

## Conflict Settlement in Post-Colonial Africa: Recolonization or Decolonization? A Reflection on the Mafeje/Mazrui Debate\*

---

### The Debate

Ever since the beginning of the decade, at the same time that the democratization process was launched, Africa has been plagued by serious problems which recall those it experienced on the eve and immediately after the era of independence. Not only is Africa confronted with unprecedented economic doldrums never experienced during the colonial regime, from the East to the West, North to the South, it is also rife with conflicts of all kinds, and exceptionally violent, which constitutes a matter of great concern to the intellectual elite.

As observed by Fares (1993:19), Africa is in 'troubled waters' and has become the subject of major concern. Already in 1991, Kâ Mana wondered whether Africa was going to die while Mbembe expressed the view that it was going to implode.

In an article published in the *International Herald Tribune*, Mazrui (1995:24-26) noted that the continent 'was losing its elite' and 'disintegrating'. He proposed 'a benign colonization of disintegrating areas in Africa, a form of 'self-colonization in search of *Pax Africana*'. At the institutional level, he suggested, as an instrument of this 'self-pacification', the establishment of an 'African Security

**André Mbata Betukumesu Mangu**  
Faculty of Law  
University of Kinshasa  
Zaire

Council' composed of 'five key regional States' or 'potential States' (South Africa, Egypt, Nigeria, Ethiopia and Zaire, in spite of the reservations he expressed about the last two States, due to the problems with which they are presently confronted). The said council would supervise the continent and be entrusted with the 'burden' of 'recolonization'.

He also proposed the setting up of a 'Pan-African Emergency Force', an army that will be charged with any indispensable intervention and peacekeeping operations as well as an 'African High Commission for Refugees', in collaboration with the United Nations Agency for Refugees. His major concern is that Africa should undertake its own colonization through the use of a 'well-intentioned force' for its own pacification, to avoid falling victim to the misuse of authority and colonization by foreign powers. According to him, 'our self-managed colonization would be better than the type administered by foreigners'.

As could be expected in Africa where such debates are well-sustained since the establishment of CODESRIA, Mazrui's proposals were met with angry protests from Mafeje who saw in this 'benign recolonization' attempts by the 'malignant minds' serving the cause of imperialism. He in turn proposed a 'decolonization of the body politic and *esprit de corps*' (Mafeje 1995:20-24) instead of a 'recolonization'. Most naturally, Mazrui riposted (Mazrui 1995:24-26).

In its *Bulletin* (2, 1995), CODESRIA published items from both parties and sought the points of view of its members. We have just received this entry after it had probably been circulated in the capital cities and libraries around the world. However, it would be a wrong step on the part of CODESRIA to hurriedly end the debate which is of great interest to the African Social Science Community. If it has already done so, this reflection on the topic will constitute, for that matter, a request to reopen debates on the issue.

### Parties to the Debate

Mafeje and Mazrui should be commended for initiating the debate on how to settle conflicts in Africa, and fortunately, without making an in-depth analysis of the

subject, thereby making it possible for the African social science community to further examine the issue while leaving the door open for other analyses.

I have not yet had the privilege of meeting directly with any of them although it has been my ardent desire for nearly a decade. It was when I attended CODESRIA's Summer Institute on 'Constitutions, Institutions and Democratic Governance in Africa' in 1994 that I took interest in acquainting myself with some of the articles written by Mafeje and Mazrui.

The little I knew of Mafeje was that he was one of the leading intellectuals of the continent. The several telephone calls he had received from Egyptian intellectuals and those from other African countries, in reaction to Mazrui's article, testify to his position in the African social science community. I knew Mazrui as one of the celebrated social scientists of the continent. He is one of the best social science professors in USA and in Africa where the sense of solidarity makes it obligatory on us to express satisfaction at the beautiful hut built by one's neighbour. I hold him in high esteem! Consequently, Mafeje and Mazrui are leading personalities in the social science field. Consequently, a young researcher should bow before such monuments with the greatest respect and admiration, even if he does not fully share the ideas expressed by any of his elders.

I did not know that Mafeje and Mazrui were both lecturers in American universities, one in Cairo and the other in New York.

I was however convinced that, as leading social scientists from East Africa, they must surely have known each other very well. Mafeje found it necessary to sum up the 'itinerary of Ali Mazrui' in a few words and even if the latter did not deem it necessary to do the same for the former, there is no doubt that they both know each other very well. For more than a quarter of a century, they have established suspicious friendly relations characterized by cordial and fraternal contempt. On this point, I have not been disappointed. The critical stand taken by Mafeje against his colleague Mazrui and the strong rejoinder of the latter constitute a sufficient proof.

### Mafeje's Critical Outlook

Personally, I did not understand why, in response to the proposals made by Mazrui on the settlement of conflicts in Africa,

Mafeje made such a strong attack on the former, referring to his professional life and his works. The impression created is that Mafeje went 'too far'.

In his criticism of Mazrui, Mafeje described the famous professor as a 'malignant mind serving the cause of imperialism'. Fortunately, the term does not imply 'evil spirit' in Islam as it is in Christianity. Otherwise, Mazrui and his abundant 'diabolic works' would be subjected to the sentence passed on Salman Rushdie and his *Satanic Verses*. In fact, that is exactly what Mafeje is praying for.

Before criticizing his ideas, Mafeje attacked the colleague's personality in the following terms: 'Mazrui's self-centeredness is well known to African intellectuals residing in the continent and abroad'. He then made ironical statements about him: 'It is said that Mazrui is the leading African professor. He is reportedly one of the three "mega professors" presently in the social science field in the United States of America'.

According to Mafeje, the celebrated Mazrui owed his fame to the certificates lavished on him, the publicity made around him by 'his western show case' for which he 'operates' and whose interests he serves. For Mafeje, Mazrui is simply useless as a social scientist:

Mazrui [...] has become a master in the art of forging attractive expressions which recall ludicrous and ridiculous images. He has never believed in carrying out a real empirical work [...] the only issue he once raised was whether work done in a library was worth anything. Indeed, judging by the bibliography of his works, he obviously culled most of his data from newspaper clippings, news items from radio broadcasts and his conversations [...] He conceives brilliant but short-lived ideas comparable to phosphorus in a bowl of water. Is it lack of sufficient intellectual ability or self-prostitution?

Mafeje's answer to this question on Mazrui is certainly affirmative:

the discourse of Mazrui leaves much to be desired intellectually...it is superficial, sensational and dishonest... Mazrui makes suggestions bordering on mental alienation. He is easily excited by an idea and loses any sense of reality [...] Above all, he has a confused mind.

Instead of talking about himself, Mafeje showed his preference for Edward Said 'the illustrious Palestinian professor' at Columbia University whose works and scholarship 'would totally astound Mazrui' and Galtung 'a brilliant and practical European professor' who made to Africans a recommendation 'with some wisdom which our African professor did not have'. Complex (which?) or refusal to recognize the merits of a renowned colleague? Such were the sentiments shared by African intellectuals. In any case, more than twenty books and about a hundred articles published as well as chairs in leading universities prove that our brother Mazrui is an eminent intellectual.

Cheikh Anta Diop, our scholar and our celebrated Samir Amin are not prominent because they are not in the good books of the western world. However, they are eminent by virtue of their intrinsic qualities. The western world did not offer them red carpets. Never mind if it offers Professor Mazrui red carpets. Would one refuse to recognize him if a Nobel Prize were awarded to him, simply because one does not share his ideas or that the prize would have been awarded to him by the western world? As confessed by Mafeje, 'in spite of all that, Mazrui had a lot of qualities to make professors in Africa and elsewhere envious of him'. He still has them.

Mafeje asserts that 'praising oneself does not constitute, in any way, a *recommendation*'. However, it is difficult to believe that the lack of courtesy towards a colleague or an unrestrained insult of an opponent whose ideas are not shared can constitute lessons learnt from the British!

The nihilism shown by Mafeje in his direct quotation of theses defended by Mazrui amply reflects the scope of the gap created between the two men over the years and which they now seem determined to bridge through heated debates.

### Settling Scientific and/or Ideological Scores?

Mafeje and Mazrui have had stormy exchanges for nearly thirty years. Mafeje often felt frustrated. On several occasions, he was offended by the haughty, proud and contemptuous attitude of Mazrui, this very self-conceited liberal, towards his African papers:

His direct meetings with his African colleagues, the young and old alike, generally led to negative intellectual and ideological reactions of the latter [...]

This remark dates back to our university days at Makerere College, in the mid-1960s [...]

The situation remained the same 25 years later, as revealed at a colloquium organized by CODESRIA in 1991 in Kampala [...] I also tried, on my part, to engage Mazrui in a more peaceful debate but all my efforts were in vain.

During an Afro-Arab conference held at Sharja in 1977 [...] one of the intellectuals from the United States left the Conference hall in protest against this man's obscenity.

### Ali A. Mazrui

Binghamton University, USA Mafeje therefore had several scores to settle with Mazrui personally and on behalf of other African intellectuals who, at one time or other, felt scandalized by the remarks of the latter.

Furthermore, when the article written by Mazrui was published in October 1994, Mafeje received telephone calls from African intellectuals and scientists who were 'outraged' and in January 1995 in Europe, a copy of the original text was sent to him by African colleagues. These reactions confirmed my fears: Mafeje is a great man; nonetheless, why the 'alert' and calls solely to Mafeje? Why did the Egyptian correspondents ask him such questions 'with indignation': 'What kind of African intellectual is this Mazrui?' Why were the African colleagues so preoccupied with sending him the original article written by Mazrui? The response to these questions seems clear. His correspondents knew fully well that Mafeje was one of the rare African academics who was quite familiar with the itinerary of Mazrui, his personality and his ideas. He was one of the few personalities who could confront him. They were also aware that no one else had ever been so outraged by Mazrui as Mafeje and that the Cairo American University Professor was the only African intellectual better armed to lead the battle with all the force required to break the myth built around the famous East African Professor of the Institute of Global Cultural Studies, Binghamton, University of New York. An 'alert' by way of telephone calls was enough. Mafeje did not have cause to solicit such entreaties. One could count on his immense talent at this crucial moment. One could take him into full confidence as to his ability to institute, as expected, a brainstorming debate

on Mazrui, and he really deserved it. He was not disappointing, for he discharged his duty with enthusiasm.

Since Mazrui is presented by his opponent as a 'malicious spirit in the service of imperialism', a self-conceited liberal acting for his western audience, an unrealistic intellectual hostile to 'leftist' ideas, a conscientious agent of capitalism who is unconscious of racism, as well as the peripheral adviser of centralism and the neo-colonial order guaranteed by the United Nations, the brainstorming debate launched against him by Mafeje should also be directed against 'imperialism', 'liberalism', the western world, 'rightist parties', capitalism, racism, centralism, colonialism, neo-colonialism or 'reco-lonization' and, to a certain extent, against the United Nations system.

In any case, was it a prophecy or provocation? – Mazrui had warned that his comments were 'frightening ideas for a proud people who had spilled so much blood and deployed all the necessary political will to liberate themselves from the hegemony of European powers'. He should therefore have expected to be confronted by Mafeje, one of the most dignified adversaries of 'imperialism' in Africa and one of the most ardent defenders of African nationalism, resolutely committed to the 'Left' out of conviction and necessity.

Mafeje denounced the demons of 'imperialism' (the term is used abominably three times along with 'imperialist', four times), of capitalism (two times as a noun and two times as a qualifying adjective) and racism (three times) who accompany the 'devil' of colonialism or 'recolonization' of which the professor acts as a prophet.

As a self-styled radical nationalist, Mafeje has not forgotten that, in 1966 at Makerere, Mazrui had made a disturbing statement affirming that, without the English language, there would never have been any such thing as 'African Nationalism'. However, in 1991, Mazrui returned to his point of departure: like other intellectuals, he declared that 'a nation which does not produce knowledge in its own language cannot develop'. Mazrui never reacted. Nevertheless, since it is never too late to return to one's good opinion or idea, should we reproach him for this? Unless we wish to preach some fixed ideas in social sciences or demonstrate scientific fetishism, both of which do not fit

Mafeje at all. The important thing now is to, among other things, find out whether since 1991, those excellent ideas have begun to materialize or whether these African intellectuals who take pleasure in abstract phraseology, have finally moved on from slogans to concrete actions so that African nations produce knowledge in their own languages. Unfortunately, several of them, alienated to the marrow, continue to act as sycophants of *Anglophonie* or the puppets of *Francophonie*. The conclusions we drew from the colloquium on Educational Innovation in Post-Colonial Africa, held in Cape Town in December 1994, remain a dead letter for lack of support from governments which are on the payroll of western 'cultural imperialism'. Swahili, for example, which can serve as a tool for the production of scientific works in East Africa, continues to be regarded as 'degrading' and I have observed with much admiration that Mafeje and Mazrui continue to produce knowledge in a style of Shakespearean English which they communicate to their students in American universities with great skill, with one demonstrating his talent in Africa, and the other in America itself. The sad reality is that we do not only continue to produce works in foreign languages; we also seem to impart knowledge not to our people primarily but to people in the western world.

In Mafeje, one observes the expression of a 'leftist' who has not forgotten and who is not likely to forgive or make concessions to the too liberal Mazrui who has built a solid reputation for himself by waging war against the African 'leftists'.

'In 1970, he denounced the leftists of Dar-es-Salaam University for their intolerance and declared that everyone had the right to express his opinion'.

Is intolerance the 'strong point' of the 'left'? Mafeje also had a grudge against this generally 'unrealistic' man who perceived the fundamental ideas but 'refused to draw practical lessons from them unless they emanated from the 'left'.

Finally, it is the colonial monster itself that Mafeje is fighting, there is no such thing as 'recolonization' or 'benign colonization'. From this point, the professor suddenly shifts from scientific thinking to concrete action, threatening and warning: 'Africans will not allow themselves to be deceived'.

## Decolonization and Conflict Settlement in Africa

Mafeje begins by affirming that contrary to the 'disintegration' issue raised by Mazrui, Africa was rather 'decaying'. However, beyond the divergences about concepts and discourse on the sex of angles which African intellectuals are so fond of, there are basically no concrete differences and this is reflected in the fact that, notwithstanding the beautiful expressions used and the scholarly theories propounded, Africa's situation is worsening each day as if the continent is infected by the Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) as a result of colonization.

Mafeje sees conflict settlement in post-colonial Africa as being contingent upon 'the decolonization of the body politic and *esprit de corps*'.

Mafeje has most probably presented his idea of 'decolonization' in one of his numerous publications which, unfortunately, he does not mention.

The fundamental issue which events brought to bear on Mazrui consisted in knowing how to settle conflicts in Africa and put an end to the 'disintegration' of the continent. Mazrui tried to respond to it and could not escape criticisms. For his part, Mafeje seems to be in the clouds. In the end, who is more realistic than the other? In criticizing Mazrui's 'unrealistic' proposals one unfortunately gives the impression of coming up with vague suggestions. Galtung may have to be called in to impart wisdom to another African professor. However, it should be recognized that his so-called wisdom never escaped Mazrui who, like him, had suggested regional integration and who contradicts himself while insisting on self-colonization and on the need for Africans themselves to address the problems facing the continent.

## Harsh Rejoinder from Mazrui

In a short rejoinder to Mafeje, Mazrui reaffirmed his proposals as already published in the *International Herald Tribune*. He first defended himself against the accusation that he was serving the cause of imperialism and bent on destroying Africans. Thus, he produced supporting documents to prove that the issue of 'self-pacification' and the search for 'Pax Africana' had preoccupied him for several years. The international scholar reaffirmed his support for the United States

and immediately after, like an answer from the shepherd to the shepherdess, like a seriously wounded animal it seems that is called to self-defence in the trial of a scientific case the lawyer returned blow for blow, insult for insult and discourtesy for discourtesy. He loaded his anger in one of those magic words known to him alone and hurled his bomb spitefully at Mafeje whom he accused of expressing 'confused reasoning' and for whom he recommended 'colonization and inter-African intellectual re-education'. Even though Mazrui confessed that he had been 'less spiteful and less insulting', he is not justified for that matter. He is in a better position to know that to reply spitefulness with spite and trade insults, even if moderately applied, is not an excellent source in the social sciences.

I hope Mafeje and Mazrui, are still practising Muslims I have the greatest respect for Islam, even if I disapprove of certain Islamic principles and practices. Perhaps it might be necessary to recall this verse of the Spittle of Jude (1,9) which teaches Christians that even when involved in an argument with the Devil – the true one – about the corpse of Moses, Michael the Archangel dared not utter insults against the Devil. Alas, the brainstorming debate between the two men appeared to be violent. It was marked by the regrettable lack of courtesy and was rife with insults, whereas the two professors were expected to put up a better behaviour. Mafeje distinguished himself by his lightning attack, characterized from beginning to end by the type of annoyance said to be rare among Anglophones, even when they disagree. Provoked, Mazrui unfortunately also ended up not observing professional ethics and the rules of propriety. As a result, the two fighting eagles were swept off by the devil's tide toward murky waters of the debate.

## Recolonization and Conflict Settlement in the Continent

Issues such as 'self-pacification', 'self-colonization' and 'Pax Africana' are fundamental and date back to the early works of Mazrui. In 'Toward a Pax Africana: A Study of Ideology and Ambition' (1967), his major work in this domain, Mazrui had already expressed concern about the future of peace in Africa after the collapse of the colonial order. His proposal makes recolonization the mechanism for conflict settlement in Africa and the very basis for peace on the continent.

## Peace as Conceived by Mazrui; Mazrui's Peace Proposal

Mazrui is absolutely a man of peace! He very well merits an African Peace Prize and even a Nobel Peace Prize. He is obsessed by peace and really believes in it. If he spontaneously accepted the invitation to go to South Africa to listen to Archbishop Desmond Tutu, personally congratulate President Mandela, both winners of the Nobel Peace Prize, it was partly because he was convinced that he was following their foot steps. Was it not because they had also seen in him a potential Nobel Prize Winner that they invited him? It will therefore not be surprising if Africa is again honoured with another Nobel Peace Prize through Mazrui, after being totally ignored in the past whereas it had offered shelter to the Son of God when his life was threatened in Israel.

However, Mazrui's conception of peace is not the same as that of Tutu or Mandela. The latter conceive peace without servitude, peace without colonization or apartheid which negates it. Mazrui, on the other hand, conceives peace under slavery, under colonization, under apartheid or its new form, 'recolonization'. Since the 'peace professed by the professor' is practically opposed to that of the South African leaders and that the latter very well knew the professor they had invited, one may wonder whether Archbishop Tutu and President Mandela had not invited Mazrui to South Africa to subject him to what Mazrui himself called 'inter-African intellectual re-education'! Was it not to have him change his ideas on peace that they considered it worthwhile to see him directly listen not to the *Te Deum* but rather the *requiem in aeterna* of colonization and apartheid which he always claimed to be a better guarantee for peace? The invitation was too enticing to be refused and the aim too far-fetched to be understood. Did this smack of foolhardiness or misunderstanding? The professor seized the opportunity to publish right in the heart of South Africa, which was just throwing off its cloak of racism, his famous article on 'recolonization', while making sure he had reserved a place for South Africa on his 'African Security Council'. This attempt to seduce had no impact in the South African political circles and on the intellectual elite, for they did not react. However, in Soweto and the townships, the people who had paid the highest price to see the end of apartheid

were outraged. Mafeje became their spokesman and legal adviser; unfortunately, he did not present any special authorization to the court of CODESRIA.

As Mazrui is concerned, peace should be attained at all costs, irrespective of the means used and the conditions. Mazrui's peace is that of the cemetery and nothing else. It does not matter whether the peace comes from Allah or Satan. The question which quickly comes to mind is: if Idi Amin's peace were good, why did Mazrui resign from Makerere University when the peace-loving Amin came to power in 1971? He can still find another pretext to say that in any case, it was an excellent evil given that his flight finally opened for him the gates of the world as well as the road to fame with the result that he is now presenting himself on the Nobel platform.

Mazrui's peace unfortunately remains associated with the defence of the dictatorial, colonial or neo-colonial order.

### **Mazrui's Colonial Order: 'Recolonization' and Peace**

'Now that the colonial order has come to an end, who will undertake peacekeeping in Africa?' (Mazrui: 1967).

Mafeje was wrong in situating the decline of several African States in the 1990s as the basis of Mazrui's frustration. In fact, Mazrui's frustration dates back to the 1960s and is linked to the collapse of the colonial order which, according to him, maintained perfect peace.

One would say that Mazrui adored the colonial order to the extent that he became demoralized by its collapse. As a man with foresight, he considered that the independence movement was not a good thing and for that matter, that independence would lead to several conflicts (he was right as regards the form). This explains his preference for colonization and the colonial order.

For Mazrui, if the colonizer has not existed, it would have been necessary to create him; if he has left and cannot be recalled from overseas, it is necessary to find a local one, an 'authentic' model, as the President of Zaire might say. It can thus be understood why Mazrui outrages and provokes several Africans who are hidings behind Mafeje. In law, it is always the good intention which is presumed. I am tempted to believe that Mazrui simply tried to lead a debate on a social science subject and I think he succeeded in that

respect and therefore merits our gratitude. For one thing, science makes progress through the exchange of ideas and debates. Did Mazrui really want to conduct debates in the African media? It is difficult to say so because he confesses through his rejoinder that his opinion on the subject has not changed over thirty good years.

Mazrui seems to have the nostalgia of the colonial order. Terms such as: 'colonial', 'recolonization', 'self-colonization' etc., have been accorded special attention in his works. In 1977, ten years after his brilliant defence of the colonial order which was on the verge of 'disintegration', he placed the Afro-Arab Conference in Sharja within the framework of 'the counter-penetration of the colonizers by the colonized'. In August 1994, he came up preaching 'recolonization' or self-colonization'. In 1995, in spite of the 'criticism' levelled against him by Mafeje in the second edition of *CODESRIA Bulletin*, he persisted in his arrogance, a style which threw his enemies into panic. The Western world might have found in Mazrui its best African adviser during the colonization era and since this 'humanitarian mission' is still not over, Mazrui is one of the celebrated heads who should be exempted from presented a job application or curriculum vitae.

The peace conceived by Mazrui is peace in hell, sustained by inequalities, oppression, exploitation and servitude. As far as we are concerned and, as observed by Patrice Lumumba, 'there is neither honour nor peace in servitude'. It is not this chimeric and empty peace that the African people want. Besides, if the 'colonial peace' administered through flogging and exploitation had really been the right peace, nobody would have felt the need to fight or sacrifice himself for independence, unless the prominent professor ascertains that independence was an error!

Besides, when he refers to 'recolonization' it is because at a given time, colonization has ceased and the colonial order considered better than the previous one needed to be restored. However, he who spends most of his time meeting with the colonial masters in their home countries, does he, Professor Mazrui, think that the colonization of Africa ended, and hence his proposal of 'recolonization'? The independence attained has remained nominal and the Western world is still pursuing its colonization activities in new forms through its peripheral agents and

international institutions. This fact cannot be denied, unless one should continue to consider Africans as eternally under-aged or the fake independence as a genuine achievement. I cannot believe that Mazrui, who knows so well the secrets of the colonial deities, can make the mistake of taking the superficial for the essence, lightning for light, starlit night for day and the wrong side as the right one.

In his first statement, Mazrui envisaged a 'recolonization from outside, inspired by humanitarianism [...] and administered by powers from Africa, Asia or member countries of the United Nations Organization.

Is 'recolonization' by Africans conceivable for countries of Eastern or Western Europe, America or Asia which are facing problems similar or comparable to those of the African countries where the term 'colonization' has already been thrown into the dumping ground of history and 'recolonization' is viewed as a dangerous ghost to be fired at sight by nationalists? For instance, when will Bosnia, Ireland, some former Republics of USSR, certain provinces of Spain or Corsica be 'recolonized' by Africans? Perhaps the Professor proposes a one-way 'recolonization' of Africa by foreign powers with preference to 'the former' colonizers, this would constitute a kind of repetition of the history of colonization, this time, upon request!

It is obvious that the West does not need to make any request before carrying on with an enterprise it had never really stopped. It has become the self-proclaimed guardian of the democratization process and distribution of patents for 'good governance', the moral authority to decide on the fairness of elections – manipulated by it at any rate – and to announce the corresponding results. It has already intervened in Zaire under cover of the Troika (the coalition comprising USA, Belgium and France) which actually constitutes the country's supervisory authority. However, democracy under supervision is a mere farce.

In recommending a 'recolonization based on humanitarianism', is Mazrui forgetting so soon that humanitarianism has always served as a Trojan horse for colonial invasion? Has he forgotten that at the Berlin Conference of 1885 the objective put forward for the colonization of Africa was equally humanitarian in character – to being 'civilization' to barbaric peoples and put an end to the slave trade [...] – or that without sharing the views of the Bagh-

dad dictator, 'the humanitarian' phenomenon had also been advanced by the West to justify its colonization of Iraq? I have only a slight knowledge about this subject but I do not know of any colonizer who never uses humanitarian motives to justify his enterprise.

In fact, colonization always goes hand in hand with violence and enslavement of the colonized peoples. Whether it was the work of States of the West, Asia or even Africa, the colonial order hides some real objectives which consist in exploiting their subjects under the pretext of humanitarianism. The African type of colonization, with Namibia under South Africa, Western Sahara under Morocco and part of Chad under Libya, were not underscored by humanitarian or charitable provisions. At any rate, it is that aspect that justified or still justifies all the means employed by the people of Western Sahara to put an end to the colonization of their brothers as well as those initiatives taken by the latter to settle on their fatherland.

Whether it came from Africans themselves or from foreigners outside Africa, colonization remains a bad experience for the colonized peoples. The black devil is not preferable to the white one. Moreover, a good devil or a good colonist cannot be found anywhere. It is therefore of no use to bring the colonial monster back to life in Africa, if this monster is already dead or about to die. Who can control it?

Colonization establishes the colonial system which crystallizes into a permanent system of exploitation. The lightning intervention of the Tanzanian army in Uganda in 1979 to rescue the people of that country from the bloody claws of monstrous Idi Amin from whom Mazrui escaped and for which Africa is grateful to God – and the intervention of ECOMOG troops in Liberia cannot be interpreted, in my opinion, as cases of 'African colonization' or 'recolonization'.

In advocating 'self-colonization' or 'recolonization' Mazrui seems to forget that 'Pax Africana' has already been imposed or is still being imposed in certain States by authoritarian regimes. In such cases, the central authoritarian state had certain regions or provinces of the country 'recolonized' by the national dictator. Soon after the passage of the festivities marking the nominal independence, new African leaders took over the seats and armory of the white colonizers and thus

put on their helmets and held their whips. The neo-colonial state colonizes some of its provinces and a segment of its population. However, like the peace preferred by any authoritarian system, colonial peace is an antithesis of genuine peace.

'Recolonization' would only generate new liberation struggles. Mazrui could also have advocated the procedure for settling conflicts created by the 'recolonization' process.

Mazrui commends the United Nations Organization for its peacekeeping efforts in the world. He admits and deplores the failure of some UN missions, but he does not go farther. He was also expected to have pointed to the lacunas inherent in a system in which certain entities have a complete say in the affairs of the Security Council while others do not have much or anything to say and only applaud or laugh during General Assembly sessions which offer several African Heads of State and their Ministers an opportunity to tour New York and its suburbs. I also expected Mazrui to express, in passing, the fact that he supports Africa's membership of the Security Council. However, this issue does not seem to interest him, as attested in his proposals. Maybe he has discussed it in one of his twenty works which, unfortunately, are more available in the Western world than in the African continent.

Africa will always need the United Nations services but that does not mean it will swell the ranks of those extremists who bear a grudge against Africa for their own reasons. It seems to me that the UN system suffers from serving as a tool for 'recolonization' managed, moreover, in an undemocratic manner.

Does Mazrui give the United Nations Organization more than its due on account of its peacekeeping vocation or because it is an instrument of 'recolonization' manipulated by the countries forming the UN Security Council, particularly the five permanent Members?

The two aspects go hand in hand, according to Mazrui's philosophy. First, it is by virtue of its status as an instrument of 'recolonization' vital to world peace that the United Nations Organization has won the favours of the celebrated professor. Indeed, the UN system makes it possible for the give 'great' powers to 'recolonize' the world, using all procedures including even those that are contrary to the provisions of international law which is itself

in an indisputable state of imperfection. The UN peace is first the peace proclaimed by America, Britain, France, Russia or even China as well. This type of peace imposed as a new form of colonial peace is too fragile not to carry Mazrui away.

It is difficult to support Mazrui's point of view that 'the great countries' are not those that need the services of UN and its specialized agencies but rather 'the small countries' of which the majority are in Africa. Thus, taking into account the fact that UN is a charitable enterprise for the 'small countries', which should be grateful to the 'great' countries, only one step is quickly taken. Even though he does not contradict Mafeje – who considers that the westerners have been using him but only asks to know whether it is 'Newt Gingrich who has been using him – it would be surprising to argue that Mazrui does not serve western interests'.

The truth is that USA, France or Great Britain, to cite only three countries, actually need the UN and its specialized agencies. It is not because of the beautiful eyes of the citizens of the 'small' countries that USA for instance refuses to quit the United Nations in spite of the strong criticisms from a segment of its public opinion. It is not for humanitarian reasons either that the five 'great' powers refuse to extend the membership of the Security Council to include Africa, Asia or South America. Their charity in this regard actually goes to Germany!

The Western states, i.e. the 'great countries' actually need the UNO to 'recolonize' the rest of the world, to exploit it and maintain their leadership in the world. Such an interest is of great significance; it is also essential and strategic in character. General de Gaulle even qualified UNO as a *machin* ('thing') but neither the General nor his successors withdrew from that 'thing'. It was the same General de Gaulle who said that 'States have no friends, they have only interests'. Ever since the proclamation of this notion, France has made that philosophy part and parcel of her spiritual heritage. French interests in the United Nations and its specialized agencies are such that the 'Liberator of France' dared not change course and his successors did not do so either to discredit the *grandeur* of France.

However, the greatness of France, like that of the other counterparts, lies in their 'imperialism'. France remains within the United Nations to strengthen its position

as a 'super power', to reconquer or enlarge its colonial empire.

Eventually, and as an instrument of 'recolonization', the United Nations Organization serves the 'great countries' more than it serves the 'small' ones, unless one considers that the apartheid system benefited the blacks more than the whites in South Africa, that the slave trade was more advantageous to the slaves than to those who sold them, that colonization was a 'bad enterprise' for the colonizers and very lucrative for the colonized people or that the exploitation of Africa is more profitable to Africa than to the Western world. I cannot imagine Mazrui supporting such an argument that would then call for Mafeje's death threats.

Even 'recolonization' by Africa herself within the framework of an African Security Council will still benefit the Western world. Mazrui's five 'key States' that will set up the said council are within the framework and under the control of the Western world. Consequently, they would only constitute western proconsulates in Africa entrusted with the administration of African territories under the authority of the West which would supply them with arms, money and experts in addition to teaching them the expedient techniques that enabled it to exploit the rest of the world for several centuries.

In his Security Council for 'recolonization', Mazrui seems to have forgotten two other key states which however have sound experience in the field: Morocco and Libya, which respectively inherited from Spain and France the colonies of Western Sahara and Northern Chad.

The Pan-African Emergency Force advocated by the distinguished professor also poses problems. How can Africa set up such a force, ensure its efficiency and sustain it if the continent already lacks the means of maintaining ECOMOG troops in Liberia? To intervene in Chad for example, Zaire had to wait for several months until France financed the operation and supplied the Zairian troops with aircraft, vehicles, provisions and arms. At any rate, this particular initiative of France was amply justified because the Zairian army intervened as a platoon of black French parachutists established in the continent, i.e. on the orders and in the interest of France.

Africa lacks the requisite moral and material resources for its 'recolonization'. Several millions of her sons have sacrificed

their lives to put an end to colonialism and apartheid. Accepting 'recolonization' would therefore be tantamount to desecrating the tombs of the martyrs.

Coming back to Mazrui's five key states, one notices that almost all of them are plagued with problems of 'disintegration', Egypt is shaken by internal tensions. Ethiopia, Nigeria and Zaire are 'breaking up' and the newly born South Africa is very fragile. That being the case, from where will these prominent states mobilize the strength they need to 'recolonize' the others? From where will they derive the resources required to enable them to fight simultaneously on both fronts – on the one hand, by arresting their internal 'disintegration' and, on the other hand, by arresting the disintegration of the other countries and foster *Pax Africana*?

The 'disintegration' of a 'key state' is yet another relatively imminent problem. Who will 'recolonize' such a state, supervise it and act as its 'big brother'. Indeed, several lessons can be drawn from the above-mentioned supervision of Zaire by the 'Troika'. The guardian will definitely come from the West.

What therefore prompted our great Mazrui to declare support for colonization or 'recolonization' and thus abandon 'self-pacification', the term he was using in the 1960s? Is it he who teaches us that, at any rate, 'self-colonization' and 'recolonization' mean the same thing to him. However, is it not possible to 'pacify oneself' without being 'recolonized'? The answer is yes and it therefore seems to me that Mafeje and Mazrui starved away from that course which is identified with democratization.

It is strange to notice that, in the 1990s, Mazrui prefers 'self-colonization' or 'recolonization' as opposed to his preference in the 1960s when he advocated 'self-pacification'! Is this because he has now found a better opportunity than he did find in 1960 to make people accept a proposal he would never have attempted to formulate for Africans who had just buried the martyrs of their independence? Fortunately or unfortunately, he can still find along his course nationalists such as Mafeje who, in spite of his scientific approach to the argument, does not hesitate to draw on the wrath and violence that marked the liberation movements, thereby complying with courtesy and ethics.

## Democratization and the Settlement of Conflicts in Africa

More pragmatic than Mafeje, Mazrui takes the merit especially since he expressed his anguish, raised the problem of conflict settlement in Africa, proposed 'recolonization' as a means of fostering peace in Africa and suggested at the same time the framework for such an enterprise. Mazrui makes observations and formulates a proposal and therefore does not limit himself to merely making observations and passively accepting the *status quo* with resignation. He could not be expected to do anything less than that in his capacity as a scientist. Solicited on many occasions and also pestered with severe criticisms, he had the duty to reflect on this issue and he did fulfil that obligation.

In social science, certain solutions are often inappropriate because the corresponding problems are not properly defined, because efforts are not made to master the terms of the equations generally comprising several unknown quantities or that the time dimension is not adequately taken into consideration.

The fundamental question one should ask oneself before proposing solutions – 'Decolonization' or 'Recolonization' – appears to be as follows: what is or are the cause(s) of the conflicts underlying the 'disintegration' of Africa? This question seems to have eluded Mafeje and Mazrui.

CODESRIA organized a seminar on 'ethnic conflicts in Africa' from 16th to 18th November 1992 in Nairobi. Several papers were read on that occasion and these made it possible to establish the fact that almost all the countries are affected and that most of the conflicts plaguing the entire continent are closely linked to the phenomenon of ethnicity or tribalism.

Conflicts arise whenever certain groups of people are exploited by others, whenever certain provinces or regions are marginalized by the central government or consider their situation as the outcome of the authoritarian attitude of governments toward the citizens. Others are either orchestrated or entertained by forces outside Africa. Some of the conflicts appear as true liberation struggles.

The effects of external and internal imperialism cannot be permanently and effectively overcome by imposing a new form of imperialism or those forms identified

with colonialism through 'recolonization', however light it may be.

The root causes of the conflicts have to be overcome in order to ensure lasting peace. The said root causes are many and appear in the form of ethnocentrism, tribalism, regionalism, marginalization, oppression, inequitable development, etc.

As peace still constitutes the ultimate goal of *Pax Africana* and, since Mazrui admits that the United Nations Organization has an important role to play in this regard, it seems to me that the question he attempted to answer – which interests both Mafeje and myself – can be summed up as follows: 'what is the best procedure for restoring peace in Africa?' . Perhaps, in this regard, and as Africans, a 'peace-loving' people, we should rather humbly solicit the opinion of another African in the person of Boutros-Boutros Ghali of Egypt, also a professor, who is currently reputed to know better the United Nations and peace-related problems in the world, and who, by coincidence, is the incumbent Secretary General of the United Nations Organization at a time when we are fighting scientifically and shaking fists at opponents in an effort to find solutions to the conflicts plaguing Africa.

More than one year before the publication of Mazrui's article and two years before the debate between Mafeje and Mazrui, Boutros-Boutros Ghali had already arrived at the conclusion that could have been taken into account to spare us heated and less courteous debates. According to him, 'Democracy is a guarantee for peace and that sound development is impossible in the absence of democracy' (Ghali 1993:15). Ghali also warned those who might be tempted to consider positive economic performance as a solution to conflicts: 'if the States do not initiate democratic reforms after obtaining the first economic results, they will eventually end up with declining growth which is the source of the increasing levels of inequalities and the attendant social disorders'. Ghali ended his argument on an authoritative note: 'I repeat, it is democracy alone that gives development a meaningful dimension' (Ghali 1993:16).

The synchronous relationships between democracy, development and peace were also highlighted by Tafsir Malick Ndiaye (1992:26).

After all, the general concern of everybody – Mafeje and Mazrui, members of the CODESRIA Community and all Afri-

can intellectuals – consists in settling conflicts in Africa and beyond, ensuring the survival of a continent in 'decay' or being 'disintegrated'. One of our colleagues, Ake, had earlier on observed that, for Africans in the present situation, just as for the citizens of all the States of the world, 'Democracy is the basic prerequisite for survival' (Ake 1991:4). One can hardly live or survive without peace. Be it at the institutional or economic level, the absence of democracy, in the broadest sense of the concept, mainly accounts for the wave of conflicts raging throughout the continent and plunging it into a state of hypertension.

Africans and all peace-loving people in the world should first of all and right now support the on-going democratization process if they wish to see lasting peace restored in each African country.

The *Pax Africana* worth its appellation will depend on national peace in each African State guaranteed by democracy.

There is no doubt that, as long as the human race lives, there will always be conflicts. Democracy is the ideal framework for settling conflicts. It does not suppress them but it helps to limit them and the most serious conflicts are peacefully settled through the implementation of rules established by law and through dialogue.

Peace and servitude cannot be matched, and neither can democracy and (re)colonization nor paradise and hell, for that matter. Without a real independence or full sovereignty democracy and peace are inconceivable.

Once we succeed in achieving 'self-pacification' for each African country, through democratization, we will then be able to tackle with greater force and success the political, economic, social and cultural integration of the continent. To this end, it will be necessary to redefine the mandate of the OAU. The positive economic results obtained through a transparent and democratic management by people who set themselves back to work after winning the democratization struggle will make it possible to finance and sustain continental institutions such as the 'Pan-African Peacekeeping Force' to restore peace and not 'recolonization'. Consolidated democracy, peace and development will considerably reduce the number of political and economic refugees or even ensure that there are no more refugees at all, since the factors that make people

become refugees would have disappeared completely.

However, we should not jump the stages and we should not sleep on our oars. The major challenge Africa has to meet at the end of this 20th century and at the dawn of the third millennium consists in ensuring the success of the democratization process and its consolidation.

The struggle for democracy and total decolonization in Africa is already bitter and will be worse. However, it is an existentialist requirement binding on all citizens and peoples of Africa. Africans should therefore be prepared to confront 'imperialism' and all of its demons.

The Western world continues to successfully implement the 'divide-and-rule' principle in order to maintain African countries under its control. It plays the role of prompter or even director in several plays involving conflicts in Africa. It pulls the strings! Indeed, but for its intervention, many conflicts would not have erupted or would have easily and quickly been settled.

The action taken by the Western countries and particularly France during this 'Transnational' period shows that the Western world is not ready to leave Africa to assume its independence or to see it implement democracy in its own way with the men and the regimes it wishes to have but rather to follow plans with experts and men chosen and prepared by the West. Togo, Gabon, Burkina Faso, Algeria, Zaire and many other more examples can be mentioned. The recent *coup d'état* orchestrated in the Comoro Islands by the famous French mercenary Bob Denard, against a democratically elected African president, is heavily loaded with implications. For one thing, Bob is very popular in eastern Zaire and that was not the first *coup d'état* he had ever engineered; he had always wished to reign in Africa over Africans and France, his country, had always been more lenient with him than with 'terrorists'. There is therefore cause to wonder if he did not operate under cover of the authorities of his country!

Furthermore, a democratic and independent Africa will be detrimental to the interests of the Western world and all those who live by exploiting Africa. After supporting the most bloodthirsty dictators in the service of its interests, the Western world continues to support the totalitarian regimes.



To prove its goodwill and to support the pacification of Africa, the Western world should cease intervening in the internal affairs of the States; they should stop imposing regimes and people of their choice on the States and rather rid the continent of the numerous mercenaries, wild dogs who are the cause of terror and many conflicts in Africa.

It is first and foremost the duty of Africans themselves to accelerate the decolonization and democratization of the continent as well as fight to cut the umbilical cord binding Africa to the Western world just as it links a baby to its mother.

In this struggle against the 'disintegration' or 'decay' of the continent and for the settlement of conflicts, scientific reflection should play a predominant role and debates constitute an important framework. 'Yes' to actions in favour of democratization and decolonization. 'No'

to 'recolonization', which one would however have considered understandable, in view of the *status quo* in Africa. Neither Mafeje nor Mazrui should be excommunicated. We should hold discussions without fighting one another. The temptation to give into Afro-pessimism is quite great but we should also consider the time-frame. Fortunately, the CODESRIA court has this characteristic quality as it receives direct summons, presides over hearing sessions and produces evidence. Moreover, it can deliberate over issues while making provision for an appeal without necessarily passing sentences or pronouncing judgments.

### References

Ake, Claude, 1991, 'Africa in Search of Democracy', *Africa Forum*, Vol. 1.

Fares, Zahir, 1992, *Africa and Democracy: Hope and Illusions*, Paris, Harmattan.

Ghali, Boutros-Boutros, 1993, 'The United Nations and Africa', *Africa 2000*, no. 14.

Kâ Mana, 1991, *Is Africa Going to Die? A Brainstorming Essay on African Political Ethics*, Edition du Cerf, Paris.

Mafeje, Archie, 1995, 'Minor Recolonization and Malignant Minds in the Service of Imperialism', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no.2.

Mazrui, Ali, 1995, 'Self-Colonization and Search for *Pax Africana*: A Rejoinder', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no. 2.

Mazrui, Ali, 1995, 'Toward a Benign Recolonization of the Disintegrating Areas of Africa', *CODESRIA Bulletin*, no. 2.

Mbembe, Achille, 1991, 'Black Africa is going to implode', in *Monde diplomatique*.

Ndiaye, Tafsir Malick, 'Democratic Transitions in Africa', *Democratic Alternative in the Third World*, no. 6.

\* *CODESRIA Bulletin*, Number 1, 1996, (p. 21-30)