding to African struggle against colonialism. Accordingly, plenty of issues like the early form of resistance movement against colonialism, the ways and forms of resistance, the historical and philosophical foundation and founders of the resistance movements, different uprising and rebellions against colonizers, issues that contributed and fascinated African elite resistance, African socialist nationalism and Pan-African movements have been broadly discussed under this chapter.

To begin with, throughout Africa's history, distant as well as recent, Africans have resisted forces of domination. The theme of Africans rejecting or fighting the rule of others, African or non-African, and their struggle against forms of domination, injustice or exploitation has been a closely studied subject ever since the inception of modem African studies in the early 1960s. The interest in this central theme emerged in the heyday of anti-colonial struggle that was itself generally articulated through modern nationalist discourse.

Colonization was mostly a negative, exploitative, and oppressive experience. Africans have bad memories of that experience, even though some may appear to have benefited materially. But at the most part, they were humiliated, their culture denigrated and distorted, and their land confiscated. From about 1885 to the end of the Second World War, most of Africans were under the yoke of colonialism. According to this imperial historiography, Africa had no history and therefore the Africans were a people without history. In do so; Europeans propagated the image of Africa as a dark continent. It was argued at the time that Africa had no history because history begins with writing and thus with the arrival of the Europeans. Thus, African historiography was closely linked with the colonial period and its own official historiography, with prejudices acquired and disseminated as historical knowledge, and with Eurocentric assumptions and arrogant certainty.

Later on, since the later 19th century the study of African history has undergone radical changes. In a sense due new African historiography was a development of and a significant factor in the intensification of national liberation movements. In other words, it was part of the decolonization process and the first phase which had essentially a demonstrative character. Consequently, political independence created the necessary conditions for the flowering of the New African Historiography.

Objectives

At the end of this chapter, you will be able to:

- Explain the ways and forms of early African resistance against colonialism
- Identify issues which have been contributed and fascinated for motives of resistance movements; and the different phases of reaction against colonialism
- Recognize the different African nationalist movements against colonialism and independence
- Analyze the philosophy of Pan-Africanism, its founders and roles played for African independence and continental unity
- Recognize the roles of different African and Afro-American Scholars and elites for African independence and liberation movement
- Examine the concept of African Socialism and its contribution for African unity

3.1 Early African Reactions and Resistance Movements Against Colonialism

Brainstorming

Were Africans simply accepted European colonization at the beginning? How Africans reacted against the colonizers?

It is worth stressing that African nationalism, like nationalism elsewhere in the world, is not new; it is as old as ancient times. In fact, in Africa, contrary to a common view in Western scholarship of Africa, African nationalism predates colonialism.

After colonial rule had been firmly established, Africans continued to exhibit many forms of estrangement and resistance. Because Africa had been divided into different colonies, as the resistance coalesced, organizations formed to protest various elements of colonial rule were often based on the territory under one colonial power. In doing so, European imperialism and colonialism sparked immediate response from the Africans. This reaction varied between the acceptance of, collaboration with and opposition to the new foreign rulers of the continent. The initial opposition came mainly from the traditional leaders and took place in the ethnic or tribal context. Thus, more recent views see the early opposition to imperialism as a well-ordered process with specific significance for the eventual development of nationalism and the decolonization process which set after the WWII. On the part of this, less active forms of resistance were disobedience, absence from work, feigned illness, laziness and dawdling, and refusal to plant the expected crops. In addition, the rejection of alien civilized institutions such as schools and churches was also common and some Africans repudiated the language of their conquerors.

Furthermore, after the completion of partition, rebellion and uprisings continued against the introduction of colonial rule though that was localized and limited to the countryside, usually sparked by the collection of taxes, expropriation of land, enforced growing of certain crops, the actions of colonial officials, the introduction of Western education, or the renunciation of

indigenous culture, which affected daily life in the tribal context. In these instances, religious cults and the spirit media usually played important roles. Pertaining to this, the Maji-Maji rebellion in German colony of East Africa is an example of such an event. In some regions this form of resistance continued even after the WWI.

In fact, at the very beginning of colonial occupation, the African resistance took the form of armed revolt. For instance, the Temne and the Mende of Sierra Leone revolted against the hut tax; the Nama and the Herero people in Namibia revolted against German forced labor. Evidence of severed human limbs and ears in King Leopold's Congo proves that many Africans there resisted forced labor. These kinds of revolts were typical of "primary resistance /first phase of resistance/ and local uprisings. They were not militarily successful for obvious reasons including the lack of a country-wide organizational base and were brutally suppressed. Since it was virtually impossible for Africans to organize on a country-wide basis, regional or ethnic organizations became the most practical option. This surge in African nationalism was fueled by several catalytic factors directly or indirectly besides the oppressive colonial experience itself. Some of these include: missionary churches, World Wars I and II, the ideology of Pan-Africanism, and the League of Nations/United Nations.

3.1.1 Missionary Church and School

Brainstorming

➲ **How did the missionary Schools and Churches help African nationalism?**

African nationalism is a subjective feeling of kinship or affinity shared by people of African descent. It is a feeling based on shared cultural norms, traditional institutions, racial heritage, and a common historical experience. In this regard, missionary churches and schools have hade immense contribution for Africans' consciousness and their consequent struggle against the colonies. The catalytic role of the church in developing African nationalism arose from the

education that the church schools provided in colonial Africa. In many African colonies, mission schools also were the main educational institutions.

At the beginning, Europeans' Mission education in Africa had three modest goals. *First*, to provide the basic literacy that would enable Africans to absorb religious education and training and help in the spread of the Gospel; *second*, to impart the values of Western society, without which missionaries believed the Africans could not progress; and *third*, to raise the level of productivity of the African workers (both semi-skilled and clerical) without necessarily empowering them sufficiently to challenge colonial rule. However, mission education was inadequate, flawed and limited with its objectives; it was enough to stimulate the appetite of African people for more education and to pique their political consciousness. In central Kenya, for instance, the Kikuyu people were fascinated by the possibilities offered by a good education from the missionaries. Thus, missionary education became window of opportunity for many Africans to be mastery in European language which helped to deal with them and developed their political career. For instance, Léopold Sédar Senghor, the late first president of Senegal was educated in Catholic mission schools in Senegal and later studied at the Sorbonne at the University of Paris. He rose through the ranks to become an important political figure in the French colonial system and, despite the intellectual controversy that attended his articulation of ideas such as negritude; he was a significant interpreter of African culture to the French-speaking world. In addition, Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya was also sent to British to forward the grievances of the people of Kenya.

Another sense in which the church influenced the growth of African nationalism was in the doctrine and content of its teachings. Christian doctrine stressed the spiritual kinship of people, the idea that all human beings, regardless of color and nationality, were God's children and equal in the eyes of God therefore endowed with a right to treat each other, and to be regarded, with kindness and consideration.

In general speaking, Missionary education had dual consequences for the Africans. At the first glance, it gave them skills with which to articulate their demands and question the legitimacy of colonial authorities. On the other hand, it also turned out to be a powerful medium of African acculturation of Western Christian (and political) values, values that the African very cleverly and ingeniously, to the utter surprise of colonial master, incorporated into political debate over

their struggles for freedom. In deeded, the majority of the first generation of African leaders, among them Julius Nyerere (Tanzania), Jomo Kenyatta (Kenya), Léopold Senghor (Senegal), Kenneth Kaunda (Zambia), Nnamdi Azikiwe (Nigeria), and Hastings Kamuzu Banda (Malawi), who had been played immense contribution for African nationalist movement and independence were products of missionary education in their own countries.

3.1.2 The Significance of the Two World Wars

Brainstorming

Do you think that the WWI and WWII had backed African struggle Movements? How?_____

During the two World Wars Europeans were running their business of exploitation in Africa. An African poet, Taban Lo Liyong, once said that Africans have three white men to thank for their political freedom and independence namely Nietzsche, Hitler, and Marx. The reasons behind are: Nietzsche for contriving the notion of the superman, the master race; Hitler for trying to implement Nietzsche's idea in Germany with a view to extending it globally, thus setting of the most destructive war the world had ever witnessed; and Marx for raising the consciousness of the oppressed and colonized masses in Africa by universalizing the concept of economic exploitation of human beings. Accordingly, there is no denying the fact that both world wars had a tremendous impact on African nationalism in several important ways.

First of all, Africans were drafted to serve in both wars—a million of them in World War I and 2 million in World War II for the freedom of their colonies. They learned modern military skills in battle and demonstrated leadership abilities. Nevertheless, African veterans were resented very much by the lack of gratitude shown by their colonial masters. However, these African soldiers

after returning home were willing to use their new skills to assist nationalist movements fighting for freedom that were beginning to take shape in the colonies.

Beyond the military and leadership skills acquired, the two world wars had very important psychological influences. Because the conquest of Africa had been accomplished so thoroughly and so effectively, a myth of the white man's superiority and invincibility had developed. The Africans noticed that, in war, the white man bled, cried, was scared, and, when shot, died just like anyone else. They also saw a range of emotions and abilities that Africans knew they themselves had. It dawned on the African that beneath the skin, there was no difference between them and the European so that they can struggle their colonies and win independence.

3.1.3 The Pan-Africanism: Historical and Philosophical Overview

Brainstorming

How do you understand Pan-African and Pan-Africanism?

_____

_____.

Can you explain the roles have played by Pan-Africanism for Africa independence and continental unity?

_____

_____

The concept of Pan-Africanism has its roots in slavery and the first Pan-Africanists were slaves that were transported across the Atlantic to the Caribbean. Throughout the course of the history of the European-African relations the white man had the slave trader, the new world plantation owner, the racist and segregationist, and the colonizers. Africans have been compelled to endure each of these situations to the detriment of freedom, culture and dignity as a human being. With this regard, pan-Africanism had strong desire in awaking consciousness of freedom and unity through combat oppressions.

Pan Africanism is a movement for unity by Africans and black Diasporas in a joint struggle, a struggle ordained by the pains of the deep historical wounds inflicted by slavery, racism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. It is a political and cultural phenomenon which regards Africa,

Africans and African descendants abroad as unity and seeks to regenerate and unify African and promote a feeling of ones among the people of the African world.

3.1.3.1 Prominent Figures and Founders of Pan-Africanism, and It's Major Conferences

Activity

Who were the prominent figures and founders of Pan-Africanism? Please explain their motives and approaches?

_____
_____
_____
_____

As many literatures have discussed, there is a general agreement among historians and scholars that the usage of the term pan-Africanism appeared in the beginning of the twentieth century. Pertaining to the notion and philosophy of Pan-Africanism, three names often associated namely Henry Sylvester-Williams, W. E. B. DuBois, and Marcus Garvey.

The West Indian barrister, Henry Sylvester Williams, originated the idea of Pan-Africanism and had found the world's first Pan-African association on 14 September, 1897, which had a Pan African tendency in that it preached unity among the black people all over the world, and sought to secure their freedoms and rights. For William, Pan-Africanism as an ideology consists of two prominent elements. One is the common heritage of people of African descent all over the world, and the other is incumbency of African people to work for the interests and the well-being of one another everywhere. Sylvester-Williams, alarmed by the frantic extension of colonial rule all over Africa then underway and the racist treatment of Africans then living in London, decided to summon Africans to a meeting in 1900 to protest these actions to the British government. That conference was the first attempt to form a world-wide pressure group constitute of black people to voice the blacks' grievance and gave birth to the word "Pan-Africanism".

After the death of Williams, soon the responsibility to continue this work then fell upon Dr. W. E. B. DuBois, an African-American intellectual and political-social activist. It is ironic in a sense that a Pan-African movement, embodying the unity of all people of African descent, had its origins outside Africa, specifically in the United States and the Caribbean. He felt that black

people in the new world must reclaim their African roots and proud of their heritages to free themselves from racial discriminations and oppression. In light of this, he strongly argued that: *"*people neither proud of who they are nor aware of where they come from could not successfully combat negative stereotypes being heaped upon them by other racial groups". Moreover, two factors have had immensely inspired DuBois to moved and revive the Pan-African movement.

- The *first* one was Africans severely mistreated for resisting colonial exploitation, especially in the Belgian Congo, where that Africans refusing to sign up for labor were being physically tortured and mutilated.
- *Secondly*, the need to seek some recognition for the important contributions that African veterans had made in World War I. As discussed above, African soldiers who fought for their colonies during the WWI were not honored, only European veterans were rewarded kindly. Consequently, he was interested that the European powers to adopt a charter for human rights for Africans as a reward for the sacrifices they had made during the war for the allied powers.

The other prominent individual associated with Pan-Africanism was Marcus Garvey. Despite the agreement on the basic promises of their struggle (the lack of racial pride among black people was one key ingredient missing in the struggle for racial equality); the Pan-African movement was marked by intense and bitter rivalry between DuBois and Garvey. Unlike DuBois, Garvey was a racial purist; he had deep disdain for blacks, and he felt that the best way to redress the tribulations of black people was to return to Africa (*back to mainland approach*). Garvey, through the slogan, "Africa for the Africans at home and abroad," founded the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) in Jamaica in 1914 and moved it to the United States in 1916. He hoped that the UNIA would become a powerful mass movement with the goal of returning to Africa (to establish an African kingdom in Ethiopia which would rival in grandeur any white civilization that had ever existed). Consequently, he started a series of business ventures (including a merchant ship), adopted a flag for the black race (red, black, and green), introduced an African national anthem set to martial music (that spoke of Ethiopia as the land of our forefathers, which our armies were poised to rush to liberate), and founded a newspaper, entitled *The Negro World.*

Activity

Dear Students would you mention the major Pan-Africanism conferences which have been held at different times?

_____

_____

_____

_____

In the meantime, DuBois continued with his strategy of holding international conferences like the 1919 Pan-African conference. This Pan-African conference was demanded self-rule of Africans, providing of education, abolishing of slavery, forced labour and corporal punishments. Consequently, in 1921 Pan-African conference was held in three sessions in London, Brussels, and Paris, respectively. The first session, chaired by DuBois, declared the world that the inherent equality of human beings. The second session was held in Brussels, in Belgium, and affirmed the resolutions adopted at the London conference. The third session then moved on to Paris, where it was chaired by Monsieur Blaise Diagne of Senegal, attracting a large number of Africans from the French colonies. Once again, the demands for reforms were affirmed and DuBois was chosen for further petition to the League to look the treatment of African people all over the World.

Again, in 1927 Pan-African conference was also held in New York where several events of some significance to the black community were occurring at the time. Among these, First, Marcus Garvey's UNIP was near collapse and an end to the bitter and divisive rivalry between DuBois and Garvey was imminent. Secondly, the supreme ruler of the Ashanti people of Ghana, King Prempeh I, who for years had been exiled to the Seychelles islands for refusing to co-operate with the British, had been allowed to return home. Thirdly, the imminent economic depression in the United States saw financial contributions to DuBois' work dwindle to a trickle since he had relied for financial support on the small but loyal African-American middle class.

Later on, in 1945 Pan African conference was held at Manchester, in England, where more Africans were involved ever before. The conference was chaired by many prominent Africans

some of them were Kwame Nkrumah (Ghana), Petere Abrahams (South Africa), Jomo Kenyata (Kenya), and others like Georg Pandrom (West India). What made a different this conference from the previous was that of the first time in which African political parties, trade unions, youth leagues, and students' associations sent representatives. In fact, the gathering was the largest and the most representative of Pan-African conference ever held. It was a crowning achievement for DuBois, and then universally acknowledged him as the "Father of Pan-Africanism". Therefore, these congresses brought people of African descent together to discuss their plight with particular emphasis on continental African affairs. One of basic premises of the organizers of these congresses was the underlying connection and sense of nationhood between Africans and members of the African Diaspora.

In general, as many discourses have discussed in different centuries, Pan-Africanism has three identified objectives in which each of them coincided with a specific time period.

- At the first glace, Pan-Africanism began as a movement to protest against the racism endured by black people in the New World;
- Secondly, it was slowly evolved into an instrument for waging an anticolonial struggle dedicated to bringing about African rule in Africa; and
- Thirdly, to ended up as a dream or inspiration for African leaders and intellectuals who hoped that perhaps in the future, African states might be federated as the United States of Africa.

Indeed, as inspirational effort behind Pan-Africanism and its dream of Africans independence; Kwame Nkrumah of Kenya, Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, and Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt were instrumental in founding the Organization of African Unity (OAU), a meeting forum for all newly independent African nations after many ideological differences (conservatives Vs. radicalists) overcome. There were conservatives and radicals among independent African leaders over future African unity: there were those who wanted a very strong organization that would be a foundation for a continental government and those who were interested only in a much weaker association of sovereign states. At the end, the contribution of Pan-Africanism to the successful development of African nationalism and to the consciousness of people of African descent all over the world in helping them to secure a sense of connectedness with their African roots was quite significant.

3.1.4 The League of Nation and the UN

Discussion Point

Do you think that the League of Nation and the UN had played roles for African liberation and decolonization?

_____
_____
_____

Following World War I, the world community was so shaken by the immense destruction wrought by that war that they decided to establish a new world organization to try to prevent the outbreak of another world war. In deeded, the establishment of the League of Nation had provided sort of window opportunities for the colonized Africans. With this regarding, the League set up a mandate system under which colonies in Africa and elsewhere that had been governed by the losing World War I combatants, Germany and Italy; could be transferred as mandates to victorious Allied Powers. Such transfers were based on two conditions:

- One, that these mandated territories be administered with a view to their ultimately being granted independence;
- Second, the European powers in charge of these mandated territories submit annual progress reports to the League as to what they were doing to prepare the territories for eventual self-rule.

Just as it had happened after World War I, the world community was once again faced with the challenge of establishing a new world order that would try to prevent yet another conflagration on an even larger scale i.e. the WWII. Later on, after the atrocities of the WWI, Forty-six countries, including the United States, met in San Francisco and produced the founding Charter of the United Nations Organization and the League's mandates system was transformed in to the United Nations' trusteeship system, overseen by a Trusteeship Council.

In 1948, the United Nations approved a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which spelled out an array of rights that all human beings are entitled too, regardless of their nationality or race. In Article 73, with respect to non-self-governing territories, the U.N Charter charged the relevant members of the World organization to develop self-government, to take due account of the political aspirations of the peoples, and to assist them in the progressive development of their free political institutions. Furthermore, the United Nations found itself being used increasingly by the emerging leadership of the independence movements in African colonies as a forum to press for their people's right to be free. Through the United Nations, the international community went on record as condemning colonialism and offering support to those struggling for freedom. The United Nations has continued to be a catalyst in promoting independence, human rights, and literacy. It has provided hope to millions of working people by encouraging the adoption of progressive international labor legislation and by protecting the right of workers to form unions to improve their working conditions. On the part of this, the record of the United Nations in consistently opposing apartheid in South Africa and in helping newly independent African states to get on their feet was unforgettable.

3.2. Colonial Struggle for Liberation /Independence/

Brainstorming

What were the sectors of the societies involved in the struggle against colonizers for African's liberation? Would you identify the organizations through which African nationalism was channeled?

This section gives cognizant on the second phase of resistances which were more or less violent and systematically organize against colonizers. In political terms, African nationalism has begun to assert itself primarily after World War II. Organizations through which nationalism was channeled were varied and heterogeneous. African nationalism was, therefore, composed of a

number of different elements, representing sometimes interlocking but often divergent economic interests which united temporarily in an anti-colonial struggle. Pertaining to this, William Tordoff (1984) has identified seven social/economic groups, each with its own factional interests to protect, yet willing to support initiatives directed toward securing greater political rights and even independence for the countries. These seven groups were:

- **Professional groups**: consisting of lawyers and doctors, who tended to be allied with wealthy merchants and contractors
- **Teachers, clerks, and small merchants** or, in Marxian terms, the petty bourgeoisie who were impatient with the status quo and eager to have the system transformed so that they could better themselves and perhaps help others as well.
- The colonial bureaucracy, including Westernized Africans who were the immediate beneficiaries of the "Africanization" of top government positions when independence came.
- **The urban workers**, interested in improving their wages and working conditions through trade Unions (some of which were affiliated with emerging political parties, while others were not).
- Small Shopkeepers, petty traders, and hawkers who made up the "informal sector" of colonial economies.
- Cash crop farmers, some of whom were wealthy, and all of whom constituted a powerful and important segment of Africans.
- Peasant farmers, who toiled on their small farms in the country side and grew most of the food eaten in the country. Peasant concerns had to do with agriculture; they protested policies that controlled the market prices of their produce in urban markets, restricted ownership of cattle, or charged exorbitant fees for cattle dips.

The nationalist struggle was waged, in part, by religious associations, trade unions, and welfare organizations, as well as by political parties. In the case of religious associations, mission churches in Africa were closely identified with colonial rule from the very beginning. Many African churchgoers broke away in order to be able to practice their customs: funeral rites, marriage celebrations, modes of dress, etc. Early secession of churches occurred in Nigeria and

South Africa as early as the 1890s, like the Zoinist church. In addition, such churches were the Kimbangu and Kitawala in the Congo. In Kenya, there was also the *Dini ya Musambwa* (Religion of the Spirits) founded by Elijah Masinde, which preached against colonial rule and attacked foreign religions as a deviation from the Africans' old and revered cultural ways. It was strongly sympathetic to the Mau-Mau uprising in Kenya.

On the other hand, Trade unions and welfare associations were formed as towns began to grow, particularly after World War II, and Africans in urban areas began to form associations to assist new arrivals from the rural areas with accommodations, jobs, spending money, and a supportive network of individuals from home. Accordingly, trade unions were begun to organize on a sectorial basis since they were not permitted to go national or to become political. Moreover, the leaders of these organizations became a pool from which political organizations could draw.

However, in some cases, the trade unions themselves became indistinguishable from nationalist movements. For instance, Tom Mboya of Kenya began his career as the head of the Local Government Workers' Union in Nairobi while also serving as an official of the Kenya African Union (KAU) which was banned during the Mau-Mau uprising against the British. When Mboya was elected General Secretary of the Kenya Federation of Labor (KFL) in 1953, he attacked draconian colonial measures that included mass removals of African families from their homes, the practice of collective punishment, and the introduction of the kipande (the pass book) for controlling the movement of Africans in the country. Tom Mboya's rise to the position of General-Secretary of the Kenya African National Union, the party led Kenya to independence in 1963.

Similarly, Sekou Toure of Guinea also began his political career as a trade unionist. As General-Secretary of CGT-Guinee, he used African trade unions for political education and mass mobilization. During a long strike in 1953, he stressed that workers' unity was essential to any success and preached against "tribalism." They believed that the trade union must integrate as the nationalist revolutionary movement, not a reformist forces in its political instances.

Furthermore, many of African political parties at the time began as interest groups composed of educated African civil servants, lawyers, doctors, and pastors often living in urban areas. One of the earliest such groups was the Aborigines' Rights Protection Society founded in 1897, in Ghana, to ensure that the African people did not lose their rights to land. Some political parties

also began as youth movements. A prime example would be the Nigerian Youth Movement, which began as the Lagos Youth Movement (LYM) in 1934, formed hastily by young people to protest the establishment of an African college in Lagos, which was to require the same amount of time in training, but would only issue diplomas instead of college degrees. Other political parties that arose out of young people's clubs were the *Rassemblement Democratique African* (RDA) founded in 1946 in French West Africa, the United Gold Coast Convention founded in 1947 in Ghana, and the Northern Rhodesia African Congress formed in 1948.

The British policy of "indirect rule" impeded the ability of Africans in the colonies to establish nationwide organizations or to be able to work with others outside their regions. However, the colonial politics of Nigeria, from the early 1950s to the achievement of independence from Britain in 1960, was to be influenced by the existence of these three major political parties: the NCNC, the Action Group /AG/ and the NPC (Northern people's Congress).

In Tanzania, the Tanganyika African Association (TAA) was formed in 1929 as a discussion group, consisting of teachers and lower level civil servants, who met often and shared their experiences and ideas. They were not permitted any political activity and did not get involved in politics until after World War II. In 1954, a young university graduate by the name of Julius Nyerere decided to transform the TAA into the Tanganyika African National Union (TANU), a mass political party prepared to address the rising demands of the African people and to press for independence. Nyerere became a persuasive and articulate political thinker.

In Kenya, in keeping with British practice of discouraging national organizations, a number of small regional tribal organizations were formed early in the century to protest specific colonial policies, but they found themselves targets of colonial repression. For instance, the Kavirondo Taxpayers' Welfare Association (KTWA) was formed in the 1920s by Africans from the western part of the country around Lake Victoria (comprising the Luo and Luhya) to protest unfair tax and land regulations. Harry Thuku formed the Young Kikuyu Association in 1922 to protest the expropriation of Kikuyu land. The Young Kikuyu Association was soon succeeded by the Kikuyu Central Association (KCA), which later became the Kenya African Union, intended to be a territory-wide organization both in its program and its strident rhetoric of Kenyan nationalism. The Kenya African National Union (KANU), which has dominated Kenya politics to this day, was formed in March 1960. In South Africa, following a history of hostilities

between the British government and the white settlers, power was ultimately transferred to the whites with no attempt to ensure constitutionally that the rights of the other racial groups in the country would be protected though apartheid prevailed.

4.2.1 Key Resistances Movements and Uprisings for Independence

Activity

What were the different group resistance movements and uprisings in Africa against colonialism?

3.2.1.1 Mau Mau Rebellion

ow do you understand the Mau Mau Rebellion and its contribution for Kenyan's independence?

Most colonies had African elite who had European education initially supportive of mother country but later became leaders of independence. During the World Wars, the colonies were needed to provide resources (foodstuffs) and soldiers. European powers promised reforms (and greater independence) for colonies if they helped the mother country. But the reforms never came and after the great depression the colonies were given no assistance or aid led to resistance. The British Land Acts were a series of actions taken by the colonial government to provide land to incoming white settler populations. For this, African land would have to be alienated in the

interests of European economic development, and African labour would have to be procured even if it meant forcing the African to work.

With this regard, Kenya was colonized by Great Britain between 1901 and 1960. British settlers, who came to Kenya because of its resources and comfortable climate, forced indigenous farmers and herders onto infertile land or made them work on European-owned farms and plantations. They created unprecedented ethnic conflict between various groups in their divide and conquer campaign. British rule in Kenya was characterized by unfair labor practices, structural racism, and forced resettlement based on the desires of the colonial settlers. As a result of the growing discontent, there was a sustained rebellion against colonial rule. The Young Kikuyu Association was formed in the 1920s, and attempted to unite the divided Kikuyu and promote nationalism. The Mau Mau Rebellion emerged from the Kikuyu Central Association through the creation of the Land and Freedom Army. The British claimed the rebels were part of a secret and savage society known as the "Mau-Mau", whose members had supposedly pledged to slaughter Europeans and drive them out of Africa. The Mau-Mau uprising was initiated by an ethnic group known as the Kikuyu but grew to include many different ethnic groups in Kenya. In the 1940s' members of the Kikuyu, Embu, Meru, and Kamba tribes took oaths to fight for freedom. Biggest frustration: LAND, à supposedly "vacant", was taken over by the British settlers. Africans, especially the Kikuyu who traditionally occupied the most fertile lands, were forcibly removed and placed in resource-poor areas.

The issues of ethnicity and class within the framework of Mau-Mau were initially unsuccessful to promote nationalism in Kenya. While Mau-Mau was the beginning of understanding Kenyan nationalism, the attempt ultimately failed, however a new idea of nationalism, one that would succeed, grew in its place. Tensions between Kenyans and the Colonial Government continued to increase in the post-war period, due to lack of solutions "to the longstanding problems of land, labor and lack of adequate political representation in the colony's legislature. Fourthly-nine Nationalist movements, including within the Kikuyu, Embu and Meru tribes encouraged forceful liberation from colonial oppression. In the meantime, British has taken many measures to halt the resistance including arrested and imprison major actors like Jomo Kenyatta as a leader of the Mau-Mau in 1953. British declared a state of emergency from Oct 1952 – Dec 1959. Officially, the number of rebels killed included 11,000, including 1,090 hangings. The Kenya Human

Rights Commission says 90,000 Kenyans were executed, tortured or maimed during the crackdown, and 160,000 were detained in appalling condition.

The British war against the Kikuyu, who represented the largest group in the rebellion, was ruthless and justified by charges that the rebels were terrorists. The British created detention camps for people suspected of being associated with the Mau-Mau, including the elderly and children, and used methods of extreme torture to find information and to limit uprisings. Over one million Kenyans were forcibly removed from their homes and put into the camps. Initially, the Kikuyu ethnic group, which was affected by the British land grabs the most, started their protests against colonialization peacefully. However, by the mid-1950s they became more radical and decided they could not achieve independence through peaceful means. Members, who joined the Mau-Mau movement, whether or not they were actually from the Kikuyu tribe, were required to take an oath of allegiance. As resistance grew so did repression and the situation became violent on both sides. The Kikuyu resorted to guerilla warfare and the British used propaganda to convince Western powers and other ethnic tribes in Kenya that the Mau-Mau were fanatical, secretive, and the common enemy of both the British and the rest of the indigenous Kenyans.

At the core of the Mau-Mau movement was access to basic rights: higher wages, increased educational opportunities, return of alienated lands, and African self-determination. The movement was eventually defeated by the extreme measures taken by the British. Although the Mau-Mau rebellion was eventually put down, Kenya's eventual independence in 1963 was undoubtedly a result of the political and economic pressures created by the Mau-Mau rebellion.

From the end of the Mau-Mau emergency to 1960, the British retained control over Kenya and its government. Essential to the new Kenya, which officially gained independence on December 12, 1963, was the creation of a constitution and a government. In the lead up to independence, alongside the formation of a coalition between KANU (Kenya African National Union) and KADU (Kenya African Democratic Union), the British government aided the rival parties in the negotiations for both the future independence constitution and the organization of government

3.2.1.2 Apartheid System in South African

South Africa has the distinction of being the only country in the world which adopted the policy of officially discriminating its citizens on the basis of race/colour of the skin. This system of official racial discrimination in South Africa was in existence for almost 90 years, whereas, the *apartheid* system continued for four and half decades (1948-1994). The strong Anti- Apartheid Movement (AAM) has launched inside and outside South Africa played a significant role in dismantling the apartheid system in 1994.

Apartheid is Afrikaans word (literally "apart-hood") meaning racial segregation as practiced by the National Party which came to power in South Africa in 1948. Though *apartheid* system was institutionalised in 1948, the previous governments in South Africa had passed many laws during the 19th and first half of the 20th century, which were precursors of *apartheid.* The British colonial rulers had enacted Pass Laws during the 19th century, which restricted the movements of blacks into the areas occupied by whites and coloured. Blacks were not allowed on to the streets of towns in the Cape Colony and Natal after dark and had to carry their passes at all times. Important legislations were passed between 1905 and 1946 imposed many restrictions on blacks and Indians. In 1905 the General Pass Regulation Bill denied blacks the right to vote, limited them to fixed areas and inaugurated the infamous Pass System. Then followed the Asiatic Registration Act (1906) requiring all Indians to register and carry passes, the South Africa Act (1910) that enfranchised whites, giving them complete political control over all other race groups and removing the right of blacks to sit in Parliament; the Native Land Act (1913) which prevented blacks from buying land outside reserves to them. In the meantime, some bills were introduced residential segregation and some prevented blacks from practicing skilled trades.

4.2.1.3 Institutionalization of Apartheid*: Apartheid* Laws after 1948

In the year of in 1948, the process of institutionalization of *apartheid* system began. The British government passed many laws to institutionalized apartheid which paves the way for grand Apartheid through separating races on a large scale by compelling people to live in separate places defined by race.

The first grand *apartheid* law was Population Registration Act of 1950. It classified every person in South Africa by race into such groups as a white, coloured, African or Asian. Once classified and issued an identity card to that effect, it determines where one can live, which schools one can

attend, job reservations on the basis of skin colour and also separate health services for blacks, whites and coloured. The second pillar of grand *apartheid* was the Group Areas Act of 1950. Until then, most settlements had people of different races living side by side. This Act put an end to diverse areas and determined where one lived according to race. Each race was allotted its own area, which was used in later years as a basis of forced removal. Furthermore, this Act reserves 87% of the land for the whites constituting 4.5 million people; it reserves only 13% of the land for the 27 million blacks. The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 prohibited marriage between persons of different races, and the Immorality Act of 1950 made sexual relations with a person of a different race a criminal offence. Thus, black people were provided with services greatly inferior to those of whites, and, to a lesser extent, to those of Indians and coloured.

Moreover, laws had the aim of suppressing resistance, especially armed resistance, to *apartheid.* For instance, the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 banned the South African Communist Party and any other political party that the government chose to label as 'communist'. Besides, education was segregated by means of the 1953 Bantu Education Act, which crafted a separate system of education for African students and was designed to prepare blacks for lives as a labouring class. In 1959 separate universities were created for blacks, coloured and Indians.

During the 1960s, 1970s and early 1980s, the government had implemented a policy of *resettlemen*t to force people to move to their designated group areas. Some argued that over three and a half million people were forced to resettle during this period. These removals included people re-located due to slum clearance programs, labour tenants on white-owned farms, the inhabitants of the so-called black spots, areas of black-owned land surrounded by white farms, the families of workers living in townships close to the homelands, and surplus people from urban areas.

3.2.1.3 Anti-Apartheid Movement /AAM/

The seeds of AAM in South Africa were sown by Gandhi. Gandhi was well-known in his teaching of peace through peaceful means. He established the first anticolonial and anti-racial discrimination movement there and founded the Natal Indian Congress on 22 August 1894. When Gandhi learnt that the South African Government is likely to pass a law to disfranchise

Indians, he urged the Indians to protest. Gandhi's *Satyagraha* experiment began in 1906. He opposed the 1906 legislation requiring the registration of Asians. Opposing this law, thousands of Asians boycotted registration. When Gandhi left South Africa in 1915, he had left behind his legacy- Phoenix Settlement (in which he placed his third son Manilal in charge of his work there), the Natal Indian Congress and Transvaal Indian Congress and the weapon of Satyagraha to struggle against the racial discrimination policies. In 1946, Manilal played a leading role in a major campaign of protest against new laws that discriminated against the persons of Indian origin. Consequently, due to their protests Indians of all classes were involved and around 2000 were jailed. Although confined to the Indian community, many blacks were deeply impressed by the power of the protest.

The AAM was the first successful transnational social movement in the 20th century. What is unique about the AAM was the extent of support it received from individuals, governments and organisations from all sides of the continents. Although national liberation and Marxism might both be considered as successful trans-national social movements, neither of these had the global support that the anti-apartheid movement garnered. There were two main aspects of the AAM:

- *The internal campaign to destabilize the racist apartheid regime in South Africa:* At the heart of the movement was the struggle of black Africans to end white supremacy in South Africa. This internal movement was both a catalyst for actions at the international level and the critical link that gave coherence to the movement as a whole
- *The external campaign for political, economic, and cultural sanctions*: The external effort can be divided into two fronts: (1) regional efforts to provide military bases, material, and diplomatic support for liberation movements; and (2) the diaspora movement, which focused on seeking international sanctions against the regime and providing direct aid to the liberation movements.

There were three phases of anti-apartheid movements. The first one was the resistance movement responded with non-violent direct-action tactics under the leadership of organisations such as the African National Congress (ANC), the South African Communist Party (SACP), the Indian National Congress (INC) and the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC). May 1, 1950, this coalition organised a national strike to oppose the Suppression of Communism Act. These strikes were a prelude to the mass civil-disobedience campaigns of 1952-1953 known collectively as the

"Campaign of Defiance of Unjust Laws. The ANC's volunteer-in chief Nelson Mandela made hundreds of speeches across the country urging black people to defy apartheid laws, and in turn the government responded by shooting demonstrators and arresting movement leaders, including Mandela.

The *second phase* was an armed struggle followed the 1960's apartheid regime response through declaring emergency to banning Anti-Apartheid Organizations including such as the SACP, ANC, and PAC. This was characterised by the internationalisation of the struggle, with support from the African Union (previously OAU). The exiles acquired bases of operation, military training, and political education through both the AU and a coalition of South Africa's neighbors known as the "Frontline States".

The *third phase* was in 1980's with a massive resistance. The movement reached its climax in this stage, which was characterised by the determination of antiapartheid activists within South Africa to make the country ungovernable through strikes, boycotts, demonstrations, and acts of sabotage. Moreover, the international anti-apartheid movement had matured, and most countries in the world had imposed military and economic sanctions against South Africa.

For nearly 80 years, the ANC was the primary source of anti-apartheid movement. Prior to 1940s, ANC activity had been remained strictly political. Its leaders and the nationalists were continuously resisting the policies of *apartheid* regime through Gandhian tactics of non-violence and constitutional forms of protest. In 1949, it made a change from the strictly constitutional protest of the past to peaceful yet unlawful demonstrations. To facilitate this, it launched the Defiance Campaign of 1950. This Campaign was the beginning of mass movement of resistance to *apartheid.* In February 1990, the *apartheid* regime was forced to officially recognise the ANC and other affiliated organisations. This recognition had indicated the government's possible willingness to solve South Africa's problems peacefully. In 1991 Mandela was elected as President of ANC, who later became first President of the multi-racial South Africa.

3.2.1.4 Nelson Mandela and Anti- Apartheid Hero: His Contribution for Independence of South Africa

One of the World's most revered statesmen, Nelson Mandela led the struggle against South

Africa's apartheid regime and was eventually elected President in the country's first non-racial elections from1994-1999. Nelson Mandela, Nobel Peace Laureate in 1993, was a leader who dedicated his life to the anti-apartheid struggle, democracy and equality in South Africa. He preached inspirations to the people around the world fighting oppression and injustice as well. Mandela joined the African National Congress (ANC) in 1943 and led national anti-apartheid activities throughout the 1950s. He was repeatedly banned, arrested and imprisoned by South Africa's apartheid government and became part of the underground resistance movement, often travelling abroad to generate support for the anti-apartheid struggle. Mandela was arrested in 1962 and sentenced 27 years to live in prison. But remained an influential leader of the anti-apartheid struggle throughout his time in jail in prison and he was also charged with plotting to overthrow the government by violence. Due to international pressure on the part of apartheid government increased, Nelson Mandela was able to begin a dialogue with the apartheid government in 1985 and released in1990. After his release from prison, Mandela stepped up to lead his people's liberation struggle, becoming leader of the ANC in 1991. In 1994 he was elected President in South Africa's first non-racial elections – the first time that Mandela himself was able to vote in his own country.

3.2.1.5 The Role of United Nation to ban Apartheid in South Africa

Besides black South Africans movement and struggle, UN had declared many resolutions against the Apartheid government of South Africa. Both the General Assembly and the Security Council adopted more than 500 resolutions and recommendations concerning the racial policy of South Africa constituting probably the largest number addressed to a single country on a single issue. On the broad aspects of apartheid, the General Assembly annually adopted resolutions requesting:

- South Africa to modify its policies;
- Member States of the UN to take retaliatory action against South Africa;
- Special Committees to study the situation and recommend action;
- The Security Council to use economic sanctions or to consider the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations; and

- The Specialized Agencies to take by all appropriate means to apply pressure on South Africa to modify its policies

Moreover, in 1962 the General Assembly requested member States to: break off diplomatic relations with South Africa; close their ports to South African vessels; forbid their ships to enter South African ports; prohibit all imports from or exports to South Africa, especially sales of arms or ammunition to that country; and refuse landing rights to all South African aircraft. Consequently, the 1971 resolution declared that apartheid as "crime against humanity". Another resolution also reaffirmed the recognition of the legitimacy of the struggle of the people of South Africa to eliminate apartheid by all means at their disposal and to attain majority rule in the country by universal suffrage. Finally, there have been in the 1970's suggestions from some members that South Africa should be expelled or suspended from the United Nations. The Assembly Resolution 2505 (xxiv) welcomed the Manifesto on South Africa (S/7754) which *inter alia,* urged the exclusion of South Africa from the UN. Thus from 1974 to 1994 South Africa was not allowed to participate in General Assembly sessions.

3.2 Africa's Mainland Nationalists

Activity

Who were Africans mainland nationalists and their respective ideological projects?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

The human and natural resources of Africa were exploited, independent African communities lost their political liberty, and Africa suffered a crisis of 'self-confidence', creating a lasting sense of inferiority and subjugation that builds a barrier to growth and innovation. In the face of these exploitative and ideological devaluation of the black race, emerged an interesting package to the development of African political ideology.

Many Africans began the search for an ideological project of self-affirmation and assertive cultural nationalism. Among these were Nnamdi Azikiwe, the Pilot of Nigerian Independence, Leopold Senghor (appraised as an apostle of negritude), Kwame Nkrumah (a radical nationalist and a proponent of Pan-Africanism), Obafemi Awolowo (a socialist oriented nationalist), Julius Nyerere (the father of Ujamaa Socialism).

Kwame Nkrumah, Ghana, was one among the notable mainland African Nationalists of the 20th century and *proponents of Pan-Africanism, a strong movement for African unity.* He quickened the pace of liberation in Africa (and) inflamed revolution in many parts that never knew it. Nwoko (2006) avers that he was the first African leader to attract international fame and represents for the black world a symbol of unity. Kwame Nkrumah's thoughts on colonialism lay the foundation of his political and cultural philosophy. He found colonialism crude and overt in terms of economic exploitation. Besides, it was also insidious as it dehumanized the cultural personality of the African. Nkrumah criticized the imperialist's government for their intention to perpetually dominate Africa, a domination that finds expression in the monopoly and control of capital by the imperialists against their dependent colonies, the financial enslavement of the world's majority, the emergence of unequal development and struggle between the rich and poor countries; Nkrumah's liberation movement aims at three spheres: political freedom (in terms of independent government); democratic freedom (in terms of a democracy whose sovereignty is vested in the masses); social reconstruction which includes freedom from poverty and economic Exploitation.

Nkrumah has christened neo-colonialism as the highest stage of imperialism. He sees it as imperialism abandoning its old form of naked exploitation and to enter the neo-colonial stage. In the neocolonial state, the old exploitation continues but this time the supervisors are the national bourgeoisies. Three methods of exploitation are noted. First, the multinational corporations supervise one aspect of the exploitation; second, balkanization also enables neo-colonialism to continue, and finally, those who provide aid to the African countries subtly ensure its perpetuation.

Consciences as a Path towards Liberation: According to Nkrumah (1964), African history through the centuries has accumulated much of confused teachings and orientations from external influences: colonial imperialists, and Euro-Christian elements, thus producing equally as

confusing and conflicting vision. The situation has been worsened by the deceptive presentation of African history as a story of Western adventure. To undertake fully the venture of the unification and liberation of Africa, a reforming, revolutionizing and inspiring philosophical system is indispensable. He calls this system *Philosophical Conscientism*. It would serve as a body of connected thought which will determine the general nature of our action in unifying the society which we have inherited, this unification to take account, at all times, of the elevated ideals underlying the traditional African society.

To help resolve the crisis of conscience already created by the contact between Africa and the West, Nkrumah further argued that our philosophy must find its weapons in the environment and living conditions of the African people. It is from those conditions that the intellectual content of our philosophy must be created. The emancipation of the African continent is the emancipation of man. This requires two aims: first, the restitution of the egalitarianism of the human society, and, second, the logistic mobilization of all our resources towards the attainment of that restitution.

3.4. The Philosophy of African Socialism and its Contribution for Continental Unity

Brainstorming

***What is African socialism? Can you explain its peculiar natures*? How could it differ from Marxism and European Socialist Theory?**

_____

_____

_____

_____.

Most post-independence Heads of African States revered pre-colonial repertoires, such as the "conscienceism" of Nkruma in Ghana; the "negritude" of Senghor in Senegal; and the "ujamaa" ideology of Nyerere in Tanzania, making reference to mystic powers and boasting of idealized traditional forms of solidarity. At the same time, this same movement renamed various countries. But national borders were maintained; the colonial period was not discarded, and neither was the

territorial legacy left by the colonial powers after the Congress of Berlin. Many leaders contributed toward the balkanization of Sub-Saharan Africa, for example, Houphouet-Boigny of Cote d'Ivoire, and even more progressive figures such as Sékou Toure of Guinea-Conakry, Modibo Keita of Mali, or Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana and, more lately, Samora Machel of Mozambique, and became symbols of alternative development with policies based on national targets.

The concept of African socialism emerged in African thoughts in the 1950"s at a time when many of the African countries were getting ready for independence. Then the problem confronted by the first crop of political elites or leaders in their various territories was how to mobilize the values and the energies of their people, tradition and modern, for the development of the territories after independence. It was within this atmosphere that African socialism emerged as a (compass) body of ideas. Some of these African leaders and proponents of African socialism were Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, L. S. Senghor of Senegal, kwameh Nkurumah of Ghana, Nnamdi Azikiwe and Obafemi Awolowo of Nigeria and SekouToure of Guinea.

According to Friedland and Rosberg (1964), the common principles of the various versions of African socialism were: economic development guided by a large public sector, incorporating the African identity and what it means to be African; and the avoidance of the development of social classes within society Senghor claimed that Africans 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 was different from Marxism and European socialist theory.

For a working definition, African socialism is an attempt to recapture and modernize the communal way of life practiced by the traditional African before the exposure to the world and values of the white man. It is a search for an altogether different type of a social system with its root in African soil.

It was in this vein that Tom Mboya conceives of African socialism as a political philosophy which stands to restore national values, communal social practice and above all to restore the traditional values in the African socialist mentality and outlook, and to create more values in the changing world of money economy to build an economy which reflects the thinking of the great

majority of people. Accordingly, Mboya's list of basic values and social practices of traditional African consist of the communal spirit, hospitality, hard-work, generosity, acceptance and practice of equalitarianism, communal ownership of land, equality of opportunities for all, tribal loyalty.

Nyerere also views African socialism, he called Ujamaa Socialism, as more than a political system, it is a philosophy, a world view as well as a gateway to African selfhood. Nyerere asserts that African socialism is: essentially an attitude of the mind which involves a change in personal attitude and a reconciliation of individuals but goes beyond these to effect structural change consistence with the socialist outlook, creating a pattern of justice in which creative and justice in which equality and freedom of all will be assured. Julius Nyerere was one of the most original political thinkers to emerge from Africa, and led his country Tanzania to independence through the party he founded in 1952, the Tanganika African National Union (TANU), his Ujamaa philosophy emphasized breaking Tanzania into small sizeable villages and pursue intensive grass root human and material development. The concept Ujamaa comes from the Swahili for extended family or family hood, which is distinguished by several key characteristics such that "a person becomes a person through the people or community" (Brockway, 1963; Friedland and Rosberg, 1964). In spite of the difficulties Nyerere faced in the pursuit of his Ujamaa, he was recognized all over the world as one of the few African leaders with integrity. His death in 1991 was mourned by many statesmen all over the world.

Leopold S. Senghor sees African socialism as a form of socialism that is peculiarly African by saying: Our socialism is not that of Europe; it is neither atheistic communism nor quite the democratic socialism of the second international; we have modestly called it the African mode of socialism. Senghor believes that two elements are central to African socialisms, namely economic democracy and spiritual freedom.

Likewise, Kwame Nkrumah explains African socialism through the communal life practiced by traditional African; he says: Anyone who seeks the socio-political ancestors of socialism, the one must go to communalism. Socialism has characteristics in common with communalism, just has capitalism is linked with feudalism and slavery. Nkrumah believed that the idea of the original value of man imposes duties of a socialist kind upon him.

Peculiar Nature of African Socialism

Proponents of African socialism argued that it is neither a form of Marxist socialism based on the proletariats, who wield power and dictate to the bourgeois nor a form of Chinese collectivism, whose basic unit is the commune, established on the basis of an oath of mutual aid among the participants or communism based on the holding of property in common, since the state would have withered away. The form of socialism campaigned for by these first crop of African leaders was not new to African. The traditional Africa that they believe was socialist in Africans mental outlook, and their life was governed by indigenous socialist rules, customs and institution.

From the foregoing, African socialism as an ideological orientation presents to the modern Africa (individual and the society), messages from the past which it can learn a lot from concerning the traditional past, it has a beauty of its own. It was highly integrated in a peculiar way and embodied those tracts by which Africans are to be distinguished as a people. Therefore, African socialism calls the modern man back to the land and culture as the source of authentic social progress and self-hood for there seem to be regretful awareness by the present day African, that being exposed to European education, culture, values and capitalist exploitative tendency has eroded from the African true self and has alienated him for his development, hence the need to pursue progress from the roots of the African culture.

3.5 All African Peoples Conferences at the Wave of Independence

Activity

Can you mention some of the All African Peoples Conferences which have been held in the early independence period?

3.5.1 The Accra Conference of 1958 (First African Independent States)

The first all, African peoples conference convoyed by Kwame Nkrumah, met the first time in Accra in December 1958. This conference was organized to create a mechanism through which the independent states of Africa could assist the dependent countries to gain their independence. The conference was dominated by it's the conservative elements like Tome Mboya of Kenya and

Taibe Slim of Tunisia. In this regard, Nkrumah of Ghana was aligned himself with the moderate position of non-violence. There was a nucleus of radicals under the leadership of delegates from Guinean and UAR which was strong enough to force a compromise on the important questions of whether the use of violence justified in the struggle for independence.

The final resolution on this subject, which approved the use of peace full methods in areas where democratic means are available but pledged full support to those in other areas, compelled the use of violence in order to meet the violent means by which they are subjected and exploited.

3.5.2 Tunis Conference in 1960 (Second All African Conference)

There was also the second All African People's Conference held in Tunisia in January 1960. During this conference Abdoulaye Diallo was elected as a secretary and thus greatly weakening the position of the moderate groups. Furthermore, Nkrumah also changed his position by the opening of the Tunis conference giving all support to Diallo. Most delegates at Tunis accepted without question the use of violence as legitimate method to be used in the winning of independence.

3.5.3 The Cairo Conference: Third All African Conference and its Major Events

Brainstorming

What were the themes of the Cairo Conference and its contribution for Africans?

The third meeting of All African Conference was held in Cairo, Egypt on 25 March 1961. In this meeting internal organizational problems, the writing and ratifying of the constitution and the selection of the secretary General, which were the major occupations of the first two conferences (Accra and Tunisia) had been resolved. It was not surprising, therefore, that the Caro conference applicably different from its processors and devote itself to measures in support of the current themes and objectives of the Sino-Soviet bloc. The speech that took up the first three days of the conference boomed Moscow's propaganda diatribes against the neo-colonialism of the United States and against US domination of the United Nation. The resolutions passed by the conference were violently anti-imperialist, violently anti-West, and violently against the United Nation. In

some instance they called for direct action on the part of African independence. Other resolutions called for the establishment of African organization under aegies of the All African Peoples Conference to lead the struggle against neo-colonialists. The resolutions were drafted by the following five committees. These were:

1. Committee of Dependent Territories (chairman, Ahmed Boumendjel of Algeria)
2. Committee on Neo-colonialism and the UN (chairman, Mehdi Ben Barka of Morocco)
3. Committee on Reorganization of structure and Liquidation of the Remnants of imperialism, (chairman, Leon Maka of Guinean)
4. Committee on Democratic, Economic and Social Development (chairman, James Gichuru of Kenya)
5. Committee on Unity and Solidarity (chairman, John Tettegah of Ghana).

The conference also took steps to enable the AAPC to give material support to the national movements struggling against imperialism. The resolution on the liberation of dependent states said; the All African Peoples Conference welcomes the creation of an African Freedom Fund and the willingness of African independent states to contribute to this fund. To consolidate and administer this fund namely an All African Freedom Fund committee consisting of three members elected by the steering committee from independent African countries and three from the dependent African states, with a secretary general. Consequently, this funding committee had been used as a channel for communist funding in Africa. For instance, in 1961 offered made by the world Federation of Democratic Youth for African Youth seminar through the AAPC was the first reported of this channel for community funding of African organization.

Moreover, in order to expand the scope of its activities, the All African Peoples Conference called up on African Trade Unions, and Youth, Women, Farmers groups to organize Pan African Movement. In the six months following Caro conference and in responsive to the conference directives, concrete moves were made to establish all African organization for trade unions and future African organization.

3.6 Pan-Africanism and the Road for African Unity

Activities

What do you think the contribution of Pan-Africanism to African Unity? What were the two divergent groups about the formation of African Unity?

_____

_____

_____

_____.

The trans-Atlantic slave trade was a significant landmark in the annals of African history. It produced the forced migration of millions of Africans as slave-laborers to Europe, the Americas and the Caribbean. The 'carry over' of African cultures to the 'New World' has kept alive their African roots. Pan-Africanism was born in the Diaspora out of a longing for the African homeland. This laid the foundations for Pan-Africanism and Black Nationalism in the United States and West Indies.

Originally, Pan-Africanism, as a unique cultural and spiritual movement for the promotion of negritude became first used among the black Americans and West Indians of the 19th century. However, it assumed a political dimension in the 20th century, with several adherents, within and outside Africa. Kwame Nkrumah was one of the proponents of Pan-Africanism, a strong movement for African unity. He was the first African leader to attract international fame in this regard and represents for the black world a symbol of unity. It is therefore not surprising that the organization for African Unity is his brain child. As a radical nationalist, he believed that the true and complete independence of African can only be achieved as a united people with a common goal.

The Pan-African vision has its basic premise that the people of African descent throughout the globe constitute a common cultural and political community by virtue of our origin in Africa and common racial, social and economic oppression for liberation and future progress. While the underlying aim of Pan-Africanism was and still remains the struggle for unity and empowerment of African peoples against oppression and exploitation, the other major challenge it had

encountered in the course of its history is how to institutionalize the pan-African idea. On the one hand, it seeks to promote the unity of peoples of African descent in the entire world by seeking to unite Africans in the African continent with the African Diasporas in the other continents, while on the other hand it seeks to promote the unification of all African peoples within the continent of Africa which referred as *Global Pan-Africanisms and Continental Pan-Africanism.*

Stimulated by the nationalist struggles for political independence in the aftermath of World War II, the newly independent African states adopted a Pan-Africanism in their common struggle against colonialism and white-dominated territories on the continent. The idea of Continental Pan-Africanism can be traced back to the time of African nationalists. Since late 1950s, African states have experimented with various forms of formal integration arrangements to promote unity and economic development.

The search for African political and economic integration, which began outside Africa, finally led to the formation of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in 1963 and was transformed into the African Union (AU) in 2002. Despite the pursuit of divergent and competing national interests by member states, both the OAU and AU represent Africa's collective efforts in search of formal integration and development. The renewed debate on African integration is whether the objective of building the United States of Africa should support the processes of socio-economic and political transformation of African states and societies either through a process of immediate creation of a central government or through 'gradual instrumentalism or functional evolution of African state-system.

Gold Coast (Ghana) in 1957 was the first sub-Saharan African nation to gain independence from colonial power. Consequently, Ghana recognized Guinea's political independence. In 1959, the two states joined to form what was to constitute a nucleus of a 'United States of Africa'. Two years later, Mali briefly joined the 'Union'. In spite of their different colonial background, they all embraced Pan-Africanism. Undoubtedly the most visible aspect of regionalization after decolonization was the attempt to create an African supra-national institution which was officially launched by the First Conference of Independent African States (CIAS) in 1958. As more African states achieved independence, further interpretations of Pan-Africanism emerged including the Pan-African Freedom Movement of Eastern, Central and Southern Africa (1958),

the Union of African States (1960), the African States of the Casablanca Charter (1961), the African and Malagasy Union (1961), and the Organization of Inter-African and Malagasy States (1962).

Activity

Would you mention the two opposing ideological groups on African Unity in the aftermath of independence?

African states, at independence, shared important commonalities that were to serve as the stimulus for unity. This became a powerful mobilizing and unifying force for African peoples and societies rooted in Pan-Africanism. Soon after, the Pan-African continental movement fractured into two major ideological blocs, namely, the **Casablanca** called progressives /radicalists/ led by Ghana, and the **Monrovia** called conservatives/gradualists led by Nigeria. The Monrovia group consisted of Nigeria, Liberia and most of the French-speaking African countries. On the other hand, the Casablanca group consisted of Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, Algeria, Congo, Mali, Tanzania, and Egypt.

The Casablanca group favored political integration as a prerequisite to economic integration and a socialist path to economic development. In addition to Nkrumah, the political standard-bearers of this radical and militant brand of Pan-Africanism and African socialism were Ben Bella of Algeria, Patrice Lumumba of Congo, Julius Nyerere of Tanzania, Ahmed Sekou Toure of Guinea, Modibo Keita of Mali, and Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt. In contrary, the Monrovia group favored ***functional approach*** to African cooperation. The twenty-four members of the Monrovia bloc considered their political independence to be still very fragile and therefore advocated *a* ***gradual approach*** to the question of African unity over those of the Casablanca bloc that advocated immediate integration based on the institutional framework of a "***federalist model***."

Although unity may have been their aim, these various institutional constructs soon began to clash as Africa's new states tried to exalt national independence and continental unity at the same time. The most fundamental point of disagreement concerned the questions of why unity should be sought in the first place, which objectives and interests inter-African-cooperation

should serve, and how it should be institutionalized. Moreover, the type of relationship Africa should maintain with its former colonial masters divided the continent's states and movements. Some wanted to retain collaborative structures and thus the flow of assistance; others strove passionately for total independence and African autarky.

While the so-called Casablanca group (the "revolutionaries") consisted of countries who proposed the immediate creation of a political union for Africa in which economic, cultural, and military activities would be coordinated centrally, the states in the rival Brazzaville group (the "*moderates*") which latter joined the Monrovia group considered themselves more conservative and gradualist. Far from condemning regionalism as a distraction from, or even an obstacle to, African unity, these initially exclusively Francophone states saw themselves as a counterweight to Nkrumah's aggressive Pan-Africanism and its omnipresent advocacy of immediate and absolute integration. Instead of a close organic identification within a constitutionally unified Africa, the moderates thus argued for a unity that was not "political integration of sovereign states, but unity of aspirations and of action considered from the point of view of African social solidarity and political identity."

Discussion Point

Did Ethiopia played a role for African Unity? How?

Pertaining to this, Ethiopia and Emperor Haile Selassie, in particular, not only played an instrumental role in supporting liberation movements in Africa to ensure freedom, independence but also African brotherhood, stability and lasting Peace through welcoming African unity. The "Father of Africa," Emperor Haile Selassie was a visionary leader and did everlasting contributions to the freedom and independence of Africa and African peoples, and played a key role in establishing the OAU. Emperor H/Selassie has played pivotal role in mediating and reconciling the two major groups existed between African nations on how the concept of African unity implemented having opposing philosophical beliefs: the Monrovia and the Casablanca. The philosophical differences between these groups had continued in the beginning of 1960's and the prosperity of achieving African unity appeared bleak. But later one, with unreserved diplomatic efforts of the then Minister, His Excellency Ketema Yifru, and under the visionary leadership of Emperor H/Selassie that the two opposing groups (Monorovia and Casablanca) reconciled their

differences in Addis Ababa, celebrating the establishment of Organization of African Unity /OAU/ on May 25, 1963.

Though based on the lowest common denominator of unity acceptable to the more than thirty heads of states who participated in the Addis Ababa meeting, the OAU nonetheless represented an unprecedented chance for continental cooperation. For Casablanca heads of state like Sékou Touré, the new organization held the eventual promise of much wider inter-African cooperation than would have been possible through their own politically isolated projects such as the United African States/UAS/. The Monrovia bloc, on the other hand, not only saw its gradual approach to political integration enshrined in the OAU's charter, but also the national sovereignty of all African states clearly safeguarded from further interference by the likes of Nkrumah and Touré (of the seven principles of the OAU charter, five were in defense of the sovereign rights of member states). Thus, the Monrovia-Casablanca split seemed finally subsumed in the OAU which, in the words of Ethiopia's Emperor Haile Selassie, was ready "to rouse the slumbering giant of Africa, not to the nationalism of Europe of the nineteenth century, not to regional consciousness, but to the vision of a single brotherhood bending its united efforts towards the achievement of a greater and nobler goal."

Although there was no apparent unanimity among African states, there was a shared common interest on a number of crucial questions as to constitute an African approach to international affairs. This African approach was reflected in the OAU's efforts to destroy the last vestiges of colonialism and apartheid on the continent and particularly in South Africa. Although political independence was achieved for African states with the help of the OAU, economic independence and political stability proved far more difficult for it. One important step it took toward solving the economic crisis of the continent was adopting the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA) in 1980, which was aimed at restructuring the economic foundation of Africa based on the principle of collective self-reliance.

3.6 The 1963 Addis Ababa Summit Conference

Brainstorming

What was the task of the 1963 Addis Ababa summit conference?

The Conference of Foreign Ministers of the African States opened, on May 15, 1963, with Ketema Yifru being elected chairman and Dr. Tesfaye Gebre-Ezgy, the Ethiopian Permanent Representative to the United Nations, elected as Provisionary Secretary General. The task of the African Ministers was to create a charter, which could become the cornerstone of a future organization.

Some of the governments that were represented in Addis Ababa had different views on what the charter should consist of. Among them, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Nigeria had drawn up charters, which could possibly become the basis for discussion. While the charter of Ghana represented the views of the Casablanca group and the Nigerian charter represented the position of the Monrovia bloc, the Ethiopian draft charter embodied the views of both groups. As a result, the Ethiopian draft charter was chosen to become the basis for discussion

Ethiopia's draft agenda consisted of the following:

- The establishment of an Organization of African States, with a charter and a permanent secretariat.
- Cooperation in areas of economy and social welfare, education and culture, and collective defense.
- The final eradication of colonialism.
- Means of combating racial discrimination and apartheid.
- Possible establishment of regional economic groupings and,
- Disarmament.

Before a consensus could be reached on adapting a charter, the Heads of States Conference was convened on May 22, 1963. In the middle of their conference, the heads of states summoned

Foreign Minister Ketema Yifru, who was the chairman of the Foreign Ministers conference, and ordered him to convene a Foreign Ministers conference for the purpose of creating a charter that could be signed by the heads of states before the Summit was adjourned. Armed with this mandate, Ketema Yifru convened a Foreign Ministers meeting once again.

3.7 From OAU to AU

Why OAU shifted to AU?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Although established as the one All-African organization, the OAU was never to be the only such organization on the continent. It was generally thought that since one of the driving motives for creating the OAU had been to end the political divisions that split the continent into feuding blocs, the OAU should be the supreme political authority with the power to coordinate the continent's many cooperative activities and ensure their compatibility and unity of effort. However, in the end the OAU charter did not contain any specific provision clarifying the continental hierarchy of institutions and organizations, nor did the first Council of Ministers of the OAU meeting in Dakar determine the actual relationship between the OAU and the sub-regional groupings. Existent institutions expanded and new ones sprung up in all parts of the continent and in the most varied specializations. According to Jon Woronoff, there were at least three principle reasons for this revival of regionalism:

- *Firstly*, Africa's sheer immensity and the nature of its countries' political, economic, and social relations seemed to favor regional over continental cooperation as ties did generally not extend much beyond neighboring states. Consequently, the cohesion needed to ensure effective and meaningful cooperation was more likely to be found on a regional level and most initiatives promised greater chances of success if undertaken in smaller groupings.

- Secondly, far from being a clean sheet or an inchoate mass on which a simple organizational structure could be imposed, Africa is one of the most varied regions in the world in which layers of strong and underlying unity cross or intertwine with other layers of diversity and disunity. As these differing lines of force are known to constantly pull the continent in several directions at the same time, it should have come as no surprise that, once the phase of *rapprochement* had ended and contentious issues had reappeared on the political scene, blocs should form again and that some of the blocs might again become sub-regional organizations.
- The third reason for the growth of regionalism was the failure of the OAU to provide a true continental framework for cooperative ventures. Although Article XX of the 1963 OAU Charter had established several Specialized Commissions (Economic and Social; Educational and Cultural; Health, Sanitation, and Nutrition; Defence; as well as Scientific, Technical and Research), these never really materialised. Instead, the OAU's merely lukewarm attitude to its commitment "to coordinate and intensify [member states'] cooperation and efforts to achieve a better life for the people of Africa" left a sizeable vacuum in the continent's perceived potential which the states themselves ventured to fill. They did so by expanding and intensifying sub-regional cooperation.

As a result, relations between the OAU and many of the continent's other organisations and groupings like the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and others soured to such an extent that often only formal agreements could overcome the substantial unease between them. Rather than seeing a disappearance of institutional competition, the post-Casablanca/Monrovia period was thus characterised by the resurgence of rivaling regionalism(s) which flourished on the expense of the OAU and the effective conduct of Pan-African cooperative affairs.

Furthermore, in its life the OAU unable to promote peace and security in the continent anymore like the genocide in Rwanda in April 1994, the collapse of Somalia state and the Eritrean /Ethiopian wars were all clear manifestations of its impotence to solve its own conflicts. As a result, after almost forty years of existence, it was apparent to African leaders that the OAU as an organization was no longer viable. It was against this background that the African leaders decided to dissolve the OAU and reconstitute it as a new organization that will address the

problems of the continent. Some African observers have viewed the initiative to create the African Union (AU) and its economic offshoot, New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) as one of the most important strategic and historical decisions taken by African leaders in the new millennium. The AU was formally launched by African Heads of State in Durban, South Africa, on July 9, 2002, as the new body to meet the collective aspirations of the African peoples.

Conclusions

This chapter has discussed Africans struggle against colonialism. On the part of this, many factors have been mediated the struggle for independence: colonial education, the churches, ideas and expressions of support from individuals of African ancestry through the Pan-African movement, the exposure to the world through world wars, and, of course, the forum provided briefly by the League of Nations and later by the United Nations as well. Pan-Africanism, as philosophical and social movement, played imperative roles for African struggle, liberation and continental unity. In this regard, the homeland nationalist movements were unforgettable. On the part of African liberation and continental unity, Ethiopia paled immense contribution through reconciling the two major opposing groups (Casablanca and Monrovia).

Review Questions

Part I: Write "True" if the statement is correct and "false" if it is incorrect

1. At the beginning of colonization, Africans had not been resisted the system
2. European missionary schools and churches had contributions for African struggle against colonialism

Part II: Write a short answer and an Essay for the following question accordingly

1. What factors were motivated and helped African resistance against liberalism?
2. Discuss pan Africanism and its contribution for African liberation and continental unity.
3. Identify the Afro-American and Caribbean scholars who were the founders of Pan Africanism and their respective approaches.
4. Explain the early /first/ phase of resistance and second phase of rebellions against colonialism.
5. Discuss Apartheid system and anti-apartheid movement in South Africa.
6. Identify the mainland nationalists for African liberation/independence?
7. What makes African socialism philosophy different from others like Marx's socialism?
8. What were the two opposing groups for African unity? And explain the role Ethiopia played to reconcile these groups.
9. Identify the different rebellions and resistance groups against colonialism in Africa.
10. Discuss the All African Conference held at Cairo, Tunis and Accra and their respective positions.
11. Why Ethiopia selected to be the head-quarter of OAU? And why OAU shifted to AU since 2002?

CHAPTER FOUR
POST-INDEPENDENCE NATION BUILDING IN AFRICAN

Introduction

This chapter enables you to be cognizant about the context of post-colonial nation-building process in Africa. Nation-building has long been seen as an important focus for postcolonial African governments. Upon African decolonization in the 1950s and 1960s social scientists were concerned about the need for what was then called "national integration" in societies with multiple ethnic, religious and racial cleavages. This concern has been more recently resurrected by Collier (2009), Miguel (2004) and others who have argued for nation-building as a policy to promote state building in a continent now notorious for political instability. National integration was one of the most prominent topics among both academics and policymakers in Africa upon independence in the 1960s. Indeed, one scholar noted at the time that nation-building "takes precedence over all other tasks, including economic development" (Zolberg, 1967).

Objectives

- To recognize the nature of post-colonial states and policies of Nation-building
- To identify the prevailing discourses of nation-building: from Above or from Below (Assimilation, Accomedationist & Colonial Thesis)
- To explain the structural Challenges of postcolonial Nation-building efforts of African States: Colonialism and its legacies
- To identify the phases of nation-building
- Democratic reversal and Patrimonialist political systems
- The Cairo Agreement of 1964 on Colonial borders and quest for self-determination: Statuesque Ante
- The first–wave of independent African state and the quest for continental unity.

4.1. Understanding Concepts

4.1.1. State Failure and State-Building

Activity
Do you think that are there a difference between failed states and weak state; state building and nation building?

To begin with, in order to have clear impression about the post-colonial nation building in Africa there needs to understand the concept of state or/and nation failure and building as well. Accordingly, Von Bogdandy et al. (2005) argued the distinctive features of failed and weak state as well as the essence and process of sate/nation building as follows.

State failure can be defined as the failure of public institutions to deliver positive political goods to citizens on a scale likely to undermine the legitimacy and the existence of the state itself. State failure occurs in respect to a wide range of political goods, of which the most important ones are the provision of security, a legal system to adjudicate disputes, provision of economic and communication infrastructures, the supply of some form of welfare policies, and increasingly also opportunities for participation in the political process. On the other hand, **state weakness** does not necessarily mean under-performance in all those categories. A number of states appear to be strong in terms of government institutions and control of territory while failing to deliver political goods, especially public services to their citizens, a growth of criminal violence, corrupt institutions, and a decaying infrastructure. A number of indicators and causes for state weakness which potentially leading to state failure have been identified:

- Disharmony between communities,
- Inability to control borders and the entirety of the state
- Economic underdevelopment, failures made by the former colonial powers in general and
- The drawing of arbitrary post-colonial borders in particular,

- Lack of democracy, misgovernment,
- Widespread poverty,
- Heavy dependence on foreign aid, problematic programs by international institutions such as the IMF or the IBRD are of particular importance

Accordingly, it is possible, though, to identify two fundamental categories of state failure: cases which do not alter the underlying willingness of the population to accept rules, decisions and measures adopted by a common government on the one hand, and cases which do alter this disposition, on the other.

***State-building*:** means the establishment, re-establishment, and strengthening of a public structure in a given territory capable of delivering public goods. Essential to state-building is the creation of sovereign capacities of which the fundamental one is the successful and generally undisputed claim to a monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force. To be sure, the aim of state-building is not the use of physical force, but rather the establishment of a state as a concentration and expression of collective power without the need to exercise coercion.

The foremost source of legitimacy in societies today is the people, a concept which in substance calls for a balance between both the differentiation between the governing and the governed, and a bond uniting the governing and the governed at the same time. The idea of the 'nation' comprises all these elements and is thus often central to legitimizing state-building processes.

The allied occupation and reconstruction efforts in Western Germany and Japan following World War II, but also the process in Cambodia or post-communist Poland are examples of successful state building which underlying and stabilizing sense of national identity which has never been disputed.

4.1.2 Nation Failure and Nation-Building

In some cases of failed statehood, however, the failure is not limited to breakdown and illegitimacy of the structure of public power. Sometimes, the "basis" for that structure, i.e. the nation, is also substantially weakened. According to Von Bogdandy et al. (2005, nation failure thus describes as a process in which the requirements of normal politics, the social substratum essential for the acceptance of majority and redistribution decisions, disappear. Nation failure is an aggravated form of state failure particularly relevant to multi-community states. The

individual communities may define themselves by shared religion, class, language, or ethnicity, different to that of the other communities. Along these characteristics irreconcilable dissensions can emerge that make it unlikely if not impossible that government decisions will be adhered to.

Nation failure, therefore, occurs when in a particular state nationhood no longer provides the foundation of accepted public power. In other words, the cultural projection of a nation is no longer convincing to many; there is no consensus on the cultural traditions, customs, symbols, rituals, and the historical experience. A situation like this can descend into violence and civil war. The key moment here is when individual and mutually exclusive nationalisms replace the former common identity. Then militant and violent community leaders, often termed as *elites* might create an atmosphere of fear in which war in the name of national self-defense appears to a significant part of the affected population to be not only a reasonable but, perhaps, even the only solution. The collapse of Yugoslavia and the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina in particular, are examples of what can happen in such a case.

Nation-building is the most common form of a process of collective identity formation with a view to legitimizing public power within a given territory. This is an essentially indigenous process which often not only projects a meaningful future but also draws on existing traditions, institutions, and customs, redefining them as national characteristics in order to support the nation's claim to sovereignty and uniqueness. A successful nation-building process produces a cultural projection of the nation containing a certain set of assumptions, values and beliefs which can function as the legitimizing foundation of a state structure. So far, this has happened essentially in societies with substantial elements of social modernity. Among the elements which distinguish such societies from pre-modern ones, are: an open system of stratification allowing and encouraging social mobility, the state as an impersonal form of government, the pursuit of economic growth, and a cultural system establishing collective meaning and identity for all envisaged members of society.

It is important to avoid composing a western influenced blueprint of a universal model of the nation state as a self-evident normative standard for other regions in the world regardless of their own cultural, political and historical experiences. State-building measures in such a context are unlikely to be successful if they do not respond to the contrasting patterns of social identity. A dual response is therefore recommendable. This would need to stop the process of national

erosion, provide openings for a re-linking of increasingly separate identities, re-establish areas of cooperation, and stabilize the existing institutions charged with fulfilling common tasks in order to turn them into widely accepted institutions.

Given the limited possibilities to influence nation-building from outside, it is important to note that any attempt to inject certain values or concepts into such a process will need time and substantial financial resources: as the nation is a cultural conception, much of the necessary work will have to be done in the cultural sphere, too.

The literatures on nation building and political socialization have concerned themselves with these and related questions, namely, with how individual political ideals, opinions, identities, and preferences are created. Thus, to the extent that it is successful, political socialization offers a way out of the dilemma of determining the origin of "tastes" for ethnic cooperation. Nation-building policies may therefore be viewed more generally as investments in *social capital*. Yet there is limited empirical evidence regarding which public policies are most successful in addressing ethnic divisions. One possible institutional reform would be to promote power sharing across groups within governments or other organizations. Second and perhaps more promising approach advocates promoting dialogue and interaction among the leaders of distinct ethnic communities, who are then better able to coordinate responses to violations of intergroup cooperation norms. A closely related form of elite coordination is the establishment of formal associational bonds across ethnic groups. Therefore, Nation-building represents a particular kind of transfer from the center of the population towards the periphery to reduce the costs of being located towards the periphery and therefore avoid separation.

4.3 Approaches of Nation building by Stein Rokkan

Would you like to explain different approaches of Nation-Building?

_____

_____

_____.

There are still marked imbalances in the ranges of variables covered in comparative analysis of processes of political development. Models of political development vary along a variety of dimensions: in their theoretical focus, in their logical structure and their openness to direct empirical testing, in the number and the precision of the variables and in the possibilities of adequate matching with actual or potential data sources, in the ranges of historically given variations which they seek to explain. To bring some order into this great variety of efforts of model-building Stein Rokkan propose to group these by their focal variables:

- ***Firstly,*** total system variables, variables representing components and phases of change in the entire system of interaction within the territorial domain claimed for the central authority;
- ***Secondly,*** variables characterizing processes of mobilization or counter mobilization in the territorial peripheries; and
- Thirdly, variables characterizing the strategies, the conflicts and the coalitions of the centre-building elites within the territories compared.

As they further argued that other questions should be addressed and critically examined: these questions include: What is built up for what purposes? What materials and resources are at hand and what are the costs likely to be incurred in bringing these together? Who are the architects, the financiers and the entrepreneur active in the building of the system. Again, these three groups of questions correspond roughly to the three approaches distinguished by Samuel P. Huntingto: structural Functionalism theories (to answer what is the purpose), social process theories (materialist and resource questions), and comparative history (architects, financiers, entrepreneur's questions).

4.3 The Nature of Post-colonial African States

Brainstorming

What do you think about the political context of post-colonial African States?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____.

The majority of African peoples have liberated themselves from colonial occupation and set up their own national states in 1960s'. The imperialists, forced to abandon direct political rule, have tried to take advantage of their former colonies' economic dependence in order to maintain indirect political control and thus keep them within the capitalist orbit.

When colonial authorities drew boundaries, they did not pay any regard to the actual distributions of the various national peoples and ethnic communities; thus, the geographical entities that had been drawn to the convenience of the Europeans contained diversities of peoples.

Half a century after independence, there is a general consensus among Africa watchers, scholars and commentators alike that the prototype postcolonial state in Africa is undergoing deep crisis. It has failed to provide for the needs, promote the wellbeing, cater to the aspirations and safeguard the security of the people. Dismal performance and inability to deliver have led to its irrelevance and alienation. Oblivious of the imperatives of the social compact, certain states are at war with their own people. Unable to govern with the consent of the governed and contemptuous of their will, they perpetrate their indefinite and despotic rule and seek to achieve submission through repression and intimidation, creating a general sate of fear and insecurity.

There is also growing recognition that the postcolonial patrimonial state has proved incapable of performing its fundamental functions, overcoming its *crisis of legitimacy*, *delivery* and *relevance* and engendering revival. Unmindful of their concerns and alienated from the people, the prototype African states in post-independence are weak, insecure and unstable. They are repressive, corrupt and dysfunctional. As a result, nation building, state construction and development remain essentially critical tasks and assignments for Africans.

Critical thinking

What were the problems faced by African governments in the immediate aftermath of independence?

African governments in the immediate aftermath of independence have faced a multitude of pressing political problems including:

- *Sovereignty and security*. Sovereignty is a fancy term for authority and power to insure security. The brand new African governments inherited countries that were created by colonialism. These colonies were created and maintained by the force of the colonial governments. Not without cause, the new independent governments were concerned that once colonial rule ended, there would be a strong chance that newly independent countries would face the possibility of disintegration. Consequently, one of the top priorities of the new governments was to ensure the sovereignty and security of their new nation-state.
- *National Unity*. Remember that. with the exception of a few colonies such as Swaziland and Somalia, European powers created colonies in Africa that were comprised of many different language, religious, and ethnic groups. Moreover, colonial governments through the practice of *indirect rule* and *divide and rule*, created colonial societies that were often deeply divided along ethnic lines. However, central to the very idea of a nation-state is the necessity of national unity. A nation-state has no chance of remaining a nation-state if it is deeply divided along ethnic or religious lines. National unity is essential for the success of any country. Consequently, a top priority of the new African governments was the development of national unity. For this goal to be met, citizens have to develop a stronger loyalty and identity to the nation than they do to an ethnic group. Can you imagine how different the history of the United States would be if citizens would not identify themselves as Americans, but rather, would identify themselves as first and foremost belonging to a state, a local area, or ethnic group?
- *Basic human services*: Colonial governments paid little attention to meeting the basic social needs of citizens. This was particularly true in the areas of education, health-care, and housing and adequate employment opportunities. New nationalist governments came to

power on the promise that they would work towards meeting these important needs for all citizens. The *legitimacy* of the first independent governments in Africa depended on their ability to meet these needs.

4.4 Post-Colonial African States and the challenges of Nation Building

The postcolonial state is an alien implantation on African soil. It is encumbered by its European origins and the weight of its colonial legacy. Its problems are compounded by palpable failures in nation building, state construction and development. Weak governments in fragile states pursue the politics of repression, exclusion and marginalization. This provokes discontent at the centre and resistance and civil wars on the periphery. As a result, Wars and conflicts of varying intensity plague Africa. They destroy lives, livelihoods and opportunities for development. Underdevelopment breeds poverty and disease. Half of the people in Sub-Saharan Africa live on less than a dollar a day, while 33 per cent of the continent's people suffer from malnutrition. An estimated 20,000 Africans die every day due to extreme poverty manifested in chronic food shortages, malnutrition and hunger. Hundreds of millions of people in large parts of Africa are locked in a daily struggle for survival, competing for increasingly scarce resources to eke out the food, water and energy needed to sustain life at the margins of death. Therefore, despite the positive changes taking place in some African countries, such as Botswana, Ghana and Tanzania, it is as if much of Africa continues to rotate on an axis of undemocratic governance and revolve around a vicious cycle of war and conflict that breed underdevelopment, environmental degradation, poverty and disease.

States in post-colonial Africa have significant variations though they have had similarities in history. This is due to the radically different policies and strategies of nation building packages in post-colonial period. The colonial legacy of bureaucratic authoritarianism, pervasive patron-client relations, and a complex ethnic dialectic of assimilation, fragmentation and competition has persisted in post-colonial societies. Patron-client networks remain the fundamental state-society linkage in circumstances of social crisis and uncertainty and have extended to the very centre of the state. Colonialization has been the most important factor in the evolution of the modern African state. It sets the boundaries of the state, provided it with state structure - constitution, governance systems, bureaucracy etc. as well as linked Africa with the global

economy in a centre-periphery relationship. Nevertheless, in discussing the current state of the state in Africa, we must not fall into the error into which many have fallen of thinking that there was no state before the colonial encounter.

Unfortunately, elements of the colonial state have been dominant since political independence. Both within the colonial and post-colonial states, the official policy is to suppress and supplant the pre-colonial state. As George Ayittey (1991) recognized there were two broad types of African pre-colonial political formations - the Stateless or a cephalous societies, and states which centralized authority (chiefs), administrative machinery and judicial institutions. Stateless societies included the Igbo of Nigeria, the Kung of Liberia, the Tallenssi of Ghana, the Somalis, Jie of Uganda and Mbeere of Kenya. Whether in the state or stateless societies, African pre-colonial political organizations had some common important attributes. First, the state was concerned with the welfare of all its citizens. Some have gone ahead to label this as communalism, but the central notion was that the welfare of every member, rather than just a few within the community, mattered. Secondly, the society was organized for political purposes on the basis of lineage: thus the lineage connected the family to the state. This ensured the state of maximum popular support but also ascertained that state sanctions can be effectively communicated. Thirdly, there was an aversion to concentrated authority.

4.4.1The Colonial State and Its Postcolonial Legacy

Brainstorming

What do you understand the postcolonial legacy of colonial state in Africa?

The colonial state is a state created and sustained by force of arms. As a state of conquest, it at once displaced and bastardised pre-colonial state institutions. It did this for two reasons. *First,* the colonial state was based on a theory of racial superiority best articulated in Lord Lugard's Dual Mandate. It therefore had to supplant whatever `inferior' institutions it met. *Secondly*, the colonial state was short of personnel even for the purposes of effect its overriding agenda of extracting resources for the benefit of the metro-pole. To be able to secure law and order, it

adopted an *indirect rule* system whereby local chiefs were transformed into local potentates with absolutist powers similar to those of the colonial governors. Even where there were stateless societies, the colonial authorities created 'warrant chiefs.

As many have discussed, philosophically, the colonial states were *elitist, centrist and absolutist.* What was constant in the colonial administration was the concentration of authority to establish, revise and interpret rules in a structure entirely removed from local, popular mechanisms of control. It is unfortunate that the African post-colonial state has taken on more elements of the colonial state rather than of the pre-colonial state. The legacy of the colonial state is the weak vertical and horizontal integration of the African state, the dominance of power rather than authority and the low-level of government, accountability and responsiveness. Several factors were predisposing to this situation.

- *First*, there was really no major transformation of the philosophical and organizational principles of the state at independence.
- *Secondly*, a number of environmental factors – the prevalence of intellectual and realpolitik traditions in the West and East that favored strong centralized state and central planning.
- Finally, the people were themselves content to give their faith to new found central authorities which promised much but delivered little.

4.4.2 Multiple Disconnectedness

According to Dele Olowu (1994), the problems of African states in post-independence are flows from the three dimensions of historical analysis. First, the African state is disconnected from the past. Second, the African state is disconnected from the mass of the people of Africa. Thirdly, the African state is normless or best at amoral.

I. Disconnection from the Past

By mean the African states are disconnected from the African past, a sense that states constructed principally on their colonial origins in terms of philosophy, structure and organization. Instead of building on its pre-colonial forbears, they rather attempted to suppress, distort and bastardize pre-colonial conceptions of the state and state institutions. As a result, state

institutions have a peculiarly alien character. The emphasis of the state seems to be on power to the exclusion of ethics and a complete reliance on Western conceptions of authority and imported Western institutions of government such as the legislature, executive, military and so on without the attending norms supporting them. This has alienated the African state further from the past and the people.

Furthermore, what has further worsened matter is the attitude of the immediate post-independence African leaders. Claiming that they fought or led the struggle for independence, they appropriated the state as their personal property. The fundamental division expected between public and private realms in Western traditions of governance were dispensed with. Hence, many African heads of state either declared themselves *Presidents for life*, legislated other political parties out of existence and proscribed or circumscribed other institutions of dissent of social criticism such as the media, legislatures or even interest groups.

Politically, all institutions of dissent are proscribed. The state attempts to overpower societal institutions rather than accommodate them. Institutionally there is a high centralization in the formal distribution of power and resources between the various branches and levels of government. What usually emerges from this structure of governance are African states which put a premium on leadership by one man or a small clique that attempts to impose its wishes on the rest of the society.

The imposition of one-man rule is thus a form of violence on the psyche of African peoples. It led to a further distrust of their leaders and the formal structures of governance and their withdrawal to parallel informal social organizations. These result the centralized state on governance in Africa and made these countries ungovernable.

II. Disconnection from the People

Largely because the African state is disconnected from the past it also became disconnected from the mass of the people. According to Claude Ake (1989), the African state is not a state of all but the state of the few who are fortunate to be at the helm of affairs. Since this group will be small, the rest of society is stateless. For instance, except in a few countries which have adopted African languages as their lingua franca, most African countries conduct all official transactions in the metropolitan language even though the majority of the population remains illiterate even in their mother tongue.

There are two important implications of this state disconnectedness from their own people. *First*, the state does not respond to the wishes of the people. Operators of government have found ways of justifying their entry or perpetual stay in power without the peoples' consent. For this reason, governments operate without caring for the impact of their policies on the public. They rely solely on force to get the citizen to comply with the government's directives. As a result, the loyalty of the people to the state is weak. Another implication of African state's disconnectedness from its people is that it is non-accountable. Accountability involves three important principles - responsibility, reporting and answerability. Therefore, The non-accountable and non-responsive character of African states when coupled with the formal centralized structure explains the 'softness' of the African state - its weakness, inability to exact loyalty or obedience, high tax evasion and the growth of parallel social institutions in the informal sector to cater for peoples' needs.

III. Amoral Character of the African State

The amoral nature of African states have within the two contrasting system of morality. The first are the traditional norms to which the majority of the society subscribes—which emphasizes primordial loyalties and particularistic qualities to the family, clan and village. On the other hand, there are also the modern norms associated with the larger state system and its institutions which emphasis universalism, objectivity and neutrality. These two conceptions of norms have led one scholar to propose that two types of publics - *the civic public and the formal public* exist in the African state. The existence of the two norms leads to value conflict, poly-normativism and, especially within the bureaucracy, to administrative normlessness.

4.4.3 Approaches Expound the Crisis of Post-colonial African States

Activities

Can you identify approaches/theories which explain the crisis of state?

Do you believe that these approaches would best explain the case of post-independence African states?

Bjorn Beckman argued three approaches which explains the crisis of the African state in post-colonial period of nation building. The first one relies on the incapacity of the African state primarily on personal rule and tribalism. This has been discussed as the *neo-patrimonial theory.* The second emphasizes the monopolistic position of the bureaucracy and the political class in the economy. This also called the *monopolistic theory*. The third focuses on the distortion of the state caused by imperialist domination, which referred to as the *comprador theory*.

Having this in mind, these theories have three important deficiencies in common, all related to a tendency to write-off the African state too easily, ignoring long-term processes of class and state formation: ***Firstly,*** there is a failure to take African ruling classes seriously, including their expanding material base, their ideological commitments (nationalism), and the way in which they enhance their competence and build their class institutions; ***Secondly,*** the foreign stake in the processes of state and ruling class formation is grossly underestimated. The post-colonial state, large, must be seen as a transnational project; ***thirdly***, there is a tendency to ignore the growing organizational experience of subordinate classes and their ability to impress themselves on the administration of state power.

A. The Neo-patrimonial Theory: Personal Rule

Brainstorming

What does it mean by neopatrimonialism?

_____

In the Politics of Africa's Economic Stagnation, Richard Sandbrook (1985) sees personal rule coupled to communal ties as the central factor behind political falling-off and the failure of the state to provide appropriate conditions for capitalist development. In Africa, states are overwhelmed by their own incoherence, indiscipline and shrinking fiscal base. By reproducing the structures of the colonial state and extending patronage networks through them, however, post-colonial states in Africa have been unable to resolve the inherited contradictions of the colonial political economy

The principal reason, according to Sandbrook, is the absence of strong classes. For instance, the modern state in the West and Japan evolved within the context of class societies. Class power and a pluralist political system made it disciplined and responsive. In Africa, class forces are too weak: Where then is the social agent to champion capitalist transformation. In the absence of hegemonies class capable of forcing coherence and discipline on the state, *personal rule or neo-Patrimonialist* becomes the order of the day. A frame of personal rule led a creepy picture of greed, tribalism and violence. This has been the experience of African states so far.

B. The Monopolistic Theory: bureaucratic Monopolization

The monopolistic position of the state in the economy makes political and administrative positions the most fruitful means of securing economic resources for private use. State agencies proliferate; bribery and corruption become the normal form of official transactions and a necessity for engaging in private business. The political class seeks to legitimize its authority by offers to client groups, generating factionalism and tribalism. Political instability encourages it to take what it can while the going is good. The contradictions built into this process lead either to the consolidation of oligarchic rule and stagnation of political life, or, at the opposite extreme, an escalation of military and civil violence.

C. The Comprador Theory: Foreign domination

The most radical critics of the performance of the African states are found at the stake of foreign domination in its end. The political class has failed to make the state an instrument of national development precisely because it serves the interest of foreign domination. The state exercises comprador functions. It buys goods and services of doubtful value and inflated costs from foreign firms so that commissions can be collected by state officials, politicians, and businessmen who either award the contracts or assist in linking-up the contracting parties. Consequently, the radical nationalists envisage call for all patriotic forces to unite and eject the compradors from the state. On the one side stands imperialism and its local lackeys; on the other, an entire people who have everything to gain from stopping the bleeding of the nation's resources.

4.4.4 Ethnicity and the Nature of Political Parties in Post-colonial Africa

Activity

What seems the nature and operation of political parties in post-colonial Africa?

_____

_____

_____

Ethnicity is the product of a continuing historical process, always in simultaneously old and new, grounded in the past and perpetually in creation. Colonial states were grounded in the alliances with local *'Big Men'*, incorporating ethnically-defined administrative units linked to the local population by incorporation of pre-colonial patron-client relations. With this regard, there are a paradoxical answer to what has happened to the colonial state and its links to patronage networks and ethnic development since independence. On the one hand, the colonial power structure of bureaucratic authoritarianism and clientelism have continued essentially unchanged, especially the structures of rural control and collaboration between the state apparatus and local strong men. The nationalist regimes that came to power at independence faced the continuing problem of exercising effective control in the countryside, and most chose not only to rely upon the existing apparatus, including the prefectural field administration immediately over the local tribal authorities, but also to extend and intensify colonial modes of domination and surplus appropriation.

At the moment of independence, competitive elections and the Africanization of the bureaucracy began to make ethnicity increasingly important as a basis of political support and access to the higher levels of the state. The post-colonial state, like its predecessor, presents two faces to the world. The first is the face of modern state power, bureaucratic omnipotence and technical expertise—the avatar of modernity; the second is the scene of the real business of government in the patronage handed out from the verandah 'governed by a logic which is no longer that of efficiency, but of the share-out.

A political party is any political group that presents at elections, and is capable of placing through elections, candidates for public office. A party system subsequently refers to a collection of parties competing with other parties in elections for the control of public office. Political party development is defined as the process through which a political party originates, evolves into an organized structure and becomes either more or less electorally accountable.

In such post-war societies, political parties are often associated with the monopolization and abuse of power, corruption and the incitement of (ethnic) hatred. Stable and representative political parties are vital for the development of a sustainable and democratic peace after civil war just as they are important to building representative democracy in its own right. Until recently our understanding of political parties was mainly informed by the trajectories of party development in Western established democracy. Only in the last two decades or so there has been more attention for party formation in the so-called '*Third Wave' or 'new democracies'* of Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, Asia and Africa.

Compared to party development in the Western world, political parties in regions such as Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa are of a much more recent origin and typically have not benefitted from decades of parliamentary experience. In political terms, many of the sovereign states in developing countries are fairly new and gained their independence from colonial administrations only in the last half century or so. The political parties that emerged in these countries have been profoundly affected by these external forces. Another problem that hinders the analysis is the lack of detailed knowledge about political parties and party systems in these regions, especially in Southeast Asia and Sub-Sahara Africa.

In sub-Saharan Africa, the political context in many African societies is characterized by weakly institutionalized states run on a non-bureaucratic, neo-patrimonial form of governance. Although there are a few notable exceptions, the origins of most African political parties lay in the period of decolonization after the Second World War. Before the period of decolonization, African party development was rather limited as several key conditions for political mobilization and party formation, such as competitive elections, suffrage and parliamentary representation either did not exist or were restricted under European colonial administrations. Because of this, a lot of African parties did not emerge from domestic political pressures, but emerged in response to what was increasingly perceived as the repression by Western, imperialist powers. Other

important factors that influenced party development in Africa were the relatively late introduction of universal suffrage.

Regarding the nature of party politics in the developing world and Africa, a number of general characteristics can be distinguished. These have been characterized by single party and military rule. Particularly in African societies these uncompetitive forms of politics were often justified by distinct political ideologies. Other common features of party politics in Africa context include the personalization of power by party leaders and presidents; the limits placed on the role of interest groups, especially trade unions, both by the colonial authorities and the new post-independent rulers; the subordination of the party to the state; the use of clientelist networks in mobilizing party support; and the emergence of parties based on ethnic cleavages.

Currently, democracy in much of Africa is constrained from delivering on its development potential for three reasons. First, governance capacity is lacking. Second, the quality of electoral democracy is thin. Finally, neopatrimonialism undermines electoral democracy in Africa. Most African governments (as in poor countries elsewhere in the world) are classified as neopatrimonialism and/or rent seeking, but the resilience of neopatrimonial practices as part of Africa's democratization has been remarkable. As Pierre Englebert and Kevin Dunn suggest:

One of the most remarkable characteristics of contemporary African politics is indeed the degree to which authoritarian neopatrimonial regimes have been able to adapt to the formal trappings of electoral democracy.

4.4.5 Foreign Intervention and the Resilience of the Post-colonial African States

The post-colonial state is a transnational project. It originated in most places in the efforts of the late colonial period to achieve mutual accommodation between the rising nationalist movement and two sets of rival foreign forces: *the old colonial interests*, anxious to preserve as much as possible of the special access they had enjoyed under colonialism, and the new ones, demanding the removal of colonial privileges with a new epoch of *multilateral imperialism.*

The process of reconstruction has been accelerated through foreign state intervention. The IMF and the World Bank, operating as international state apparatuses, are involved in formulating policy, monitoring performance, placing advisers in key positions, and financing reform packages, both directly and by mediating relations with other creditors and donors. The liberal

expansion of commercial lending to Africa in the late 1970s and early l980s prepared the way for this intervention. The Fund and the Bank push short term conditions for debt management while simultaneously pursuing long-term political objectives. The crises of indebtedness and poor world market conditions for most African exports have opened the door for foreign state intervention on an unprecedented scale, accelerating that process. The failure to situate the current crisis of the postcolonial state within the context of the long-term process of bourgeois class and state formation, with its strong transnational backing, has important political implications. It invites defeatism and adventurism. It plays into the hands of the ruling class strategies currently at work without offering any alternative based on popular democratic aspirations.

The structural adjustment programmers imposed by the IMF and World Bank as supposed solutions to the crisis represent yet another effort to more fully integrate African societies into the capitalist world economy by removing constraints on market forces and their ultimate complete penetration and domination of agrarian communities. Economic decline, draconian reforms, the deterioration of already relatively weak states and the delay of distributable resources exacerbate reliance on patron/client relations and intensify the inter-ethnic political conflicts of political tribalism. The increasing intensity of inter-ethnic conflict has been matched by the aggravation of the intra-ethnic conflicts of moral ethnicity over social obligations of redistribution between classes. Declining and contracting states are incapable of creating new programs and positions or even paying existing officials, while patrons with declining resources become increasingly unwilling and unable to sustain distributions to their clients.

Summary

This chapter has discussed issues of post-independence nation building in Africa. However, many African states were liberated from colonial rule in the 1960's they have been facing problems of establishing the expected democratic system, development, and peace and security at large. Most of them were failed states. These have in turn been arising from mistaken nation building process and approaches. In addition, there is a gap in understanding state building and nation building since they are not synonyms as discuss above. Accordingly, in the aftermath of liberation many African governments were dictator and many civil wars have erupted like the Hutu-Tutsi Ruwanda genocide, Biafra in Nigera, Katanga in DRC and so forth.

Many challenges have been identified for the problems of post-colonial nation building in Africa. These can be understood as internal and external factors. Pertaining to this, the first and major challenges are colonial legacies that have been imitated by many newly independent African governments and leaders. In addition, as many argued that the multi-disconnectedness: disconnectedness from the past, disconnectedness from the people, and amoral character of African people has been challenging African nation building. Moreover, the approaches of nation building taken by many African leaders are best illustrated and exposed to the patrimonial theory, Monopolization theory, the Comprador theory. Finally ethnicity and the nature of political parties also a challenge for many Africans so far.

Review Questions

Part I: Matching

A	B
1. Patrimonial theory	A. Personal rule
2. Monopolistic theory	B. foreign domination
3. Comprador theory	C. a state unable to provide its basic its duties like security,
4. Failed state	D. Bureaucratic monopolization

Part III: Short answer and Essay

1. Discuss the following:
   A. State building and nation building
   B. Weak state/nation/ and failed state/nation/
2. Discuss how colonial legacies have been challenging post-independence nation building in Africa.
3. What approaches of nation building that many Africans adopted in the after math of independence?
4. Discuss the major challenges of nation building in Africa.
5. Discuss the nature of African governments and the nature of political parties in post-colonial Africa.
6. Mention and discuss civil wars erupted in different African states in the post-colonial period.

CHAPTER FIVE

POLITICAL PROCESS AND POLITICAL CHANGE

Introduction

Dear student, Well come to this chapter! This chapter is important because it will equip you with political changes and regime evolutions that have been taking place in Africa after the colonial periods. This chapter begins with a brief review of the legacy of colonial rule and the types of regimes that were emerged during the process of decolonization in the continent. It then examines the trend towards authoritarian rule and the reasons for the prevalence of the one-party state as the dominant idiom of post-colonial politics. Finally, in this chapter, political changes and various modes of political changes in Africa will be discussed one by one. Excellent reading!

Objectives of the Chapter

After successful completion of this chapter student will able to:

- Explain what is regime and the process of regime evolution in post-colonial Africa
- Identify various types of regime in post-colonial Africa
- Describe differences among various types of regime in Africa
- Explain political process and patterns of political change in post-colonial Africa
- Define political change and political process in post-colonial Africa
- Distinguish various form of political changes in post-colonial Africa

5.1 Regimes Definition

Dear student, what do you mean by regime? Please write your answer on the following space

_____

_____

_____

_____

Focus: **A regime denotes a form of rule which is determined by the actual holders of office within government and operates on the basis of established procedures and institutional arrangements for the management of public affairs.**

A regime is a more durable form of political organization than a specific government, but is generally less permanent than a state. Hence a government may change, for example through defeat in an electoral contest, but the character of the regime (e.g. liberal democratic) can remain intact.

The character of a regime is determined by five basic elements: Who rules? Individual or group, civilian or military control of executive authority? Within what limits and what scope? Degree of responsiveness to popular pressure, power to enforce dictates. In the name of what ends. Its ideological orientation. By direct or individual means? Does its source of legitimacy stem directly from the people or is it subject to the will of a personal ruler? Under what conditions and constraints? How far do economic or geo-political factors shape the form of the regime? In the following section regime evolution in post-colonial Africa will be discussed.

5.2. Regime Evolution in Post-Colonial Africa

Brainstorm: Discuss how various form of regimes were evolved in post-colonial Africa. Use the following blank space to write your answer:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

The founders of the post-colonial African states were often charismatic individuals who believed that they had earned the right to rule by virtue of their prominence in the struggle against

colonialism. Most of them shared two overriding objectives: to achieve the goals of modernization, thereby fulfilling popular expectations, and to maintain themselves in office. Nationalist leaders also shared an implicit belief in the ease of engineering social change once representative institutions had been established within a liberal democratic framework. They hoped that their people would shed preexistent ethnic allegiances and identify wholeheartedly with the modern, secular values of the post-colonial state.

However, there was greater differentiation in the character of nationalist movements than was originally realized in the 1960s, and this conditioned the form of rule in the post-colonial period. For instance, there was a striking difference between nationalist movements which achieved independence through a peaceful transfer of power and revolutionary nationalist movements which achieved independence through protracted military struggle. Many nationalist leaders were wedded to socialist ideologies which inclined them towards the one-party state, ranging from the populist African socialism espoused by Presidents Nyerere of Tanzania and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana through to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine favored by the regimes which came to power in Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia in the mid-1970s.

Contrary to the expectations of the more optimistic observers, the experience of liberal democracy in independent Africa proved to be short-lived. Within a few years of achieving independence, the trend had shifted in favour of authoritarianism, with the elimination of political competition and the creation of one-party states either by constitutional fiat or by military takeover. In several countries, elected governments were responsible for eliminating democracy by means of what Diamond (1988a) terms 'executive coups'. In Senegal this process found expression in the gradual erosion of legislative authority, the concentration of executive power and the outlawing of opposition parties. In Ghana, a highly centralized presidential system was legitimized by a national referendum in 1960 which laid the basis for an increasingly repressive one-party state headed by Kwame Nkrumah. Milton Obote in Uganda accomplished the transition to authoritarian rule by changing the constitution and crushing the political opposition through the use of force.

The shift towards authoritarianism from the mid-1960s was justified on the grounds that a strong central state was necessary in order to further the objectives of nation-building and economic

modernization, especially in view of ethnic and communal divisions. Traditional forms of decision-making which laid stress on patrimonial authority were also used as a justification for the one-party state. Such views found ready support among academic observers of various ideological hues who believed that Western democratic forms were inappropriate or at least unrealistic in view of the absence of pre-conditions such as widespread literacy and industrializations. In one way or the other the demise of democratic government in Africa raises questions about its failure to thrive.

5.3. Regime Types and Their Variations

***Brainstorming questions**: Dear student, reflect on the following terms.*

- ***Authoritarian regime***
- ***Military regime***
- ***Afro-Marxist regime***
- ***Socialist regime***
- ***Populist regime***
- ***Democratic regime***

In post-colonial Africa, there were wide-ranging types of regimes which differ from one another in so many ways. In the following sections, these types of regimes are discussed one by one:

5.3. 1. Authoritarian Regime

Brainstorm: Discuss the difference between authoritarian regimes and democratic regimes on the spaces provided.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Authoritarianism is a regime which is based on an established system of authority, rather than on consent. It is founded on the beliefs that people need authority and authority is not the outcome but the pre-condition of consent. Authoritarianism also defines a particular form of regime, or philosophy that advocates such a form, where rulers impose their values on society by force irrespective of people's wishes. It includes fascism, communism, military dictatorships and most single-party regimes. Bureaucratic authoritarianism is a political system where rules and

regulations are implemented by a trained hierarchy of professionals in alliance with military or civilian rulers who are not subject to public accountability. Populist authoritarianism is sometimes used to describe a form of. Authoritarian rule which permits controlled mobilization in support of a populist political agenda. It contrasts with paternalism which is a benign system of traditional authority founded on norms and codes of conduct defined by hereditary rule. Depending on the power the means by which the power is employed, it is possible to divide authoritarian regimes as follows:

- **Patron-Clientism**

Patronage is defined as the power and the acknowledged right of a political authority to appoint people to positions of responsibility in line with its own opinion, preference or interest. The choice made by the authority is discretionary and is based on trust, loyalty and political affinity rather than on political skill. Extended and uncontrolled patronage can lead to a misuse of public resources in the form of corruption. In degenerative political situations, the term pre-bendalism has been used to describe a pattern of competition for public resources where the state is at the centre for economic advancement, and state offices are used for the benefit of patrons and clients.

Clientelism *is* a term used to describe informal power relations between individuals or groups in unequal positions, based on the exchange of benefits i.e. patron-client relations. Clientelism in traditional societies occurs where a person with higher status (the patron) takes advantage of their authority and resources to protect and benefit somebody with inferior status (the client) who reciprocates with support and services. Patron-client relations are based on vertical linkages of a personal and affective nature, where the patron relies on prestige and the client demonstrates gratitude and devotion. In complex societies Clientelism operates through more intricate horizontal relationships involving organizations. Patrons act as brokers who establish the connection between the central power which distributes the resources, and the masses who reciprocate. Patrons control political organizations and allocate public resources (employment, material and social benefits), while clients reciprocate with political support. This type of clientelism relies on a political machine led by a boss who plays the role of a broker and a political leader.

- **Corporatism**

Corporatism refers to the incorporation of favored groups indecision making processes, especially in the area of state intervention in the economy and social welfare, in which interest groups representing economic producers and providers of services are given privileged access to an informal bargaining process over public policies. In exchange for this privileged position, interest groups guarantee the compliance of their members to the agreed policies. In authoritarian regimes (especially in Latin America) corporatist institutions permit the disciplining and control of labour, while offering protection to national industrial interests from international competition. Associations deemed legitimate by the state act as intermediaries between the state and economic producers, but there are constraints on independent interest group activity.

5.3.2. Authoritarian Regime Based on Personal Rule

Brainstorming question: Dear student discuss types of personal rule

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Jackson and Rosberg (1982:1) maintain that personal rule is the defining characteristic of African regimes: Jackson and Rosberg (1982) see the key features of personal rule as follows: The absence of effective institutionalized rules and the establishment of a political game in which individuals and factions struggle for power and place and not one in which groups and parties compete for policies. Patron-client relationships between rulers and ruled in which support is achieved by financial rewards and access to power and privileged positions and is generally isolated from wider political processes and participation. Uncontested supremacy with personal rulers are seldom subject to constitutional time limits on their incumbency, but enjoying unrivalled power, prestige, wealth and honor. Inherently authoritarian rule, monopolizing power,

eliminating constitutional checks and balances, centralizing state power and limiting political rights (though not usually the right to possess private property or religious freedom).

Moreover, under such conditions, the head of state dominates political and cultural life. Strategic positions in the police, the military and the bureaucracy are filled by individuals loyal to him, especially close relatives and those attracted by the spoils of office, with a loyal armed force used to bolster personal rule when legitimacy is weak (Sandbrook, 1985). On this basis Jackson and Rosberg (1982) identify four generic types of personal rule: princely, autocratic, prophetic and tyrannical.

- **Princely and Autocratic Rule**

Princely and autocratic rule are both characterized by caution and conservatism in the use of state power, but they differ in their relations with elite groups. The Prince (such as Senghor of Senegal) rules jointly with other oligarchs to cultivate their loyalty, co-operation and support, and presides over preferential access to state resources, but prevents other leaders emerging as serious challengers. In contrast, the Autocrat (personified by Life-President Banda of Malawi) dominates the oligarchy and the state without having to share its resources with others. As Jackson and Rosberg observe (1982:78): 'Where the Prince presides and rules, the Autocrat commands and manages; the country is his estate ...'. In a manner reminiscent of the absolutist monarchies of Europe, the Autocrat wields complete discretionary power, but maintains a close identity with the populace, however contrived, in order to fend off potential rivals.

- **Prophetic Rule**

Prophetic rule is associated with political visionaries who set out to reshape societies in ways consistent with their ideology, which is usually grounded in populist socialism. Charisma is an essential trait of prophetic rule, which favours dirigiste policies for guiding state policy and cultivating the support of others. In this conception, Nkrumah or Nyerere are examples of the archetypal Prophet. When prophetic rule fails, usually through a lack of economic and political resources, disappointment and cynicism set in, and the political legitimacy of the regime is weakened, which makes it susceptible to overthrow.

- **Tyranny**

Tyranny is the most extreme version of personal rule; the dictatorial regimes of Amin, Nguema and Bokassa fall into this category, where repression and terror are used to enforce control. Such leaders exercise maximum power and resort to socio-economic patronage and outright plunder of state resources to reinforce their absolute dominance (Decalo, 1985).

5.3.2. Polyarchic Regime

Polyarchy is defined as a regime where political leaders are responsive to the wishes of the people by means of free and fair elections, with freedom for opposition, a separation of powers with an independent judiciary, and the institutionalized rule of law. It is further premised on the existence of a participatory political culture and a relatively egalitarian social structure. In the African context, where such conditions generally do not prevail, both semi-competitive and pluralist regimes are included within this category, which is offered in preference to the term democracy which is considers to be value-laden and-too' closely tied to Western political norms.

The term polyarchy is sometimes used in preference to democracy to avoid Western normative overtones, in societies where there is a relatively egalitarian social structure and a high degree of political participation. It implies that political leaders are responsive to the majority of the citizenry by free and fair elections, freedom of thought and organization, the possibility of a legal opposition, a separation of powers with an independent judiciary and the institutionalized rule of law. The degree of democracy is a function of the extent to which the political power of the elite is minimized and that of the non-elite maximized. It can be measured on the basis of the indicators of political liberties (press freedom, freedom of group opposition, government sanctions or ability to curtail political activities) and of popular sovereignty, which includes the fairness of elections, and the processes of executive and legislative selection. Democratic transition (or democratization) is used to describe the process by which countries move from authoritarian rule to democracy. This involves the creation of appropriate institutions, agreement over rules and procedures, and constitutional guarantees over basic political freedoms.

5.3.3. Socialist Regime

Brainstorm: Discuss the difference between socialist regimes and Afro-Marxist regimes on the spaces provided.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Socialist regimes are associated with single-party structures, centralized government and an ideology which emphasizes national self-reliance and an egalitarian social order. In such regimes both freedom of expression and pluralistic forms of organization are curtailed. African socialist regimes (such as Tanzania) and Marxist- Leninist regimes (Angola, Ethiopia (Dergue) and Mozambique) are both included within this category, although these are distinguished from the former totalitarian regimes in Eastern Europe by virtue of their relatively underdeveloped condition and lack of effective social control. Media tend to be highly regulated. Such regimes enforce their legitimacy through repressive measures, although some rely on an element of popular support, usually for a charismatic leader. The class base of authoritarian regimes is narrow and they are ideologically inclined towards a capitalist market economy.

The period 1969 to 1975 saw the emergence of African Marxist regimes—many of them military—which adopted Marxism-Leninism as the state ideology. However, in general, the self-proclaimed "Marxist" African leaders did not genuinely believe in this ideology but simply used it an instrument of political domination and control of the people. The African countries (and leaders) who adopted this ideology were Angola (Agostinho Neto and José Eduardo dos Santos); Benin (Mathieu Kérékou); Congo-Brazzaville (Marien Ngouabi, Joachim Yhombi-Opango, and Denis Sassou-Nguesso); Ethiopia (Mengistu Haile Mariam); Guinea-Bissau (Luís Cabral and João Bernardo Vieira); Madagascar (Didier Ratsiraka); Mozambique (Samora Machel and Joaquim Chissano); Namibia (Sam Nujoma); Somalia (Mohammed Siad Barre); and Zimbabwe (Robert Mugabe), 1980–1995. Marxism as a state ideology was officially abandoned everywhere in Africa by 1996.

5.3.4. Afro-Marxism Regime

Afro-Marxism refers to the adoption by postcolonial governments in Africa of Marxist-style models of social and economic development supported through links with Communist Party–led governments such as the Soviet Union and Cuba. Afro-Marxism is characterized by centralized political decision making, typically within a one-party state, economic collectivization or nationalization of productive property and industry, and the direction of a national culture, often without regard for the cultures of ethnic minorities, by the ruling party. It is to be distinguished from *African socialism*, which refers to the perspective that traditional African communities exhibit characteristics, including social relations and sharing of resources that reflect a form of indigenous socialism based on local communal organization and practices. African socialism offered an alternative to the "scientific" or authoritarian socialism of Afro-Marxism, which was based on models borrowed from Soviet or Maoist regimes. For many Africans involved in liberation movements and struggles against colonialism, Marxism, especially the example of the Russian Revolution (1917), offered a model for the launching of economic and political revolutions.

This revolutionary model, in which a seizure of national power provides a lever for rapid industrialization, held great appeal throughout the twentieth century within numerous newly liberated African countries. As postcolonial governments looked for means by which to "catch up" with the industrial might of the former colonial powers, the approach of socialism, especially statist socialism or Marxism, seemed to provide both a potentially effective political program and an ideological justification for statist reorganization of the economy. It seemed to offer a distinct alternative to the exploitative and oppressive political economic regimes of imperialist rule.

The history of such movements in Africa dates especially to the movements against colonialism from the middle or late twentieth century. Important examples of Afro-Marxist movements and systems include the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) and the Liberation Front of Mozambique (FRELIMO), which took power in those former Portuguese colonies in 1975. Between 1974 and 1991 a socialist government under Lieutenant Colonel Haile Mengitsu ruled Ethiopia. In addition, numerous Marxist parties and organizations have been active in several African countries, including South Africa, where the South African Communist Party played a significant part in the downfall of the apartheid regime.

Among the most notable proponents of Afro-Marxism are Amilcar Cabral (Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde), Samora Machel (Mozambique), Michel Micombero (Burundi), Agostinho Neto (Angola), and Thomas Sankara (Burkina Faso). Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, who took power in 1980 through an armed struggle movement deploying some elements of Marxist-Leninist ideology, has positioned himself as a defender of African autonomy from Western corporate interests while subjecting his population, especially the poor and his political opponents, to ongoing repression and punishment. Afro-Marxism played an important part in bringing about the end of the apartheid regime in South Africa. Angolan (MPLA) forces, backed by Cuban troops along with forces of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), pushed back the South African forces that invaded Angola.

The stalemate forced the South African government to take part in negotiations that eventually led to the independence of Namibia and indeed played a major part in the collapse of the apartheid regime in 1994. Afro-Marxism held out a promise of self-sufficiency, equality, economic development, and prosperity. In practice, most examples of Afro-Marxism failed to deliver much in any of these areas. Also, many leaders who had advocated the more moderate African socialism fell back on authoritarian forms of Soviet-style government when attempting to implement their policies. Economic development primarily directed wealth into the hands of the new elite, which consisted of leading members of the ruling party.

Western versions of socialism, especially Soviet-inspired systems, were often inapplicable to the specific social circumstances of less industrialized countries, whose labor base was often concentrated in agricultural or resource-extractive industries. Similarly, Afro-Marxism failed to draw on local governance practices to organize social and productive life and instead relied on the centralized statist models of Sovietism.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the Soviet systems in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and early 1990s, along with the passing of Maoism and China's embrace of capitalism by the late twentieth century, all dealt severe blows to Afro-Marxist regimes. The loss of aid and trade ties with the Soviet economies left Marxist governments in Africa desperate for aid from Western capitalist governments and international financial organizations like the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. At the same time, China maintains aid and investment in many African countries and seeks to expand its influence on the continent. China's financial connection with

the regime in Sudan has been highly criticized by human rights activists and commentators. While China has attempted to develop its influence, it has not supported or encouraged the development of communist regimes or parties as the Soviet Union did. Governments also became more vulnerable to the pressures of Western governments and institutions to accept structural adjustment programs, including the privatization of government works and lands

5.3.5. Military Regimes

Their salient features are a high degree of centralization, often accompanied by marked personal rule, with a no-party system in which organized interests have limited influence. Ideologically, such regimes may display a preference for socialist-style centralized planning or for a market economy. Yet few military regimes retain these characteristics for any length of time. Some limit their role to handing over power to a popularly elected civilian regime. Where military leaders seek to institutionalize their rule they may opt for a single-party system, either with authoritarian features or follow the socialist model. Military regimes which are unsuccessful in engineering such a transition or fail to establish a broader base of legitimacy are susceptible to being deposed by a rival armed group, often resulting in continued political instability. Such regimes, which Berg-Schlosser notes are the predominant type in sub-Saharan Africa, he terms *praetorian* (cf. Huntington, 1965).

5.3.6. Populist Regime

Populism is associated with regimes which seek to ground themselves in popular legitimacy by encouraging political participation, usually through mass organizations (trade unions, women's and youth associations, etc.) and sometimes through the ballot-box. Such regimes are party-based, generally to the exclusion of organized opposition groups (in the single-party form), and often highly personalized. They tend to evoke self-reliance and favor an egalitarian social order, drawing on a rosy interpretation of pre-colonial history (as in African socialism) or the virtues of a shared African identity (pan-Africans or negritude).

Emerging in the early 1980s, African populism borrows elements of both African socialism and Marxism-Leninism, and places the people at the center of democracy and development in Africa. Its main policy is to satisfy the basic needs of the peasantry, the largest and poorest social class in Africa. African populist regimes advocate popular democracy and people-centered

development. African populist regimes include Burkina Faso (Thomas Sankara); Ghana (Jerry Rawlings); Libya (Muammar Qaddafi) since 1977; and Zimbabwe (Robert Mugabe) since 1995).

5.3.7 Pluralist Regime

Pluralism refers to a form of rule which is premised on a distribution of political power among several institutions, with a diversity of associations in civil society which channel a multiplicity of concerns, values and interests to the state for deliberation and resolution. It is generally (but not necessarily) associated with competitive multi-party elections, a clear separation of powers, an independent judiciary and an active legislature which holds the executive accountable for its actions. Pluralism encourages a healthy respect for social and cultural diversity (traditional customs, religious and moral beliefs), political openness and the protection of civil liberties.

5.3.8 Democracy

Literal meaning is rule by the people, rather than by any section, class or interest. It is synonymous with popular rule and as such itis distinct from rule by the one (monarchy and autocracy), or several (aristocracy and oligarchy). Democracy in the West was deeply contested and was the product of a process of struggle. It was concerned with fostering the accountability of rulers to their subjects through the introduction of checks on the arbitrary use of power, agreed rules and procedures, and a separation of powers between the executive and the legislature. At a later stage (as liberal democracy) it became linked with universal franchise, competitive elections and equality before the law, enshrined within a formal constitution. With the struggles for independence in colonial states, democracy became associated with collective self-determination rather than with the actuality of self-government. New nations often declared themselves as democratic on achieving independence (people's democracies or republics).

Liberal democracy is a form of rule where the powers of government are limited by law and citizens enjoy freedom of association to compete for office in free elections at regular intervals. There is a distinction between direct democracy where all citizens participate in decision-making and representative democracy where people elect representatives who then take decisions on their behalf. There is a view that democracy is not confined to the political sphere; it can be extended into the economic and social spheres, to encompass production, property and class

relations. Liberal democrats want to preserve the boundary between the state and individual liberty and property, and emphasize capitalism's free market contractual relations as a model for, and prerequisite, of democratic political life. Egalitarian democrats by contrast focus their attention on equity and social justice as a foundation for democracy.

5.4. Regime Types and Political Change

Political change can take different directions, not all of which necessarily lead to a change in political regime. These changes may affect any of the aforementioned dimensions of political regimes: pluralism and political competition, effective government performance, and political rights and civil liberties. It is thus possible to identify seven types of political change processes: democratization, autocratization, democratic regression, political liberalization, authoritarian progression, democratic deepening, and democratic consolidation.

Brainstorming questions**: **Dear student, reflect on the following terms:

- ***Democratization***
- ***Autocratization,***
- ***Democratic regression,***
- ***Political liberalization,***
- ***Authoritarian progression,***
- ***Democratic deepening,***
- ***Democratic consolidation***

Democratization

Democratizatio**n** entails a transition from an authoritarian regime to a democratic one. Democratization occurs when four conditions are met: there must be sufficient agreement on the procedures for electing a government; the government must have come to power as the result of a free and popular vote; the government must have de facto authority to generate new policies; and the new legislative, executive and judicial powers must not have to share power with other actors (such as the military or religious leaders).

Autocratization

Second, unlike democratization, **autocratization** entails the transition from a democratic regime to an authoritarian one. This occurs due to the arbitrary exercise of power and/or the placement of considerable restrictions on political competition and/or political rights and civil liberties.

Democratic Regression

Democratic regression entails the loss of certain democratic qualities without, however, losing the substantive democratic core (competitive elections, effective political opposition, guaranteed rights and freedoms for a large majority). A regime can go from being a full democracy to a defective one due to interference in political decision-making by actors not subject to democratic control or the limitation of the rights and freedoms of minorities (whether political, ethnic or religious).

Political Liberalization

Political liberalization occurs in authoritarian contexts. It involves an easing of political re-pression and an expansion of political rights and civil liberties, without fully guaranteeing them. Political liberalization does not necessarily signify the start of a democratic transition. It can lead to a shift from a hegemonic authoritarian regime to a quasi-competitive one through expanded political competition. However, often, the political reforms carried out do not change the type of political regime.

Authoritarian progression

Authoritarian progression entails a deepening of the authoritarian nature of the regime, which may exercise power more discretionally and even further restrict political competition and the exercise of political rights and civil liberties. It can occur in any category or subcategory of an authoritarian regime.

Democratic Deepening

Democratic deepening refers to an improvement in the quality of the democracy. It does not in itself entail a change of political regime, as the regime was already democratic prior to the political changes; however, it can lead to a shift from a defective democracy to a full one.

Democratic Consolidation

Democratic consolidation entails the anchoring of democratic values, institutions and practices and, thus, the legitimation of a democratic regime (Morlino, 2009: 116). Therefore, it is a process that takes place over time and within the framework of a full democracy.

5.5. Political Transitions and Patterns of Change

Brainstorm: define political process and political change and offer their basic differences. Write your answer on the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

Post-colonial history of Africa has been marked by some dramatic and significant changes on the continent's political terrain. These changes have been as varied as they have been contradictory. A more careful, historically grounded interpretation of these changes is important to understand the changing nature of political landscape in contemporary history of Africa. In this chapter different types of political process and political changes will be discussed.

Brainstorming questions: what is political change and when does it occur?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Political change occurs when the rulers in a country lose power or the type of governance in the country changes. Governance is the type of system used to rule a country. Examples of types of governance would be democracy and monarchy. Political change is a normal function of internal and external politics. Rulers will be voted out, retire, or die while in power, and the new leader will make changes.

Political and social change refers to the varying change in human behavior and institutions, in response to stimuli from society and the power relations between social groups. What then is change? What makes it necessary? What are the different forms of change? Change is the different in process, form and structure in response to certain stimuli or factors. Therefore, political and social changes are caused by certain factors or reasons in which men struggle to effect change with the hope that it will make life better for the majority of people living in society. If politics is defined as "who gets What, When and how", the political change has to do with changes in who gets what, when and how. Changes in human behavior towards constituted authority, in the state, in leadership, in political institutions and structures. Therefore, a change in government is a form of political change, just as a change in form of government, for instance, change from a Monarchical regime to a Republican regime is a form of political change, just as independence from colonial rule. Social change, is a much wider concept, used in referring to very important changes in human societies, human behavior – his values, his culture, his norms and inter-group relations, and human organizations all in response to a given set of stimuli. Social change is pervasive, leading to fundamental changes in a people's life, their attitudes, expectations and goals. In some cases, social change takes place alongside political change in what is often called a Revolution but at times it does not.

5.6. Mode of Political Change

There are two broad forms of change, politically and socially speaking, violent and non-violent change.

***Brainstorming questions**: Dear student, reflect on the following terms or phrases*

- *Violent Changes*
- *Peaceful Change*
- *Coup D'état*
- *Revolution*
- *Internal Political Change*
- *External Political Change*

5.6.1. Violent Changes

Violent change is often viewed as an illegal, unconstitutional act and bloody method of effecting change. Examples are military coup d'etat, mass insurrection or uprisings involving the use of fire-arms, and mass revolution. Such changes were common in the 18th and 19th century Europe, the classic French and American Revolutions, and the 1917 Great October Socialist Revolution which took place in Russia turning it from a semi-feudal backward empire into a socialist superpower within a period of forty years. In the 20th Century the bulk of violent changes have occurred in the Third World countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America which are struggling to embark on the path of development.

5.6. 2. Peaceful Change

Peaceful change on the other hand is change that does not involve any violence or the spilling of blood. It often takes the form of constitutional changes through the ballot box or the electoral process. It follows laid down procedures and relies often on the goodwill of the people concerned and a desire to abide by the wishes of the majority. Thus, governments can be changed peacefully through the ballot box, and government officials removed in accordance with the popular will. Such change also involves the use of peaceful demonstrations, petitions, campaigns and moral persuasion to demand for change. Such acts are common in the industrialized countries such as France, England, U.S. A., Japan, etc.

Revolution or violent change is often the 'revolution from below' often carried out by and justified in the name of the oppressed and exploited majority who seek to break the chains of bondage and regain their freedom and dignity. According to W.F. Wetheim, "Revolution is aimed at the overthrow of an existing social order and of a prevalent power structure.' Thus, it is a process of socio-political transformation or change which must be differentiated from a coup d'etat, strike or acts of assassination. Since the coup d'etat is aimed primarily at political change i.e. a change in the political leadership, it is not a revolution.

The Differences between Coup D'etat and Revolution

Coup D'etat	**Revolution**
Mainly to effect political change in leadership.	To effect socio-political change, i.e. social transformation
Highly, enclavistic, the work of a clique of conspirators working secretly to overthrow an existing government or existing individuals in a government.	The result of popular mobilization of an oppressed people over a period of time, with a large scale organization, strategy and tactics.
Relies mainly on the Armed Forces and public sympathy	The target is often to overthrow existing socio-political and economic order. It often relies on the people and the Vanguard Party or Mass Movement
Could be the result of external forces and intervention on behalf of, and in support of local allies, e.g. U.S intervention in Chile, and Grenada, Tanzania's, intervention in Uganda, in order to toust Idi Amin.	Mainly the result of internal factors mainly social frustration, corruption, poverty, dictatorship, oppression. But receive inspiration from successful revolution, elsewhere.
Relies on circumstance, change and elaborate planning with strategic places as targets – airports, seaports, radio/TV stations, military installations and communications network.	Carried out by threats, sabotage, propaganda or even armed insurrection. And often based on an ideology which is built around freedom, social justice, truth, equality and democracy, as an alternative to decadent status quo.

Can take place during period of wealth. Takes place at night to reduce the possibility of civilian causalities.	Exploits public frustration, can break out at any time
Leads mainly to reforms aimed at stabilizing the political system.	Leads to social transformation.

In addition, there are also another categorization of political changes: internal or external. You should realize, however, that both types of political change can occur at the same time to create a mixed political change.

5.6. 3. Internal Political Change

Internal political change is initiated by citizens of the country. It can be done through regular events, such as elections and rulers choosing to hand power over, or through irregular events, such as a coup d'etat or a rebellion. A coup d'etat is an illegal overthrow of the government that almost always involves the country's military. It differs from a rebellion by the personnel involved. Coups usually involve top political and/or military figures leading the overthrow while rebellions could be started by individuals with little to no power. Coups are also more likely to keep the style of governance or make minor changes while rebellions would be more likely to want major changes in governance.

5.6. 3.External Political Change

External political change is initiated by other countries. It is usually achieved through military threats or action but could occur through embargoes and/or withholding foreign aid. If it is achieved by the military, then a new leader will be placed in charge by the victorious, foreign power. The victorious country may also choose to change the style of governance as well.

Political changes can also occur when political, military, or rebellion leaders in a country receive support from a foreign country. The foreign country will likely talk to the leaders to ensure that the next leaders and/or style of governance is preferable. If it is, then the foreign power will supply weapons and other kinds of aid, such as money, naval blockades, military leadership training, and, as seen recently, airstrikes, to the leaders attempting to take power. This would be

preferable to an external political change to a foreign country because it is usually less expensive in terms of money and lives lost.

Review Questions

I. Write 'True' if the statement is correct and 'False' if the statement is incorrect.

1. A regime is a more durable form of political organization than a specific government.
2. All African nationalist movements have achieved their independence through peaceful means
3. Contrary to the expectations of the more optimistic observers, the experience of liberal democracy in independent Africa proved to be short-lived.
4. Authoritarianism is a regime which is based on an established system of authority, rather than on consent of the governed..
5. Political change occurs when the rulers in a country lose power or the type of governance in the country changes.

II. Match phrases listed under column 'A' with its respective meaning from column 'B'

'A'	'B'
1. Authoritarian Regime	A. Patron-clientelism
2. Liberal Democratic Regime	B. Advocate people centered development
3. Socialist Regime	C. Economic collectivization and Nationalization
4. Afro-Marxist Regime	D. Advocate national self-reliance and egalitarian order
5. Populist Regime	E. Power of government is limited by law

III. Discuss the differences between the following form of personal rule and associated them with African leaders in post-colonial period (1960s-1990s).

1. Princely and Autocratic
2. Prophetic and Tyrannical

IV. Define the following terms and phrases

1. Political change
2. Political process
3. Political opportunities
4. coup d'eta
5. Revolution

6. Revolution from below
7. Revolution from above
8. Violent political change
9. Peaceful political change
10. External and internal political Change

CHAPTER SIX

THE COLD WAR AND AFTER: IT'S IMPACT ON THE AFRICAN SOCIO-POLITICAL SYSTEMS

Introduction

The emergence of the Soviet Union and United States of America (USA) as superpowers, with a faithful of European supporters led to the escalation of hostility, tension, arms race and sometimes indirect confrontations. The unhealthy rivalry started in the 1940s and did not come to an end until the early 1990s. Throughout this period, the rivalry between the superpowers was played out in multi-scenarios: military coalition, ideology, psychology and espionage: sports, industrial and technological development, this also includes the space race, nuclear arms race, and many proxy wars. During this period, Africa was affected in the bid to gain more allies, apart from Europe. Most African nations experimented with socialism, communism and Nigeria voted for Non-aligned policy. Like the Second World War, Africa did not lose lands and territory, but they also suffered a setback in that experimentation. This will be discussed in full.

Unit objectives

At the end of this unit, learners should be able to discuss:

- the meaning of cold war
- the players in the cold war
- The impact of the Cold War on African socio-Political systems
- The nonalignment states in Africa
- The end of the cold war and the Emergence of Neo-Colonialism
- The African Debt Crisis
- The Era of Structural Adjustment
- Democracy and the continuation of Neo-Liberalism
- Democracy and the Emergence of Developmental State
- The Obstacles to Democratic Consolidation in Africa

6.1. The Cold War and Africa

Brainstorming question: Dear student what come to your mind when you hear the term Cold war?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Focus: The Cold War was a state of geopolitical tension after World War II between powers in the Eastern Bloc(the Soviet Union and its satellite states) and powers in the Western Bloc (the United States, its NATO allies and others).

Historians do not fully agree on the dates regarding the beginning and end of cold war. But a common timeframe is the period between 1947, the year the Truman Doctrine, a U.S. foreign policy pledging to aid nations threatened by Soviet expansionism, was announced, and either 1989, when communism fell in Eastern Europe, or 1991, when the Soviet Union collapsed. The term "cold" is used because there was no large-scale fighting directly between the two sides, but they each supported major regional wars known as proxy wars.

During the Cold War, the two sides in the superpower struggle were the United States of America(USA) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Russia (USSR) sometimes referred to as separate "worlds." The capitalist nations of the West were known as the First World (USA) while the communist countries of Eastern Europe were the Second World(USSR). Both sets of countries had advanced industrial economies and great economic and political power. In economic terms, they were considered developed countries.

To the contrary, most countries, however, fell into another category, called the Third World. Because these countries were in less advanced stages of economic development, they were known as developing countries. It was among the developing countries of the Third World that most Cold War conflicts called proxy war took place. Many Third World nations were caught in the middle of the superpower struggle. Some had clear ties to one side, but did not fully belong to either camp. Other countries had less defined loyalties. Many Third World countries had only

recently shaken off colonial rule. Others—such as those in Latin America—had been independent for longer but were still struggling. These nations faced many problems. Most suffered from conditions of extreme poverty and social inequality. Often, a small minority of citizens held most of the wealth and power. By controlling the reins of government, this upper class was able to stifle reforms that might help the poor and benefit the nation as a whole.

In the 1950s and 1960s, however, a number of nationalist leaders emerged in the Third World. These leaders wanted to build stronger, more developed countries. They also wanted to reduce the influence of foreign powers over their affairs. At the same time, they also needed aid and assistance from wealthier nations.

If a country accepted aid from one of the superpowers, though, it risked falling under that superpower's control. It also might prompt a hostile reaction from the other side. The country could become the target of covert actions or other measures designed to undermine the government and remove its leader. In this way, Third World nations were often squeezed between East and West and became a battleground in the superpower conflict.

The period saw the spread of communist ideology to Africa. The white minority rule in South Africa was afraid of communism. The collapse of single party rule in Eastern Europe created more fear in the minds of the apartheid regime. South Africa and Egypt were the first to embrace communism. The two countries had communist parties as early as 1920s. After 1945, Africa was caught between the crossfire of East and West confrontation – Cold War. Anti-Communism informed every aspect of South African government's foreign policy and much of the domestic policy.

6.1. The Communist versus the Western Power in Africa

Learning Activities:

- How relevant was this war to Africa?
- Discuss the ideological camps in Africa during the Cold War years.

At the start of the Cold War, when the East-West conflict had not yet assumed global proportions, most African governments faced a simple choice. Close, stable ties with Western patrons would guarantee their domestic position. This was the most they could hope for. The Eastern Bloc countries did not present a realistic alternative. They were not interested in Africa and were in any case not in a position to provide the degree of support available from the West.

In the mid-1970s, this started to change. While the United States declined in stature due to its problems in Vietnam, the Soviet Union stepped up its activities worldwide. By this time, there were plenty of opportunities for it to intervene in Africa's internal affairs: the struggle for independence in the Portuguese colonies was reaching a climax and the revolution in Ethiopia was destabilizing the entire Horn of Africa. In this period of mounting tension between East and West, African governments sometimes had a serious choice to make between patrons. In the Horn of Africa, the situation produced a real renversement des alliance: Ethiopia and Somalia simply switched allegiance from one superpower to the other. But there was also scope for governments to sit on the fence, though it required a tricky political balancing act.

In a few places in Africa, the Soviet Union and its vassal states provided extensive military support. Overall, however, their influence over the continent remained very limited. The Eastern Bloc simply did not have the resources to compete successfully with the West so far from home. The West (particularly France) continued to invest in multifaceted relationships with Africa, including not just military and financial support, but also economic, monetary, political, cultural and development assistance. The African authorities were able to use this support to maintain the internal stability of their countries, frequently in a way that permitted them to line their own pockets.

The inability of the Eastern Bloc to offer a serious alternative to the West was a blow to many African governments. Given the history of colonialism, it is not surprising that there was much anti-Western and pro-socialist rhetoric in Africa during the Cold War, even if such rhetoric largely ignored the material existence of continuing close ties with the West and a virtual absence of new ties with the East. There was, however, widespread support for the socialist model of state-centered, planned development. The West was unconcerned. In the eyes of Western strategists, whose attention was absorbed by the global conflict between East and West, the application of this model of development in Africa presented no threat to political stability or security. And, indeed, there was some support in the West for the idea that it might sometimes be better for development not to follow the capitalist Western model. This is why it was possible for new African socialist ‘people's republics’ (including some in the relatively stable countries that had once been French colonies) to remain within the Western sphere of influence.

The level of ideological commitment or interest in socialist doctrine varied among all the different governments and movements which received Soviet military aid. But for many leaders, it made more sense to evolve an African form of socialism, drawing on African traditions than following the footsteps of the Soviet Union. **See table below**.

African Governments Which Received Diplomatic or Military Support From The Soviet Union	
Angola	Under Agostinho Neto and Eduardo dos Santos
Mozambique	Under Samora Machel
Guinea Bissau	Under Amilcar Cabral
Congo (Conakry)	Became a Marxist Leninist state in 1970, under Major Ngouabi
Egypt	Under Gamel Abdel Nasser in 1954 – 69
Somalia	Under Siad Barre. Allied in 1969, but soon changed sides to become violently anti-Soviet. During the Cold War period, it was the only government to do so under the same leader in Africa
Ethiopia	Under Mengistu Haile Mariam, following the revolution in 1974.
Uganda	Briefly under Milton Obote in 1969.
Benin	Declared a Marxist Leninist state in 1974, under Mathieu Kerekou.

6.1.1. Superpower Rivalry in the Horn of Africa: Ethiopia versus Somalia

Brainstorming question: Dear students write the consequence of super power rivalry on Ethiopia and Somalia? Write your answer on the space provide:

_____

_____

_____

_____

In 1956, with Egypt's nationalization of the Suez Canal and the ensuing international crisis, the Red Sea and the Horn of Africa regained the strategic importance they had possessed almost a hundred years earlier. The United States could not leave the defense of the region to Western Europe, even though the French already had a strong military presence in little Djibouti. Washington's attention focused in particular on Ethiopia, where Emperor Haile Selassie showed

himself an enthusiastic champion of close relations between Ethiopia and America. Substantial American military support would protect Ethiopia from Somali aggression and would at the same time guarantee the presence of a Western military base in this strategically vital region.

But immediately after independence in 1960, Somalia also applied for American support. Economic aid was granted, but military assistance was withheld in order to avoid disturbing the balance of power between Somalia and Ethiopia. But this was precisely what the leaders in Mogadishu wanted to do. Accordingly, they seized the opportunity provided by the Cold War and in 1963they played the Soviet card. The Somali government offered to promote Soviet interests in the region if the Russians would give Somalia the extra military muscle it needed to expand its territory. At first Moscow responded cautiously, but eventually Soviet military assistance started to flow into Somalia.

In this way, Ethiopia and Somalia used the international tension between the superpowers in the interests of their mutual rivalry and created an arms race in the region. The increasing military build-up continued despite the 1969 coup in Somalia, which established a military regime under Siad Barre. Somalia did change its tactics, however. It no longer displayed direct aggression towards its neighbors but attempted to undermine them by supporting local Somali 'liberation movements'. Its expansionary rhetoric waned and public support for the military regime became less general. The new government tended to rely on the support of only a few clans, while playing the others off against each other. Ties with the Soviets remained intact. Somalia became a 'socialist republic' and in 1974, when Nikolai Podgorny became the first Soviet president ever to visit Africa, Somalia was the chosen destination.

Brainstorming question: What was the main reason for lieutenant Colonel Mengistu Hailemariam to terminate ties with the USA? Write your answer on the following space

_____

_____

_____

_____

That same year, however, regional stability was threatened by a coup in Ethiopia. Emperor Haile Selassie was dethroned and a military junta seized power. In 1977 Colonel Mengistu Haile Mariam personally liquidated his rivals during a shoot-out in military headquarters in Addis

Ababa, enabling himself to rule Ethiopia as a dictator. Mengistu belonged to a radical movement advocating a clean break with the Ethiopian past, including the country's ties with the United States. He embarked on a revolutionary socialist path towards complete modernization of the country. The Americans were expelled and approaches were made to the Soviets. For Moscow this was almost too much of a good thing. Because South Yemen had also turned to the Soviet Union, all the countries around the southern end of the Red Sea were now Russian allies, but there were major tensions between them. In an attempt to resolve these and to create an atmosphere of mutual cooperation within a large socialist federation, a conference was held in Aden under the chairmanship of the Cuban president, Fidel Castro.

The approach was doomed to fail. The Somalis saw no advantage in such cooperation because it meant they would have to give up the dream of national expansion which had been the reason for approaching Moscow in the first place. In desperation, when it became clear that the Soviet Union preferred Ethiopia to Somalia, Siad Barre decided to take pre-emptive action. By this time, Somalia had one of the largest armies in Africa (as indeed did Ethiopia). While Mengistu's attacks on political opponents and rivals (the 'Red Terror') were causing chaos in Ethiopia, Somalia expelled its Eastern Bloc military advisers and embarked on a stealthy but swift invasion of southeastern Ethiopia. In an impressive logistical feat, Moscow responded by transferring its military base from Berbera in Somalia via Aden in South Yemen to Ethiopia in the space of just a few days. Cuban soldiers were flown in to strengthen Ethiopia's defenses. By the end of 1977, Somalia was in possession of virtually the entire Ogaden, but the fruits of its conquest were mainly desert sand. The Somalis lacked the military might to strike at Ethiopia's heart and to end the war with a decisive victory.

Over the next few months, the roles were reversed. Ethiopia's Eastern Bloc support proved decisive: the Somali army was driven back over the border, losing almost all of its tanks and air power in the process. In a dramatic *renversement des alliances*, Somalia called on the Carter administration in Washington to supply military assistance. It drew a blank, spelling the final failure of the great Somali project after years of extraordinary effort. The country had failed to expand its territory, its huge army had been destroyed and no national development had been achieved. In the 1980s, Somalia would continue to receive economic assistance from the West (mainly from the United States and Italy), but – bereft of its dream of expansion – the state became mired ever deeper in clan rivalries.5

Despite its victory in the Ogaden, Ethiopia was little better off. All the resources of the destitute country were absorbed by its military, since it also had to engage in military action in the north in order to put down a secessionist uprising in Eritrea. Eritrea had originally been taken from Ethiopia by Italy but was returned to Ethiopian rule as a mandated territory following World War II. In 1962, Emperor Haile Selassie formally annexed it, in effect restoring the situation prior to 1880. However, the Eritreans resisted reintegration into the Ethiopian empire. Historically, Eritrea had been far more open to the outside world than more inward-looking, traditional' Ethiopia. Its period as an Italian colony had heightened the contrast between the two countries. Annexation by Ethiopia was a signal that peaceful secession was no longer possible and instantly prompted violent hostilities.

6.2. Impact of the Cold War on African Socio-Political Systems

Brainstorming question: Dear student write the impact of cold war on African on the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

The emergence of the Soviet Union and United States of America (USA) as superpowers, with a faithful of European supporters led to the escalation of hostility, tension, arms race and sometimes indirect confrontations. The unhealthy rivalry started in the 1940s and did not come to an end until the early 1990s. Throughout this period, the rivalry between the superpowers was played out in multi-scenarios: military coalition, ideology, psychology and espionage: sports, industrial and technological development, this also includes the space race, nuclear arms race, and many proxy wars. During this period, Africa was affected in the bid to gain more allies, apart from Europe. Like the Second World War, Africa did not lose lands and territory, but they also suffered a setback in that experimentation.

6.2.1. Political Impacts

Brainstorming question: Dear student write the political impact of cold war on African on the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

The Cold War had a major influence on Africa. Above all, it stabilized the patchwork of weak independent states. Most of the countries of Africa remained beyond the scope of tensions between the superpowers, even in the 1970s when these tensions boiled over in many other parts of the Third World. This positive effect was especially true of the ex-British and French colonies. These new countries enjoyed a relatively large measure of internal stability. This was partly due to the state structures built up during the colonial period, but the importance of their close continuing ties with their former colonial masters is undeniable. These meant that their leaders felt no need – and indeed had no chance – to turn to either of the superpowers. The only exception to the rule was Guinea, which deliberately broke off ties with France and was then, as it were, disowned by the West. In other former French colonies, like Benin and Congo (Brazzaville), the influence of the Cold War remained relatively slight. These countries borrowed their rhetoric and their economic policies from the Soviet Union but, since they received no material assistance from that quarter, they too remained within the Western sphere of influence and were not sucked into any serious East-West conflict. However, in the rest African countries there were wide-ranging impacts which are discussed below.

- **Delay in Granting Independence**

The situation was quite different in almost all parts of Africa which had not been colonized by France or Britain. This historical difference created special local conditions which left these areas exposed to the global struggle between East and West. The most important special condition of all was the delay in granting independence to the Portuguese colonies. Over the years, the nationalist movements in Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau drew military and other support from the Eastern Bloc, inevitably evoking a response from the West. The mounting struggle in the Portuguese colonies, with the Cold War shaping events behind the scenes, only

made it more difficult to reach the inescapable settlement in the form of independence. Both these (sometimes fierce) struggles for independence and the continual postponement of the transfer of power must be seen as consequences of the Cold War.

- **Politicization of Armed Forces and Militarization of Politics**

In the countries which were most directly influenced by the Cold War, another important consequence was the politicization of the armed forces and the militarization of politics. In the new African states, whose internal political structures were still relatively undeveloped, it was only to be expected that the military would become more involved in national politics if international tensions affected national security. The armed forces began to take a firmer stance on issues like the national budget. Their foremost aim was to secure sufficient funds to procure military equipment. But their influence frequently went further than that and could even extend to the whole of national politics.

Even without the stimulus that the Cold War provided, internal conditions in most African states favoured an expanding role for the military, whether its leaders were already part of the elite or had to muscle their way into the elite. The position of the civilian leaders was often quite vulnerable. Military commanders had inherited troops and equipment which were intended for maintaining law and order, but which could equally well be used to stage a coup d'état. There was thus considerable temptation for them to seize power, dramatically enhancing their own authority and that of their clients. Apart from their monopoly on international contacts, the civilian leaders had almost no means of staving off the military. However, the veneer of legitimacy that they could provide sometimes enable them to reach some kind of settlement with the armed forces, a settlement that offered both groups the advantages of exploiting the state. The growing importance of the military in turn had major repercussions for the fledgling political cultures of the African countries. It gave an authoritarian twist to politics, at the expense of human rights and nascent democratic institutions. It also meant that development ended up low on the list of national priorities.

6.2.2. Socio-economic Impacts: Underdevelopment of Social Sectors

Brainstorming question: Dear student write the Socio-Economic impact of cold war on African write your answer on the space provided below/

_____

_____

_____

_____

The Cold War damaged not only the political conditions of post-colonial Africa but also the socioeconomic development of the African countries that became most deeply involved. Military coups and other forms of political instability in themselves reduced the chances of healthy social development. Global tensions sometimes translated into increasing conflict between ethnic communities or clans in their struggle to control the state, or even just to hang on to a decent power position in their multi-ethnic society. And there was also, almost always, an inequitable distribution of government funding among sectors. Defence tended to receive the lion's share at the expense of the other, more development-oriented, sectors like education and health. The authorities often neglected their responsibility for development. Somalia was an extreme case of this widespread phenomenon. In those African countries drawn furthest into the Cold War, priorities shifted from development to security and military spending.

6.2.3. Security Impacts

Brainstorming question: Dear student write the security impact of cold war on African write your answer on the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

The Cold War also had major consequences for the security situation in Africa. Superpower rivalry increased the tension surrounding local conflicts, for example in the Horn of Africa and in the former Portuguese colonies in the south. Perhaps the rivalry between capitalism and communism in Africa (and elsewhere) served as a release valve for the aggression of the superpowers, unable as they were to engage each other directly in armed conflict in the presence

of the nuclear deterrent. The United States and the Soviet Union were careful to ensure that their own or allied armed forces did not find themselves ranged directly against each other: the fear of escalation was as effective a deterrent in Africa as it was elsewhere. After the Cold War, however, African actors would no longer be restrained by the superpowers and could settle their differences freely. Deterrence was followed in those years by a kind of decompression. But the end of Cold War rivalry also left room for a positive new trend: international cooperation aimed at resolving local conflicts. Southern Africa was to benefit greatly from this development.

6.2.4. Creation of Non- aligned Movement (NAM)

Brainstorming question: Dear student what were the main reason for the creation of Non-Aligned movement? Write your answer on the space provided below

_____

_____

_____

_____

African leaders were often aware of the dangers of excessive involvement in the global conflict between East and West. There was immediate and widespread interest in the deliberately neutral position advocated by the Non-Aligned Movement. This worldwide organization was the brainchild of the leaders of the newly independent countries in Asia, Africa, Latin America and other regions of the world and at the height of the Cold War. During the early days of the Movement, its actions were a key factor in the decolonization process, which led later to the attainment of freedom and independence by many countries and peoples and to the founding of tens of new sovereign States. Throughout its history, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has played a fundamental role in the preservation of world peace and security.

While some meetings with a third-world perspective were held before 1955, historians consider that the Bandung Asian-African Conference is the most immediate antecedent to the creation of the Non-Aligned Movement. This Conference was held in Bandung, Indonesia on April 18-24, 1955 and gathered 29 Heads of States belonging to the first post-colonial generation of leaders from the two continents with the aim of identifying and assessing world issues at the time and pursuing out joint policies in international relations. It was attended not only by prominent

figures like Sukarno of Indonesia, Jawaharlal Nehru of India and Chou En Lai of China, but also by Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana from African continent. In the years following this 'Afro-Asian' meeting in Bandung, ever more African countries are joined the movement.

The principles that would govern relations among large and small nations, known as the "Ten Principles of Bandung", were proclaimed at that Conference. Such principles were adopted later as the main goals and objectives of the policy of non-alignment.

The Principles of Bandung

The followings are the main principles of Bandung:

1. Respect of fundamental human rights and of the objectives and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
2. Respect of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
3. Recognition of the equality among all races and of the equality among all nations, both large and small.
4. Non-intervention or non-interference into the internal affairs of another country.
5. Respect of the right of every nation to defend itself, either individually or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
    - Non-use of collective defense pacts to benefit the specific interests of any of the great powers.
    - Non-use of pressures by any country against other countries.
6. Refraining from carrying out or threatening to carry out aggression, or from using force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
7. Peaceful solution of all international conflicts in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
8. Promotion of mutual interests and of cooperation.
9. Respect of justice and of international obligations.

The fulfillment of those principles became the essential criterion for Non-Aligned Movement membership; it is what was known as the "quintessence of the Movement" until the early 1990s. In 1960, in the light of the results achieved in Bandung, the creation of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was given a decisive boost during the Fifteenth Ordinary Session of the

United Nations General Assembly, during which 17 new African and Asian countries were admitted. A key role was played in this process by the then Heads of State and Government Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru of India, Ahmed Sukarno of Indonesia and Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, who later became the founding fathers of the movement and its emblematic leaders.

Six years after Bandung, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries was founded on a wider geographical basis at the First Summit Conference of Belgrade, which was held on September 1-6, 1961. The Conference was attended by 25 countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Yemen, Myanmar, Cambodia, Srilanka, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Lebanon, Mali, Morocco, Nepal, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, Yugoslavia. The Founders of NAM have preferred to declare it as a movement but not an organization in order to avoid bureaucratic implications of the latter. The membership criteria formulated during the Preparatory Conference to the Belgrade Summit (Cairo, 1961) show that the Movement was not conceived to play a passive role in international politics but to formulate its own positions in an independent manner so as to reflect the interests of its members.

Thus, the primary of objectives of the non-aligned countries focused on the support of self-determination, national independence and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States; opposition to apartheid; non-adherence to multilateral military pacts and the independence of non-aligned countries from great power or block influences and rivalries; the struggle against imperialism in all its forms and manifestations; the struggle against colonialism, neocolonialism, racism, foreign occupation and domination; disarmament; non-interference into the internal affairs of States and peaceful coexistence among all nations; rejection of the use or threat of use of force in international relations; the strengthening of the United Nations; the democratization of international relations; socioeconomic development and the restructuring of the international economic system; as well as international cooperation on an equal footing.

Since its inception, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has waged a ceaseless battle to ensure that peoples being oppressed by foreign occupation and domination can exercise their inalienable right to self-determination and independence. During the 1970s and 1980s, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries played a key role in the struggle for the establishment of a new international economic order that allowed all the peoples of the world to make use of their wealth and natural resources and provided a wide platform for a fundamental change in

international economic relations and the economic emancipation of the countries of the South.

During its nearly 50 years of existence, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has gathered a growing number of States and liberation movements which, in spite of their ideological, political, economic, social and cultural diversity, have accepted its founding principles and primary objectives and shown their readiness to realize them. Historically, the non-aligned countries have shown their ability to overcome their differences and found a common ground for action that leads to mutual cooperation and the upholding of their shared values. The Movement played an important role in the support of nations which were struggling then for their independence in the Third World and showed great solidarity with the most just aspirations of humanity. It contributed indisputably to the triumph in the struggle for national independence and decolonization, thus gaining considerable diplomatic prestige.

6.2.5. Creation of African Union (OAU)

Brainstorming question: Dear student write the reason behind the formation of OAU on the space provided below/

_____

_____

_____

_____

The desire of the African countries to occupy a distinct international position and to have their own political forum, separate from the great powers rivalry elsewhere in the world, was also expressed in the establishment of the OAU. This took place in 1963 in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The event demonstrated the survival of the old Pan-African ideal, but from the beginning there was also recognition that this was not likely to be achieved any time in the near future. To promote the stability of the member states, therefore, the organization adopted five principles. They were absolute equality of all states, non-interference in internal affairs, respect for the sovereignty of each state, condemnation of subversive action by neighboring states and promotion of cooperation based on tolerance and the non-acceptance of personal leadership.

The principle that national borders of independent countries were not to be disputed, however artificially those borders might have been drawn in colonial times. The African leaders were aware of the risk that any discussion of borders might open up a Pandora's box and ultimately destabilize the whole continent. The purpose of the OAU was to promote African unity through voluntary cooperation between the independent member states.

6.2.6. Organization of African Union (AU) Transition to AU

The African Union (AU) is an offshoot of Organization of African Unity (OAU). AU consists of 55 African nations as well as intergovernmental organizations. It was established in July 9, 2002. The AU was formed as a successor to the then African Economic Community (AEC). The African union government consists of the Pan African Parliament which is based in Midrand, South Africa; African Union Commission is based in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. Among the objectives of AU are to accelerate the political socioeconomic integration of the continent; to achieve peace and security in the continent; defend Africa common positions on issues of interest to the continent and its peoples; and to promote democratic institutions, good governance and human rights.

6.3. The End of Cold War

Activity: Dear student, list down factors leading to the end of cold war :

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

In the mid-1980s, a new generation of Soviet leaders, led by Mikhail Gorbachev, came to power. They recognized that military expenditures were crippling their nation’s economy and thwarting their desire to improve the standard of living of Soviet citizens. Among other things, they concluded that fewer nuclear weapons could deter a prospective attack from the United States or from any other potential enemy. Gorbachev and his reformist colleagues sought to relax tensions

in order to focus on domestic reform: glasnost and perestroika. In 1988, they announced that their belief in a common European home and a common humanity would guide their foreign policy rather than their ideological commitment to class conflict. Instead of using force to stymie the democratic revolutions in Eastern Europe and to thwart German unification, Gorbachev grudgingly acknowledged that coercive control over East European peoples and East Germans was incompatible with democratic and economic reform in the Soviet Union. West Germany's peaceful behavior for almost two generations and its integration into a web of military (NATO) and economic institutions (the European Community) that circumscribed its autonomy allowed Gorbachev and his reformist colleagues to take risks that their predecessors never would have taken.

American leaders could hardly grasp the magnitude of change occurring in the Soviet Union. Ronald Reagan, the conservative leader of the Republican Party, became president of the United States in 1981. He launched an unprecedented peacetime military buildup, and hoped to negotiate nuclear reductions from a position of strength. He championed the superiority of capitalist enterprise and called the Soviet Union an evil empire. Yet he was willing to meet with Gorbachev at a number of summit conferences, signed a path breaking agreement on intermediate nuclear forces in 1987, and gradually came to appreciate the Soviet leader's unique qualities.

Many of Reagan's advisers remained suspicious of Gorbachev's intentions. After Reagan left office in January 1989, his successor, George Bush, reassessed the Soviet–American relationship. When the Berlin Wall came down in November 1989, Bush and his colleagues made it clear that American goodwill required Soviet acquiescence to a united Germany inside NATO. Their suspicions might have lingered even longer if not for the Kremlin's repudiation of class conflict as the underlying principle of the Soviet approach to international relations and if not for the dissolution of the Soviet Union itself in December 1991.

The demise of Communism as an appealing ideology was critical to the ending of the Cold War. At the conclusion of the Second World War, the future of capitalism as an organizing principle for society was anything but secure. The Soviet Union enjoyed enormous prestige as a result of its leading role in defeating Nazi Germany. At the same time Socialist parties came to power in Great Britain and Scandinavia, and Communist parties were strong in France and Italy. There was a widespread belief in many European countries that economic planning was necessary to

ensure economic growth and social equality. At the same time, for many people in the Third World the managed economy of the Soviet Union seemed to provide a model for rapid modernization and industrial transformation.

6.4. The Emergence of Neo-Colonialism in Africa

> ✍ **Focus: Neo-colonialism, otherwise, called post-colonial dependency is a major feature of most African states today. Neo-colonial structure was deliberately put in place by the former colonial masters to ensure that their vital interests were not endangered in the newly independent African states. This was achieved through many forms: economic links, military ties, and political associations. African states were still largely dependent on the West, particularly their erstwhile colonial master.**

The concept of neo-colonialism was developed to describe the phenomenon where the attainment of political independence by African States was not accompanied with economic independence. In other words, it is being applied to describe a situation where the acquisition of juridical independence has not succeeded in eliminating colonial exploitation. Nkrumah was more profound and penetrating in his description and exposition of neo-colonial intrigues and maneuvers in Africa. He described neo-colonialism "as the last stage of imperialism" Nkrumah wrote: "*The essence of neo-colonialism is that the state which is subject to it is in theory independent and has the outward trappings of sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside".* (Nkrumah, 1965:XI).

Under direct colonialism, where the institution of the colonial powers could be easily identified, colonialists were compelled to justify their rule, like Lord Lugard did, in his Dual Mandate. But within eo-colonialism the picture is different. As Nkrumah explained "neocolonialism is also the worst form of imperialism. For those who practice it, it means power without responsibility and for those who suffer from, it, it means exploitation without redress" (Nkrumah 1965:XI).

In another word, when colonialism finally ended, the big Western powers could not afford to keep their hands completely off their colonies, thus, they continued to influence politics and

developments in these regions where their political and economic relationship was based on their colonial ties on multilateral relations and engagements. The impact of colonialism, and the subsequent relationship and exchange between Africa and the West has seen the continent moved from post independent political and economic hope for prosperity to despair and dependence on the West. This dependence in political processes and economic development and sustainability has continued to preserve the continent as a poor and devastate region of the globe. Similarly, even foreign aid with conditions for Africa which according to the west should help steer Africa off poverty and underdevelopment has produce the opposite due to the economic interest of the West behind it and the accompliceship of tyrant and selfish African leaders.

- ***Neo-colonialism operated in varying ways in post-colonial Africa: These are the followings*:**

- **Controlling the Incumbent Government**

Control over government in the neo-colonial state through foreign financial support for this state or through the presence of foreign consortium serving and upholding foreign financial interest. Whichever way one analyzes it; neo colonialism resulted in the exploitation of the African states such that the foreign capital entering the state to foster development instead "promoted" underdevelopment.

- **Controlling the Troops**

In some cases, neo-colonialism has gone as far as using troops of the colonizing nations to control or support the government of the neo-colonial state. For example, French troops remained present and active in French colonies long after independence: In May 1996, French soldiers in support of CAR government fired at national soldiers angry against their government for failing to pay them their salaries.

- **Controlling Foreign Trade**

Neo-colonialism survived because the West had established a dependent economic and political structure on the continent which was inherited and never changed by the new leaders. These "ambassadors" of the colonizers as N. Mwuara (2000) describes them, promoted foreign interest over domestic interest, maintaining the economic and political structures of the colonizers. They got involved in "brainwashing" their followers to support and uphold neo-colonialism. The mass

brainwashing of post-colonial rulers and their successors, which has sustained neo-colonialism to the detriment and underdevelopment of the African people, meant that the "wrong" political culture was instilled into the minds and brains of the elites. Deji Odetoyinbo (1994) chooses to describe the instilling of the neo-colonial political culture into the African leaders as "brain-dirtying". According to Odetoyinbo, brainwashing forces up the understanding of "cleaning or make pure" in one's mind which is far from being the case with neo-colonialism. In opposition to this understanding, the minds of Africans "have been deeply and thoroughly sullied by our contact with Europeans", Odetoyinbo continues, including all "contacts, past and present, willful and enforced, intimate and casual, malicious and well intentioned".

In a nutshell, the consequence of neo-colonialism is the resultant permanent client-patron relationship that existed and still exists in some cases between ex-colonial powers and the ruling elitist governments. The external dependence, propagated and supported by neo-colonialism, renders African states permanently dependent as resource-based economies, unable or unwilling to assert their independence and develop their nations. The patron-client relationship between ex-colonizers and the neo-colonial elite rulers serves as a foundation, that is, structural bases for the enforcement of neo-patrimonial rule for in the neo-colonial states. Leaders like Ghana's Nkrumah and Guinea's Sekou Toure openly opposed neo-colonialism because of the nefarious economic and political outcome it had on African states.

6.5. Features of a Neo-Colonial State of Africa

Activity: Dear student, list down features of neo-colonial state of Africa:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Among the many features of neo-colonial state of Africa, the following are the most important one.

Lacks Essential Attribute of Sovereignty State

A neo-colonial is a client or pawn state, which enjoys nominal independence, but lack the essential attributes of a sovereign state. In other words a neo-colonial state is independent name, but is bereft of power to pursue independent action that will result in self-reliant development. According to Nkrumah, because it was no longer possible to reverse the momentum generated by anti-colonial nationalism, "old fashioned colonialism" was everywhere on the retreat. In order to safeguard and preserve their economic interest, the imperialists took a retreat and resorted to a neo-colonial arrangement, as a tactical expedient.

Problem of Internal Contradictions

A neo-colonial state is also, usually, faced with internal contradictions. According to Nkrumah, to make it attractive to the citizens of such states, it must be shown to be capable of improving their standard of living. But this can only be achieved at the expense of neo-colonial interest, which is to keep African countries, economically subjected. A state in the grip of neo-colonialism is also not a master of its own destiny, and this constitutes a threat to world peace. In the Cold War era, the two super-powers employed neo-colonial states as pawns or proxies to fight their limited wars. The crisis, which engulfed Congo on attainment of independence, was a manifestation of neo-colonialism.

Insensitive to the Interest of African People

Being the final and perhaps, the most dangerous stage in the capitalist development, neo-colonial powers are never sensitive to the interests of the people of a neo-colonial state. Indeed, authority to govern is not from the people, but from the metropolitan power. It can even come from multi-national corporations, which dominate economies of African countries, because of their pervasive, and often, negative mode of operations.

Exploitation, Fragmentation and Penetration of Poor by Rich

Since neo-colonialism, according to Lenin (1917), is imperialism in its "Last stage", or in the words of Nkrumah (1964) in its' highest stage". It is based on exploitation, fragmentation and penetration. This was further elaborated by John Galtung in his structural theory of imperialism. The process includes an uneven trade pattern or flow of an asymmetric or unfair trade relations, and protective tariffs. The second component of dominance is fragmentation. The picture here is

that of coordinated and united rich counties versus a disorganized and dis-united periphery. Also, while the center countries establish links in different directions, the poor countries concentrate their activities to the center. This was achieved, for example, in the early years of independence, by given African countries associate membership of bodies like the European community, which in actual fact amounted to de facto second class membership.

6.6. The African Debt Crisis

Brainstorming: why Africa is one of the most indebted continents on the earth? Write your answer on the space provided.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Focus: That Africa has been under the unbearable weight of a debt crisis is not disputed. By debt crisis, we mean a condition whereby a country has accumulated so much debt that it can no longer sustain the management of the debt, resulting in severe distortions and contradictions in the domestic political economy. This has been the African condition for decades, so much so that the struggle for debt cancellation for Africa has been in the forefront of the public discourse on the matter since the 1990s.

The first half of the 1960s, when the bulk of African countries gained political independence, was a period of great expectations. It was generally believed that political independence would lead to rapid progress in raising incomes and improving the peoples' welfare. Indeed, the first United Nations Development Decade (1960-1970) was a period of socio-economic reconstruction and consolidation. Many African countries successfully expanded their basic infrastructure and social services. However, after this initial period of growth most African economies stagnated and then went into decline. For instance, in sub-Saharan Africa per capita

income has been falling in real terms since 1973. Put differently, overall Africans are almost as poor as they were thirty years ago. In 1950 the region's per capita income was 11%of the industrial-country average; in 1990 is 5%? Its collective GNP has shrunk from US $ 200 billion in 1980to US $140 billion in 1990 social services.

By the early 1980s, most African states were no longer able to meet their financial obligations. Declining prices for African agricultural and natural resource exports, rising oil prices, increased costs of African industrial imports, growing populations and mismanaged budgets combined to put the African state into crisis. Most state governments were severely weakened during this time as the most basic public services could no longer be carried out. Governance continued on its downward spiral as people increasingly created their own communal support systems in response to the state's inability to provide services. The informal economy grew; corruption became rife; and credit dried up for African governments. Heavy lending from international entities allowed African governments to function at a minute rate. But by the late 1980s and early 1990s, sub-Saharan Africa's debt burden had become so colossal that international lenders were no longer willing to extend credit to African states. African states were forced to agree to the harsh austerity programs from the lenders of last resort, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Suffice it to say that Africa's over-indebtedness is not attributable, as many creditors would have it, merely to poor governance, rapacious and corrupt leaderships, protracted civil wars in too many countries on the continent; no democratic checks and balances on government borrowing and spending, excessive population growth, and the stubborn pursuit of economic policies which contributed to the relentless impoverishment of a rich continent for over two decades. All of these factors have indubitably played a major part.

6.7. The Era of Structural Adjustment (SAP)

Brainstorming question: Dear student, what is SAP? Write your answer on the space provided.

Because of economic failure and governance related challenges, Sub-Saharan African countries have implemented structural adjustment programs in the 1980s. The essence of these programs is the reduction/removal of direct state intervention in the productive and distributive sectors of the economy and the restriction of the State's role to the creation, mainly through the manipulation of fiscal and monetary instruments, of an institutional and policy framework conducive to the mobilization of private enterprise and initiative.

Most of these structural adjustment programs were negotiated with the Interactional Monetary Fund (IMP) and the Word Bank and Sub-Saharan African countries are being actively encouraged to enter into such programs by both bilateral and multilateral donors. Yet, at least some of the programs which have been implemented by Sub-Saharan African governments have had serious negative effects on the quality of life enjoyed by their people, and particularly the most vulnerable groups within their societies. These include rising unemployment, increased food prices, higher costs for education and health care, and a rapid decline in the availability of services in rural areas. Both the IMF and the major multilateral donor organizations, including the World Bank, have acknowledged that there have been severe costs associated with the programs.

6.7.1. Objectives of Structural Adjustment Program

Activity: Dear student, list down objectives of SAP:

To bring this about, all or some of the following six objectives are supposed to be addressed in every adjustment programs implemented in sub-Saharan Africa.

1. Reduction of public expenditure: The aim is to reduce, if not eliminate public borrowing and budget deficits via spending cuts.
2. Increase in domestic savings: To be achieved via tax and other incentives.
3. Reduction of the state's economic role: The object is to reduce the state's role to the barest minimum and to ensure that the state enterprises remaining are profit-orientated and less protected and subsidized.
4. Liberalization of the economy: The above measures fall within this heading. However, more specific liberalization measures include: devaluation; the abolition of exchange controls; and the removal of import, price and distribution controls.
5. Promotion of exports: This is the flagship of all SAPs and is meant to address the chronic shortage of foreign exchange.
6. Promotion of foreign private investment: Via extensive concessions to foreign investors.

On the continent, like elsewhere, SAPs failed to achieve their stated objectives. Therefore, the 1980s came to be dubbed Africa's lost decade. This was because Africans were worse off in the 1990s than at the time of their political independence, with high levels of poverty, unemployment, inflation and infrastructural decay prevailing in most countries. And even the few countries that experienced remarkable economic growth, such as Botswana, continued to be marked by high income and wealth inequalities. The World Bank in a study entitled 'Can Africa Claim the 21st Century', elegantly summed up the dire developmental situation in the continent thus: Despite gains in the second half of the 1990s, Sub-Saharan Africa enters the 21st century with many of the world's poorest countries. Average per capita income is lower than at the end of the 1960s. Incomes, assets, and access to essential services are unequally distributed. And the region contains a growing share of the world's absolute poor, who have little power to influence the allocation.

6.8. Democracy and the Continuation of Neo-Liberalism

Democracy is a concept that virtually defies definition. The popular definition of democracy offered by Abraham Lincoln as "government of the people by the people and for the people" gives the impression that all citizens have the opportunity of participating or influencing the process of governance. But because the world has advanced beyond the Greek-city states, participatory democracy is no longer feasible, hence the necessity for representative democracy.

The most basic idea in a democracy is that political power comes from the people and that government is legal when the governed consent. This is the basis of the theory of social contract as canvassed by political philosophers, indifferent forms, from Plato to J.J. Rousseau.
After colonial rule, African states focused on developing democracies styled after those of their former colonial masters. The problem of grafting democratic principles of competitive party politics, periodic elections, and struggling for political offices, which are alien to Africa, has been blamed as partly responsible for democratic failures in Africa. Others have located the problem around the pluralism of most African states, echoing Aristotle who said "it is difficult to achieve and maintain a stable democratic government in a plural society". But beyond these preliminary points, the problems of democracy, democratization and constitutionalism in Africa lie in the failure of African leaders to appreciate that democracy, has both philosophical as well as procedural content.

The political transformations so characteristic of the 1990s did not bypass Africa. Many African states experienced significant political change during this decade. Reforms were undertaken leading to increased political space. Political parties were legalized and multi-party elections were held. Several states saw the peaceful transfer of power; South Africa's apartheid regime came to its end; political liberties were expanded. However, the democratization process is far from complete. The initial excitement and speed with which political reform was carried out abated as most African states experienced an erosion of the progress that was achieved. Some African leaders continue to manipulate the system (alter constitutions and electoral laws, control campaign resources, etc.) in order to stay in power. Nonetheless, no longer is it the case that the vast majority of African states has autocratic governments engaged in patrimonial rule. Most states have engaged in some form of democratic reform and public support for democracy is widespread throughout the continent today.

It has been illustrated above that democracy as a modern style of governance was not born in Africa. The literature shows that in the early 1980s the IMF and World Bank used a number of measures, such as financial aid and economic sanctions, to try to force many African countries into adopting a form of liberal democracy. This is the main feature of neoliberal policies. According to Pause wang et al "today Europe is the driving force in spreading democracy in

Africa". By the 1980s, democracy in Africa was often promoted as inseparable from free market economy to the third World. This is also the view of Asad who argues that "the imperial and colonial states (i.e. Western European countries) are behind the construction and destruction of any processes going on in Africa". The literature shows that the IMF and the World Bank's democratization project have generally fallen short of African peoples' expectations.

6.9. Democracy and Emergence of Developmental State in Africa

With regard to conceptualization of the Developmental State, it has been described variously as one that places economic development as the top priority of government policy, and which is able to design effective instruments to promote such a goal. The instruments alluded to here include the establishment of well-functioning formal institutions; weaving of formal and informal networks of collaboration among citizens and officials; and the utilization of new opportunities for trade and profitable production. It has also been characterized as a State that promotes macro-economic stability, as well as establishes an institutional framework that provides law and order, effective administration of justice and peaceful resolution of conflicts, ensures property rights and appropriate infrastructure investments, and advances human development. It has also been seen as a State that is determined to influence the direction and pace of economic development by directly intervening in the development process, rather than relying on the uncoordinated influence of market forces to allocate economic resources.

As a matter of fact, by the late 1990s, the view that the lack of good governance and the poor quality of State institutions were the root causes of economic problems in developing countries became widespread and institutions such as the IMF and the World Bank started to impose the so called "governance-related conditionalities," in addition to the conventional "economic conditionalities" attached to multilateral and bilateral financial assistance to developing countries. These new conditionalities required that the borrowing countries should adopt "better" institutions that improve "governance." Around the same time, many developed-country governments and development partners also started to attach governance conditionalities to their bilateral aid. This growing recognition of the role of the State in economic development was most succinctly captured in the 1997 *World Development Report*, which stated that "An effective State is vital for the provision of the goods and services – and the rules and institutions – that

allow markets to flourish and the people to leave healthier and happier lives. Without it, sustainable development, both economic and social, is impossible" (ECA, 2010).

The debate about the role of the State in economic development has come full circle, when, with the onset of the global financial and economic crisis in 2007, many developed countries, led by the United States, undertook radical State-led financial and economic intervention measures to rescue their economies from collapse. This has further broadened and strengthened the case for an active role for the State in economic development, particularly in the developing world. The concept of developmental States had already risen to the top of development discourse, following the spectacular economic performance and rise to emerging economies' status by a number of South East Asian countries in the 1970s and 1980s, through robust state-intervention measures.

While acknowledging the multidimensional capacity weaknesses of the post-colonial African State as a major source of the continent's current underdevelopment, proponents argue that there is enough reason to adopt a developmental-state model. In fact, the expectations are that a well-thought out Developmental State would be able to target and address many of these capacity and related constraints. There is, for example, a repository of evidence that a "Developmental State" can be a major pivot for the promotion of human-centred development. Indeed, as African States continue to be plagued by the vagaries of the human-needs deficit, as reflected in mass abject poverty and deprivation, burgeoning unemployment, including the alienation of the youth, and the inadequacy of public education, public health, clean drinking water, and acceptable sanitation, the establishment and functioning of a "developmental State" in African countries could lead to a "renaissance" in terms of socio-economic development and human security.

It would seem that a preponderance of views, particularly from Africanist scholars and African policy institutions subscribes to the emergence of democratic Developmental States on the continent. Such States are seen as having the potential to address the two inter-locking critical issues of democracy and development that have continued to plague the continent. Despite the growing consensus on the imperative of working towards establishment of Developmental States on the continent that use democratic models, questions continue to linger over the concrete methods, measures and means that need to be deployed to effectively establish them. There

appears to be much yearning among Africans for democratic Developmental States in Africa. The unresolved issues need to be addressed and require appropriate research and policy focus.

Africa has in the past decade and half registered remarkable progress in both political and economic governance institution-building. Although the continent continues to lag behind other regions of the world on many economic and political governance issues, it has been recognized as harboring some of the countries with the fastest-growing economies in the world. Yet, poverty levels in the majority of countries have remained very high and conflict, particularly of the type generated by inconclusive competitive electoral processes and exclusionary politics has remained widespread. While a few African countries, such as Botswana and Mauritius, by virtue of their remarkable state-led economic development, are increasingly described in the literature as Developmental States, they are still only the exception and not the rule in Africa. Overall, the image of Africa remains mixed, with pockets of development and governance progress, juxtaposed with numerous cases of grinding poverty, underdevelopment and poor governance. Notwithstanding these rather worrying realities, Africa is being projected as the future pole of global economic growth. For these projections to come true, the continent needs States that are capable of overcoming the numerous developmental challenges – preferably democratic developmental States.

6.10. The Obstacles to Democratic Consolidation in Africa

Democracy in Africa has been shaped by the colonial powers that ran Africa until the period of decolonization that began in the 1960's. Thereafter Africa has attempted to follow the European model of democratic governance. However, whilst African democracy has shown some improvement, it is still having legitimacy problems and African states are characterized by corruption and autocracy. This section of the chapter highlights the impediments to the furthering of democracy in Africa.

To begin with democracy is not a single approach but rather a commitment to certain institutions such as the rule of law, civil society and political accountability through free and fair elections by an electorate based on universal suffrage. It also includes (to a varying degree) freedom of speech, the development of a civic culture and the acceptance of a social contract.

For democracy to emerge there must first be liberalization of the state, for example, the release of political prisoners, followed by a transitional period that sets the groundwork for a democratic constitution. Finally, there is a consolidation period that is characterized by regular elections and

the development of civic culture and society. However, these features of democracy have been doomed in Africa because of many complex and interwoven factors discussed below:

6.10.1. Ethnic Fragmentations

At the Berlin Conference, European powers carved up the map of Africa without regard for the integrity of existing cultural groups and state systems. As a consequence, some large ethnic groups were split up, while others with little in common or a history of warfare and enmity, were forced to be part of a single new state. With it, the colonial powers also created a class system based on race, laying a foundation for even more social tensions. These ethnic divisions can be a huge challenge to political stability because the clash of diverse cultural traditions fosters political tensions between groups in Africa, threatening the democratic system.

6.10.2. Legitimacy Deficit / Weak States

The colonial powers imposed a political system on the African states which is directly copied from the Western model of democracy but alien to African people. The lack of articulation between modern democratic systems and ancient cultural traditions may help to explain the failure to embrace democracy. Cultural traditions of ethnic tribes driven by patronage were completely ignored. Pre-colonial Africa existed with a political system where each leader ruled his 'nation' through the use of well-established patron – client relationships, an informal system for the conveyance of influence to and from the ruling elite. Each faction had representatives at government level, conveying the wishes of their community or sub-group of the tribe. To some extent this system continues to operate, creating weak states with a lack of legitimacy for the central governments. Another impediment to democracy is the fact that political beliefs and values may be seen as democratic in Africa, democracy being a very western concept. It has been argued that most nationalist leaders found democratic elections were simply a condition for independence and continuing Western support. So after the first wave of independence there came a rapid decay from democracy into single party dominance, mirroring the strong leadership of the colonial period and the traditional African patriarchal society. The democratic arrangements quickly devised by the colonial powers, soon appeared superfluous to the new leaders, and democracy was destroyed from above in many countries like Ghana, Uganda or Nigeria.

6.10.3. Lack of Economic Development

The future political development of a country depends on the trust of the population in an honest and efficient government and in the economic success of their state. Two obstacles to obtaining the trust of the citizenry and security for democracy are inefficient economic performance and corruption. Severe economic problems play a central part in political instability, restraining the transition towards democracy and the progress of democratic structures. Currently, social problems such as refugee migration, debt, poverty, illiteracy, crime, unemployment, diseases, inflation and missing infrastructure seem to be more pressing than the transformation to democracy. Where resources are scarce, the priority of political contestation is to secure economic consumption, not democratic structures.

6.11. Revolutions and the Quest for Democratic Rights in North African Countries

The year 2011 may well be remembered as a transformative one in the history of modern Arab states, a moment in which societies across the Middle East and North Africa "kicked back," after decades of unbridled domination by authoritarian state structures. The intent here is to discuss the dynamics and challenges facing Tunisia, Libya, Morocco and Algeria, the countries of the "Maghreb" (Arab-Islamic "West"), in the wake of the upheavals of 2011. .

Transitions towards Democracy in North African Countries

After the fall of their authoritarian leaders, Tunisia, Egypt and Libya all embarked on processes of democratic transition. However, to date, the only case of democratization – and it has yet to be completed – is that of Tunisia.

- **Tunisia**

On 23 October 2011, Tunisian citizens chose a Constituent Assembly through free and competitive elections. The winner, the Islamist party Ennahda, formed a government with two secular political formations. Not without difficulty, the Tunisian political actors have negotiated and reached agreements in order to advance in the process of democratic transition. Thus, on 28 September 2013, Ennahda and the opposition parties signed an agreement establishing a road map that called for the resignation of the current government and the formation of a technocratic transitional government, the adoption of a Constitution, the passage of an electoral law and the

holding of the next legislative and presidential elections. As a result of this partisan consensus, the National Assembly was able to approve the democratic Constitution at its plenary session on 26 January 2014. Days later, an agreed government of technocrats was formed with the aim of holding the planned legislative and presidential elections by the end of 2014. Should these two electoral processes succeed, they will confirm the democratic path taken by Tunisia.

- **Egypt**

In Egypt, it is necessary to distinguish between two different processes of political change following the fall of President Mubarak on 11 February 2011. First, the country embarked on a process of democratic transition, which failed due to a lack of understanding between the various political forces, the imposition of a specific political model, and the Army's interference in political affairs. As a result, the country has undergone **a process of autocratization and a return to a restrictive and hegemonic pluralist regime.**

The holding of competitive legislative and presidential elections was not enough to democratize Egypt. The elected Parliament was suspended in October 2012, following the Supreme Constitutional Court's ruling, on 14 June 2012, finding the electoral system to be partially unconstitutional. With regard to the government, President Mohamed Morsi proved unable to make concessions and reach agreements with other political forces, choosing to impose instead his own model of political co-existence, the Constitution of 25 December 2012, which was rejected by liberal, nationalist and progressive forces. Widespread social mobilization against Morsi's authoritarian politics served as an excuse for the Military to abort the stalled process of transition. The military coup of 3 July 2013 ousted President Morsi and suspended the Constitution. Subsequently, a new process was launched entailing a return to a restrictive and hegemonic authoritarian regime, albeit with new actors. The new political system prohibits the participation of the Muslim Brotherhood, which, despite representing a significant portion of Egyptian society, was declared to be a terrorist Organisation on 23 September 2013.

✍ Libya

Libya is currently immersed in a **situation of uncertainty** with regard to its process of democratic transition. Following the death of Gaddafi, the emerging political forces reached consensuses on several key points: approval of the electoral system; holding of the first competitive elections; formation of transitional coalition governments representing the main political trends (independent, liberal and Islamist); approval of the procedure for drafting the Constitution; recognition of Libya's multicultural identity (Arab, Amazigh, Tuareg and Toubou); etc. However, the lack of prior institutional architecture and of experience with political participation is proving to be an obstacle to the country's democratization, which is moreover hindered by other serious problems, such as the unilateral declaration of independence of the Cyrenaica region, insecurity due to terrorist actions, tribal confrontations, the lack of state control over the territory – as certain groups that fought both for and against the Gaddafi regime remain armed – etc. Moreover, the Constitution has yet to be approved. On 3 February 2014, the political forces agreed to extend the current Parliament's term to August to allow it to finish writing the Constitution. To this end, elections were held on 20 February 2014 to recruit the 60 members of the Constituent Assembly tasked with writing the draft Constitution. Should the Constituent Assembly fail in this mission, a committee of 15 experts will be appointed and tasked with drafting a provisional Constitution and an electoral system that will enable the holding of both presidential and parliamentary elections in September. This would signify a third transitional period, to last a maximum of 18 months, after which it could only be extended again by referendum.

✍ Political Liberalization without Democratizing Effects

As a result of the Arab Spring, other countries in the region also launched processes of political liberalization, although not with a view to achieving democratization. Of these countries, Morocco has carried out the most far-reaching process of political liberalization, although it has not had democratizing effects for the political regime. As a result of the social protests that gave rise to the 20 February movement, on 9 March 2011, King Mohammed VI announced political reforms. Within this process of political liberalization, attention should be called to the high degree of pluralism and competitiveness of the legislative elections held on 25 November 2011, and, following the elections, the appointment of the Islamist Abdelilah Benkirane, the head of

the party to win the largest number of seats in the House of Representatives, as Head of Government. It was the first time that Islamists were allowed to rise to power, albeit through a coalition government with other political forces. However, despite this significant progress, the King continues to wield considerable legislative and executive power that limits the power and independence of Parliament and the government. Thus, the Moroccan political regime can still be considered a restrictive and quasi-competitive authoritarian system.

Review questions

1. Explain the factors responsible for the imposition of neo-colonial structures on African States after their independence
2. Identify and explain the major features of a neo-colonial society in Africa.
3. Describe the major mechanisms of neo-colonial control in Africa.
4. What are the major dimensions of neo-colonialism in Africa?
5. What are the Impediments to the success of liberal democracy in Africa?
6. What is your assessment of the success of democracy in Africa?
7. List and explain the impacts of cold war on Africa
8. list and explain the main reason behind the formation of the OAU and NAM
9. Why do you think that developmental state ideology is relevant for Africa
10. How do you evaluate transition to democracy in the horn of African countries,

References

Adogamhe.P.G. (2008).pan-Africanism Revisited: Vision and Reality of African Unity and Development, department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

Abu-Bakarr Bah. (2004). Approaches to Nation Building in Post-Colonial Nigeria; Journal of Political and Military Sociology

Aihie .J. (2014). Africa at Fifty: The Paradox of the Post-Colonial State, University of Benin

Alofun, Grace Olufolake O. (2014). **African Socialism: A Critique** , *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 19, Issue 8, Ver. VI (Aug. 2014), PP 69-71*

BERMAN. B.J.(1998). Ethnicity, patronage and the african state: the politics of uncivil nationalism

Björn Beckman. (n.d). the post colonial states: crisis and reconstruction, stitute of Developutetti Studies,

David Austin. (2010). pan-africanism, caribbean exile, and post-colonial Africa, working paper series

DELE OLOWU. (1994). THE NATURE AND CHARACTER OF THE AFRICAN STATE

FRANKE.B.F.(2007). Competing Regionalisms in Africa and the Continent's Emerging Security Architecture, *African Studies Quarterly* | Volume 9, Issue 3

Irobi. E. (2013). Ethnicity and Nation Building in Contemporary Africa: A Perspective for Non-killing, Center for Global Nonkilling

Langerud.M.H.(2016). From the Organisation of African Unity to the African Union: *From a policy of non-interference to a policy of non-indifference?, UNIVERSITY OF OSLO*

LERUMO., A. (n.d). Forms and Methods of Struggle in the National Liberation Revolution; Violent and non-violent transition

Lewis A.E (2007).A Kenyan Revolution: Mau Mau, Land, Women, and Nation, East Tennessee State University

Mannin. P. (2003). Africa and the african diaspora*: n*new directions of study; Journal of African History, Cambridge University Press

Motsefaoui, A. (2011).The evolution of pan Africanism and the Gold coast nationalism from the origin to 1960

OFORDI.O.S. (1995). Regional Organization in a Unipolar World Order: A case study of the Organization of African Unity, University of Nigeria

Ogot. B.A. (n.d). African historiography: From colonial historiography to UNESCO's general history of Africa

The pan African movement: ideological and philosophican origin, an introduction

von Bogdandy and R. Wolfrum. (2005). State-Building, Nation-Building, and Constitutional Politics in Post-Conflict Situations: Conceptual Clarifications and an Appraisal of Different Approaches

Walraven,K V and Abbink J .(n.d). Rethinking résistance in African history: An introduction

William Tordoff, *Government and Politics in Africa* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984), pp. 51–52.