THE INFLUENCE OF BRITISH COLONIAL EDUCATION PROVOKING A DESIRE FOR DECOLONIZATION

Thesis submitted to the
Institute of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

English Language and Literature

by

Çağrı Tuğrul MART

Fatih University

December 2010

To my family

APPROVAL PAGE

Student **:** Çağrı Tuğrul Mart

Institute **:** Institute of Social Sciences

Department **:** English Language and Literature

Thesis Subject **:** The influence of British Colonial Education provoking a desire for decolonization.

Thesis Date **:** December 2010

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Head of Department
Prof. Dr. Mohamed Bakari

This is to certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts.

Supervisor
Assist. Prof. Dr. Vassil Hristov Anastassov

Examining Committee Members

Assist. Prof. Dr. Mustafa USLU

Assist. Prof. Dr. Ebubekir CEYLAN

Assist. Prof. Dr. Hasan UĞUR

It is approved that this thesis has been written in compliance with the formatting rules laid down by the Graduate Institute of Social Sciences.

Director
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Karakuyu

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

1. The material included in this thesis has not been submitted wholly or in part for any academic award or qualification other than that for which it is now submitted.

2. The program of advanced study of which this thesis is part has consisted of:

i) Research Methods course during the undergraduate study

ii) Examination of English, American and African Literatures including criticism, a comparative approach to the literatures and assessment of several literary theories which have contributed to this thesis in an effective way.

3. This thesis is composed of the main sources including several books by the major authors discussed in comparison; and the secondary sources including scholarly articles from academic journals as well as newspaper articles, and theoretical books on the criticism of colonial education.

Çağrı Tuğrul MART

December 2010

ABSTRACT

Çağrı Tuğrul MART **December 2010**

THE INFLUENCE OF BRITISH COLONIAL EDUCATION PROVOKING A DESIRE FOR DECOLONIZATION

As a result of colonization, the colonizing countries implements its own form of schooling within their colonies. Colonizing governments realize that they gain strength in their colonies not necessarily through physical control, but through mental control. This mental control is applied through school system.

This study deals with colonial education. At the heart of this policy is the paternalist idea that the "backward" undeveloped inhabitants of the colonized areas need to be educated and brought up to the level of the superior culture and life-style of the colonizing power. The study tries to reveal why colonial education was a need for both colonizers and colonized people. The study neglects how this colonial education was given to indigenous people. But mainly focuses on why White supremacy insisted on its "superiority", and kept on referring colonized people as "backward", or "inferior" in the colonial education process.

Key words:

Colonial education, superiority, inferiority, otherness, backwardness, decolonization

KISA ÖZET

Çağrı Tuğrul MART **Aralık 2010**

İNGİLİZ SÖMÜRGE EĞİTİMİNİN AFRİKA YERLİ HALKININ BAĞIMSIZLIK İSTEĞİNİ ARTTIRMASINDAKİ ETKİLERİ

Sömürgeciliğin sonucu olarak sömürge kuran milletler sömürge kurdukları ülkelerde kendi egitim sistemlerini zorla uygulamışlardır. Sömürge kuran devletler sadece fiziki kontrol ile degil aynı zamanda asimile yoluyla da sömürge ülkelerde güç kazandıklarını farketmişlerdir. Bu asimile çoğunlukla okul sistemi yoluyla gerçekleştirilmiştir.

Bu çalışma sömürge eğitimi ile ilgilidir. Bu uygulamanın temelinde geri kalmış, gelişmemiş sömürge ülkelerin halkları eğitilmek zorundadır ve buralarda sömürge kuran ülkelerin üstün kültür seviyesine getirilmesi zorunludur fikri vardır. Bu çalışma eğitimin neden hem koloni kuran ülkeler hemde sömürge ülkeler için bir ihtiyaç olduğunu ortaya çıkarmaya çalışır. Bu çalışma sömürge eğitimin yerli halka nasıl verildigi üzerinde durmaz. Bu çalışma çoğunlukla bu eğitim yöntemi boyunca beyaz ırkın neden ‘üstünlük’ konusunda ısrar ettiğini ve sömürge kurulan ülke insanlarına ‘geri kalmış’ veya ‘alt sınıf’ diye gördüklerini inceler.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sömürge eğitimi, üstünlük, alt sınıf, başka olma, geri olma, bağımsızlık.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to divulge my unbounded gratitude to all who succoured in the composition of this study as an idea, theory and thesis. Firstly I want to thank the thesis committee who despite their loaded schedule accepted to read my thesis and furnished me with their inestimable insights.

Secondly, my family whose perspicacious endeavour permeate nearly most of the time spent in the writing of this thesis and space allotted to the existence of that thesis deserves the essential portion of recognition. They alleviated my temper when my zest tended to dwindle and consoled me when my study began to get frantic.

Ultimately, I would like to proclaim my deep acknowledgements to my supervisor Vassil Hristov Anastassov for his considerate guidance and perspicacious comments. He buttressed me with his selfless nature and always lent an ear to my precarious statements with his conscientious profundity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

"We seem... to have conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind."

These lines by Sir John Seeley explains the language and education policy of the British Empire during colonization. Education was a crucial point of interaction between 'the native' and the settler, so most colonial powers tried to impose their own education on the local population in Africa at large. Local people had to learn the language of the colonial power because it was the language of instruction at least for higher education and it was the instrument through which intercourse of all varieties could be maintained with the advanced European and European descended people. It was the language of the metropolitan state which was associated with modernity, sophistication and social status. In almost all colonies the language of the colonial power was used as the language of administration. For this reason, the education system needed to produce people who knew the language of the colonizer's well. In many cases people received their education in the metropolitan state, which offered better educational facilities and more exposure to the language and culture of the colonial power.

So far the idea of educating colonized people seems useful because so as to keep up with the education level of the world, those people in African colonies had to be educated as they had no chance of having a good education. But the imperialist project of colonizers exploited this idea. The colonial government began to realize the necessity of training Africans for service to the white man (Urch, 1971). Imperialism was fueled by a widely held belief that the "superior" white race of Europe should bring civilization to the "less developed" people of color living on other continents. The colonizer considered the colonized as inferior beings. On the one hand he considered them inferior, therefore, justified to exploit and subdue; on the other hand, the colonizer maintained it was his ethical and Christian

responsibility to civilized them. The colonizer negated their values as human beings (Gebrewold 2008). The discrepancy teaching the whole nation your language which is an indispensable part of education or educating them in your system but referring them as “backward” started colonized people’s loathing against colonizers. Native people in Africa who passed through the schools were ‘brainwashed’ to discard their own cultures and embrace Western cultures, which were supposedly superior. This resulted in a culture of dependency, mental enslavement and a sense of inferiority (Whitehead, 2005). European missions, the founders of Western education in Africa, had independently begun to set up schools that they hoped would attract eager pupils. From the missionary's perspective, the most urgent purpose for native education had to be conversion and indoctrination in the tenets of Christian faith. Colonizers share the idea that education is important in facilitating the assimilation process.

Later the “superiority” and “inferiority” terms which were occurred with the imperialist project of colonizers brought about “othering” category. Some local writers such as Chinua Achebe in “Things Fall Apart”, M.G. Vassanji “The In-Between World of Vikram Lall”, and Austin Clarke in “The Polished Hoe” even started to complain or criticize about these terms. The more the voice of the black community raised, the less authority colonizers on the African people had. They began to lose faith and confidence in colonial power justice. The education the indigenous people had brought about extensive changes for them. It increased their awareness against colonizers and this enabled them to raise their national feelings. The colonial power authority weakened when these ideas of colonized people occurred.

This study tries to enlighten whether this colonization process which started with the goal of colonizers’ providing a good education for colonized people turned into a means of service for white people, whether White supremacy used education for its own sake, and whether colonial education was a deliberate policy to continue

colonial rule. Another reason that makes this study significant is it tries to discover whether the idea that education which was implemented by the colonizers is important in facilitating the assimilation process.

In the study in order to understand the dependent variables colonialism and colonial education the study presents some key words such as “superiority”, “inferiority”, “backward”, and “other” which are independent variables in the study. And referring these key words for native people of Africa became a major reason for decolonization which is another independent variable in the study.

To present the dependent variables which the study primarily focuses, the research starts with the history of British colonialism in Africa. The article then expresses the goals of colonialism mainly in Africa. The article states the relationship between colonialism and colonial education by stressing some independent variables such as “superiority”, “inferiority”, and “backward”. The study defines these terms and what they refer to. Reasons for referring these terms for native people are explained. The best way to show this is presenting the impositions on native people by colonial power. The research studies these impositions and tries to relate independent variables which occurred with native people’s afflicting by these impositions. The impositions on culture, religion, and mainly language can best be expressed through the devastations they brought about. The study explains these devastations through independent variables. The main focus of the study colonial education is expressed at first presenting the purpose. How colonial power used the education for her own sake is then stated. And the outcomes of this misusage are shown in the study. Finally how these outcomes became a major reason for decolonization is explained.

CHAPTER I

1.1 European Colonialism

Margery Perham, colonial historian of British Africa, remarked in 1961: “Our vanishing empire has left behind it a large heritage of history which is loaded with bequests good, bad and indifferent. This neither they (the critics of colonialism nor we can easily discard”.

Colonialism is generally defined as the establishing and maintaining of colonies in one territory by people from another territory. Colonialism is a practice of domination, which involves the subjugation of one people to another. One of the difficulties in defining colonialism is that it is difficult to distinguish it from imperialism. A colony is part of an empire and so colonialism is closely related to imperialism. Frequently the two concepts are treated as synonyms. Like colonialism, imperialism also involves political and economic control over a dependent territory. Turning to the etymology of the two terms, however, provides some suggestion about how they differ. The term colony comes from the Latin colonus**,** meaning farmer. This root reminds us that the practice of colonialism usually involved the transfer of population of the colonizer’s to a new territory, where the new arrivals lived as permanent settlers while maintaining political allegiance to their country of origin. Imperialism, on the other hand, comes from the Latin term imperium**,** means commanding. Thus, the term imperialism draws attention to the way that one country exercises power over another, whether through settlement, sovereignty, or indirect mechanisms of control (Kohn, 2006).

Though imperialism is usually understood as a strategy whereby a state aims to extend its control forcibly beyond its own borders over other states and peoples, it should be remembered that such control is usually not military, but economic and

cultural. A ruling state will often impose not only its own forms of trade, but also its own political ideas, its own cultural values, and its own language upon a subject state (Habib, 737).

Both colonialism and imperialism were forms of conquest that were expected to benefit Europe economically and strategically. The term colonialism is frequently used to describe the settlement of places such as North America, Australia, Africa, Asia that were controlled by a large population of permanent European residents. The term imperialism often describes cases in which a foreign government administers a territory without significant settlement; typical examples include the scramble for Africa in the late nineteenth century and the American domination of the Philippines and Puerto Rico. The distinction between the two, however, is not entirely consistent in the literature. Some scholars distinguish between colonies for settlement and colonies for economic exploitation. Others use the term colonialism to describe dependencies that are directly governed by a foreign nation and contrast this with imperialism, which involves indirect forms of domination (Kohn, 2006).

Two scholars on colonial education, Gail P. Kelly and Philip G. Altbach, help define the colonialism process as an attempt "to assist in the consolidation of foreign rule". These two scholars in their article “The Four Faces of Colonialism” states that colonialism is a process that is an attempt to strip the colonized people away from their indigenous learning structures and draw them toward the structures of the colonizers (Gail, Altbach 1984).

Colonization is the manifestation of the attitude of the colonizer towards nature and human beings. The colonizer re-forms and redefines the nature of the human and non-human beings. This new definition of the nature of the environment and of the human beings by the colonizer is the beginning of the exploitation. To exploit means to alienate. The self-alienation of the coloniser from the rest of the

human beings and the nature is not a pure negation of the non- Self (the colonizer) in itself. The coloniser is an ambivalent being, which distances itself from its object (the colonized) and at the same time dependent on it. The ambivalence lies in the fact that the colonial annihilation is on the one hand depreciation (destruction) of the Other as sub-human, and on the other hand from this depreciated object the colonizer attains his identity. Hence annihilation is negation and creation at the same time. Through the annihilated and colonized being the colonizer realizes its own being; by negating the counterpart the colonizer knows who he is, since his identity is based on the nothingness of the other. To exploit the alien nature and the owners of this nature is not only an historical phenomenon that happened in the past, but also a proof of the eternal desire to enrich the Self and to determine and exploit the alien, the non-Self (Gebrewold, 2008).

Colonisation is an act of denying the Selfness of the Other. This denial is caused by the consciousness of the own deficiency. Paradoxically, the mind of the coloniser is colonised by the colonised; he needs the other to know himself. The coloniser permanently tries to create and maintain a difference between himself and the colonised. Therefore, any tendency of universalism is not a process or desire for equality, instead a process to demonstrate the superiority and Otherness of the Self (Gebrewold, 2008).

European colonialism saw and presented itself as the actuality of the normatively proper relations among human beings, ranked in a hierarchy of subordination. In this context, colonial subjection was seen, its harshness and violence notwithstanding, as a caring act with long-term beneficial effects. A kind of stern, unselfish venture aimed at bettering a "darker" and less fortunate humanity (Serequeberhan, 2010: 27). As Edward W. Said argues:

> But what distinguishes earlier empires, like the Roman or the Spanish or the Arabs, from the modern [colonial] empires, of which the British and French were the great ones in the nineteenth century, is the fact that the latter ones are

> systematic enterprises, constantly reinvested. They're not simply arriving in a country, looting it and then leaving when the loot is exhausted. And modern empire requires, as Conrad said, an *idea of service,* an *idea of sacrifice,* an *idea of redemption.* Out of this you get these great, massively reinforced notions of, for example, in the case of France, the "*mission civilisatrice."* That we're not there to benefit ourselves, we're there for the sake of the natives.

It was under the guise and mantel of such an *idea* that, by the end of the nineteenth century, the dismemberment and partition of Africa, among the Christian powers of Europe, was completed. In shouldering its responsibility to the rest of us—"The White Man's Burden," in Rudyard Kipling's memorable phrase—Europe expanded on the face of the earth and became global. In globalizing itself, as Said further points out, Europe generously utilized force, "but much more important...than force...was the *idea* inculcated in the minds of the people being colonized that it was their *destiny* to be ruled by the West." (Said, 68).

Colonialist Europe firmly entrenched in the conscious self-awareness of westernized Africa—both explicitly and subliminally—the civilized- uncivilized dichotomy, and convinced this Africa of its shameful deficit within the scope of this all-engulfing and fundamental distinction (Serequeberhan, 2010: 28). As Basil Davidson has pointedly noted: "[M]ost Africans in Western-educated groups...held to the liberal Victorian vision of civilization kindling its light from one new nation to the next, [and] drawing each within its blessed fold, long after the local facts depicted a very different prospect." (Davidson, 82-83).

In other words, European colonialism was established in the belief that "superior races" have the privilege and the duty to civilize the less fortunate, "inferior races." The "ideological pacification" of the colonized occurs when this insidious and humiliating *idea* is decisively implanted in African psyches and is accepted by Africans as their *destiny.* As Frantz Fanon put it: "In the colonial

context, the colonizer does not stop his work of breaking in *[d'ereintement]* the colonized until the latter admits loudly and clearly the supremacy of white values." (Serequeberhan, 2010: 29).

As one of Sembene Ousmane's tragic-comic characters confesses, in a rather lucid moment of angst: "We are nothing better than crabs in a basket. We want the ex-occupiers' place? We have it...Yet what change is there really in general or in particular? The colonialist is stronger, more powerful than ever before, hidden *inside us*, here in this very place." (Sembene, 84).

In our present postcolonial condition, it is imperative to note that the former colonizers, the Western powers, occupy a dominant position not merely through "the force" of their "weapons" but, much more importantly, through the "'models' of growth and development" that, they have created, and that "are today adopted everywhere." Colonization did not merely destroy the modes-of-life through which pre-colonial Africa lived its existence; in demolishing pre-colonial Africa, it constituted Africa as a dependent and servile appendage of the West (Serequeberhan, 2010: 33).

Colonization concurrently established the intellectual parameters, the "models of growth and development" that are operated in, and determined of, the actuality of the present. Within this array of systematically deployed understandings and of methodically amassed knowledge (in and through which humanity interpretatively comprehends itself and regulates its relation with the natural environment), within the symmetry of concepts, models, ideas, and interpretations, that constitute the *paradigms* of knowledge and technical know-how of the human sciences and modern technology, and within this complex assemblage of conceptual instruments of knowledge and its production: To the "vast storehouse of lurid images" has been added the *idea* of an innately dysfunctional continent, incapable of doing for itself (Serequeberhan, 2010: 33).

Colonialism normally refer to a period of history from the 15th century to the 20th century when people from Europe built colonies on other continents. In Europe three of the most influential colonizers were the British, Spanish and French. These three countries were driven by three basic motives: a desire for material gain, a desire to spread religion, and a desire to expand territory (Nosotro, 2003).

The Colonial Empire consists of some forty units of administration scattered in every continent varying in size from the great West African dependency of Nigeria, three times the size of Great Britain, with its population of some twenty million African Natives, to the little Rock of Gibraltar. It comprises Crown Colonies, Protectorates and Mandated territories, with a total population of about fifty-five millions. With the exception of Gibraltar, Malta, Cyprus, St. Helena and the Falkland Islands, the majority of this population is everywhere non-European. Over forty millions are of African race, the remainder being in numerical order, East Indian (including the Sinhalese), Malay, Arab, Chinese, Jews, Melanesians, and Polynesians and American Indians—the last amounting only to a few thousands in British Guiana, British Honduras and the island of Dominica. The total numbers of persons of British race (the self-governing Colony of Southern Rhodesia being excluded) resident permanently or even temporarily as settlers, traders, officials and missionaries in our Colonial Empire is under fifty thousand, i.e. less than one British individual to every thousand non-British (Gore, 1937:162).

In modern times, there have been at least three major phases of imperialism. Between 1492 and the mid-eighteenth century, Spain, Portugal, England, France, and the Netherlands established colonies and empires in the Americas, the east Indies and India. Then, between the mid-nineteenth century and World War I, there was an immense scramble for imperialistic power between England, France, Germany, Italy, and other nations. By the end of the nineteenth century, more than one fifth of the land area of the world and a quarter of its population had been brought under the British Empire: India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South

Africa, Burma and the Sudan. The next largest colonial power was France whose possessions included Algeria, French West Africa, Equatorial Africa, and Indochina. Germany, Italy and Japan also entered the race for colonies. In 1885 Belgium established the Belgian Congo in the heart of Africa, a colonization whose horrors were expressed in Conrad's Heart of Darkness (1899) (Habib, 738).

European colonialism began in 1415, with Portugal's conquest of the Muslim port of Ceuta , Northern Africa. Colonialism was led by Portuguese and Spanish exploration of the Americas , and the coasts of Africa , the middle East , India and East Asia. The latter half of the sixteenth century witnessed the expansion of the English colonial state throughout Ireland. European exploration of the African interior began in earnest at the end of the 18th century. After the creation of a unified Germany (1871) and Italy there was no room left in Europe for expansion. Britain, France and Germany were in an intricate political dance, trying to maintain their dominance. Despite some earlier attempts, it was not until the 17th century that Britain, France and the Netherlands successfully established overseas empires outside Europe in direct competition with Spain and Portugal and with each other. In the 19th century the British Empire grew to become the largest empire yet soon. The British had three major areas of interest in Africa that led to their colonization of it, strategic ports and routes to their Asian colonies, trade interests, and political objectives such as beating the French in the Scramble, and Christianizing the natives (Brownfield).

1.2 The 'Scramble for Africa'

a) Britain

"How can one dare compare the advantages and disadvantages of colonization? What advantages, even if a thousand times more important, could make such internal and external catastrophes acceptable?" (Albert, 118).

At the end of the 18th century colonialism seemed to have become a thing of the past. Britain had lost its thirteen colonies in America, Spain and Portugal had lost most of South America and Holland was having difficulties holding onto the East Indies. A hundred years later, however, a second wave of colonisation took place. Within twenty years, from 1880 to 1900, every corner of the Earth, from the highest mountains in the Himalayas to the most remote Pacific island and Antarctica, came to be claimed by one or other European power. Africa saw the most dramatic colonisation. It was divided up as if it had been a cake split between European leaders. This was called the "Scramble for Africa". Historians still debate the reasons for this "New Imperialism" and find it difficult to agree on any single cause. It seems that the "Scramble for Africa" for Britain began for strategic reasons. After the Congress of Vienna Britain acquired the Cape Colony in South Africa. It was an important port on the sea route to India (Burchill, 2010).

In 1867, the Suez Canal was built across Egyptian territory between the Mediterranean Sea and the Red Sea. Steamships could now go to and from India without passing round the southern tip of Africa (the Cape). The Egyptian government became hopelessly unstable, however, and, reluctantly, in 1882, Britain took over the administration of the country. This began for the British Empire the "Scramble for Africa". Little by little the rest of East Africa was occupied by the British, again principally to safeguard the Indian Ocean sea-routes. At the same time, British colonists in South Africa were interested in extending their possessions northwards, particularly since gold and diamonds had been found in the interior of the region. One colonial leader, Cecil Rhodes, dreamt of building a railway right across Africa, from Cairo in the north to the Cape in the south. Any obstacles, such as the tough Boer settlers who did not like British rule, would have to be brushed out of the way. The Boers were descendants of Dutch colonists who had arrived in the Cape long before the British. It took the British two difficult wars, in 1895 and 1899-1902, to defeat the Boers (Burchill, 2010).

An extract from a speech entitled 'The True Imperialism' made by Lord Curzon at Birmingham Town Hall in 1907

> "Wherever the Empire has extended its borders ... there misery and oppression, anarchy and destitution, superstition and bigotry, have tended to disappear, and have been replaced by peace, justice, prosperity, humanity, and freedom of thought, speech, and action.....
>
> But there also has sprung, what I believe to be unique in the history of Empires, a passion of loyalty and enthusiasm which makes the heart of the remotest British citizen thrill at the thought of the destiny which he shares, and causes him to revere a particular piece of coloured bunting as the symbol of all that is noblest in his own nature and of best import for the good of the world"

b) France

In West Africa trade was the main interest. Originally, trading stations had been set up on the West African coast to deal in slaves to be transported to the Americas. By the late 19th century, trade in palm oil and timber was interesting for Europeans. French colonists were particularly active in West Africa. After defeat in the Franco-Prussian War of 1871, some French politicians, led by Jules Ferry, sought commercial gain and prestige by expanding eastwards into the African interior from Senegal and southwards from Algeria and Tunisia. At the same time, Ferry was interested in Indo-China and Madagascar. He claimed that these new colonies were in France's commercial interests, but perhaps the need to compensate the loss of Alsace-Lorraine with a large empire was a more important consideration (Burchill, 2010).

Since 1908, the educational service in AOF had been an agent of social control, subordinated to the direct authority of administrative officers. Schools were designed to provide the colonies with loyal labourers and junior officials; no ladder provided access to the metropolitan system of secondary and higher education,

although a few well-publicized individuals managed to make the ascent. In some areas school attendance was regarded as the third colonial prestation, along with taxation and forced labour; although only 24 percent of the age-group had school places in 1938-9, in some areas absenteeism was common (Hargreaves, 1991: 360).

c) Belgium

An important factor in the "Scramble for Africa" was the sense of "grabbing" territory, even if it was impenetrable jungle or waterless desert, simply to prevent a neighbour in Europe from putting up his flag on the same land. It was King Leopold of Belgium, and his claim to the huge Congo Basin, who contributed most to this sense of urgency. He was prepared to pay from his own pocket for a colony bigger than his own country. Caught in the frenzy, Portugal felt obliged to extend its old claims, going back to the 16th century, to enormous parts of Angola and Mozambique. The Congo provides the most curious and the most bloody example of European colonisation in Africa. Belgium had only become independent in 1830 and was obliged by law to be a neutral country. Consequently, it could not engage in any adventures in Europe alongside the big powers. Although the Belgian people and government were not particularly enthusiastic, the king, Leopold, was desperate to give the country an Empire. "There are no small nations .... only small minds", he is quoted as saying (Burchill, 2010).

Creating an "Association Internationale Aticaine", he had, by 1875, laid claim to a huge territory, eighty times the size of his own country, in the Congo basin. It was the king's own property, paid for entirely out of his own pocket. By the 1880's, however, his finances were in difficulty and, by a series of royal ordinances, the colonial tax-collectors were authorised to go into villages and extract quotas of rubber from the villagers as taxation. The British Consul in the "Congo Independent State", Roger Casement, produced a famous report in 1903, in which he revealed how Congolese natives were being systematically mutilated (hands, ears, noses cut

oft), ',whipped and executed for not 'producing enough wild rubber for their (taxes. The scandals grew so great that the Belgian parliament demanded that their king relinquish his private colony and hand it over to the Belgian state (1908). The Congo had become the most notorious of all European colonies in Africa (Burchill, 2010)

For almost all the colonial era, Belgium education in Africa was in the hands of the mission. It was universally at the primary level, where a mere two years were the norm, much of it spent tending mission land. Instruction was often in the local language, thus depriving the pupils of an essential means of advancement, a knowledge of French. Only a negligible fraction of pupils proceeded further and education abroad was banned. Looking at other African territories, the Belgians concluded that educated Africans created nothing but trouble for the colonial power. Even as independence approached, the catch phrase was ‘pas d’elites, and pas d’ennuis’. Only in the 1950s were secular secondary and tertiary institutions created. At independence, there were a mere seventeen African graduates, and not a single qualified African doctor, lawyer or engineer (Ewans, 2003: 172).

Although the Portuguese took a few Kongolese to Europe to teach them to speak Portuguese and to learn European culture, real Western education did not begin in the DRC until 1906 when the Roman Catholic Church established schools in return for government grants and land concessions. Belgium made the Catholic Church responsible for education under the terms of the 1906 agreement between the Vatican and the government of Belgium. These schools or *Ecoles Libres Subsidiees* formed the backbone of the educational system until 1948. The Catholics monopolized education throughout this early period. Catholic schools taught religion and won converts, while also teaching utilitarian subjects that made Congo's population more useful to Belgium. First level primary schools were known as *ecole primaire du degre ordinaire.* Students began at age six and went to school for five years. Students who successfully completed only the first level of

primary school were not considered candidates for secondary school. However, they were eligible to go on to second level primary schools known as, *ecole primaire du degre selectionne.* This level took an additional six years to complete. Very few students went on to secondary school. Most were enrolled in the first level primary schools where reading, writing, mathematics, and French were stressed. Upon completion most went immediately into the labor force. Secondary schools were specialized, somewhat like "A" levels in the British system and comparable to junior colleges. After finishing secondary school, many students spent an additional year taking college preparatory courses to help to qualify to enter universities. During the colonial era, the number of Africans who reached this level was so negligible that for all intents and purposes it was as if none did. Church schools, which received government subsidies were called *regime congolaise.* Schools that were for Europeans only were known as *regime metropolitain.* The curriculum in the African schools was far less rigorous than in the European schools where it was assumed that most students would go on to the university. In this two-tiered system equity did not exist. In 1954, the Belgium colonial government tried to remedy this problem by creating secular secondary schools called *ecoles laiques* or *ecoles officelles,* which were separate but allegedly equal to the *regime metropolitain* for whites. This was an apartheid-styled educational system. The aim was to provide minimal or basic education, not complete education. It was an education for servitude, rather than an education that made independent thinkers of learners who became problem solvers. Those who were allowed to receive secondary education concentrated on agriculture and industry, rather than academic preparation for leadership. Two Catholic universities were created in 1954; the Lovanium and the Universite Officielle du Congo. They planned to prepare a well-educated African elite who would eventually assume power in a peaceful transfer of authority. They were overtaken by events before this could happen, so at independence the African population did not have enough educated individuals to efficiently run a modern government. The world blamed Belgium for failing to prepare them in time. Consequently the world judged the Belgium Colonial educational system a failure,

compared to the British and French systems of colonial education (www.education. stateuniversity.com).

d) Germany

Germany arrived very late in the "Scramble". After unification of his country in 1871, Bismark, the Chancellor, was against colonising distant parts of the world. In 1881, under pressure from businessmen and nationalists, he was forced to change policy, but it was almost too late. There was hardly anything left? Germany finally had Namibia and Tanzania (Burchill, 2010).

Unlike the Belgian, British, French and Portuguese colonial masters in central Africa, Germany developed an educational program for Africans that involved elementary, secondary and vocational schools. "Instructor qualifications, curricula, textbooks, teaching materials, all met standards unmatched anywhere in tropical Africa." In 1924, ten years after the beginning of the First World War and six years into British rule, the visiting American Phelps-Stokes Commission reported: "In regards to schools, the Germans have accomplished marvels. Some time must elapse before education attains the standard it had reached under the Germans (Miller, 1974). Germans had occupied in Africa since 1897 and totally altered many aspects of everyday life. They were actively supported by the missionaries who tried to destroy all signs of indigenous beliefs (www.ponude.biz).

CHAPTER II

2.1 Colonization of Africa by the British Empire

Britain under Queen Elizabeth began exploring after defeating the Spanish Armada in 1588. From Francis Drake to Cook and Hudson, England sought to catch up with its chief rival, Spain, who had well established colonies in the Americas exporting gold and silver back to Europe. Britain began seeking its own source of precious metals, and looked toward the American territories and the Caribbean. Failing to find its own supply of gold on land, Britain turned instead to the sea for its fortune. Increasing in the latter half of the 17th century, Privateers, pirates endorsed by the government for a share of the profits, attacked Spanish ships and sacked Spanish towns, capturing huge amounts of gold. In 1655, the English conquered the Spanish settlement of Jamaica, and established other multiple colonies in the Caribbean, along with several plantations in America, such as the colony of Jamestown. Multiple colonies that were founded for religious freedom from persecution in Europe. However, none of these explorative voyages and colonies ever yielded gold. They did, however, yield abundantly tradable resources. Spices, tea, lumber, sugar, tobacco, and cotton began to flow in from England's colonies, and an economic boom followed. Companies such as the East India Trading company, established in 1600 to handle trade with the British territory in India, and the Hudson Bay Company, dealing with the fur trade in America established in 1670, were private groups given monopolies for trade in certain areas by the British government. The Royal Africa Company, formed in 1672, traded in the controversial resource of slaves. The African slave trade was the perfect way for the British to get labor for their Caribbean plantations (Nosotro).

Entering the 18th century, British trade continued to expand right up to the Seven Year War (1756-1763), known as the "French and Indian War" in America. Over the course of the war, Britain overtook many French possessions, including

Québec; the last French territory in Canada. Not long after the war ended, however, Britain was to a have a sharp blow to its colonial power. In 1776, the American colonies declared their Independence, and in 1781, the British commander surrendered, giving the colonies their freedom (Nosotro).

The industrial revolution, which Britain had given birth to, needed to be fed as it grew across the globe. Having lost its major interest in North America, Britain sought raw materials in other territories. Just two decades before the colonies had gained their freedom, Britain made major headway into dominance over India. By this time, the East India trading company had already established multiple trading posts in India. The death of the Mughal emperor in 1707 had severely destabilized the Indian nation, and in the 1750s, the East India trading company began to fight the French for dominance. In 1757, at the Battle of Plassey, the British decisively defeated the French, establishing England as the dominant foreign force in India. Just as the 19th century was beginning, Wilberforce led England set the moral precedent of banning slavery (1807) which was enforced as the royal navy added teeth to the law. Europe was embroiled in the Napoleonic wars (1799-1815). By the end of the wars, Britain owned several French islands in the Caribbean, and the Dutch possessions of Cape Colony, Ceylon and Guiana. In India, British forces under the command of the East India Company had by 1805 turned the Mughal emperor into a puppet governor. By 1858, after putting down a revolt, the British dropped the pretense of a puppet emperor, and brought India under direct control of the British government. One advantage of this action was that Christian missionary activity increased, widow burning (suti) and child sacrifice outlawed. Situated next to India was Burma. Burma had begun to take control of new territory just as Britain had begun to take total control of India. The resulting clash ended in 1886 with Britain controlling both India and Burma (Nosotro).

Although mismanagement by East India Company caused the English crown to take control of India, the moral high ground was not always held. The Opium

Wars against China were the darkest blemish on England's record. Trading India's opium for China's silks, tea, and porcelains, despite the protests of the Chinese government, led to war. A 100 year lease was granted England for the development of Canton (Hong Kong), and increasing spheres of foreign influence gave the west the benefit of unequal treaties into China's resources (Nosotro).

It is often asserted that the British enthused about much of Africa's past. It is claimed that there was an admiration for a simplified, pre-modern existence, in keeping with a Rousseauean conception of the 'noble savage'. Some, particularly postcolonialists such as Homi Bhabha, have argued that this all added a sense of disquiet to imperialist proceedings. Bhabha claims that a colonizing power advocates a ' colonial mimicry', that is, it wants those it ruled over to become a 'reformed, recognizable Other, as a subject of difference that is almost the same, but not quite'. Such mimicry is 'constructed around an ambivalence'; 'the authority of that mode of colonial discourse … is therefore stricken but an indeterminacy: mimicry emerges as the representation of a difference that is itself a process of disavowal (Bhabha 86). In other words, for Bhabha, empire is constantly grounded in ambiguity. The British wished for the 'Other' to be both altered, in keeping with notions of the 'civilizing mission', and, at the same time, to remain different, in order that a space between 'them' and 'us' perpetuated British claims to the role of colonizer (Prior).

The British Empire – those countries under British sovereignty or control existed as early as the sixteenth century but reached its fullest extent around 1920, when it covered some 14 million square miles of territory with over 400 million subject people. Yet by 1980 all the major colonies had gained their independence (Colman, 2006: 28).

In 1870 Britain bought almost a half-share in the recently completed Suez Canal in Egypt, thereby securing a hold over this valuable new trade route to India.

There was more expansion in the Persian Gulf, the Middle East and above all in Africa in subsequent years. This rapid growth of the Empire was part of the ‘New Imperialism’, when Britain and other European powers embarked upon an accelerated phase of colonization. This process was encouraged by the Berlin conference of 1884, which in effect provided a charter for the division of Africa into ‘spheres of influence’(Colman, 2006: 28).

The outbreak of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe saw Britain's land empire expand once again through a series of conquests of French or French allied territories. This expansion was linked to the great British naval victory over the French fleet at the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805: the destruction of the French fleet led to the British navy establishing its mastery of the seas, a situation which would remain unchanged until the early 20th Century. A British naval fleet, operating out of the new British bases in the Mediterranean, were instrumental in chasing the French out of Egypt after Napoleon invaded that country in 1798 (Kemp, 1999).

In 1794, Britain captured the French sugar-producing islands around Guadeloupe in the Caribbean. This resulted in a glut of sugar on the British market and contributed indirectly to British legislation in 1807 abolishing the slave trade, by virtue of the fact that production was so high that few new slaves were needed. (The islands were later returned to France) (Kemp, 1999).

During the war, the Netherlands became aligned with France, and Britain seized several Dutch possessions, including the Cape Colony in South Africa; Ceylon (later Sri Lanka) off the Indian coast; and parts of Guiana in South America. Thousands of British colonists settled in South Africa after 1820, and English became the official language in that colony in 1822. South Africa developed into one of the most interesting racial case studies. Due to the large non-British element of the White population, its relations with Britain were always stormy: they are reviewed in full in a later chapter (Kemp, 1999).

By 1893, British rule had extended north to Matabeleland in present day Zimbabwe, leading to the creation of what became known as the Colony of Southern Rhodesia, later Zimbabwe. The Black Matabele revolted against British rule almost immediately in 1896, but were put down with a massive show of arms by the White colonists, sparking off a conflict of that nature which would only finally end in 1980. The establishment of British outposts on the west coast of Africa - initially as trading posts, then for emancipated slave settlements and then for military base purposes, led to an ever increasing area of jurisdiction being established. These territories included Sierra Leone and the Gold Coast (Kemp, 1999).

This creeping influence of the British over the Black tribes led to a number of race wars in West Africa: the longest running being with the Ashanti tribesmen. These race wars started in 1823 and ran intermittently from that year until around 1900. In the Niger delta of Nigeria, (from the Latin "niger", for "black") the British decided to take control of the increasing trade in palm oil, and in 1852, by sheer military threat, they forced the Blacks in Lagos to accept British protection. In 1861, Lagos was annexed as a crown colony (Kemp, 1999).

The construction of the Suez Canal in 1869 (designed by an Austrian, Alois Negrilli, and built by a Frenchman, Ferdinand de Lesseps), saw Britain being given a protectorate over the canal region to safeguard it. As the rest of Egypt had dropped into Third World chaos, the new arrangement effectively meant a British administration for all of Egypt. During the First World War, Britain declared Egypt a protectorate as a defensive measure against the Turks who had entered that war on the side of Germany. Effective British control of Egypt continued through a series of puppet Egyptian rulers until 1952 (Kemp, 1999).

The creation of British rule over Egypt sparked off a new wave of African colonization for Britain, this time racing against other European powers for

territory. By 1885, Britain had effectively seized or annexed, through war or treaty, huge slices of Africa: the Sudan (1881), Bechuanaland (now Botswana) in 1885, Uganda in1894; the first British settlers in Kenya started arriving towards the end of the 19th century (Kemp, 1999).

2.2 Reasons for Colonialism

The reasons for the practice of colonialism at this time include:

a) The profits to be made

b) To expand the power of the metropole

c) To escape persecution in the metropole

d) To convert the indigenous population to the colonists' religion

The 19th century in Europe was a time of industrialization. Factories in Europe required raw materials to be manufactured into marketable products. As a result, Europeans sought both a source of raw materials, as well as, a market for manufactured goods in Africa. This economic motivation played a large role in the colonization of Africa. Nationalism-a strong of identification with and pride in one's nation-resulted in competition between European nations. This competition often resulted in wars between nations. Competition over colonial expansion in Africa was another way that national competition between European nations was demonstrated in the late 19th century. One of the causes of the Scramble for Africa, (1885-1910) which resulted in the colonization of all of Africa in just twenty-five years, was the competition between European nations. No major nation wanted to be without colonies. The competition was particularly strong between Britain, France, and Germany, the strongest European nation-states in the late 19th century. In addition, ideologies of racial hierarchy were prevalent in Europe in the 19th century. Many Europeans viewed themselves as the most advanced civilization in the world, and some saw it as their mission to "enlighten" and "civilize" people in the rest of the world. Many inaccurate and racialized stereotypes of African

peoples, which existed at the time, were used to justify colonialism in Africa. The colonization of Africa coincided with the expansion of Christian missionary activity in Africa. Such countries as Ethiopia and Egypt, were home to Christians right from the beginning of Christianity as a region. However, Christianity was introduced to the rest of Africa only in the modern era. Christian missionary activity began in earnest in the 19th century during the same period of time that European countries were becoming more engaged in Africa. Historians do not all agree on what the relationship was between Christian missionary activity and colonialism. However, evidence suggests that while many missionaries opposed the harsher aspects of colonialism, they were supportive of the colonization of African countries. Missionaries who supported colonialism believed that European control would provide a political environment that would facilitate missionary activity in Africa. This support for colonialism played an important role in legitimizing the colonial endeavor among the citizens of the colonizing powers in Europe (Getahun).

There were various motives behind Britain's zealous participation in the New Imperialism (Colman, 28). Firstly, there were intensified rivalries with other powers, as states such as the newly-unified Italy and Germany, along with France which sought to compensate for its defeat in the Franco-Prussioan War in 1870, looked to the non-European world for expansion. An expansionist Russia posed a particular threat in the decaying Ottoman Empire in the Middle East. British policy-makers wanted to secure further gains before their rivals did, in case they lost out in the international 'balance power'. Secondly there were economic motives, notably the desire to capture new markets and sources of raw materials, preserve or expand trade links and to prevent the loss of existing overseas markets to other countries. Countries such as Nigeria offered valuable resourcessuch as palm oil, which was used as a lubricant for industrial machinery. Thirdly, there was a growth of imperial nationalism, militarism and a sense of racial superiority ('jingoism') throughout Britain society. This jingoistic sentiment may have been as much an effect as a cause of British expansionism, but in combination with the other factors it helped to

push Britain further along the colonial path. In relation to Africa, for example, between 1885 and 1914 Britain took control of nearly 30 percent of the continent's population, compared to 15 percent for France and nine for Germany. The formalization of British rule in Africa included Somaliland (1884), (Bechuanaland (1885), East Africa (1887), Rhodesia (1888), The Gambia (1888), Nyasaland (1889), Swaziland (1890), Uganda (1894), the Sudan (1898) and Nigeria (1900). European nations were able to make certain areas of Africa into their colonies in two main ways. Some African leaders were willing to sign treaties with Europeans for various reasons. In some cases, they saw it to their benefit to gain European allies. In other cases, there was not a clear understanding of what the treaties were about or what the consequences of them would be. Secondly, military force was used in some cases when there was a large amount of resistance to colonial rule (Colman, 2006: 29).

a) *Demand for Raw Materials.* In the 19th century, Europe experienced the industrial revolution. Industrial production, like all modes of production, requires human resources, capital resources, and natural resources. There was no shortage of labor in Europe. Two centuries of trade with Asia, the Americas, and Africa (including the Atlantic Slave Trade) had brought great profits to European traders. These profits provided the capital necessary to finance the industrial revolution. However, most of Europe was resource poor. Consequently, European industries were dependent on raw materials from Asia, the Americas, and Africa. For example, one of the earliest industries in Europe was the cotton textile industry, which helped stimulate the industrial revolution. This industry was completely dependent on imported cotton. As industrialization grew and spread throughout Europe, competition for raw materials increased. Consequently, some European industrialists encouraged their governments to colonize African countries as a method of guaranteeing sources of raw materials (Getahun).

b) Need for Markets. By the late 19th century, the industries in Europe were producing more industrial goods than Europeans could consume. Consequently, industrialists sought markets for there goods around the world. As competition between industries for markets grew, industrialists encouraged their governments to undertake colonization of Africa in order to protect markets for their industrial goods (Getahun).

c) Commerce, Christianity, Civilization. Some historians argue that one of the most important economic reasons for colonization was the belief by some Europeans, particularly missionaries, that the development of trade and commerce in Africa was an essential component to the restitution of "civilization" in Africa. Today, historians reject this ethnocentric conception of civilization, but many Europeans of the period felt that Africa was not "civilized". They believed that trade and commerce, along with introduction of Christianity, were key to development in Africa. Christian mission societies and other advocates of this position pushed European governments to colonize Africa and thereby provide a supportive environment for the expansion of commerce (Getahun).

Establishing political control, or sovereignty, over their colonies was the primary objective of the colonial powers in the early years of colonialism. The colonial powers used a combination of warfare, threat of force, and treaty making with African rulers in their efforts to gain political control of African colonies. Once political control was realized and institutions of governance were in place, economics became the main concern of the colonial governments. Europe experienced an economic depression at the end of the 19th century; consequently, the colonial powers felt that they had no money to spend on political administration, social programs, or economic development in their colonies. They were adamant that the colonies should pay for themselves. The colonial administration in each colony was charged with raising the revenue necessary to pay for all expenses, including the colonial army and police force (Getahun).

Given the great geographic diversity of Africa in terms of natural resources, climate, vegetation, topography, and precipitation, there was no uniform model that the colonial powers used to raise revenue throughout Africa. Just as economic activity in the early 20th century varied throughout Europe and in the United States, so too, economic activity in Africa was diverse. Within this diversity, economic historians of Africa have identified five modes of economic activity and revenue generation in colonial Africa (Getahun).

a) Mineral exploitation. Africa is a continent rich in mineral resources. In colonies where there were large deposits of minerals, colonial governments encouraged the exploitation of the minerals. Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) and the Belgian Congo (Congo) are examples of colonies whose economies were dominated by copper production. In these colonies, colonial governments initiated policies that forced some African farmers to leave their homes to become mine workers (Getahun).

b) Large scale agricultural production. In colonies in East and Southern Africa that had climates attractive to European settlers, the primary colonial economic activity and revenue generation was large scale farms owned by Europeans. Examples include Angola (coffee), Kenya (coffee, tea), and Southern Rhodesia/Zimbabwe (tobacco, beef). In this system, European settler farmers *needed* land and labor. To meet these *needs*, the colonial governments instituted unpopular policies that removed good farm land from the local population and forced some men to work as laborers on European controlled farms (Getahun).

c) Small scale agricultural production. Most African colonies had neither large deposits of minerals, nor the environment to encourage European settlement. In these colonies, the colonial governments actively encouraged farmers to grow special *cash crops* that would be exported to raise revenues. Cash crops included food crops such as groundnuts/peanuts (Senegal, Nigeria), coffee (Tanganyika,

Rwanda, Uganda), cocoa (Ghana, Togo, Cote D'Ivoire) and non-food crops, such as cotton (Mali, Niger, Sudan) and tobacco (Malawi) (Getahun).

d) Supply of Labor. Parts of some African colonies were poor in natural resources. In these situations, the colonial regimes instituted policies that strongly *encouraged* able bodied men to leave their homes and migrate either to distant areas within the same colony or to neighboring colonies where they worked in mines or on large farms. Mine owners and commercial farmers paid a recruitment fee to the colonial government of the worker's home country. For example, in Southern Africa the colonies of Bechuanaland (Botswana), Basotholand (Lesotho), Swaziland, and parts of Mozambique and Malawi became labor reservoirs for the mines and large farms of Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and South Africa (Getahun).

e) Mixed Economies. Most colonial economies in Africa are called *mono-economies* by economists. This indicates that the colonial economies were dependent on mining, settler agriculture, or the small scale production of a single cash crop. There were a few exceptions to this trend. By the end of colonialism in South Africa (1994), the country had a very vibrant and diversified economy boasting mineral, agricultural, and manufacturing industries, and an advanced commerce sector. Another example of a mixed economy is Nigeria. In the 1950s, the last decade before independence, the discovery of large reserve of petroleum helped diversify an agriculturally based economy (Getahun).

In most African colonies, given the lack of revenue, very little was done officially to promote social change or social development. However, the colonial experience had a dramatic impact on African societies. Once again, it is important to remember that the colonial impact on Africa was not uniform across the continent. However, some social consequences were experienced in most African colonies (Getahun).

1. *Movement of People.*

Colonial economic and political practices resulted in the massive movements of people in most African colonies. In some locales, migrations were primarily from one rural area to another. In other places, the migration was from rural areas to urban areas. In either case, these movements resulted in dislocation of peoples that impacted society and culture. Social and cultural beliefs and practices were challenged by these migrations. Long-held practices had to be adapted (and at times were completed abandoned) to fit the new circumstances. In U.S. history, rural to urban migration in the early 20th century had a similar impact on American society and culture (Getahun).

2. *Dislocation of Families.*

Families were often split up by migration. For example, men recruited to work in mines and on plantations often had to leave their families behind. As a result, women and adolescents were forced to take on new roles and to cope in absence of their husbands and fathers. Even when families remained unaffected by migration, they underwent considerable stress and change as the result of the colonial experience. Prior to colonialism, the *extended family* structure was the norm in most African societies. But by the end of colonial era, *the nuclear family* was becoming the norm in many African countries (Getahun).

3. *Urbanization.*

A number of pre-colonial African societies had towns and small cities. However even in these societies, most people were engaged in agriculture in rural villages or homesteads. During colonialism, urbanization occurred fairly rapidly in many African colonies. Urban living resulted in changes in economic activities and occupation, and in changes in the way people lived. These changes often challenged existing values, beliefs, and social practices (Getahun).

4. *Religious changes.*

There was a significant change in religious belief and practice as a result of colonialism. At the beginning of the colonial era, less than five per cent of the people in Africa identified themselves as Christian. Today, nearly fifty per cent of the people in Africa identify themselves as Christians. Colonial rule provided an environment in which Christianity, in many forms, spread in many parts of Africa. While Islam was widespread in Africa prior to the coming of colonialism, it also benefited from colonialism. British and French colonial officials actively discouraged Christian mission work in Moslem areas. Peace and order established by colonial rule provided an environment in which Islam could consolidate its hold in certain African colonies (Getahun).

5. *Education.*

Throughout human history, all societies have practiced a form of "public" education. Education is the method by which families and societies transfer beliefs, values, and skills between generations. Throughout human history, education has mainly been informal. That is, values and knowledge were learned in informal settings in the home, church, and through work and play. It is has only been in the past 200 years that public education has become more formalized, taking place in schools with an added emphasis on *literacy* and *numeracy*-reading, writing, and mathematics (Getahun). Koranic Schools were widespread in the Islamic areas of Africa prior to the coming of colonial rule. Koranic schools focused on learning to read the Koran, the holy book of Islam. The Koran was written in Arabic. Consequently, students learned to read Arabic, and not their local language, at the Koranic schools. However, schools that emphasized literacy and numeracy in African languages were not common. Proponents of colonialism claimed that it was necessary to enlighten and civilize African peoples and societies. Given this concern, you would think that colonial governments would have made a major effort to introduce schools throughout Africa. The truth is that most colonial

governments did little to support schools. Most formal schooling African colonies were a result of the work of missionaries. Missionaries felt that education and schools were essential to their mission. Their primary concern was the conversion of people to Christianity. Missionaries believed that the ability of African peoples to read the Bible in their own language was important to the conversion process. However, most mission societies were not wealthy, and they could not support the number of schools that they really wanted. Consequently, with limited government support, most African children did not go to school during the colonial era. In fact at the end of colonial rule, no colony could boast that more than half of their children finished elementary school, and far fewer attended secondary school (Getahun).

2.3 Missionaries and Colonization

The foundation of Western education in Africa was laid by Christian missionaries who were eager to use literacy training to introduce Christianity and win converts to their religion. The missionaries also used Western education to train Africans as catechists, messengers, and other positions needed to assist them in realizing the social and economic development and transformations desired by the European missionaries and their agents. Merchants and traders also required qualified personnel to handle their business transactions. The African commercial and business elite also required personnel that was well-trained and equipped to handle political and economic transactions between Africans and outsiders involving record keeping and correspondence regarding the exchange of European and African goods and services (Omolewa, 2006: 267).

Hilde Arntsen in his article *Missionaries and Colonization* argues that Christianity was introduced in North Africa as early as the first century AD., but it was only in the late nineteenth century, when colonialism was advancing, that Christianity seriously increased its presence on the continent (Ray, 1976: 193). In

what later became Southern Rhodesia, now Zimbabwe, the first mission station was opened in Inyati close to Bulawayo in 1859 by the London Missionary Society through Reverend Robert Moffat. It is pertinent to keep the following critical questions in mind: Who brought "education" but Christian missionaries? Who fought against tradition religions but Christian and Muslim missionaries? Who saw traditional religions as deadly adversaries but Christian missionaries? Who therefore detached the African from his [sic] religion but the church people? (Taban Lo Liyong, 1988:81-91)There may have been many reasons for missionaries to travel to Africa, but not only as remarked by Father Wermter: "The community culture of Africa fascinated the European missionaries who came from individualistic cultures." Moyo remarks that the introduction of Christianity made the mistake of believing that to become a Christian, people had to be "removed from their indigenous cultures" (Moyo, 1983, in Haar, 1990: 139). African religions were treated as an evil which had to be encountered. This can be seen in the following quotation: "Once their children have gone to school, they begin to show interest in the strange religion of the white missionaries, religion which denies the truth of Tonga religious beliefs." It was frequently believed by Western missionaries that traditional religious beliefs and practices were inferior, and traditional customs had to be done away with before the acceptance of Christianity. This did not happen without resistance or problems, and gave for instance rise to the process which can be seen as religious syncretism in religious beliefs today. What Bishop Desmond Tutu described as a "form of schizophrenia" was thus the result of having to disclaim the indigenous culture before converting to Christianity (quoted in Moyo, 103). There is no reason to dismiss such attitudes as a thing of the past, however. Many of the same sentiments can be found in contemporary religious expressions and among the leaders of various religious groups. The role of the missionaries in the colonisation of the region was also considerable in terms of cultural and political domination of the people. Although the missionaries' task was to make people accept the Bible and its teachings, Christianity was turned into an ideology which could be used to convince people not to resist white domination.

Religion was used to legitimate, sustain and even promote political tyranny and oppression, as well as in other instances for reasons of political liberation of the people. In the words of Charles Villa-Vicencio, religion has functioned both as the "opiate of the people" and a "source of the social renewal" (1989: 25). Bourdillon, on the other hand, maintains that "missionary Christianity cannot simply be identified with colonialism" (Bourdillon, 1990: 269). Regardless of claims that the missionaries regarded themselves as opposed to the colonial ideology, they were part of the colonial structure and brought with them religions, beliefs and practices which were alien to the area. In the words of Father Wolf Schmidt, "the early missionaries did not differentiate between their faith and their own culture" (Hilde 1997: 49-50).

> The people of Akropong keenly felt {the missionary's} intending (sic) departure from among them, and the Chief is quoted to have addressed him at a farewell durbar in the following words: 'When God created the world, he made BOOK for the whiteman, and JUJU or fetish for the blackman, but if you could show us some black men who can read the whiteman's BOOK, then we would surely follow you'. (Agyemang, 1967: 20)

This story, from Agyemang's (1967) *A Century with Boys,* reflects the prominent role of missionary education in the history of the British African colonies. In fact, the missions figured so prominently in the British conception of colonial education that they were often referred to as Britain's 'unofficial partner' (White 1996:18).

CHAPTER III

3 Colonial Education

A broad history of education in colonial Africa can be roughly broken into three phases. The first phase, from the waning years of the nineteenth century until around World War I, was one dominated by missionary education and a civilizing mission. Government institutions in London and in the various colonial contexts usually steered clear of the work of missionary societies. There is a second phase between World War I and World War II that is best characterized by official programs that sought to 'adapt' education to what was then understood by experts to be traditional cultural practice and the unique 'African mind'. Projects were designed to provide education at little cost to the state and to address welfare concerns in an era of global depression, but they were also meant to forestall political movements that threatened the colonial order. Missionary involvement in education in this period by no means ceased; in fact, most government education projects involved missionary societies and influential mission leaders at the planning stages. Often, too, government worked through the missions for recruitment of students for teacher training in government schools and also used grants to mission schools that would cooperate with government. After 1921, however, the British state took an unprecedented role in administering education in its colonies, protectorates, and in the mandates it had received after the breakup of the German empire at the conclusion of World War I. Before this period, there was no concept of 'British Education' in Africa, as mission education undertaken by competing denominations lacked the cohesion of state policy. To be sure, the missionaries were British, and to the people of Africa the strengths and limitations of mission education were often considered in their evaluations of colonialism more generally. But between the wars there was a concerted effort to set out policy statements for all of 'Tropical Africa' and to design programs and implement models of 'Native Education' by Colonial Office officials in London, influential

missionaries in Africa, veteran Government House administrators from each colonial setting, and representatives of corporate philanthropic organizations in the United States. It was in this period, too, that movements for African independence in education gained significant force, as some interwar state interventions in education were hugely unpopular with the people they were intended for. Interwar controversies over educational control point to a third phase in the history of colonial education, discussed here by way of conclusion, that is inextricably tied to various histories of struggle for national independence in the 1950s and 1960s (Windel, 2009: 2).

Education in the Colonies was, as in England, neglected by Government and left almost entirely to private enterprise, notably to the missionary bodies, or to ecclesiastical authorities, non-Christian as well as Christian. These educational departments have not waited for direction from home ; they have just gone ahead, and it was not until 1922, and then only for Native education in tropical Africa, that any educational organisation was established in the Colonial Office (Gore, 1937: 164).

British interest in the control of education policy in Africa and elsewhere in the colonial empire was of relatively short duration. It started in the early 1920s but was fast waning by the 1950s as various territories assumed increasing responsibility for the conduct of their own internal affairs as a prelude to independence. Nevertheless, critics were not slow to attack British direction of colonial education in the 1930s and thereafter. Much of the criticism focused on the concept of adaptation and the claim that it was a means of keeping indigenous peoples in their (subservient) place. Other criticisms were levelled at the slow pace and scope of educational development. By 1939, schooling extended to only a minority of children in most colonies and most of that was confined to the primary stage. It was claimed that colonial administrations deliberately neglected education for both political and economic reasons. One especially outspoken critic was

Professor Victor Murray who challenged various aspects of British colonial education policy including adaptation. Others critics who also berated the British included Professsor W.M. Macmillan, Leonard Woolf, Norman Leys and Leonard Barnes. They accused the British of not extending the benefits of European civilization, including education, to Africans in the spirit of the trusteeship principle enshrined at Versailles. Macmillan also argued strongly against 'Indirect Rule' and for more recognition in government and administration of educated Africans: 'Whatever education we may have given them, the one lesson they have never been allowed to learn is responsibility. They have been allowed to talk and discuss, but never to do things for themselves, least of all to deal with money.' The two Phelps-Stokes Reports of the early 1920s were also critical of education in Britain's African colonies, mainly because of the acute lack of schooling and the strong literary nature of the curriculum. The Phelps-Stokes Fund, under the leadership of Thomas Jesse Jones, strongly advocated that the African colonies should adopt the manual/vocational type of curriculum that had been developed for ex-slaves in the American southern states after the civil war (Whitehead, 2005: 444).

In more recent times Stephen Ball criticized the Carnoy-type analysis of colonial schooling for placing too much emphasis on the economic functions of colonial schooling but he still took colonial officials to task for using schooling for overt political purposes. By 'denying' education to Africans, Ball claimed that the British achieved social control. He also believed that the lack of access to secondary education for Africans throughout East Africa in the 1930s had racial overtones because it was linked to the implied intellectual inferiority of Africans. Nevertheless, Western education sowed the seeds of the demise of colonial rule as it did in India. Western concepts of freedom and human rights only served to highlight the contrast between the theory and practice of colonial rule and its outward display of power and intolerance. Ball's criticisms were mild, however, compared with those of the African historian P.G. Okoth, writing about British education policy in Uganda in the period prior to 1939. In what can only be

described as an angry verbal diatribe in the tradition of men like the late Walter Rodney, Samir Amin and Abdou Moumouni, he accused the British of deliberately pursuing forms of cultural and ideological domination to destroy or paralyse the cultures of the Ugandan people. In this exercise, he claimed that Western education played a crucial role. Ugandans who passed through the schools were 'brainwashed' to discard their own cultures and embrace Western cultures, which were supposedly superior. This resulted in a culture of dependency, mental enslavement and a sense of inferiority. In short, the minds of Ugandans were colonized in the best Carnoy tradition! Limitations of space preclude any rejoinder to these claims but even Stephen Ball was quick to point out that Western academic schooling was not forced on Africans. Indeed, the reverse was the case. It was the Africans who demanded the same type of education as their colonial overlords because they readily saw its economic and political advantages. Ironically, it was British anthropologists, not Africans, who expressed grave fears for the future of traditional African culture (Whitehead, 2005: 445).

In retrospect it is clear that colonial education policy was fraught with much confusion of purpose and lack of resources throughout the interwar years. It is also true that education officials both at home and abroad fought a constant uphill battle against Colonial Office apathy and even the open hostility of some colonial officials. As W.E.F. Ward later remarked, 'The basic problem was the lack of any real interest on the part of the British people in the welfare of colonial peoples. If only we had known, above all, that people cannot learn from other people's mistakes but only from their own' (Whitehead, 2005: 445).

More favourable accounts of colonial education policies, which actively sought to highlight the manifold problems in colonial education, were provided by Lord Lugard in a very influential chapter on education in his Dual Mandate, Arthur Mayhew in his book Educational Policy in the Colonial Empire, and H.S. Scott, a former Director of Education in Kenya, who wrote various journal articles and book

reviews, and who was also responsible for the long chapter on education in Hailey's An African Survey C.T. Loram, the South African who later became a professor at Yale, also wrote extensively on the education of indigenous peoples and provided further support for the theory of adaptation. Another significant writer was Julian Huxley whose book Africa View highlighted the confusion of purpose in native education policy in Africa. H.S. Scott, writing in 1938, thought it had probably been too late to reform African education in the 1930s. To have refused Africans access to Western education would have been widely regarded as a deliberate attempt to deny them their right to ultimate self-determination as enshrined in the League of Nations trusteeship principle. It would hardly be an exaggeration, Scott claimed, to say that the African, especially the educated African, recognized no form of education other than that in Western garb (Whitehead, 2005: 445).

Perhaps the most influential was Martin Carnoy, whose book Education as Cultural Imperialism, published in 1974, strongly condemned colonial education everywhere as part of a deliberate policy to perpetuate colonial rule. Carnoy argued that considerations of power and conflict are central to all educational processes. By definition he believed that imperialism implied the control of the weak by the strong. It followed that the educational objective of imperialism was to colonize the intellect of the ruled in the interests of those who ruled over them. Another equally damning indictment of British colonial education policy was contained in a doctoral study by the American scholar D.G. Schilling, who traced the development of African education policy in Kenya during the years 1895-193 0. He argued that education policy was rooted in the political and economic realities of life in Kenya, which were influenced primarily by the British settlers' aim to create 'a white man's country'. It followed that native education policy should ensure that Africans knew their place in the social hierarchy. Schilling's criticisms might equally have been levelled at native education policies in both Southern and Northern Rhodesia where 'white' settlers sought to maintain their superior status (Whitehead, 2005: 446).

The most scholarly critic of British colonial education was Trevor Coombe, who completed a PhD at Harvard University in the early 1960s on the origins of secondary education in Zambia, the former colony of Northern Rhodesia. The study was subsequently published as three consecutive and lengthy articles (1967-68) in the journal African Social Research. His study, based on extensive archival research in the Zambian national archives, was designed to highlight what he claimed were the deliberate moves on the part of the colonial administration in Northern Rhodesia in the 1930s and thereafter, to limit the provision of secondary education for Africans. As a result, when independence was achieved in October 1964, the country's supply of educated manpower was utterly inadequate to run the country. To quote Coombe, the provision for secondary education 'was begun late, advanced hesitantly, encountered frequent and exasperating delays, and (until the last years of colonial rule) was marked by a dawning and fitful sense of urgency' J.C.E. Greig in his doctoral study of education policy in the Gambia and Malawi in the interwar years claimed that there was no central policy emanating from Whitehall 'only general guidelines ... and these guidelines were worked on, very much like raw material, by local factors, forces and pressure groups to produce systems of education that while bearing a superficial similarity to each other were, in reality, often quite different' (Whitehead, 2005: 448).

But the pressures of the introduction of a settler population or the European demand for labor in service of their agricultural, mining, and industrial operations meant that, while Africans' political lives should stay on the reserves, they should be free to labor off the reserve and for the settlers. Settler economies like that of Kenya required cheap African labor, which, from the vantage point of the settler seemed to exist in overabundance, and its exploitation made more business sense than investing in expensive equipment. The story of white settlement in Kenya, officially sanctioned by authorities in the East African Protectorate by 1903, is in many ways one of expropriation and domination as white settlers seized – with either the outright consent or the passive blind eye of colonial authorities in London

– the best land of the Kikuyu, restricted Africans to smaller ‘native reserves’ and then offered minimal remuneration for laborers on plantations tending cattle and growing sisal, coffee, and sometimes tobacco. The better-paying jobs were taken by those who could speak English and act as middle men in the administration of agricultural enterprise or as clerks in growing cities like Nairobi. Incentive, then, for an education in English was built into the new economic orientation of the region for which settlers, more than any other group, were responsible. As the most politically empowered group in Kenya, the administration of ‘Native Affairs’, which included education, often bent toward settler interests. When settlers needed English-speaking Africans to help administer business, the mission schools provided them in the interest of literacy for reading the Bible. When settlers complained of the lack of skilled labor, a commission was led that inquired into the best educational model for the colony, and it came back with a decidedly industrial focus. Grants-in-aid were provided to mission schools out of Kenya government funds in return for assurances that school lessons would focus on fitting Africans with the technical knowledge needed to work as artisans for settlers (Windel, 2009: 5-6).

Education was a crucial point of interaction between ‘the native’ and the settler, and European missions had independently begun to set up schools that they hoped would attract eager pupils. From the missionary's perspective, the most urgent purpose for native education had to be conversion and indoctrination in the tenets of Christian faith. In the kraal schools established by the missions, the rudiments of English would be taught insofar as they were necessary to teach the Gospel. Ultimately it was hoped that the fruits of evangelism would be born in the conversion of African disciples who could witness more effectively for being insiders. For a number of missions it was viewed as disadvantageous to teach English, since missionaries feared that too much fluency in English would alienate their African disciples from the base of prospective converts. And yet instruction in English was more often exactly what Africans wanted from European education. It

was easy for many to see that the coming of Europeans – especially when their numbers began to increase exponentially as white settlement began in earnest after 1900 – meant that English was becoming the language of power and status. To advance in the economy being created meant that one needed fluency in English. In fact, in East Africa missions tended to set up schools in a piecemeal fashion, usually locating them near their central stations and expanding outward only when necessary to get local cooperation in their main mission to convert. But, as historian John Anderson noted in his seminal work on education in Kenya, 'Schools spread rapidly across East Africa only after the Africans had realized the significance of education, and took action themselves', which included giving land and labor for the construction of permanent schools (Windel, 2009: 9).

Still, education before the war was a largely *ad hoc* process with disconnected European interests sometimes finding common voice in the call for a 'civilizing' education. The British Imperial state, however, was largely uninvolved. This was due partly to the limitations of communication over large spaces before World War I and the difficulties of administering so vast a territory from a central location. Administration of Britain's African territories before the war relied almost exclusively on local authorities, from the Government Houses set up in a territory's principle town to the so-called 'man on the spot' who would serve as representative for the British state and as cultural interpreter to authorities seeking to understand the seemingly inchoate territory under the British flag. However, events after the war made this administrative distance troubling for government in London, and from the early 1920s until World War I the administrative routine was drastically adjusted and more control taken by the Colonial Office in London. Between the wars, 'Native Education Policy' became a major front in the battle of competing interests of the colonial state, missionary societies, international organizations and governing bodies, and Africans themselves (Windel, 2009:11).

Initially, the Africans expected much from the attainment of Western education, but they quickly became disappointed and frustrated over the results. This disenchantment was expressed in complaints from Africans and Europeans alike that the "imported" educational system failed to achieve its objectives. Western education was considered "too European," and therefore, ill-suited and irrelevant to African needs, and that in the process, the indigenous values of love, community relationships, and profound spirituality were being lost. At the same time, some complained that the new system had introduced new values of hatred, intolerance, "cutthroat competition," disharmony, pride, arrogance, covetousness, and even cheating. It was further suggested that there was too much rote-learning and too little application of the principles being taught in the schools. Colonial officials soon resolved that massive reform was required (Windel, 2009: 15).

Kehinde in the article “Post-Colonial Literatures as Counter- Discourse: J.M. Coetzee's *Foe* and the Reworking of the Canon” states that a century of European (British and French mainly, but also Portuguese, German, Italian and Spanish) colonization left behind an African continent dazed, bewildered and confused. This is why modern African writers see the need for and admit a commitment to the restoration of African values. In fact, the Western world equates knowledge, modernity, modernization, civilization, progress and development to itself, while it views the Third-World from the perspective of the antithesis of the positive qualities ascribed to itself. Such negative stereotypes are perpetrated by a system of education, which encourages all the errors and falsehoods about Africa/Africans. Writing on the jaundiced portrayal of Africa/Africans in Western canonical works, Edward Wilmot Blyden asserted over a hundred years ago that:

> All our traditions and experiences are connected with a foreign race -we have no poetry but that of our taskmasters. The songs which live in our ears and are often on our lips are the songs we heard sung by those who shouted while we groaned and lamented. They sang of their history, which was the history of our degradation. They recited their triumphs, which contained the records of our

> humiliation. To our great misfortune, we learned their prejudices and their passions, and thought we had their aspirations and their power.
>
> (Kehinde 33).

Africa and Africans are given negative images in Western books of geography, travels, novels, history and in Hollywood films about the continent. In these texts and records, Africans are misrepresented; they are portrayed as caricatures. Unfortunately, Africans themselves are obliged to study such pernicious teachings. Reacting to this mistake, Chinua Achebe declares that if he were God, he would "regard as the very worst our acceptance, for whatever reason, of racial inferiority." He further comments that his role as a writer is that of an educator who seeks to help his society regain belief in itself and put away the complexes of the years of vilification and self-denigration (Kehinde, 34).

Homi Bhabha also declares that Western newspapers and quasi-scientific works are replete with a wide range of stereotypes . In similar fashion, Andrew Milner and Jeff Browitt dwell on the inscriptions of stereotypes of Africa/Africans in Western religious canonical texts (the Bible in particular). To them, canonical texts are:

> Those Christian religious texts considered divinely inspired by the Church. In secular aesthetics, literary and other texts accorded a privileged status, within some version or another of a 'great tradition', as embodying the core values of a culture.
>
> (Kehinde, 34)

Actually, the colonization of Africa is explicit in the physical domination and control of its vast geographical territory by the colonial world and its cronies. However, this physical presence, domination and control of Africa by the colonizer is sustained by a series or range of concepts implicitly constructed in the minds of the colonized. Therefore, more than the power of the cannon, it is canonical knowledge that establishes the power of the colonizer "I" over the colonized

"Other" (Foucault, 174). It should also be stressed that the available records of Africa's history handed down by the Europeans, far from being a disinterested account of Africa, are interested constructs of European representational narratives. This view is supported by Ania Loomba : "the vast new world (Africa inclusive) encountered by European travelers were interpreted by them through ideological filters, or ways of seeing, provided by their own culture" (Kehinde, 34).

The English novel is the "terra firma" where the self- consolidating project of the West is launched, and *Robinson Crusoe* is an inaugural text in the English novel tradition. It is also an early eighteenth-century testament to the superiority of rational civilization over nature and savagery, a text that foregrounds the developing British Empire's self- representation through encounters with its colonial Others. Crusoe, the eponymous hero of the novel, anticipates the Hegelian Master. A postcolonial reading of the novel, however, reveals that Defoe discloses - however unwittingly- some deeper ideological operations: Western colonialism is not content with pillaging human and material resources to sustain and consolidate its power over its colonies; it has to destroy the indigenous cultures and values (religion, language, dressing codes, etc) and supplant them with distorted and totally ambivalent versions. As Frantz Fanon asserts:

> Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind perverted logic, it turns to the past of the oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures and destroys it. This work of devaluing pre-colonial history takes on a dialectical significance today.
>
> (Kehinde, 36)

By distorting the history and culture of Africa, the colonizer has created a new set of values for the African. Consequently, just the subject fashioned by Orientalism, the African has equally become a creation by the West. On his 'island', Crusoe attempts to subjugate all of nature, including Friday, his manservant. The founding principle of subjugation is force, as he uses his gun to save Friday from

his captors (and to silently threaten Friday into obedience). He then begins a programme of imposing cultural imperialism. The first method in this programme is a linguistic one. Crusoe gives Friday his new name without bothering to enquire about his real name. He instructs Friday to call him "Master." He thus initiates Friday into the rites of English with a view to making him just an incipient bilingual subject. He teaches him just the aspects of the English language needed for the master-servant relationship -to make Friday useful, handy and dependent. The master-servant orders suggest how Africans and other 'natives' have been tabulated and classified by the West throughout colonial (and neocolonial) history. The second method is theological.' Crusoe's attitude to Friday's religion is akin to the later imperialist missionaries' attitude to the indigenous religions they encountered on African soil. Crusoe sees African traditional religion as blindly ignorant pagan creed. He believes that his own (Western) God is the true God, and that he is doing Friday an invaluable service by converting him. As constructed moral and cultural inferiors, then, indigenous people are 'naturally' suited to work for Westerners; when Crusoe wants to build a boat, for instance, he assigns Friday and his father the dirty and difficult tasks, while the Spaniard is merely to supervise. Perhaps to justify such incipient tyranny, Crusoe sees all natives as savages (marked most of all by their cannibalism) and constantly refers to them as such:

> All my apprehensions were buried in the thoughts of such a pitch of inhuman, hellish brutality, and the horror of the degeneracy of human nature, which though I had heard of often, yet I never had so near a view of before; in short, I turned away my face from the horrid spectacle
>
> (Kehinde, 37).

With tongue, pen, gun and Bible, Crusoe is able to prove and assert his superiority and assume a new mantle of power. He is a 'Master' who controls and thus can exploit his environment, a budding imperialist conveniently furnished with an inferior Other to reflect, even constitute, the superior Self. James Joyce also

identifies some prototypes of colonial experience in *Robinson Crusoe* in forms of colonization, subjugation, exploitation and Christianization of the colonized:

> The true symbol of the British conquest is Robinson Crusoe, who cast away on a desert island, in his pocket a knife and a pipe, becomes an architect, a carpenter, a knife grinder, an astronomer, a baker, a shipwright, a potter, a saddler, a farmer, a tailor, an umbrella maker and a clergyman. He is the true prototype of the British colonist, as Friday (the trusty savage who arrives on an unlucky day) is the symbol of the subject races
>
> (Kehinde, 38).

In Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe,* Crusoe the Western European self is equated with futurity, vision, civilization, rationality, language and light. Conversely, the depiction of the non- European (the Amerindians, the African) in the text is an absolute negation of the Other. The black is associated with pre-history, savagery, cannibalism, unconsciousness, silence and darkness. Crusoe, the archetypal Western man, assumes the posture of a king, a prince, a governor, a general, and a field marshal. He is worried by the sense of his self-assumed greatness. He suffers the pang of delusions of grandeur, seeing himself as some kind of God. This temper is reflected in his unconscious (his dreams) most especially, in which he rescues a savage from his enemies. The so-called savage kneels down to Crusoe as a sign of reverence, praying him for assistance (Kehinde, 37).

To a great extent, Crusoe has the passion of racial consciousness. In fact, he is "an unlikable man for [a] hero" (Palmer 10), an egoist who has little interest in anyone but himself. In his portrayal of Africa/Africans/Amerindians, Defoe was expressing an opinion common to his contemporaries. *Robinson Crusoe* articulates the European attitude about the peoples of Africa and America that structured an expanding imperialist venture. Once considered a model for alternative Rousseauean concepts of education and growing up, the 'Robinsonade' and its protagonist (Crusoe) have had to face harsh criticism. In fact, Crusoe, his kith and

kin, and Defoe, the author, are guilty of ethnocentrism, logocentrism, proto-imperialism, and even megalomania. Crusoe is not a role model in this multicultural, pluralistic world of ours. Instead, he plays a role that begs to be rewritten -thus the existence of alternative versions of the Robinson myth in post-colonial fiction (Kehinde, 38).

Several Africans who experienced colonial education report that it had the effect of undermining traditional societies; on the one hand, by introducing an individualistic Eurocentric value system that was alien to African communal mores and, on the other hand, by isolating students from their local communities (Woolman, 2001). For Apollo Rwomire (1998:19), the role of colonial education in the service of imperial domination and economic exploitation caused a number of undesirable effects, such as economic inequality, social stratification, cultural and intellectual servitude, devaluation of traditional culture, and curricula that were irrelevant to the real needs of society. Ali Mazrui (1978:16) sheds more light on this cultural discontinuity in terms that explain the linkage of education with the rural-urban divide:

> Western education in African conditions was a process of psychological de-ruralisation. The educated African became … a misfit in his own village… when he graduated … his parents did not expect him to continue living with them, tending the cattle or cultivating the land
>
> (Woolman, 2001)

After independence African governments invested heavily in educational expansion and diversification; the gains in enrolment, literacy, skilled human resources and educational facilities have been impressive given the constraints of limited resources. Many critics, however think the system has failed to improve life for most Africans and continues to destabilize society. One social observer, B.S. Kwakwa (cited by Bray, Clark and Stephens in Nwomonoh, 1998: 265) reported on the social divisiveness of schooling in Ghana:

> The effect of the Western type of education has been to produce …three nations in one country, each unable to communicate effectively with the others… the 'educated' … many who do not understand the ways of the 'educated' … a third group, the 'half-educated' who understand neither the ways of their own indigenous society nor those of the 'highly educated'
>
> (Woolman, 2001)

The colonizer considered the colonized as inferior beings. On the one hand he considered them inferior, therefore, justified to exploit and subdue; on the other hand, the colonizer maintained it was his ethical and Christian responsibility to civilized them. The colonizer negated their values as human beings (Gebrewold, 2008).

The desire of the colonial powers was to make their countries strong by exploiting the others (Illiffe, 1997:251). King Leopold II of Belgium, for example, had invested his private property in the construction and expansion of trade basis in Africa since 1880s. Those colonial powers who went to Africa first and established themselves enabled the late comers a free trade (for example Portugal enabled the free trade of Great Britain in the lower Congo). For some colonial powers the protection of trade interest in Africa was a political obligation. In order to materialise this, Germany established in 1884 its protectorates in Namibia, Cameroon and Togo. Besides the trade interests and protectorates the elimination of the competing colonial powers in the respective regions was an important colonial strategy (for example, the occupation of Tunisia by France in 1881 in order to prevent the Italian dominance in the region). Under disguise of "stabilising" the government and the finances of the country Egypt was occupied by Great Britain in 1882 (Gebrewold, 2008).

During the so-called conference of Berlin the colonialism was agreed under international law. The delegates of the conference accepted the British hegemony at

the upper course and the French hegemony at the lower course of the Niger river in west Africa. The future European demands for African territory began to be more substantial than the informal supremacy enjoyed by Great Britain because of its see dominance and trade power for example to India and Nigeria respectively ((Illiffe 1997:254). The politics of protectorate enabled Germany in 1886 to occupy Tanzania. Because of the agreement in the Berlin conference Great Britain could take up Uganda as its colonial territory in 1890. In 1886 the right to protectorate in the Niger delta enabled Great Britain to expand its supremacy in the region. Benin and Ivory Coast were some of the areas of the French occupation in the region. Towards the end of the 19th century the French succeeded occupying the territories at the upper course of Niger and Chad see (Gebrewold, 2008).

The competition for colonisation continued also in the North East Africa. Startled by the French ambitions in Ethiopia, Great Britain pushed the Italians to overtake the French in the competition, which caused the occupation of Eritrea by the Italians in 1889. Moreover the Italians tried to expand their occupation into the Ethiopian Empire ((Illiffe, 1997:255). In 1889 the Sudan was controlled by Great Britain. Since the demand of Great Britain for Egypt was stubborn, France was allowed to occupy western Africa, and the Italians could march into Lybia. In 1885 Great Britain declared Botswana as its protectorate. The gold deposit in the South African Republic increased the interest of Great Britain to expand its colonial territory to the north. Even though because of these reasons the occupation of north Rhodesia (Zambia) and Nyassaland (Malawi) by Great Britain could endanger the interests of Portugal in the region the colonial demand of both sides could be settled through an agreement on the course of the border lines of Mozambique and Angola ((Illiffe 1997:256). The colonial occupation was based on the hope of a long term exploitation. The decisive economic reasons for the division of colonial territories were the global imperial interests of Great Britain; long term hopes and fears because of the visions of King Leopold II concerning the richness of Congo, and French dreams of an *eldorado* in Timbuktu or the British fears of exclusion from

the colonies under the French control (Illiffe, 1997:257). The territories and properties owned by colonial division had to be regulated. This regulation was nothing but violence against the nature and against human beings. The maintenance of an established order demands the implementation of violence. One of the aspects of the violence against the human beings began with the tax collection from the oppressed. It had happened very often that the colonised could not pay the demanded taxes and committed suicide. Forced labour such as carrier, construction worker, soldier etc. were a kind of animalisation (dehumanisation) of the colonised Africans. The French were forcing each man to work for them 12 days a year for an unpaid labour (Illiffe, 1997:264). In 1903 the people of the Belgian Congo were forced to work 40 hours per month for free. The forced labour was formally abolished in the Portuguese colonies only in 1961/62. In the British colonies the Africans were forced to work 5 months annually up until the 1920s ((Illiffe, 1997:264). The advanced step of this dehumanization of the Other and universalization of the Self is the spiritual annihilation or immaterial colonization (Gebrewold, 2008).

The main purpose of colonial school system was to train Africans to participate in the domination and exploitation of the continent as a whole . . . Colonial education was education for subordination, exploitation, the creation of mental confusion and the development of underdevelopment (Rodney).

It is now an accepted fact that Africa is the birthplace of Man and Human Societies and the birthplace of civilization. Nonetheless, for a very long time European academicians and historians denied Africa any achievement. They argued first that the Africans were sub-human creatures not capable of building any form of civilization. However, these Europeans came later to accept the humanity of the African but as a primitive man without past or future. Why did the Europeans hold these views about Africa and the Africans? Why the Africans were considered sub-human and primitive? (Tadesse).

These views were the product of two eras: The era of the Atlantic Slave trade (16th to the 19th century) and the era of European colonization of Africa (19th to 20th century). The era of the Atlantic Slave Trade witnessed the forceful removal of millions of Africans to be sold into slavery in the New World where they worked in mining industries and the agricultural plantations that capitalists of Europe developed there. Indeed, the enslavement of Africans grew rapidly to become the most dominant factor in the economic system of Europe so much so that Europe owed its subsequent prosperity and power to the labor of these African victims of slavery. Henceforth, the Europeans became interested in the African as a commodity, and as chattel. The African was thus seen as sub-human, an animal that worked under the whip for the European master (Tadesse).

Colonial education did more than corrupt the thinking and sensibilities of the African, it filled him/her with abnormal complexes which de-Africanized and alienated him/her from the needs of his/her environment. Colonial education has thus dispossessed and put of out the control of the African intellectual the necessary forces for directing the life and development of his/her society (Rodney).

The attitude of Europeans towards Africa and its people during the era of the slave trade can be captured in the quotes below:

William Bosman: "a New and Accurate Description of the Coast of Guinea" (1704) were:

> "They tell us that in the beginning God created Black as well as white men, and they tell us that God having created these two sets of men, offered two sorts of gifts, gold and the knowledge of reading and writing. Giving the blacks the first election they chose gold, and left the knowledge of letters to the whites. God granted their request, but being incensed at their avarice, resolved that the whites should forever, be their masters, and that they were obliged to wait on them as their slaves."
>
> (Tadesse)

The German philosopher Hegel who had never been to Africa was of the opinion that:

> "In Negro life the Characteristic point is the fact that he has not yet attained the realization of any substantial objective existence-as for example, God and religion the Negro exhibits the natural man in his completely wild and untamed state ¦There is nothing harmonious with humanity to be found in this type of character Africa should never be mentioned for it is no historical part of the world what we properly understand by Africa is the unhistorical, undeveloped spirit, still in the conditions of mere nature Africa had to be presented here only as on the threshold of world's history the Negro has no movement or development to exhibit."
>
> (Tadesse)

The colonial period is generally considered to have begun in earnest from 1884-1885 and continued until African nations obtained their independencies in the early 1960's. During this period Europeans exploited Africa's human and natural resources in as late as 1923, the views of the European historians and academicians during the colonial period could be summed up in a lecture by Professor A.P. Newton delivered that year. Professor Newton, who was invited to address the Royal African Society on the topic "Africa and Historical Research." This historian began his lecture with the categorical statement: "Africa had no history before the coming of the Europeans. History only begins when men take to writing. And since Africa had no knowledge of writing, information of African history could be found only in material remains, in language and in primitive culture. These are the concerns of linguists, archaeologists and anthropologists and not the concern of historians." (Tadesse).

This statement was reproduced some 40 years later by Professor Trevor-Roper with equal pomposity and arrogance Regius Professor of history at, Oxford University, in 1963 he said:

> "Nowadays, undergraduates demand that they should be taught African History. Perhaps in the future there will be some African History to teach. But at the present there is none; there is only the history of Europeans in Africa. The rest is darkness, and darkness is not a subject of history. Please do not misunderstand me I do not deny that man existed even in dark countries and dark centuries the present world is one that is dominated by European techniques, Europeans examples, and Europeans ideas. It is these which have shaken the non-European world out of its past, out of barbarism in Africa. The history of the world, for the last five centuries, is so far as it has significance, has been European History. The study of History must therefore be Europe-centric we cannot, thus, afford to amuse ourselves with the unrewarding gyrations of barbarous tribes in picturesque but irrelevant corners of the globe."
>
> (Tadesse)

In general, the European anthropologists of the colonial period were attempting to justify the colonization of Africa by Europe: First, they were telling their audience in Europe that the superior white men with his superior culture were justified in colonizing the so-called inferior and primitive African. Only then would the African be guided to Christianity and civilization. Secondly, the anthropologists were conveying to the European colonizer that the African was primitive and weak and would never have the strength to challenge them effectively. Thirdly, the anthropologists were confirming to the colonizers that Africans were children who were incapable of growing up, but were dangerous and had to be subjugated by force (Tadesse).

The Europeans established control in many diverse ways--sometimes by violent conquest, other times by less direct means. One method was based on the argument that Africans were in need of civilizing influences--and the Europeans were just the ones to provide this assistance. This argument developed from new "scientific" theories of the time that were based on Charles Darwin's biological principle of "survival of the fittest." Europeans and Americans argued that the white

race was superior to all others and that its economic successes were attributable to racial characteristics. With the scientific "proof" on their side, they set out to dominate other, non-white peoples. One means of civilizing Africa was through religious influence. Christian missionaries would spread the truth of their religion throughout a dark and ignorant continent. In fact, David Livingstone was just such a missionary, trained in medicine and religion, and convinced that his truth would liberate Africans from superstition and fear. In 1841 Livingstone arrived in South Africa and gradually made his way northward. He traveled under a banner that proclaimed civilization, Christianity, and commerce--the three ingredients necessary, he believed, for Africa to advance into the modern world. Livingstone abhorred slavery, and much of his work was focused on its abolition. Ironically, however, he laid the groundwork for another repressive system, colonialism (Sellen).

The effect of colonialism is curved in the mind of the colonised. The eternal attempt of the colonised is to demonstrate the coloniser the own civilisation and culture, this means to liberate himself from immaterial colonization. The colonised wants to negate the negation. In the eyes of the coloniser, the colonised African is not only black, but also a personified antithesis of the white world; it is not only a despised being, but also the *not-being* of the *worth- being.* He is internally pushed to negate and disprove the prejudices of the coloniser, i.e. the aim of his acts are to disprove the qualities attributed to him such as black as dirty, disordered, unpunctual, uncivilised, etc (Gebrewold, 2008).

The Ego of the colonised is positioned as opposition (Fanon, 1991:141). The colonised moves from negative identity to the negative dialectics. The Ego establishes its being on the wreckage of the others (Fanon, 1991:133). In search for identity the negated Self tries to gain back itself through the negation of the Other by which the colonized even believes to be superior. Superiority complex is the outcome of the inferiority complex. The first cause of the black revolts is first of all

because he has socially and historically felt the inculcated inferiority. Fanon says that since the black was since centuries an inferior being it tries to react with superiority complex (Fanon, 1991:135). Through this demand for recognition the colonised tries to come out of the uncertainty of the Self. The desire for recognition is nothing but the transformation of the subjective uncertainty into universal objective truth (Fanon, 1991:138). The universal objective truth increases the subjective certainty. This is a metaphysical struggle: the colonised wants that his negating act is recognised, an assertion that he is not a non-being. Fanon says, "I demand that one has to take into consideration my negating act as far as I look for something other than life; as far as I fight for the birth of a human world, for a world of mutual recognition. The one who does not recognise me opposes me. In a wild struggle I accept the shattering death, the irreversible dissolution, but also the possibility of the impossible"(Fanon, 1991:139).

For the colonized the Good is which hurts the colonisers (Fanon 1966:44)." On the other hand, the coloniser tries to euphemize his desire to colonize while he tries to universalize the moral or cultural values. The coloniser constructs the history. He is the absolute beginning. In his "white man's burden" he has civilized the colonized. The coloniser is the everlasting Cause of all that is Good. When the colonizer left Africa said, "When we go away, everything is lost, this land will fall bock into the middle ages'. Though lazy and internally scourged creatures by fever and primitive customs, they will have to manage this land" (Fanon, 1966:42). The coloniser justifies and perpetuates his colonial will by presenting himself as the saviour of the colonised world. His political and cultural deeds are a messianic mission: civilising the blacks. What a contradiction is it when a coloniser who has for centuries enslaved, killed and exploited the blacks now mixes up his unwillingness of decolonisation with selfless messianism with the pretext of civilising the savages. The coloniser believes that his perception of the colonised blacks as animals is unshakable when he sees how the colonised fight each other in

east, central and west Africa. He cannot grasp that the post-independence inter- and intra-state wars in Africa are colonial heritage (Gebrewold, 2008).

The nationalism, patriotism, state-building, collective security policies are the heritage of the colonial culture (Gebrewold, 2008). "The intention of the colonised is not to compete with the coloniser, but to take his place and imitate him in his political culture" (Fanon, 1966:42), to replace him in his violence, atrocity, dehumanisation and extermination in order to become a human being as the coloniser himself became human being through the dehumanisation of the colonised. "The deeds of the coloniser are to make the freedom of the colonised impossible. The attempt of the colonised is to invent all possible mechanisms to destroy the coloniser. The Manichaeism of the coloniser yields a Manichaeism of the colonised. The theory of the absolute evilness of the colonised will be negated by the theory of the absolute evilness of the coloniser... The violent act functions as something integrating since everyone makes himself part of the violent chain and organisations. This chain is the consequence of the primary violence of the coloniser. The groups recognise each other, and the future nation is from the very beginning an undivided unit" (Fanon, 1966:76).

The direct and indirect consequences of the colonization are factors that undermined sustainable peace, respectful intercultural relations and tolerance. The colonizer first monopolized the human values as western civilized values and directly and violently forced the colonized to internalize these values by colonizing the mind. Since the colonization of mind happened successfully, the colonized African intellectuals are following the pattern the colonized has shown them, such as state-building, establishing regional and continental collective security, creating African Union in order to universalize and homogenize the fictitious common African values and single African culture. The fatal consequence of this African civilizing process is the destruction of various ways of political cultures, peace making and social relations appropriate to the respective places and time. This

universalization is nothing but the death of many peaces, which means death of various cultures, their world views and interpretations and the death of each individual's political creativity and responsibility within its culture to mould the form of politics as part of its cultural self expression (Gebrewold, 2008).

In Decolonizing the Mind, Ngugi observes that the lack of congruency between colonial education and Africa's reality created people abstracted from their reality. Little wonder, therefore that the negritude poets try to achieve disalienation through identification with Africa, African values and African origins. They yearn for their lost identity and the lost African heritage. Leon Dumas writes that the whites "have stolen the space that was mine." Tchicaya U'Tamsi laments that the whites have left the blacks in "a dark corner somewhere . . . gone are the forests where sung and danced the inspired priestess . . . the great Western world holds me in fee . . . Something in me is lost forever." (Rodney).

European colonialism had profound, lasting, and wide-ranging effects on the development of contemporary African states. One of the most profound legacies of the colonial period has been ethnic conflict. When the European powers imposed formal territorial boundaries throughout the continent in 1885, the seeds for ethnic conflict in post-colonial Africa were sown. Those boundaries were drawn with little or no consideration to the actual distribution of indigenous ethno-cultural groups. With the demise of colonial rule, the former colonies, with their colonial borders essentially intact, were transformed into some of the most ethnically fragmented states in the world (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 473).

Prior to the 19th century, European contact with Africa, though extensive, was largely confined to a limited number of coastal enclaves. The vast interior remained of little interest to Europe, at least so long as traders could obtain what they needed from indigenous middlemen operating out of those enclaves. The industrial revolution changed this. As their specializations moved towards manufacturing,

European powers began to import agricultural goods and raw materials. This burgeoning demand motivated a wave of colonial expansion focused on Africa and Asia. In order to guarantee supplies of these commodities, Europe used colonialism to assume direct administrative control over the territories that produced them (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 473).

Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow state two aspects of colonial legacy in their article Colonial Style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa. First in dividing Africa among themselves, the colonial powers showed little regard for the natural boundaries of existing ethnic groups. Each colony encompassed multiple ethnic groups within its newly imposed territorial boundaries, and many ethnic nationalities were divided between two or more colonial entities (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 476).

Second in establishing administrative control over their colonial territories, European powers transformed productive relations within the society. In so doing, they inevitably undermined long-standing patterns of social organizations and authority. The industrial revolution had generated unprecedented demand for crops such as palm and peanut oil as well as cotton, all of which were needed as production inputs to certain industries. By the end of the 19th century, rising incomes among Europe's industrial working classes generated demand for a second category of agricultural goods: food crops of a type that had been considered luxuries affordable only to Europe's elite prior to the industrial revolution. Included among these were coffee, tea, cocoa, and sugar (Young, 1994: 84-85). To ensure adequate production of these crops, the colonial powers instituted a variety of measures to force the native population into production of these crops. These devices included 'head taxes' that forced peasants to grow cash crops, outright mandates that they devote a certain portion of the land to cash crops, and even forced displacement of peasants from the land to make room for commercial plantations (Young, 1994: 126, 179). Patterns of social organization that had

afforded communities reliable subsistence strategies were undermined by this transformation (Migdal, 1988).

Mark Christian argues in his article “An African-Centered Perspective on White Supremacy” that White supremacy manifests in the social, economic, political, and cultural history of European expansion and the development of the New World. He stresses that White supremacy has negatively affected the lives of peoples of African descent throughout the world (Christian, 2002: 188). What is worse; from a European point of view, colonial territory was singular: colonized land and people all fell in the category of “other”. Being inferior, colonizers participate in the construction and propagation of colonial ideology by providing an implicit justification for imperialism.

Lola Young in her article “Culture, Resistance, Freedom” states that Africans were split up in such a way that those within the same language groups were separated and forbidden to speak in their own languages. George Urch argues in his article “Education and Colonialism in Kenya” that while the Africans were developing an interest in Western-style literary education, the colonial government began to realize the necessity of training Africans for service to the white man (Urch, 1971: 250). Later the “superiority” and “inferiority” terms which were occurred with the imperialist project of colonizers brought about “othering” category. Because they belong to lower class the African people were referred as “backward”.

Clive Whitehead argues in the article “The historiography of British Imperial Education Policy” that indigenous people were “brainwashed” at schools to discard their own cultures and embrace Western cultures which were supposedly superior. This situation resulted in a culture of dependency, mental enslavement and a sense of inferiority. The education the Gambian people had increased the awareness in the

Gambian people of their colonial governments which took advantage of them. The education Europeans gave to the Gambian people in actuality raised the level of nationalist feelings in the Gambian people. These feelings of nationalism grew very strong and increased (Whitehead, 2005: 445).

Harry A. Gailey in his article “Turning Point in Africa” argues that pressure from African leaders was secondary in the decision making process that led to independence for British African territories (Gailey, 1983: 446). The local people commenced to assess their conditions and began with criticizing colonizers. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o a citizen of the once colonized Kenya, in his article “Decolonizing the Mind” displays his anger toward the isolationist feelings colonial education causes. He writes:

> The process annihilates people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves.
>
> (Thiong’o, 1981: 28)

Lola Young states in her article “Culture, Resistance, Freedom” former enslaved African writers and abolitionists such as Olaudah Equiano, Ottobah Cugano and Phyllis Wheatley, in their very different ways, articulated in print the desire to be respected as human beings and their work served as rallying points for the antislavery movement. The ultimate goal of colonial education might be deduced from the following statement by Macaulay:

> We must at present do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and color, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.
>
> (McGarvey 1997: 22)

Mark Christian in “An African-Centered Perspective on White Supremacy” focuses on four main questions: What is White Supremacy?, how does it manifest itself?, can peoples of African descent overcome it?, is there hope for a future beyond the confines of White European cultural, political, and socioeconomic hegemony? (Christian, 2002: 180).

Mark Christian argues in the article that White supremacy manifests in the social, economic, political, and cultural history of European expansion and the development of the New World. He stresses that White supremacy has negatively affected the lives of peoples of African descent throughout the world. He argues that the European enslavement based on the economic plantation system led to a global affront on African humanity. It is this social history that is still plaguing contemporary human relations between peoples of African and White European descent (Christian, 2002: 181).

He states that the negative effects of White supremacy and racism are ubiquitous in different ways. With the birth of the New World, White supremacy was borne and where African descent reside it has left cultural, and socioeconomic scars. Mark Christian argues that White supremacy and cultural expansion of Europe are inextricably interwoven from the 15th century to the present. In the article Mark Christian states that the recent UN conference on world racism is testimony to the destructive and divisive nature of globalized racism. What the UN conference against racism indicated is the deep rooted compliance in White European exploitation of African peoples. Randall Robinson who surveyed the contemporary African American experience stresses the seriousness of the current situation facing mainly urban-based Blacks. Even African Americans who find themselves in a middle-class status are not used to the realities of White supremacy and racism(Christian, 2002: 181).

Mark Christian argues that the city of Liverpool could not have grown into

prosperity without its central involvement in the enslavement of Africans. Whether it is in Liverpool or Cincinnati, we find discrimination against Black people of African descent in all walks of life. Even in the present age of reconciliation, racism appears to be an unchanged reality in the social world (Christian 2002: 181). The article mentions a number of studies that focus on the meaning White Privilege and these studies speak about the day-to-day subtle realities of White privilege but they fail to consider the legacy of White European intellectual racism. Mark Christian argues that the gatekeepers of knowledge are still very much White and privileged persons. This is not openly discussed, but it is a social fact. White privilege is interwoven into the social fabric of Western societies. The social reality of it is evident in all areas of society. He stresses that White privilege is also a relevant factor when it is considered within higher education, cultural diversity and multiculturalism. Another key issue he states that in the role White privilege in higher education has been the denial of and the centrality of other cultural histories besides that of the White European (Christian, 2002: 188).

White privilege is certainly helping to unmask the hidden layers of power inherent in the interaction between designated White European cultures and the various Black/African, Asian, and Hispanic cultures in the United States. The Black African people are frustrated and subjected to an inferior position – a position of lower life or inhumane condition by the white elite; they are exploited and impoverished, since their mines and gold are taken without their consent and control. Besides, the indigenous people are forced to a position in which they have to work with a very low salary, have a poverty-stricken life in slum areas, while the white minority leads a luxurious life in their high flats as if it were the time of colonialism or imperialism, since the unseen but felt impact of former colonialism still remains like a shadow over the black people in South Africa. Once they become aware of their real situations, therefore the black native people, as the paper argues, either become consent unwillingly and submissively with their current

positions and identities in a desperate way or react furiously against their exploitation, deliberate subordination and segregation in their own territory (Gunes, 2009: 24).

In *Cry, The Beloved Country*, Paton, as a white writer, obviously represents the continuity of the legacy of former colonialism, identity crisis, fragmentation, struggles, the sense of inferiority and superiority, fragmented identity of the black native people and the internal diasporas within the home country. The novel opens with a view that the black notion undergoes a horrible time and experience in their lives which results in the dissolution of families, the lost of common relationships and social cohesion among family members and relatives; the strong family ties are wiped out when individual are sneakily displaced from their homes and land both physically and psychologically (Gunes, 2009: 26).

> Down in Ndotsheni I am nobody, even as you are nobody, my brother. I am subject to the chief, who is in an ignorant man. I must salute him and bow him, but he is an uneducated man. Here in Johannesburg I am a man of some importance… I do not say we are free here. I do not say we are free as men should be. But at least I am free of the chief. At least I am free of an old and ignorant man, who is nothing but a white man's dog. He is a trick, a trick to hold together something that the white man desires to hold together
>
> (Paton, 34)

The British Empire became more than a tangential factor alluded to in references to plantations in the West Indies or the backgrounds of characters in the writings of Rudyard Kipling. *Kim* (1901) is perhaps the quintessential novel of the empire, the story of an orphaned white boy who grows up as a native in the streets and bazaars of Lahore. At least part of Kim is semiautobiographical: Kipling was born in Lahore, grew up speaking Hindustani, and lived as any other native speaker until he was sent to school in England. Kim becomes involved in international espionage in India but is eventually sent away to school and returns to take up service in the British colonial government. Much of the power *Kim* derives from the

young man's interaction with an old Tibetan monk who is searching for the river that will cleanse him of sins. Kim becomes the monk's disciple and returns to him at the end of the novel, when both discover what they have been seeking: the monk, his river; and Kim, his destiny. The most poignant and remarkable feature of Kim is the sympathetic treatment of Indian culture that still does not contradict the legitimacy of British imperial power (Goucher, Leguin and Walton 1998).

Another European writer whose work is grounded in imperialism is the Polish-born writer, Joseph Conrad, the author of *Heart of Darkness*. As a young man, Conrad spent his life at sea, and the settings of his novels derive from his experiences in the South Seas, Central Africa, and Asia. Conrad was deeply ambivalent about imperialism and extremely adept at portraying the side of European exploitation of colonial lands and peoples and the attitudes imperialism fostered among both exploiter and exploited. In *Heart of Darkness* Conrad exposed the dark underpinnings of the imperialist venture in characters whose souls are blighted by their experiences. He probably based his characters on the actions and beliefs of real persons in the Congo. In *Nostromo*Conrad showed the economic exploitation of a fictional independent Central American republic, dominated by foreign interests because of a rich silver mine. The intertwining of economic and cultural imperialism in Conrad's eyes provides a rich source of literary complexity that universalizes his charcaters' dilemmas to the heart of modern humanity (Goucher, Leguin and Walton 1998).

By the early twentieth century, deep ambivalence characterized modern European writers who confronted the dehumanization of imperialism but were themselves caught in its web. For indigenous peoples in colonized territories, the ambivalences were different, but just as troubling, in their confrontation with the world constructed by European expansion in the nineteenth century. The adoption of European culture and institutions – Westernization – was at once a means of empowerment, enabling former colonies to assert their independence, and a source

of profound anxiety about their own cultural identity (Goucher, Leguin and Walton 1998).

Chia Sui Lee in his graduate thesis states that Doris Lessing in The Grass is Singing sets the background in Southern Rhodesia, an area of colonial world where racism plays a crucial part in the construction of the society and laws. Being the colonized, the black are enslaved and regarded as the pre-determined inferior ones under the violence of colonialism. According to Aime Cesaire, there are no equal relations but the ones of domination and submission between the colonizers and the colonized. He depicts what bumps into his eyes in the colony:

> I see force, brutality, cruelty, sadism, conflict, and, in a parody of education, the hasty manufacture of a few thousand subordinate functionaries, "boys," artisans, office clerks, and interpreters necessary for the smooth operation of business … Between colonizer and colonized there is room only for forced labor, intimidation, pressure, the police, taxation, theft, rape, compulsory crops, contempt, mistrust, arrogance, self-complacency, swinishness, brainless elites, degraded masses.
>
> (Cesaire, 2000: 42)

For the purpose of the domination over the black, white people try to put the black in the lower hierarchy by setting the binary opposition between black and white. According to David Theo Goldberg, this racial categorization is related to the modes of "visibility" and "invisibility." Providing readers with the definition of whiteness and blackness, visibility and invisibility, he explains why white men are regarded superior to black people. He claims,

> Whiteness has long been characterized in terms of light and learning, blackness in terms of darkness and degeneration. Accordingly, visibility carries with it connotations that tend to be appealing-access, opportunity, ability – in short power; and invisibility has tended to connote absence, lack incapacity – in short powerlessness.

Since the end of the war both Central and West Africa have been seeking to redress the balance of their educational systems in the course of general expansion: in Central Africa by adding to the academic facilities, and in West Africa the vocational. They have had to do this because of a paradox: in Central Africa the Europeans had prescribed what they considered African education should be, whereas in West Africa Africans had demanded what they considered to be European- type education. Obviously neither policy was fully satisfactory; but it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that African opinion demonstrated the greater wisdom. By demanding education for leadership in West Africa they hastened the day when Africans might accept responsibility for their own affairs, including the responsibility for educating their fellow countrymen. The proportion of the national budget spent on education by the West African independent states compares very favourably with that previously spent by their colonial rulers (Lee, 2006).

In this account of British educational policy in tropical Africa, hindsight has been exploited to the full. An independent African state was scarcely considered a possibility when the Advisory Committee was set up in 1923. Undoubtedly the great majority of colonial educationalists in government and Missions served Africa as best they could. But in retrospect they seem to have suffered from two human weaknesses. The first was alluded to by Aggrey when he said: ‘In Africa it is not what is said that matters, nor even how it is said; what matters is, who says it.' Too often it must have seemed to Africans that they were being told to enjoy the education that was good for them rather than the education that they wanted. Too often their aspirations were not sufficiently taken into account and educated Africans were ignored or compared unfavourably with their less fortunate countrymen. The European's attitude may often have resembled that of Lugard who, writing to his wife in 1912 from Lagos, declared: ‘I am somewhat baffled as to how to get into touch with the educated native ... To start with, I am not in sympathy with him. His loud and arrogant conceit are distasteful to me, the lack of natural dignity and courtesy antagonise me.' (Brown, 1964: 375).

The other European weakness was labelled ‘the double mind' as long ago as 1932:

> The flambeaux of 1789 burn most brightly now out of Europe. Liberty first, then equality: these are being re-asserted from new directions and in new accents. When they have taken effect fraternity will come naturally enough. But it is characteristic of the self-deceiving double-mindedness which afflicts Western man today that he can assert, with every appearance of fervency, a real fraternal sentiment for the 'black brother' without intending at all the liberty and equality which are the basis of it. Christianity and democracy, in relation to the present need, both demand this. This, or something like it, is the state of mind in which we approach the task of bringing civilisation to the African native. Is it to be wondered at that double-mindedness is over all our works? 'Segregation, 'trusteeship', 'indirect rule', 'mandate', 'conserving native institutions', even 'Christianisation', all the familiar terms reek of it. Examine any one of them vigorously and dispassionately having regard to the actual policies it describes, and the unmistakable odour emerges.

These words by Sir Fred Clarke (later to become Director of the Institute of Education in the University of London) were perhaps most vividly illustrated in the questions of ‘one of the most promising Jeanes teachers' in Southern Rhodesia in 1937:

> Why do you teach our children only to use the Native axe and knife, and prevent us using saws and hammers? Why do you tell us to make wooden spoons? Do you not want us to climb the ladder of civilisation? We buy metal spoons from the store. Is it wrong for our children to want to have chairs and beds and be like the European? It is not easy to tell our children ' No, you must want to be Native'; ' No, you must make spoons because it is hand and eye training'; 'No, the Pass Laws are not all bad because they are made to protect you.'
>
> (Brown, 1964: 376).

An African-centered scholar, Marimba Ani contributed a major work in the issue of unmasking White privilege and Eurocentric supremacist ideas masked often in liberal education. Ani contended that the European intellectual mindset has functioned in an ethnocentric manner culminating with the exclusion of African and other cultures from the role contributors to world civilization. For her, the White European intellectual narrative has ingrained within the notion of White Supremacy (Christian, 2002: 189).

African-centered psychologists, such as Bobby Wright and Frances Cress Welsing focused on the psychology of White supremacy. They attempted to more fully understand the illogical behavior and inhumanness associated with White racism. Bobby Wright was particularly sincere in his analysis of collective White European behavior in relation to peoples of color. Wright contended that White European behavior toward Black people is similar to the psychopath. Welsing writes about the idea of Black inferiority. Both Wright and Welsing approached White supremacy as a behavioral inadequacy (Christian, 2002: 191).

The article presents further the depth and breadth of White supremacy and its ideological companion, racism. Peoples of African descent have suffered under this system. Racism is alive and kicking in Western societies. Freedom from White supremacy and racism is something people of African descent have been fighting for centuries. White supremacy still prevails throughout the world. The article demonstrates that the existence of White Supremacy marginalizes African people within both societies. Throughout the last four and a half centuries, racism and white supremacy have continually threatened the existence of African people before, during, and after enslavement. These threats have forced Africans to modify their beliefs, thoughts and behavior because they are regarded as “backward”. The article mainly emphasizes the White supremacy reality and its effects on African people (Christian, 2002: 191).

The article “Education and Colonialism in Kenya” by George E. Urch focuses on how colonialism education started in Kenya. It is stated in the article that in former British Africa where no uniform policy existed. Each territory supported its own educational program and each governor had his own ideas on how to educate the “natives” (Urch, 1971: 249).

The diversity in British Africa ranged from educational policies that imposed the English model and all its components on the African to policies that attempted to develop an educational program based on the African’s own environment and on his own way of life. This lack of uniformity in British educational policy led to a great deal of controversy. On one side were those Europeans who favored rapid Westernization of the African. They argued that old African values must be replaced. The one great hope for progress in Africa, they felt, was the application of European knowledge, experience, and skill. On the opposite side were colonial officials, educators, and noneducators concerned with the maintenance of those traditions in African society. This controversy in education policy was especially evident in Kenya. They realized the necessity for modernization, but they argued it could be accomplished more easily and with less harm, if advanced ideas were integrated into the existing culture. They lamented the fact that the school, in removing the students from their rural environment, had given them a dislike for their old traditions. George Urch states in the article that missionary activity in Kenya dates back to the middle of the nineteenth century. The forces of western civilization in the appearance of trade and Christian missions had access to the area under the protection of the British flag. These traders and missionaries believed an educated population to be a precondition for the spread of commerce and Christianity; the first European educational ventures were a direct product of their activities.(Urch, 1971: 250).

From the very outset British attempts to introduce schools aroused opposition among Africans. The tribal elders permitted the early missionaries to live among

them, to preach on Sunday, and to practice medicine, but they did not want their youth indoctrinated in schools. They preferred to retain their own established educational structure one designed to perpetuate African life as it was (Urch, 1971: 251). It is stated in the article that the traditional African social order, however, was soon, threatened. Building and operating the railway greatly increased the cost of administering the territory; the British government sought ways to make the railway pay so white settlement began. When the white settlers arrived the prestige and power of the European grew. The African was drawn toward Christianity in his desire to learn more about the white man's world. The mission's educational objective was to expose Africans to a superior culture, but also to instruct pupils in the word of God. Missionaries wanted Christian "truths" spread into villages and countryside. The school curriculum was dominated by reading and writing. A relatively high degree of literacy was necessary so that the Scripture could be understood and disseminated to others. Instruction was initially given in the vernacular. However, the multiplicity of African languages and the rapid expansion of the missions resulted in a move toward the use of English. The missionaries felt their primary role was to proselytize, regardless of whether English became the medium instruction or the local vernacular was retained. A literary education was considered necessary to accomplish this task. Forms of educational work which went beyond enabling converts to read the Bible were considered to be dangerous sidetracks. The African who soon learned to equate Christianity with educational opportunity, readily responded to the missionaries' literary education. The ability to read and write became an accomplishment necessary to obtain one of the better paid positions on the newly established European farms (Urch, 1971: 252).

George Urch argues that while the Africans were developing an interest in Western-style literary education, the colonial government began to realize the necessity of training Africans for service to the white man. The demand for skilled native labor by the white settlers and commercial leaders caused the colonial administrators to reevaluate the educational program of the missions. The different

thought over educational goals arose between the government and the various mission groups. The conflict caused colonial officials to realize the necessity of educating indigenous people and the importance of creating an over-all education forward in a desired direction because a better education by white civilization would elevate the African to a better standard of living. African education was organized into three general categories.

a) “General Education” which was carried on by the missionary societies. It was to be primarily concerned with reading and writing with a view to proselytize to train African teachers.

b) “Industrial Education” in which missions were encouraged to develop the industrial
side of education through government grants-in-aid.

c) “Education of Sons of Chiefs and Headsmen” which was designed to prepare young men to participate in the administration of the territory (Urch, 1971: 254).

The article argues that it was apparent to the government that various missionary groups were continuing to use education as a tool for expanding religious activities and enlarging their own sphere of influence (Urch, 1971: 254). The article states that the early 1920s brought concern for the people of Africa from outside the world. The development of the “trustee” concept aroused a strong feeling that colonial governments had a greater responsibility toward their subjects. There was a growing recognition that the education of the indigenous population was the concern of the controlling government, a concern especially evident in 1923 when the British Colonial Office in London published a white paper declaring the interests of the African native in Kenya to be “paramount”, and emphasizing the intent of the British government to improve education in its colonies (Urch, 1971: 257).

The article states that by 1925, with control firmly in its hands, Education Department of Kenya began to criticize mission in Africa schools openly and to establish principles governing African education. Thus, by 1925 the fundamental problems which faced education in Kenya throughout the colonial period had been magnified to the point where concern was being shown by both African and European. The government continued its criticism of mission education which displayed more concern for religious training than meeting the social and economic needs of its parishioners; the missionaries were frustrated when their newly educated students left the tribal compound to seek work in the fast developing urban area (Urch, 1971: 261).

The history of Education in Kenya is presented in the article. The aim of the education by missionaries is directly explained, to propagate Christianity and how this notion was exploited by the British government is clarified. White supremacy tried to use the education for its own sake in Kenya. Colonial government used education to train Africans for service to the white man.

The article "The historiography of British Imperial Education Policy" examines British Education policy in Africa by Clive Whitehead. It is stated in the article that the missions established schools in Africa long before the British Government took systematic interest in education. The article stresses that British interest in the control of education policy in Africa in the colonial empire was of short duration, which started in the early 1920s and waned by the 1950s. In 1950s various territories in Africa assumed responsibility for the conduct of their own internal affairs as a prelude to independence. But British education system received a great deal of criticism. Nevertheless, critics were not slow to attack British direction of colonial education in the 1930s and thereafter. Much of the criticism focused on the concept of adaptation and the claim that it was a means of keeping indigenous peoples in their place. Other criticisms were leveled at the slow pace and scope of educational development. (Whitehead, 2005: 443).

Clive Whitehead argues in the article schooling extended to only a minority of children in most colonies and most of that was confined to primary stage. It was claimed in the article that colonial administration deliberately neglected education for both political and economic reasons. The article stresses that British Government was accused of not extending the benefits of European civilization; furthermore, the British were accused of deliberately pursuing forms of cultural and ideological domination to destroy the cultures of African people. African people who passed through the schools were 'brainwashed' to discard their own cultures and embrace Western cultures, which were supposedly superior. This resulted in a culture of dependency, mental enslavement and a sense of inferiority (Whitehead, 2005: 444).

On the other hand it is pointed out in the article that Western academic schooling was not forced on Africans (Whitehead, 2005: 445). It was the Africans who demanded the same type of education as their colonial overlords because they saw its economic and political advantages. After the Second World War with the emergence of the USA and the Soviet Union as the world's superpowers decolonization process gathered momentum. In the article comments of some scholars on colonial education are presented. Martin Carnoy in his book Education as Cultural Imperialism strongly condemned colonial education because it is a part of a deliberate policy to continue colonial rule. He believed that imperialism implied the control of the weak by the strong. The educational objective of imperialism was to colonize the intellect of the ruled in the interests of those who ruled over them. Another scholar D.G. Schilling argued that education policy was rooted in the political and economic realities of life in African countries which were influenced primarily by the British settlers' aim to create "a white man's country". It followed that native education policy should ensure that Africans knew their place in the social hierarchy (Whitehead, 2005: 446).

The most scholarly critic of British colonial education policy in Africa was Trevor Coombe whose study based on colonial administration's limiting the provision of secondary education for Africans. As a result he states, when independence was achieved the supply of educated manpower was utterly inadequate to run the country(Whitehead, 2005: 447).

Jason A. McGarvey in his article "Conquest of the Mind" writes about a Tanzanian man who had his master and Ph.D.degrees. McGarvey in the article writes real life experiences during colonization process of this Tanzanian man whose name is Semali. Semali says:

> Education is slavery of the mind. I was born on the slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro in a village called Chaggaland. My people, the Chagga, are an indigenous tribe of Tanzania. While I was growing up in what was then called Tanganyika, we had already been under colonization for nearly a century – first by the Germans, and then the British after the First World War. The colonial school I attended didn't teach me to be a member of Chagga society. Although I had a certain knowledge system as a member of the village, I read, wrote, and spoke things at school that didn't fit into village life. I always wore two different hats. I developed this double-consciousness so well that I didn't realize it. In order for the colonizers to exploit the Chagga for labor they first needed to establish themselves as the authority. Because authority traditionally rested in the hands of the Chagga elders, the colonizers needed to begin dismantling Chagga cultural traditions. The main tool for doing this was the colonial school. The colonial school was set up to instill the values and practices of the colonizers on the indigenous people so that the indigenous people would open up their land and their minds to market economies. In order to establish control over these economies, the colonizers had to first establish control over the socialization of the people. As a result, the colonial schools began socializing the children in ways that conflicted with their traditions. The children began to lose faith and respect for the elders as authority figures, and began to see the colonizers as the authority…
>
> (McGarvey, 1997)

McGarvey in his article states that according to Semali, his village began to fall apart as the colonizers gradually replaced Chagga traditions with colonial education. As their culture disappeared, so did the knowledge that had enabled the Chagga to be self-reliant. They became dependent on the British and Other Europeans to provide them with such everyday needs as food, clothing, and shelter (McGarvey 1997).

> "Traditionally, village elders were responsible for passing the social values and customs of our community on to the children," tells Semali. "However, children were not taught using the same methods that the colonial schools later used. Rather than reading books and taking exams, the children in the village 'learned by doing,' what is called *mtato*, or 'imitative play.' "The philosophy of this type of learning is known as *apvunda*," he continues. "Through *apvunda* children are not merely taught abstract pieces of knowledge to be memorized for exams, but instead are taught knowledge that was necessary in everyday Chagga life. This knowledge extends into three practical areas: social duties, social values, and spiritual beliefs."
>
> (McGarvey, 1997)

"As soon as we entered the fifth grade," remembers Semali, "we were no longer allowed to speak our native language, Kichagga. We had to speak English. The way that teachers enforced this rule was through a wooden block. This small block, which had the word 'English' carved on it, would secretly be given to one of our schoolmates who was told to report to the teacher if he or she overheard anyone speaking Kichagga. If anyone was caught speaking Kichagga, the teacher could punish them. "The student with the block was a spy, a witch-hunter," Semali continues.

> "The trust of the community was betrayed. We were taught by the village to trust each other as children, but now we learned that we could not trust each other; we never knew who might have the block. The community was supposed to bond together, but the colonial school was dividing us. As the saying goes, 'Divide and

> Conquer.' We were taught that the only ones we should trust were the colonizers – the colonial teachers and the colonial government."

Semali adds that the students were taught to despise their own language. They were taught that everything in Chagga culture was inferior to the colonial culture. As a result, the village elders' credibility as leaders was challenged (McGarvey, 1997).

Western education, for a long time, became the tool of colonization. Consciousness of race inferiority was accepted and internalized by many blacks. W. E. B. Du Bois spoke about double consciousness, defined as “this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of the world that looks on in amused contempt and pity.” In his well cited book, Carter Woodson spoke eloquently about what he called the “mis-education of the negro”:

> …the negro’s mind has been brought under the control of his oppressor. The problem of holding the negro down, therefore, is easily solved. When you control a man’s thinking, you do not have to worry about his actions. You do not have to tell him not to stand here or go yonder. He will find his “proper place” and will stay in it. You do not need to send him to the back door. He will go without being told. In fact, if there is no back door, he will cut one for his special benefit. His education makes it necessary
>
> (Falola)

The denial of a people’s past is not that a past did not exist—there are no such peoples without a past—but a statement about power and the uses to which it has been put. When millions of people were enslaved and when their continent was forcefully conquered, it was a strategy both of justification and domination to deny the people a past, a memory. The maintenance of power also meant the creation of a new history to erase the previous. The new history is of how domination has enabled the enslaved to benefit from their being in chains and how conquest has

rewarded the colonized. Blacks were regarded as “the white man’s burden”: to prevent their extinction, they needed to be saved. To be saved, they needed to be civilized. To be civilized, they needed to be enslaved and conquered (Falola).

The colonization of memory is also based on the assumption that the colonizer was an effective teacher. The colonizer had become the ideal citizen, even in foreign lands. The colonized had been transformed into subjects, in their own spaces, and their land a big classroom. Did not a notable British geographer, James MacQueen, arrogantly proclaim, “If we really wish to do good in Africa, we must teach her savage sons that white men are their superiors”? He did. Policies followed that assumed the superiority of the slave masters and colonial officers, and the inferiority of blacks. Inferiors could not make claims to any credible knowledge. Their knowledge had to be colonized to teach them. The sources that sustained their epistemologies—orality, performances, arts, etc—were delegitimized. They were told that to talk about the past, one needed written sources, not songs, not verbal slave narratives, not even the residues of their environments that yield tremendous evidence (Falola).

The colonization of memory has been clever in assaulting worldviews and religions. Many Christian missionaries aligned their views with those of slavery and imperialism. Turning themselves into agents to spread civilization, they were aggressive in their condemnation of indigenous worldviews, in despising indigenous religions, mislabeled as paganism. They ranged much wider in their criticisms, carefully primitivizing indigenous creative endeavors in music, art, religions, languages, and cuisines. Attires were redefined as costumes, nations converted into “tribes,” and legitimate state-building wars into political anarchies. The violence of conquest was sanitized into legitimate wars of civilization; the violence of resistance was presented as the activities of barbarians and cannibals (Falola).

In the evolutionary tree, created by the Western idea of civilization, the most superior culture was Western and white. Others might be able to progress toward the ideals of this superiority. The black race was considered to be at the lowest stage of evolution, basically children who needed time to become adults. Slaves were people with human anatomical features, but they were marked apart by race and evolution. Cultural evolutionism evolved partly out of slavery, and was reinforced by colonization and perpetuated by stereotypes. In this colonization of memory and experience, imagination ran wild, too wild. The most positive image of the African would be that of a “different person,” but never superior to anyone, only better behaved or exhibiting greater intelligence than other blacks. Rural lifestyles and the simplicity of slaves were seen as reminders of how the world used to be before progress came to the West. Universalism was invented from a premise of arrogance that one group knows and understands the truth, the only truth, which others must accept. Blacks had to be invited to learn the truth, to move away from isolationism toward universalism. This is a form of control in which the claim of one truth becomes a strategy of domination, actually of total domination in the physical as well as epistemological sense (Falola).

Race was a key sponsor of colonization. Racist theories of the nineteenth century constructed black people as inferior, a race that could be destined for extinction. A number of studies conducted by pseudo scientists (e.g., John Burgess) provided a so-called conclusion on black inferiority. With its enormous ability to conquer others, Europe was confident about itself, its civilization, its superiority. They celebrated the Industrial revolution, the progress in science, the Enlightenment, and their ability to travel world wide. They used their own evidence to construct an arrogance of culture that saw others, notably Africans, as far below them (Falola).

As the European powers scrambled for possessions in Africa, they needed to justify their actions. One such justification was the notion of the "white man's

burden," which suggested that it was the duty of whites to assist Africans and other "inferior" peoples of the world by introducing them to the benefits of civilization. Christianity was, of course, a significant element of this introduction, as well as capitalism. Rudyard Kipling, the English writer, had firsthand knowledge of the colonial system in India. In his poem, "The White Man's Burden," he expresses views held by many Europeans (Sellen).

The colonization of the black space was a global project, the domination of Africa by Western forces, technology and culture. The title of the famous poem by Rudyard Kipling, “The White Man’s Burden,” captures it all. The contents reveal a grandiose desire of greed:

Take up the White Man’s burden—
Send forth the best ye breed—
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives’ need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild—
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.
Take the White Man’s burden—
Ye dare not stoop to less—
Nor call too loud on Freedom
To cloak your weariness;
By all ye cry or whisper,
By all ye leave or do,
The silent, sullen peoples
Shall weigh your Gods and you.

The creation of the European empire in Africa after 1885 was the colonization of African space. Africa became an extension of Europe. Colonial knowledge reflected this reality: the evidence of change, according to the colonizers, was produced by the colonization of space. The colonization of space, in combination with the trans-Atlantic slave trade, led to the invention of Africa as the "Dark Continent" during the nineteenth century. It was during that century, all to justify the violent conquest of Africa, that the continent became presented as a place of strange customs: cannibalism, ritual murder, and warfare. The propaganda in Europe, to support the military invasions of other lands, was that Europeans were dealing with people without civilizations: they presented to their own public stories of Africans still grappling to learn languages, arts and crafts. Nineteenth century science and philosophy were also propagating evidence of racial differences to explain human diversity (Falola).

The colonization of Africa became so easy to justify in this circumstance. Conversion—the introduction of Western ideas to civilize Africans—became even a secondary point. Africans were said to be too far behind to be easily uplifted. Rather, what the "Dark Continent" needed was a trusteeship—as inferiors, characterized as the lowest form of humanity, they should be taken care of as babies. The colonizers did not see evidence of achievements, but of savagery and barbarism. Africans needed conquest, as a form of assistance. Scientific race theory now combined with imperialism to bring about the end of Africa's sovereignty from which it is yet to recover (Falola).

In applying Education to the Colonial dependencies we are faced with the fact that the hereditary make-up and the local traditions as well as the background and environment of the children to be educated are almost all wholly different from both the heredity and environment of children in this country, and that consequently the mere imposition of our systems and ideas, without adaptation, is not likely to prove successful. Teachers trained in England find when using books and ideas easy and

familiar at home that the whole mental background of Native pupils is so different that they become useless. I remember coming across vivid examples of this. I remember visiting a school in British West Africa where the children were being instructed in their first English reader. It was one prepared in this country for use in rural schools, and the chapter heading was " the Starling the farmer's friend." In West Africa there are no starlings or even corresponding types of bird and the chapter could mean nothing to the pupils. The first problem therefore in Colonial education is this problem of adapting what we have to offer so that pupils can really get benefit from what we have to give. (Gore, 1937:165).

The colonial government officials who believed that formal schooling in the colonies must take the culture of the "natives" into account shared their views with others in London and this theme was echoed throughout the colonial period. The Imperial Education Conferences of 1912, 1927, 1937 and the Advisory Committee Reports on Education in the Colonies all emphasized this idea, and a 1925 white paper, titled "Education Policy in British Tropical Africa," highlighted the need to adapt education "to the mentality, aptitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples, conserving as far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life." The 1925 white paper was dispatched to all the provincial governors in African colonies, and Lord Lugard, chronicler of British colonial history, described it as "one of the principal landmarks of imperial policy in the twentieth century." In October 1929, W. Ormsby-Gore, the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies and the chairman of the' Advisory Committee on Education in the Colonies, reiterated the position that schooling had to be adapted to the circumstances and lives of colonial peoples. He declared that:

> In all parts alike the need is felt for an education which will preserve and develop the individuality and traditions of the various peoples, whether indigenous or immigrant, and which will give them at the same time the means of acquiring a scientific or technical mastery of the forms of nature and a wider outlook on human experience.

It appears that the British government considered its policy of adaptation of education to suit local needs as extremely important. In pursuance of this policy, the British government supported the formation of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, which instituted five prizes for the best books written by Africans in African languages. This action was taken, according to the authorities of the Institute, to give impetus to the production of vernacular literature (Omolewa, 2006: 271).

The implementation of the adaptation strategy in Nigeria was fraught with difficulties. Western education was introduced into Africa five centuries after universities had been established in Europe, and more than one thousand years after Western education had been in practice in a written form. Those who pioneered Western education in Africa were aware that while they were dealing with "fundamental" schooling in Africa, in England the universities of Oxford and Cambridge and English grammar schools had been established as far back as the 12th century. Some colonial officials assumed that formal schooling in Africa was to be limited to basic village education in a rural setting, but there were those who begrudgingly recognized the need to extend schooling to the secondary education level. Furthermore, the Christian missionaries who introduced Western education were ignorant of traditional African educational systems, with their emphasis on apprenticeship training, oral tradition, and respect for elders, honesty, and fair play. Many missionaries and colonial officials assumed there was no educational foundation on which they could build. They later realized that their assumptions about the indigenous educational practices were invalid (Omolewa, 2006: 274).

Moreover, the new educational system produced unexpected outcomes by conferring rewards such as jobs and social status on successful students. This drove some African students to do almost anything to achieve success, including rote-memorization of the material, cheating, or even buying their way to examination

success. Unlike traditional education, which was interwoven into communal life, Western education produced a new breed of Africans who were at times alienated from their own communities because of the power and authority conferred on them by their new status (Omolewa, 2006: 274). As one colonial official observed, "Some products of the educational system overestimated their own achievement and worth." The colonial office in the 1950s had to accept that,

> Education practice in Africa has come under tire from various quarters. . . There are those who say that the education we offer is too bookish, is not related to the environment of the country, and does not pay sufficient attention to character training; that primary education ought to have an agricultural and rural bias; that secondary education turns out too many people with a desire for white-collar employment.

Adaptation was clearly a product of the fear of colonial officials who believed that the new African leaders were a threat to continued colonial occupation of Africa, and the domination of the skilled labor market by the colonizers. The criticism of African secondary school graduates therefore was a convenient invention of the colonial officials who wished to maintain their position of authority. But the larger question is whether or not real "adaptation" was possible under the colonial system. Colonialism was dominating and alienating and denied the subject peoples freedom of choice or input in the planning and implementation of policies that affected them. Imperial officials had no respect for the views of the colonized, and the schools were designed, not to meet the needs and aspirations of the indigenous population, but those of their colonizers. The colonial system did not function for the good of the colonized, who desired economic, social, and political development (Omolewa, 2006: 280).

In addition, the original concept of "adaptation" had an underlying racist assumption. Even the European supporters of adaptation concluded that the imported educational system had produced only "questionable" colonial subjects,

but often failed to acknowledge that the secondary schools produced graduates who went on to become efficient clerks, surgeons, journalists, learned ministers of religion, powerful barristers, and Nigerian patriots. Perhaps it was convenient for some biased colonial officials to brand these "promising" graduates also as potential agitators and ne'er-do-wells. At the same time, there was a very strong suspicion among Nigerians that they were considered incapable of mastering English education, and this explains their resistance to "adapted" education. As one Nigerian nationalist sniped, "What is good for the goose must be good for the gander!" ?"(Omolewa, 2006: 281). And this determination to resist adaptation was clearly reflected in Nnamdi Azikiwe's advice to Nigerian youth who wanted to begin higher studies.

> There is no achievement which is possible to human beings which is not possible to Africans. Your studies of Logic should lead to the correct conclusions. Therefore go forth, thou Sons of Africa, and return Home laden with the Golden Fleece.

Writing in 1930, Adeyemo Alakija, then a student of Oxford University, admitted that there was chaos in the Nigerian educational system because "the African could not avoid attempting to imitate the European [and] the European did not think it his duty to study the African's national institutions. He would modernise the African and advance his mode of life from the European point of view." But Alakija challenged any plan to provide substandard education for Africans because that would be based on European conceptions of the African as mentally deficient. In his opinion, "Africans are not to be a nation of clerks without a future." As part of his education, the African must be exposed to foreign influences and ideas. And he asked, "Should we say that the African ceases to be African because he finds it more convenient to discard his gabardine for the Bond Street style?"(Omolewa, 2006: 281).

By the 1920s it was clear that the indigenous African population had become highly suspicious of the intentions of the various educational "commissions" that had sought to "adapt" what they considered to be an adequate educational program to meet the needs of colonial subjects. Many of the educated African elites had been angered by the various recommendations, which they believed would produce only second-rate scholars unprepared to go on to the university or other institutions of higher learning. The context in which the adapted education system was introduced did not foster partnership between the colonizers and the "natives." In fact, adapted schooling was imposed on the indigenous people, and was strongly resisted by many. As Whitehead has aptly states:

> British models were certainly followed but not because they were deliberately imposed on colonial schools, but rather because Africans and other colonial subjects insisted on them. Anything less would have been considered second rate. It was for this reason that the policy of adaptation, so popular with colonial educators in the interwar years, failed. Africans, in particular, wanted a carbon copy of British education and qualifications acceptable for admission to British universities and University of London external degrees. A study of the classics may have made little practical sense in tropical Africa, but Latin and Greek were part of the European educational gold standard to which Africans aspired.
>
> (Whitehead, 2005: 448)

Perhaps another reason Africans resisted adaptation was because they were not allowed to make the decision themselves. As R. J. Mason, a contemporary observer, put it, "I think . . . that a successful adaptation can be made only by Africans themselves. An alien people, and a ruling one, however well-intentioned it may be, can only take another people so far along the road. Thereafter, they must find their own way, seeking such guidance as they themselves feel the need." We should also point out that even the nations that had exported educational models to the colonies had to embark on reforms at various points, as is evident in the important changes in the curriculum, educational systems, and accreditation strategies in European and other developed countries. It is important to note that

most of the educated elite that began to struggle to attain independence from British colonial rule were not those who had the advanced education of the "unadapted" type found outside Africa. In fact, many African nationalists grew up while the "adapted" version of education was being encouraged. The frustrations of the limited education and the fear and suspicion sown in the minds of the young people who went through the experiment blossomed into a rejection of the colonial apparatus, including the educational programs it generated (Omolewa, 2006: 282).

Colonial policy in Africa was concerned with three broad regions, and increasingly from the 1920s administrators grouped these under the rubric, ‘Tropical Africa’. The regions included in this vague designation were West Africa (Gambia, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast, and Nigeria); Central Africa (Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland); and East Africa (Kenya, Uganda and Zanzibar and Pemba as colonies and protectorates and later Tanganyika after the Great War as a League of Nations mandate). For administrators, the demographic differences between these territories were striking. The West was much more populous, and there was only a very small number of European settlers. Central Africa had a small settler population, and European mining interests in the Copper Belt had helped to encourage the relocation of large numbers of people to mining towns (Windel, 2009: 14).

In East Africa, a larger white settler population, especially in Kenya, contended with the ‘Indian Community’ and the ‘native community’ for political and economic power. White settlers had their own interests in native affairs, and could sometimes be quite obstinate in asserting their claims even when they came into conflict with the Colonial Office, especially in matters pertaining to land rights. One of the promises of the adapted model promoted by officials was that it would make village economies self-sufficient by creating a community bulwark against economic downfalls and slowing down the flight of African men to the cities and the high-paying professions. Adapted education, in the hopes of its most ardent

supporters, would have the effect of re-instilling a sense of community amongst Africans, and this 'community feeling' would translate into economic self-support and a peaceful co-existence with other communities (especially the white settler community). Missionaries were not unanimous in their support for programs of the adapted education, and in the Union of South Africa some even organized against adaptation as a national education policy. Some saw in the principle of education 'along their own lines' shades of what would come under apartheid. Missionaries argued that adapted education sought to revive social institutions that had long since lost their relevance to the people. While J.H. Oldham, the respected missionary and editor of the International Review of missions used such exposés of settler abuses as a rationale for a more robust government involvement in 'Native Education' and was an advocate of the adapted model, Norman Leys, one of the most strident socialist critics of settler colonialism in Kenya, himself staunchly opposed such programs. For Leys, those who embraced the doctrine of adaptation avoided the real issues at stake in the relationship between European empire and African life, which had more to do with the unequal distribution of land and wealth than with the lamentable loss of traditional cultural forms such as tribal songs and dances that newly trained African teachers were now incorporating in village school lessons. In his 1931 book, *A Last Chance in Kenya*, Leys wrote of the contemporary colonial mindset on education,

> For years this theory of differentiation has been the orthodox doctrine of the Colonial Office and is the source of all those question-begging terms such as 'Europeanizing' and 'de-tribalizing . . .' But it is well that the reader should know that if he reads of bloodshed some day anywhere in British West Africa or in British East Africa . . . the people responsible may be assumed to be the men who think that 'the African should be allowed to develop all that is best in their civilization', which, in practice, means that they are not allowed to adopt or adapt what they think best in our civilization.
>
> (Windel, 2009:15)

It should be noted that adapted education, in trying to resuscitate and modernize indigenous cultures and use traditional forms for instruction, certainly did not seek to revive ‘animism’ in the village community. Indeed, Christian principles still remained at the heart of British education, even when it was being directed more intently by the Colonial Office. The idea was to adapt western education to the ‘African mind’ that experts considered to be intimately tied to its environment and culture, which was thought to be naturally connected to agricultural life (Windel, 2009: 17).

Adapted education was never completely hegemonic, even in the Colonial Office. As Peter Kallaway has recently pointed out, administrators in London used education models in an experimental fashion, often earnestly looking for the right mix that would achieve their goals of welfare provision and the amelioration of social and economic inequalities. Adapted education presented as many open questions for policy makers as it did answers to the problem of how best to be trustees of ‘native interests’. Officials sought a wide array of missionary testimonials, for instance, on the use of the vernacular instead of English in education, recognizing that the Phelps-Stokes’ embrace of vernacular languages in educating communities ‘on their own lines’ could produce problems in drafting curricula as well as local hostility when English training was so in demand. There was also the problem of how the village school, sponsored by government and staffed by missionaries or newly trained government Jeanes Teachers, would fit in with local systems of authority where elites might view the presence of such schools as an encroachment against their own authority. In the short term, adapted education was praised by education experts in the U.S., the U.K., and in the centers of colonial government from Zomba to Lagos as the most promising initiative in the colonial state's new mission to address welfare in Tropical Africa. Judged even by its own standards, however, adapted education in the long term must be seen as a failure. The programs for supporting village communities did not lead to economic solvency for those communities, the majority of which continued to struggle as the

fundamental issues of land rights and political empowerment for groups like the Kikuyu in Kenya were relatively ignored by settlers and the colonial state (Windel, 2009: 18).

Chiriyankandath in Colonialism and Post-Colonial Development states that the colonial investment in emphasizing the traditional character of the colonized 'others' produced another of the peculiar paradoxes of colo nialism—the civilizing colonizer's preference for, in the words of the British imperial writer Rud yard Kipling, 'the real native—not the hybrid, University-trained mule—[who] is as timid as a colt' (1987: 183). On the one hand, deprecating the 'inauthentic' hybrid did not prevent colonial regimes from often favouring politically useful pre-colonial elites in imparting Western education, thereby creating a monocultural elite that created a nationalism in their own image In more extreme cases such as Pakistan and Sudan, this proved impossible to sustain in the multicultural context of the post-colonial state (Alavi 1988; Sharkey 2003). On the other hand, internalizing the colonial representation of them as the 'other' caused Asians and Africans to stress their 'dedicated' non-Western identities (Sen, 2006: 102), ironically making the identities shaped under colonialism the force for decolonization (Dirks, 2004: 30). Anti-colonial nationalists sought to distinguish between a material 'outer' domain of economy, statecraft, science and technology in which they acknowledged the superiority of Western modernity, and a spiritual and cultural 'inner' domain of language, religion, and family—the 'private essences of identity' (Young, 1994: 275)—the distinctness of which had to be preserved (Chatterjee, 1993: 6-9). The Colonial Government only made grant for it since it remained non- denominational (Chiriyankandath, 2007).

In1930, there was a mechanical Training Centre in Bathurst under the supervision of the Public Works Department that gave training in joinery, carpentering, masonry, metal work, electrical training and brick making. During this period, agricultural stations were established at Genoi, Sapu and Yundum to

provide agricultural education. They were supervised by the Department of agriculture. They gave training in agriculture at model farms. By 1960 OX-ploughing schools were opened in various parts of the protectorate under the supervision of the Department of agriculture. By 1961 an agricultural school was opened and attached to Yundum Teacher Training College to give 2-year Training Course to secondary and post-primary school leavers as agricultural field workers. The outstanding students from this school were sent to Sierra Leone for further training. Other governmental departments like marine, survey, medical and health also provided vocational training for their workers. In the primary schools the only technical and agricultural courses given were the related subjects the following disciplines: drawing, elementary science, handy crafts and gardening. There were also needle work and home-craft for girls. In the post-primary and secondary schools advanced courses given were the related subjects of the following disciplines: drawing, elementary science, handy Crafts and gardening. There were also needle work and home- craft for girls. In the post-primary and secondary schools advanced courses were given in the subjects mentioned above (Sanneh, 2009).

Despite all the above mentioned attempts made in the provision of technical and vocational education by the colonial masters during this period, it cannot be denied that their colonial education had placed more emphasis on academic education than technical and vocational education (Sanneh, 2009).

It must be understood here that when the Europeans came to the Gambia their first gifts was literacy, despite the effort of some early missions to concentrate on hand skills. Perhaps mysteriously to Gambians, this skill of using words and paper gave jobs and status though it was of singularly little value to those who hoed their land or kept their herds. Thus the system of education was geared towards the production of white collar workers with very little attention given to agricultural or vocational education. This in turn created new Gambian elite who came to prefer

academic education to technical and vocational education for their children. Thus they encouraged their children to realize the importance of academic education as the avenue for personal achievement and maintenance of their class. These families came to look down upon technical and vocational education in the country's system of education (Sanneh, 2009).

Their this attitude towards technical and vocational education through the years grew and expanded throughout the length and breath of the Gambia to such an extend that even ordinary farmers in the protectorate who were sending their kids to school preferred academic education to technical education for their kids. In fact technical and vocational education during this period was seen by parents, teachers and the students as education for the less academic achievers and school drop-outs. In the event, two characteristics can be noted; first the prestige education of the colonial masters was acquired through a limited range of subjects whose content was quite unrelated to practical affairs. Secondly literary subjects and particularly the English language counted for much more than the natural sciences. In terms of approach, intellectualism was far more highly regarded than practical. Thus, even when science began to make headway, it was the pure science rather than the engineering subjects which were acceptable (Sanneh, 2009).

In general, it could be argued that there had been a failure in the technical and vocational education to keep pace with the rate of academic progress both in the realm of attitudes and in the sphere of institutional development (Sanneh, 2009).

CHAPTER IV

4.1 Differences Between the British and French Colonial Education Style

There were four different forms of colonial rule practiced in Africa: Company, Direct, Indirect, and Settler. The practice of governing was somewhat different depending on the form of colonialism. In spite of these differences, all colonial governments shared certain attributes (Getahun).

1. *Colonial political systems were un-democratic.*

No matter what form colonial rule took, all colonial systems were un-democratic. Colonial governments did not allow popular participation. Decisions and policies were made with little or no input from the African peoples. Even in the case where decisions or policies may have benefited some people, they were still un-democratic since there were no mechanisms for the people to officially express their opinions (Getahun).

2. Law and Order ("Peace")

was a primary objective of colonial governments. As you learned above, colonial rule was most often imposed without consent from the African people. Understandably, people were not happy with being governed without any representation, and colonial governments faced the potential of civil disobedience or outright resistance to their rule. Consequently, the maintenance of "peace" and law and order was a top priority of colonial governments. As a result, in most African colonies, more money was spent on developing and maintaining a police force and an army then was spent on education, housing, and health-care combined (Getahun).

3. Colonial governments lacked capacity.

Most colonial governments were not rich. The European colonial powers were not willing to fund the governing of their colonies in Africa fully. Each colony was responsible for raising most of the revenue (money) needed to fund the operations of colonial rule. But no matter how rich in resources a colony was, the government lacked the income and revenue necessary to develop a government system able to go beyond maintaining law and order. This meant that colonial governments were not able to provide basic infrastructure, such as roads and communication networks, nor were they able to provide basic social services such as education, health care, and housing (Getahun).

4. Colonial governments practiced "divide and rule."

Given the lack of capacity and the strong emphasis on law and order, all forms of colonial rule engaged in "divide and rule," by implementing policies that intentionally weakened indigenous power networks and institutions (Getahun).

Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow in their article Colonial style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa state that although each colonial system was distinct from others, there are some differences between the French and British systems because they exercised wider areas of control in Africa than Belgium, Portugal, or other European powers. Moreover, both ended their colonial presence in Africa at roughly the same time, in the early to mid-1960s. Both French and British colonial policy in Africa was driven by economic imperatives. These imperatives dictated that colonial administration had to be as nearly self-supporting as possible (Young, 1994: 97). Consequently, neither nation relied heavily on colonization by settlement (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 477). Both installed a minimal staff of Europeans to manage the machinery of the colonial state, with lower level positions in the colonial administration being occupied by European indigenous people. The British and French systems of colonial administrations were

based upon different ideologies and methods of control. As depicted by Young (1994: 99), the British colonial state was distinct for its

> less centralized historical personality, a less thorough impregnation with an earlier absolutist tradition, and a less prefectural model of regional administration… France stood at the other end of the spectrum, with the powerful Cartesian, Jacobin impulses that … potent legacy of a fully formed absolutist tradition, modernized in the Bonapartist rationalization of the state, informed the inner spirit of republican institutions.

Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow in their article Colonial style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa state that the French approach to colonialism was based on the ideal of integrating its colonial peoples into a 'Greater France' through cultural assimilation and administrative centralization (Clapham, 1985). Indeed, French colonial subjects even became citizens of France in 1946 (Delavignette, 1970: 259). All aspects of French colonial rule reflected this push for a centralized state, which incorporated individuals from different regions and ethnic groups into a single social system, all under the control of an administrative state modeled after and controlled by the French state. A primary instrument of assimilation was the use of French as the language of commerce and government (Clapham, 1985: 21). Within this ' Greater France', the French sought to create a system of control modeled after the centralized bureaucracy of the French state. Formal authority to enact legislation for those colonies was vested in the government in Paris, but in practice colonial law was usually a matter of presidential decree or ordinaries enacted by the colonial governor (Young, 1988: 35; 1994: 116). Very little discretion was left up to indigenous local elites(Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 478). A French Governor General issued directive in 1917 stating that,

> There are not two authorities in a cercle, French and indigenous authority; there is only one. Alone, the cercle commandant commands; alone he is responsible. The indigenous chief is only an instrument, an auxiliary.

(Young, 1988: 43)

Indeed, 'African chiefs were allowed to head only the lowest echelons of the administrative pyramid', and even that concession was allowed only so long as the particular chief remained subservient to French directives (McNamara, 1989: 26). The colonial institutional machinery was designed for a European administrative elite to govern through a local, educated elite (McNamara, 1989: 28). These local leaders were not drawn from among the existing indigenous authorities. Instead, the French created new elite by conferring a French education on ambitious but cooperative locals. They were trained in French language and culture and in the administrative skills required to serve as effective agents of the colonial state. As the functionaries of the European administration, the newly assimilated elite also served as an indigenous counter-weight to traditional indigenous authorities (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 479).

The French administrative machinery remained largely unchanged during the transition to independence. Simply put, 'the machinery changed hands but not the parts' (Delavignette, 1970: 276). By capturing control over the administrative machinery of the post-colonial state, the 'modernized' elite that French had empowered remained in positions of authority, to the exclusion of other groups within the society. At the same time, other groups had seen their own ability to mobilize for collective action undermined by the penetration of this same centralized administrative structure. French colonial officials had supplanted their own leaders, and the bureaucratic machinery of the colonial state had undermined indigenous institutions of social organization (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 479).

Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow in their article Colonial style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa state that in contrast to the French system, the British style of colonial rule was much less dominated by the metropole.

The UK depended much more heavily upon local elites to manage the day-to-day affairs of the colony (Emerson, 1964). Rather than colonize their African holdings with a large number of British citizens, the British government preferred to leave in place indigenous local elites and simply coopt or coerce them into serving as agents of British rule (Wilson, 1994: 19). Through this means, the British colonial state established a network of indigenous intermediaries 'who combined the useful authority derived from some customary title to office with the literate skills and exposure to basic administrative training that would make them serviceable auxiliaries of the would-be Weberian state' (Young, 1994: 150). This strategy was especially successful in Uganda and northern Nigeria, where the British found strong structures of social control already in place and willing collaborators among those in charge of those structures (Young, 1988: 42-43). Thus, rather than dismantling indigenous social structures, as the French did, the British left traditional patterns of social organization intact (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 479).

In preserving pre-colonial social institutions, the British practiced a 'divide and rule' strategy (Clapham, 1985), whereby they purposely maintained opposing traditional structures of control in order to keep the different ethnic populations within a colony from forming a coalition to challenge British hegemony. This system of indirect rule was an attempt to stop Africans from following the Indian model of anti-colonial nationalism' (Wilson, 1994: 21). For instance, in a multiethnic colony, the British would often choose one of the smaller minority groups-one that had been relegated to subordinate status by the larger ethnic groups in the territory- to receive British education. That group came to dominate the colonial civil service and police/military forces. Thus, military units came to be dominated by the Tiv in Nigeria, the Acholi in Uganda, and the Kamba in Kenya (Young, 1994: 105). By exploiting ethnic divisions and minority resentments, the British were able to prevent the formation of anti-colonial alliances across ethnic groupings (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 480).

By allowing traditional institutions to remain, the British did not force all subjects of a given colony to integrate into a single centralized system of formal bureaucratic control, as was the French practice. In fact, the British system encouraged the opposite: it maintained control by cultivating factional rivalries among the different ethnic communities within a colony. Horowitz (1985: 150) notes that 'building colonial administration on a substructure of ethnic government helped insure that disparities would be interpreted through the lens of ethnicity' (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 480).

Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow in their article Colonial style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa state that the differences in the French and British styles of colonial administration should generate corresponding differences in the patterns of ethnic stratification confronting the post-colonial states. Specifically, the British left in place an unranked system of ethnic stratification, while the French created a system that more closely approximated a ranked system. These structural differences, we argue, had a significant impact upon the frequency and severity of ethnic conflict after the fall of colonialism. Because the extent of this assimilation and the benefits that accompanied it were unevenly distributed across ethnic groups in French colonies, socio-economic status, mobility, and access to positions of power became linked to ethnicity. Opportunities for upward mobility education, and power were severely limited outside the dominant group. With independence, this assimilated elite was able to capture control of the state machinery and use that machinery to assert its hegemony within the post-colonial state. Uneven assimilation also impeded the ability of subordinate groups to mobilize for collective action. The imposition of a centralized system of bureaucratic authority undermined local authorities and social institutions. As a result, subordinate groups were less able to develop either the political leaders or the organizational capacity to mobilize their members for collective action of any sort, whether violent or nonviolent. The dominant group was able to use its monopoly of civil service positions to dominate not just national

politics but the local machinery of government as well. This allowed it to more easily monitor and repress the activity of dissident members of the subordinate group before those dissidents could assemble the resources necessary to mobilize a challenge to the status quo. Consequently, if subordinate group members were to mobilize, their activity was more likely to take a more militant form because conventional nonviolent activity was pre-empted by the ability of the dominant group to monitor and suppress it (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 480).

In contrast, British reliance on the existing decentralized network of traditional authorities and institutions suggests an unranked system of ethnic stratification. The preservation of traditional authority structures allowed each ethnic group to maintain its own elites. As long as those elites complied with British rule and preserved order among their own constituents, they were not subjugated to the authority of rival ethnic groups. British 'divide and rule' tactics discouraged the creation of a single dominant ethnic group. As such, class lines in British colonies did not fall neatly along ethnic divisions (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 481). The French strategy of assimilation and centralization, based on assumptions about the fundamental equality of humankind, contributed to the development of a ranked system of ethnic stratification. Within these polities, assimilation was uneven, and those groups that did assimilate more thoroughly were able to assert their hegemony in the post-colonial regime, subordinating other ethnic groups in such a way as to impede their ability to pursue political grievances through conventional political channels. Violent ethnic conflict may have been less frequent in former French colonies, but that is largely because the French colonial legacy deprived subordinate groups of the mobilizing structures by which they could pursue redress of grievances through means other than militant collective action. When mobilization did occur, it was militant and revolutionary, aimed at destroying the hegemony of the dominant group (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 488). By contrast, the British style of indirect rule was based on the assumption that colonial peoples would never be the equals of the English. Therefore, they were best left to their own

institutions of social organization. These assumptions led to policies that left in place traditional social institutions that could later serve as mobilizing structures in the post-colonial state. Ethnic minorities in former British colonies were more able to organize for political action than their French counterparts. However, given the autocratic nature of the state under which they lived, nonviolent collective action was typically met with repression. This compelled those groups to shift tactics from nonviolent conventional political action to violent rebellion, a transition that they were better able to do since traditional mobilizing structures were still in place (Blanton, Mason and Athow 2001: 489).

The colonial model of British Paternalism compared to French Assimilation allowed a relatively bloodless process of decolonization for the British (but not the French). Today, the United Kingdom still maintains several small territories that choose (with the exception of the Falkland Islands) to remain under British rule. This situation is not unique as several colonies of other world powers have also preferred to remain with their colonizer. For example, residences of Gibraltar voted to remain under British authority. Beginning as a small island, Britain forged an empire upon which the sun never set as they spread technology, knowledge, and the Christian religion to the farthest reaches of the globe. Perhaps it did fall together in a "fit of absence of mind" for the British, but God certainly knew what He was doing (Nosotro).

People in Africa were burdened by colonial perceptions of who they were. The British believed Africans were essentially different from Europeans and would stay that way. This point of view invited racism, implying that Africans were not just different but also inferior. The French, by comparison, were prepared to treat Africans as equals, but only if they learnt to speak French properly and adopted the values of French culture. If they reached a sufficient level of education Africans might be accepted as French citizens. To fall below the required level was to invite charges of racial inferiority. France encouraged an increasing closeness with her

colonies on the eve of independence and thereafter. Britain took the view that it would give limited support to its colonies as they moved into independence; for the British independence meant being independent of Britain. Back in 1914 there was already an African politician in the French National Assembly (the equivalent of the British House of Commons). This was Blaise Diagne, representing Senegal. Another leading figure was Leopold Senghor. Before he became a politician, he was a teacher. In the 1930's he took the post of senior classics teacher at the Lycee in Tours, France. No British public school or grammar school at that time would have accepted an African as a teacher no matter how brilliant (www.bbc.co.uk).

At a military level, there was a continued reliance on African soldiers by the French. Senegalese soldiers continued to be in the French army after World War II. This stands in contrast with the British, who immediately demobbed African soldiers after the war. Acquiring the values and language of the French brought opportunities and prospects for people in the French colonies. But these were not enough for the growing number of nationalists. In the 1950's African delegates in the French National Assembly came together to form the Rassemblement Democratique Africain (RDA) under the leadership of Felix Houphouet-Boigny from the Cote D'Ivoire. Senghor broke with the RDA in 1948 and formed the Bloc Democratique Senegalais, or BDS. He was determined that Senegal should be the leading political force in the region (www.bbc.co.uk).

"I would like to assure the whites of our unshakable will to win our independence and that it would be stupid as well as dangerous for them to wish to make the clock march backwards. We are ready, if necessary as a last resort, to conquer liberty by any means, even violent ones." Leopold Senghor talking in August 1946.

> "I got into the French army during the colonial period...and first I was a private, then I became a sergeant in the army after four months....This was 26 July 1956. I really felt fine when I was in the French army...but unfortunately for me, after

> independence in my country, Senegal, our former Prime Minister, Mamadou Dia, asked us to leave the French army, but we didn't join our Senegalese army...instead I was sent to work in our ministry of finance. I liked to be in the French army because it gave me more opportunities than the Senegalese army. With the French army, I could have easily become a captain, whereas with the Senegalese army that was not possible. This is why I really wanted to be a French citizen, because it gave me better prospects for my future. I didn't become a French citizen because I was told at that time that if I became a French citizen I would no longer have the opportunity to see my family. This is the only reason why I decided not to become a French citizen and remain Senegalese."
>
> (Isidore Mandiouban, retired Senegalese soldier)

In 1960 independence came to most of the French colonies. In the same year Nigeria, the Gambia, Cameroun and Somalia became independent of British rule. Nigeria, because of its size and strong regional power bases, opted for a federal structure at independence (www.bbc.co.uk).

The British system of indirect rule simply meant that power over colonies would be exercised through indigenous political structures. These structures which is related to a customary law were preserved and allowed to continue. In the early years of colonial rule, local rulers were still powerful and they were able to maintain the integrity of their political structures and system of government. To a large extent ordinary people did not suffer or feel the impact of colonial rule, and for many there was a little change. This did not mean that African rulers were free to behave as if nothing had changed with colonisation. The British government introduced policies to limit local rulers power to govern their societies. For example, chiefs lost their authority to sentence anyone to death. Crimes requiring a death penalty were given to the magistrate who applied British law to judge the merits of the case. Chiefs were also forced to give up their support by a military unit made up of volunteers. Chiefs were only allowed to rule in accordance with customary laws. However, in some cases the British government introduced new

laws and forced chiefs to pass them as customary laws. For example, they introduced a Hut Tax to increase revenues to colonial governments. This tax was charged on every one who owned a hut, poor or rich. The tax was not a customary law, but it was portrayed as a customary practice by the British colonial governments (www.sahistory.org). French and Portuguese colonies were ruled differently. Unlike the British system, the French and Portuguese gave a role to local African leaders preferring to adopt a system of direct rule. Colonies were treated as if they were extensions of the two European states. For example, French colonies were treated as French departments. The French government did not include any African rulers. They were stripped of all their powers and the people were ruled directly by French colonial officers often with a military background. These colonial officers replaced African rulers because most areas were divided into districts and departments. The division of French colonies into districts and departments did not take into consideration existing boundaries of different ethnic groups (www.sahistory.org).

Whereas the British policy was based on the separation of races and preserving the culture or identities of African societies, the French policy was based on inclusion. Their policy was to encourage Africans to become French in every sense of the word. This policy was part of expanding French civilization to African people. However, this policy did not mean that African people in French colonies were treated with equality. Their inclusion into French societies was based on inequality between the French people and colonised Africans (www.sahistory.org).

TYPE OF COLONIAL RULE	POLITICAL CHARACTERISTICS	ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS	SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS
Company Rule	**minimum government since primary interest is profit.** little government support for education, health care, and other services.** primary emphasis on "law and order"-keeping peace	** exploitation of natural resources.** profits for company most important economic goal.** alienation (taking away) of land from African peoples** forced labor policies-necessary for profits	*** no money spent on social services such as education and health care.*** social/cultural dislocation brought about by forced movement of people for labor.
Direct Rule	** practiced primarily by French, Belgian, and Portuguese colonialists.** minimal government-lack of revenue.** laws created and enforced by European colonial officials, even at the local/rural levels.Emphasis on law and order.** traditional political authorities such as chiefs removed from power. ** used "divide and rule" tactics.	** exploitation of natural resources for export.** minimal taxes on exports so as to maximize profits for European companies.** revenues used to support law and order.** harsh labor policy to insure ready supply of inexpensive labor.** limited development of economic infrastructure.	*** little revenue spent on developing social services-schooling, health care, social security.*** social and cultural dislocation due to economic and labor policies .*** urbanization.***spread of Christianity in non-Islamic areas.
Indirect Rule	*** practiced primarily by the British in West Africa (Ghana, Nigeria, Sierra Leone) and parts of East Africa (Uganda, Tanganyika).*** minimal government-lack of revenue.*** laws made by European colonialists, but used traditional African leaders (chiefs, headmen) as intermediaries in local government.***emphasis on law and order.*** used "divide and rule" tactics.	** exploitation of natural resources for export.** minimal taxes on exports so as to maximize profits for European companies. ** revenues used to support law and order.** harsh labor policy to insure ready supply of inexpensive labor.** limited development of economic infrastructure.	*** little revenue spent on developing social services-schooling, health care, social security.*** social and cultural dislocation due to economic and labor policies.*** urbanization.*** spread of Christianity in non-Islamic areas.

Settler Rule	*** stronger government system to protect political rights of settlers.*** government policy oriented to protect and support settler population.*** African populations denied political participation or rights.*** harsh repression of African political movements.*** African populations ruled directly by European (often settler) officials.*** strong emphasis on law and order	*** infrastructural support for settler owned businesses.*** heavier taxes to support the development of the settler population.*** harsh labor policies used to guarantee an inexpensive labor force.	*** little revenue spent on developing social services-schooling, health care, social security.*** social and cultural dislocation due to economic and labor policies. *** urbanization.*** spread of Christianity in non-Islamic areas.

(exploringafrica.matrix.msu.edu)

The British practiced association which promised the blacks independence eventually, and the French practiced assimilation which treated the blacks as equals (French Blacks). In means of colonial enforced education, the British were exclusive and the French were inclusive. The British only allowed African chiefs' children to obtain an education in their colonies. The French allowed all Africans in their colonies to obtain an education. These niceties are of course not expected to be taken with the best intentions. Each country ruled their colonies in a way that would ensure a peaceful living without danger of uprisings. In ways of government, the British let the African chiefs in their colonies continue to rule with Brits placed as figureheads of government. This was of course another way to try to appease the Africans who had been colonized. The French set up new governments and placed both Africans and Frenchmen in power since they claimed they were equal. In the area of Africans' way of life, the British condemned everything about them. They tried to convert as many Africans to Christianity as possible, gave them English names and didn't allow the teaching of African history and culture in their schools.

The French regarded the Africans as "equals" so did not do this specific kind of damage but I doubt they pushed for the teaching of African history and culture in their schools (Windon, 2007).

Once in possession of these tracts of largely unexplored land, the colonial powers proceeded to create systems for administering them. The two nations which had acquired the largest prizes — Great Britain and France — embarked upon quite divergent programs. In fact, we might go so far as to say that at only one point do their policies agree: both recognize the fact that Europeans cannot make permanent homes in tropical lowland Africa but must regularly return to the middle latitudes for periods of recuperation. On every other fundamental issue of both theory and practice the British and the French colonial techniques differ widely (Whittlesey, 1937: 362).

One of the most significant differences concerns the degree to which the natives are permitted to govern themselves. In the administration of the French colonies Frenchmen occupy all the important positions, though properly trained Africans are allowed to fill subordinate posts, and in special circumstances even to become French citizens. Great Britain, on the other hand, has generally adopted the plan of governing Africans whenever possible through their native rulers. This is accomplished by setting up a hierarchy of European officials alongside the native administration. The two methods have come to be known as "direct" and "indirect" rule. Direct rule is the current practice nearly everywhere throughout the world. Indirect rule is being attempted in only a few places. One of those few places is British West Africa — the composite designation for Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, the Gambia and the British mandated areas in Cameroons and Togoland (Whittlesey ,1937: 363).

Government is administered to benefit British trade only to the extent that it does not prejudice native interests. Concessions to work mineral resources are thus favored, because the Africans have neither the capital nor the skill to initiate

mining; but farmland cannot be alienated to Europeans, since agriculture is the basis of African existence. The only exception of importance is a group of plantations, started by Germans in Cameroons and inherited by Britain, which are still owned and operated by Europeans. This guarantee to the Africans of their farmland in perpetuity grows out of the recognition by the British that the West African environment forbids settlement by Europeans. It is the logical foundation for indirect rule. To the African tribe and individual it is more valuable than the form of government which happens to be imposed (Whittlesey, 1937: 366).

The French mode of administration is in theory the flat antithesis of the British. France is in Africa to make Frenchmen out of the Africans. To this end African life is given no official recognition. Administrative officers from France rule directly, native leaders being allowed to handle their own people only by sanction of custom, never of law. All land is French, except that which an individual African registers with the French authorities. This amounts to very little in total acreage, because the African tribes hold their land collectively and individual ownership is a novel idea. Large concessions to exploit forests and mines, as well as allotments for agricultural plantations, may be and are made to Europeans. Since no land is set aside for native reserves, the concessionaires in effect obtain the local labor with the land (Whittlesey, 1937: 367).

All France's West African colonies combined — in local parlance known as "A.O.F." (Afrique Occidentale Francaise)— have an area three times that of Britain's West African possessions. Yet the population of A.O.F. is only five-eighths that of British West Africa. Nevertheless, to administer A.O.F. the French employ a larger personnel. The total white population of the British colonies is about 11,000, that of the French about 31,000. The proportion of traders is notably higher in the British territory because the British employ approximately twice as large a personnel to manage a store as do the French. The ratio of missionaries is probably about the same. The proportion of functionaries is therefore much higher

in the French possessions. Obviously more political officers are needed for direct than for indirect government. Even though qualified Africans may fill lesser positions in the French colonies, they have not yet taken over so large a percentage of the offices as is the case in the Native Administrations of the British colonies (Whittlesey, 1937: 367).

The discrepancy in numbers between British and French administrators appears in the technical as well as in the political staffs. The engineering needed to bring Africa into the machine age had to be performed by trained men sent from Europe. Africans could neither build railroads nor drive their engines; they had no doctors who could vaccinate for smallpox, to say nothing of discovering the secrets of yellow fever. With time, many Africans have acquired the skill necessary to run a motorcar, a railroad locomotive, or a gasoline launch. Others have become licensed doctors. In British territory such men have been worked as fast as possible into the expanding technological services of the native administrations (Whittlesey, 1937: 368).

In the French colonies there is no division between the European and native technical services. Africans who have adequate training may hold practically any post, although few of them do occupy positions or much responsibility. True, there was no group already trained in the French language and in French methods of business when France undertook serious administration of the country. Nevertheless, a full generation after the inauguration of French schools, jobs requiring only moderate technical proficiency are still performed by Europeans. White men staff many railroad trains, and white men and women sell stamps at the post office windows. Occasionally an African is found occupying a good position. For instance, one may run across a native as secretary of an important Chamber of Commerce or as a uniformed official in full charge of a principal custom house. But these exceptions only stress the gap between theory and practice. The French

continue to draw upon Europeans for their technical and clerical staffs far more than do the British (Whittlesey, 1937: 369).

The educational system in the French colonies is extensive, unified, and admirably organized. The school is perhaps the most vital cog in France's colonial administration. Her control of West Africa is postulated on the conversion of the Africans into Frenchmen. The French colonial officials recognize that adults are fixed in their African mold, but they expect to model the plastic natures of the young. With this goal in view, the African children are taught French, which they learn easily, and they are steeped in French traditions. Although there is no compulsion to adopt Christianity, missions are everywhere, and an imposing church stands conspicuously in every town, even in Moslem areas. If built to serve solely the religious needs of the European population, smaller edifices would be quite adequate (Whittlesey, 1937: 369).

There are three features which can be said to characterise French colonial education in sub-Saharan Africa. First is the widespread use of the French language. There were scattered unsuccessful experiments with local languages and France would later permit the short-term use of African languages in order to meet 'immediate' pedagogical needs such as health education and morality, but all instruction had the mastery of the French language as its ultimate goal. Second is the enrolment limitation which was based on estimates of job availability for graduating students. By implementing this policy of educational supply and demand, the French Government hoped to prevent the disillusion and disorientation experienced by youths who were educated but unemployed. Third is the dual nature of the French colonial school system. African schools were intended to educate the masses. European schools, on the other hand, were more selective and were concerned with educating an African elite that could eventually fill the lower ranks of the colonial civil service (White, 1996: 11). The use of French was important in colonies of France.

> Moulai is a good student. He comes to school to learn to speak French well, he knows he must listen to the teacher speak...He always speaks French—at school, in the playing fields, in the street, in the shops. He is not ashamed to speak French.
>
> (Kelly, 1986: 173)

Throughout France's colonial history, the use and spread of the French language has been of primary importance. White states that the French language is the cross that France bears on its universal- ising 'mission civilisatrice'. White writes about this influence in his article quoting from Bacar. The attention that was given to the French language is remembered by students of the French colonial schools:

> Since we were considered as French 'a part-entiere', nothing but French was taught. The whole curriculum was based on France and anything that was French, whereas Comorian, our mother tongue, was never considered to be a suitable medium of instruction.
>
> (Bacar, 1988: 184)

Georges Hardy, Inspector General of Education 1912-1919, commented on African children returning to their villages after being schooled in French. He could not possibly forget the good ideas that were introduced to him via this language:...these are our ideas, which constitute our moral, social and economic superiority, and little by little they will transform the barbarians of yesterday into disciples and assistants. (Hardy, in Blakemore, 1988, p. 93)

All this is markedly opposed to British procedure. Churches there are, but in the Moslem area no missionaries are allowed unless invited by the native ruler. In the pagan country, where proselyting is permitted, church buildings generally bear the cross of sectarianism; scarcely one of them is attractive in architecture or imposing in scale. British schools are likewise left mainly to chance, though a well-

planned institution of higher education is sustained by the government of each larger colony. The emirates maintain intermediate schools, conducted in the language of the country, with whatever advice and cooperation they may seek from British authority. Except in the case of mission enterprises, all schools are staffed by Africans (Whittlesey, 1937: 369).

The French colonial police may not be more numerous than the British, but a large army cantonment is a feature of every important town in A.O.F. To officer this army requires a commissioned staff of nearly 500, besides the non-commissioned personnel which is also European. Universal conscription is the law in the colonies, no less than in France itself. By no means every male African who reaches military age is ushered into the army; yet no traveller in French North Africa or Southern France can have escaped the frequent sight of negro troops, sent north for two of their five years' service (Whittlesey, 1937: 369).

In some details the two opposed modes of administration are approaching each other. Theoretically at least, direct rule looks toward the extension of the franchise and the ultimate democratization of French Africa by incorporating it with France itself. Already several thousand Africans are French citizens, mainly those who live in Dakar and some of the other old French settlements. These men enjoy the right of electing a deputy to the Chamber in Paris. British rule, on the other hand, tends to perpetuate the form of government found among those groups already highly organized in 1900. The autocratic authority of the emirs has been modified only in so far as necessary to make it conform with British ideals of fair play and justice. The application of indirect rule to small forest tribes has often meant substituting autocracy for local self-government. Village government, instead of being autocratic, is generally in the hands of an oligarchy of the older men (Whittlesey, 1937: 372).

In both the British and French colonies individual land tenure is beginning to supplant collective ownership. The French policy is to encourage individual ownership by emphasizing its legality. In general, the British make no effort to alter the local system of tribal land tenure, although in the coast towns private ownership has long since replaced communal holding. Furthermore, the law permits individuals to register specific parcels of land anywhere so long as the title is clear. Registration is becoming increasingly common, since individual tenure is best adapted for those who produce for the market. The salable crops — cotton, peanuts, and particularly tree products, such as cacao, coffee and oil palm — occupy the same land year after year, in sharp contrast to the aboriginal practice of shifting the farms to virgin soil every few seasons. Since local usage recognizes the planter as the owner of his crop, his long-term occupancy of specific plots tends to become identified with ownership of the land. In this way the concept of individual tenure is making headway (Whittlesey, 1937: 374).

The British tradition in Colonial Government has always been in the direction of decentralisation, of reducing to the minimum the power and control in London, and encouraging local responsibility and local growth. The English nation has not got a clearly defined attitude to its Colonial dependencies in the sense that the French nation or the totalitarian States have or would have. It is of course possible for a dominant race with a definite and clear cut attitude towards life and explicit religious, political and economic assumptions to devise an equally definite and clear cut policy for the education of its subject peoples including the imposition of their language, culture and ideas upon them. But the British people have long been varied in their thought and inarticulate in its expression, and nothing surprises us so much as when some foreigner traveller and observer philosophies and tries to define British policy in the Colonial Empire or in anything else (Gore, 1937: 164).

Erik Bleich in his article “The Legacies of History? Colonization and Immigrant integration in Britain and France” states about the difference that the

most common argument for a strong connection is based on four assumptions: that Britain relied on indirect rule in its empire while cultivating ethnic and cultural differences; that Britain's integration institutionsand policies have recognized ethnic differences and have replicated indirect rule on British soil; that France employed direct rule and tried to assimilate people in its colonies; and that France's policies to integrate post-war immigrants have been highly assimilationist (Bleich, 2005: 172). These four assumptions are widely held by educated non-specialists and are also frequently articulated by scholars of immigrant integration who, although they typically emphasize other factors in their analyses, regularly nod in the direction of the similarities between colonization and integration in Britain and France. Early in his book Philosophies of Integration, for example, Adrian Favell (1998: 3-4) states:

> The responses of France and Britain [to the issue of immigration], as befits their respective colonial reputations, appear to be almost reversed mirror images of one [an]other: France emphasizing the universalist idea of integration, of transforming immigrants into full French citoyens*;* and Britain seeing integration as a question of managing public order and relations between majority and minority populations, and allowing ethnic cultures and practices to mediate the process

Bleich stresses that the juxtaposition of British and French approaches is also common among experts who specialize in one or the other country. In his work on race relations in Britain, Ira Katznelson (1976:176-77) argues that "a key feature of classic colonial patterns of social control - indirect rule through a broker, native leadership - has been replicated in the mother country." More recently, Christian Joppke (1999: 224-25) followed in this vein by writing:

> Britain's readiness to acknowledge immigrants as ethnic minorities has deep historical roots. ... [T]he empire provided a pluralistic model for dealing with post-imperial immigrants. If imperial France had tried to assimilate her colonies, imperial Britain never had such pretensions. ... When the "natives" moved from the periphery into the center of empire, there was no presumption of their becoming "British" or "English" in any way.

Bleich also emphasizes that for its part, the French integration model is portrayed as highly assimilationist - far more so than the British, German, or American models, which are argued to embrace the concepts of multiculturalism and ethnic diversity (Todd 1994; Schnapper, 1992). Egalitarian assimilation of immigrants is seen to bear a striking resemblance to France's colonial civilizing mission. Michele Lamont (2000:185) remarks upon the difference between British and French colonial models in her work comparing France and the United States:

> This belief in the superiority of French culture has been maintained through colonialism via France's mission civilisatrice - its mission to carry civilization to such less-developed regions as North Africa. French culture was imposed on Asian and African elites at a time when France's empire was second only to Great Britain's. By contrast, the British colonial project supported the cultural autonomy of its subjects. For the French, barbarians could become part of humanity by assimilating.

Britain and France each ruled millions of people through hundreds of policies in dozens of regions over centuries of history. In spite of the tremendous variation in each country's empire over place and time, it is common for non-specialists to summarize British colonial policies as indirect rule that preserved cultural and social differences among the natives, and to characterize France's as based upon direct rule and a civilizing mission designed to assimilate colonial subjects through French language and culture. Although the precise line distinguishing indirect from direct rule is sometimes blurry in practice, Wallerstein (1961: 40-41) has defined the former as "leaving in place the traditional system and often the traditional ruler, and operating as much as possible through that system," and the latter as "a rational bureaucratic hierarchy with all officials operating on a state payroll and within a single judicial framework." The fundamental distinction on the continuum from indirect to direct rule revolves around the extent to which the colonizer governs

through pre-existing, "native" institutions versus through modes transplanted from the home country (Bleich, 2005: 174).

British decision-makers did favor indirect rule in parts of Africa where it "met the need to rule broad areas with millions of subjects of diverse races and levels of development with the least possible outlay and a minimum of British personnel" (von Albertini and Wirz 1982: 309; and Wallerstein 1961:41). It was carried out through policies that installed non-colonists at the head of bodies such as the Native Courts and Councils (Asiwaju, 2001: 119) and that created Native Authority police forces to preserve order in many rural areas, not only in Africa, but also in India (Anderson and Killingray, 1991: 8). Indirect rule also meant that indigenous people retained the power to collect taxes, to control budgets for local schools, markets and roads, and to legislate on "traditional" matters (Bleich, 2005: 173).

France adhered to its colonial reputation most steadfastly in the vieilles colonies (Guyane, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and Reunion), in parts of Senegal and India, and in Algeria. The 1848 Revolution brought French citizenship for former slaves in the Caribbean and in the four communes in Senegal, and voting rights for indigenous people in the five French cities of India (Weil, 2002: 235; Perina, 1997: 17). Algeria was also made an integral part of France in 1848 and was divided into three departments. Reforms between the 1860s and the 1880s extended French administrative structures and policies across Algeria (Lorcin, 1995:8-9). Advocates of assimilation in the nineteenth century presumed that natives would pass through an initial stage of being culturally civilized (France's mission civilisatrice) before being eligible to become naturalized Frenchmen (Lorcin, 1995: 7).

Further differences between British and French rule have been the subject of several comparative studies of colonialism. With respect to nineteenth and twentieth century Southeast Asia, for example, Furnivall observes that "the individualism of [the] Dutch and English contrasts even more markedly with the strongly centralized

and still more positive government congenial to the French" (Furnivall, 1941: 6). In West Africa, whereas the British often delegated local governmental functions to legitimate native chiefs, the French administrators typically deprived local chiefs of their role in administering justice and in governing, using them simply to carry out centrally mandated tasks (Crowder and Ikime 1970: xvi). The French also oversaw education policies much more than the British in West Africa, taking responsibility for the building and administration of schools. Mission schools - the norm in British Africa - were strictly controlled in French colonies, reflecting the prevailing skepticism of religion in metropolitan France (Asiwaju, 2001: 214-18). Even in the interwar Middle East (a region less central to each country's colonial history), scholars have argued that France assumed its mandates with an eye toward moral duties and to the mission civilisatrice, whereas the British had no such goals (Bleich, 2005: 175).

As V Dimier (2004) showed, historians and practitioners of colonialism have disagreed about differences between the countries' practices. British observers tended to emphasize national divergence; French counterparts tended to see distinctions as just ones of degree. Without setting this, one can identify at least as many similarities as differences in British and French colonial policies. For example, there were important elements of direct rule in British colonial administrations in India, Ceylon, South Africa, parts of West Africa including Sierra Leone and Gambia, and in the West Indies (Fieldhouse, 1981:33). In East Asia, Furnivall characterizes British rule in Burma, Singapore, and the Malay Straits as direct rule, despite the fact that in the Malay Straits "it seemed unnecessary to incur the trouble and expense of direct administration" (Furnivall, 1941: 15). Even India has been dubbed the classic example of direct rule (Fieldhouse, 1981: 32). In 1858, the Crown officially took over Indian administration from the British East India Company. The Secretary of State for India became the "de facto Indian minister" and was responsible, along with the Viceroy who was appointed by Parliament, for the development of Indian laws and

legislative powers (von Albertini and Wirz, 1982: 13). The hierarchy of power thus flowed from the Secretary of State, as an extension of the British will, to the Governor General, to the Viceroy, to the district officers, who were responsible for the tax collection and maintenance of law, order, schools, roads, and hospitals within the basic administrative unit, the district (von Albertini and Wirz, 1982: 14-15). Such a chain of command echoes the philosophy of direct rule more typically associated with French colonization (Bleich, 2005: 176).

Moreover, in many ways the British shared the notion of a civilizing mission with the French, letting themselves be guided by the idea that "less favored races needed supervision by advanced peoples in order to proceed to higher levels of civilization" (Heussler ,1971:574). This was particularly true in India, as emphasized by Fischer-Tine and Mann's edited volume (2004). In Mann's (2004: 4) analysis:

> The idea of a civilizing mission rested upon the twin fundamental assumptions of the superiority of French culture and the perfectibility of humankind. Also, it implied that colonial subjects were too backward to govern themselves and that they had to be "uplifted." ... The same was true, of course, for British attitudes towards their Indian empire and the non-white colonies. This perspective is supported not only by Kipling's notion of the white man's burden and Macaulay's desire to create a class of Indians "English in taste, in opinion, in morals and intellect" (cited in Mann 2004: 20), but also by the extension of the rule of law through the Civil and Criminal Procedure Codes enacted in India in the 1860s.
>
> (Mann, 2004: 9-10)

French colonial policy, conversely, saw a move in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries away from assimilation and direct rule. By 1892, colonial policy objectives in Algeria that were geared toward subordinating the administration to Parisian ministries were "abandoned in favour of a combination of parliamentary representation and local autonomy" (von Albertini, 1982: 286). Even more dramatic was the growing popularity among French governors and colonial

officers of the idea that "French rule could be established more smoothly if one tried to win the co-operation of the inhabitants, built on existing institutions and applied civilizing pressures slowly and 'indirectly'" (von Albertini, 1982: 286). These changes were justified by the doctrine of "association," which had competed with that of assimilation throughout much of the 1800s (Amselle, 1996:93-4; Deschamps, 1971: 545-6; Lorcin, 1995:7). According to proponents of association, it was more productive to work with colonized peoples' institutions and to respect cultural differences than to override them (Lorcin,1995: 7). By the post-World War One era, the trend toward association had taken a firm hold in French colonial policies, even in former assimilationist strongholds such as West Africa (Conklin 1997). In practice, the French policy of assimilation, signified by the granting of French citizenship to some inhabitants in Senegal, Algeria, and the vieilles colonies, was not employed outside of those regions. Under the direction of the Colonial Ministry that was established in 1894, naturalization in French West Africa, French Equatorial Africa, Madagascar, and Indochina was not easily obtained. Assimilation as a policy of converting natives into full-fledged French citizens was rare in most French colonies as demonstrated by the fact that in 1936 there were fewer than 2,500 native citizens among the 15,000,000 inhabitants of French West Africa outside of Senegal (von Albertini, 1982: 289). In Algeria, local administrators responsible for vetting Muslims who wanted to become French exhibited "exceptional bad faith," discouraging as many as possible from jumping the high hurdles to citizenship (Weil, 2002: 236-7). The predictable result was that naturalization was all but impossible for Algerian Muslims. Between 1865 and 1930 only approximately 4,400 out of over 3.5 million Muslims became full citizens (Weil, 2002: 237, 240).

The doctrine of assimilation had its limits in other spheres too. France's colonial education policies, for example, were rarely as uniform as commonly believed. In their scholarship, Gifford and Weiskel (1971) seek to overturn the image of French West African schools as carbon copies of those in the metropole.

They argue that while France set education policy, course content was adapted to the local conditions. The language of instruction was French for pragmatic reasons of fostering communication among diverse language groups. But they cite a 1906 report by the Inspector of Education in Senegal to illustrate the true tone of French educational policy in Africa: "Respectful of the beliefs, the customs, the habits and the traditions of the African peoples submitted to this authority, the Governor-General wants in no way to assimilate the indigenous peoples nor to orient in this direction the education given to them" (Gifford and Weiskel, 1971: 677). Other evidence of France's approach to education comes from Indochina, where during the interwar period, French Governor-General Albert Sarraut decreed that instruction was to be exclusively in Vietnamese, a decision clearly not in keeping with a policy of assimilation (von Albertini and Wirz, 1982: 212).

Assimilation. 'Assimilation', perhaps the most prominent of the French signposts, was the key principle of French colonial policy up until the turn of the century, when French colonial expansion resulted in the development of the policy of 'association'. Much has been written about the development of these two principles as policy, and there seems to have been a great deal of confusion over their implementation (White 1996: 15). In the eyes of the colonizer, the policy of assimilation was based on a very real need:

> The black races of Africa have not attained a complete and coherent civilization of their own, nor do they possess the necessary foundations on which to build up a real system of education. The great contribution that we can make lies precisely in the interweaving and blending of primitive civilizations with our own universally applicable civilization, which will have to justify its position of superiority and authority by the manner in which it acquits itself of the responsibility it has assumed.
>
> (Charton, 1930: 100)

Approaches to the colonies differed greatly by time, place, and policy area in both Britain and France. Each country practiced both direct and indirect rule. Each

believed it had a civilizing mission. Each viewed its subjects as inferior peoples. Laying out these facts does not imply that the two countries' colonial policies were precisely the same. It does demonstrate, however, that British and French colonial policies were neither as internally consistent nor as different from one another as often thought (Bleich, 2005: 178).

Despite local differences, two broad types of colonial language policies can be identified: The metropolitan language model and the vernacular model. France and Portugal pursued the former and Britain and Belgium the latter. “Since the end of the eighteenth century, the bases of French policy in West Africa were the liberal ideas of the French Revolution and the concept of one universal civilization towards which the world was moving and of which Europe was the leader.” (Awoniyi, 1976: 31). The education system that became implanted in French colonies was therefore closely modelled on the one in metropolitan France. Students throughout the French empire were subject to the same curriculum and French was inscribed as the only valid medium of instruction and learning. “[...] learning French was considered as an essential preliminary to all intellectual activity [... and] by teaching the French language and culture to the Africans, they were bestowing an invaluable gift, a gift which would form the key to unlock all the doors of French culture and wider civilization.” (Awoniyi, 1976: 31). The French state categorically refused to allow mother tongue education or the teaching of local languages as subjects in schools because they strongly believed it would have disadvantaged the children in the colonies in relation to metropolitan children. Local languages were however used in some religious schools “which only aimed at religious instruction” (Spencer 1971b: 543). In the British colonies, education was initially only available for a small number of people and schools were generally run by missionaries and private persons. In India, considerations about opening up education to a wider circle of people started from about 1823 but were not much pursued until the middle of that century for lack of funds and infrastructure (Pennycook, 1998: 71). It was only after the 1854 Despatch (*Despatch from the Court of Directors of the East Indian*

Company, to the Governor General of India in Council (No. 49, dated 19 July 1854)) that an Education Department and other educational facilities including regular supervision were created in India. From this point on, the government saw it as its moral duty to facilitate education. “It is one of our most sacred duties to be the means, as far as in us lies, of conferring upon the natives of India those vast moral and material blessings which flow from the diffusion of useful knowledge, and which India may, under Providence, derive from her connexion with England.” (Bureau of Education 1922: 364 in Pennycook 1998: 87).

4.2 British Colonial System in Africa and India

In many ways, British colonialism in India in the 18th and 19th centuries was quite similar to European colonialism in Africa at the same time. In both cases, Europeans, mostly for economic reasons, imposed their will upon another group of people. Also in both cases, Europeans enjoyed a technological advantage that made this imposition easier. These colonization efforts differed, however, in their structure. Whereas one country dominated India, many countries carved out their own territories in Africa. Also, Europeans set up territorial empires in Africa, while the British set up mostly an economic empire with the British East India company in India. What accounts for these differences? Geography may have been responsible for why Britain could come to control India almost exclusively, while it had to share Africa with other European powers. Africa was simply too large for the British to control exclusively. Furthermore, they had little interest in controlling the whole of Africa. While they had some interest in Africa's interior, the British were mostly interested in controlling strategic choke points like South Africa, Egypt, and Gibraltar. Controlling these key points was much more important to the British than controlling a vast, largely empty continent. Thus, while they rivaled with the French and others for control of the African interior, they were unwilling to invest as many resources there as they were in strategic areas. In contrast, India was relatively small compared to Africa, small enough that the British could control. Though they

exerted political power in India, their chief concern was in maintaining their commercial interests. It was relatively easy for the British to dominate India, because all it had to do was protect its interests by keeping other Europeans out. It did not have to establish and defend a territorial empire (Rooney, 2008).

There was a very practical reason why the British concentrated on maintaining an economic colony in India instead of administering it as directly as did a lot of European powers in Africa. It would have been hard to do this. Unlike Africa, India had a large population of people with a common cultural identity, making rebellion much more of a threat in India than it was in Africa. The biggest reason that India was more difficult to control than Africa, however, was probably technology. The British would have found it more difficult to exert as much control in India as they did in Africa because the Indians were more technologically advanced than the Africans. Hundreds of years of cultural interaction meant that Indians possessed many of the same tools that the Europeans did. In many cases, the Europeans even got those tools from Indians. Africa, however, was a relatively "Dark Continent" and vast portions of it had never had much direct interaction with Europeans. At the same time this "darkness" made African exploration an exciting prospect. It was relatively close when compared to India, but less was known about it. In such a place, small traders and adventurers stood to profit a bit more than they could in a place like India which had an existing European corporate presence. Given the dominance of the British navy at the time, it was also a great deal easier for European countries to carve colonies out of Africa than someplace on the other side of the world (Rooney, 2008).

It is important to note the differences in how each location came under colonial rule, however. Britain had ruled India for many years before a definite independence movement began. Britain's rule of India was a very calculated, comparatively well-planned endeavor. The discontent with British rule came not as much out of maltreatment by British soldiers or unfair laws as one might think. The

main reason for India's press for independence was its lack of Indian officials in powerful government positions. For the most part, Indians did not hate Britain for its rule; they were discontent that they had none of their own countrymen in the government. This is not to say unfair laws did not exist. For example, Gandhi's peaceful protests by refusal to pay taxes resisted unfair tax laws, however, this was not the primary reason India pressed for independence. Britain attempted, to an extent at least, to listen and satisfy the Indians' requests. With the Government of India Act, passed in 1919, Britain gave opened up governmental positions to Indian officials that had not previously been available. Unfortunately for Britain, this did not do enough, and the Indians realized it. It left power directly in the hands of the British governors, and did little to change the desire for Indians to be governed at least primarily by their own people. As the 20th century wore on, the desire for complete separation from Britain only grew stronger (Nosotro).

In Africa, however, there was no such calculation and well-planned execution. Quite simply, the colonization of Africa was an ill-planned power rush that left Europe in high tension and Africa in shambles. During the 1880s, European powers ceased to squabble with each other over territory and trade in Europe itself and look abroad. The so-called 'wild' lands of Africa seemed to be a good place to develop colonies. Every European power realized this, and all of a sudden in the 1880s the storm broke loose, and European nations rushed to gobble up as much territory in Africa as they could. Their lack of regard to the customs and traditions of the African nations led to the division of old African tribes and left the African people angry. This division of tribes would lead to serious problems when Africa did regain its independence, as rival tribes fought and still fight for the right to rule the relatively new nations (Nosotro).

Essentially, India was a calculated, well-planned endeavor by the British Empire to extend its wealth and power. Britain, while not treating the Indians as complete equals, did at least respect and consider the requests of the Indians.

However, the European nations, which included Germany, France, and Britain, among others, had no respect for Africans. They ruthlessly disrupted hundreds of years of tribal traditions, carved up the African continent with no respect for its former inhabitants, and essentially made themselves vastly superior to the African natives (Nosotro).

This difference between India and Africa stems directly from the way each was colonized in the first place. Britain's relative respect to Indians allowed it to let India go in comparative peace. The lack of European respect for Africa caused bloody uprisings of Africans against the weakened European countries. Unable to reinforce beleaguered garrisons, the European nations had no choice but to withdraw and give Africa their independence. Unfortunately the ill-planned carving of Africa, with no regard to previous tribal boundaries, left Africa ignorant as to how to govern itself and with much rivalry among tribes (Nosotro).

Despite the fact that Africans were certainly treated far worse than Indians, perhaps the biggest similarity between the independence of both locations is that the desire for independence stemmed from discontent over maltreatment. This is the case with every drive for independence in history. Cruelty and oppression by the ruler leads to discontentment among the ruled. If this discontent reaches a high enough level, the ruled rebel and strive to rule themselves. While their methods for doing this were different, there is no exception to the above pattern with India and Africa. In both cases, discontent over laws or cruelty or disrespect or oppression led to rebellion, both peacefully and violently, and eventually freedom (Nosotro).

From the above comparisons, it can be seen that while India and Africa both achieved, or began to achieve, independence around the same time, many differences separated the two locations. In Africa, the lack of respect by their European rulers and the disruption of tribal boundaries and traditions was a main factor for their discontent. This, added to how Africans had been treated all

throughout history; the slave trade, for example, and Africa was certainly ready to form its own nations, recognized by not only Africans but by Europeans and Americans, and the rest of the world. In India, it was discontent over laws that put only British in the power positions of government that ultimately led to independence. However diverse their differences, however, Africa and India's paths to independence followed the general outline of all movements for independence in history; discontent will ultimately lead to rebellion, which, if carried on long enough, will lead to independence. It has been like this in all of history, and will continue to be, regardless of how many differences separate one independence movement from another (Nosotro).

For colonial powers such as Britain and France, a central paradox of their rule was that its survival depended on failing to fulfil the universal promise of their liberal state ideology. For instance, the rule of law in British India was necessarily despotic in that the rulers could not be held to account by those they governed but only by their imperial masters in London. In the French colonies the concept of assimilation (i.e. to ultimately make colonial subjects French) was never officially jettisoned, though by the 1920s it was obvious that the language of assimilation was merely the 'rhetoric of colonial benevolence'. Under such circumstances it was logical that the post-eighteenth-century European Enlightenment discourse of rights should become translated into the language of liberation for the Western-educated colonized elite (Chiriyankandath, 2007).

Despite overarching commonalities, there were important differences between colonies. While the British colonial state left behind an entrenched legacy of autocratic government in both India and Africa, in India this was tempered by nearly three decades of a widening measure of partly representative quasi-constitutional self-government at the provincial level, as well as a superior administration (the Indian Civil Service) that was nearly half Indian when independence came (Chandra et al. 1999: 18). Although anti-democratic tendencies

persisted in post-independence India (and, for reasons considered later, much more obviously in Pakistan) (Jalal, 1995), the contrast with the rapid breakdown of post-colonial constitutional government in Britain's erstwhile African colonies was striking (Chiriyankandath, 2007).

The experience Great Britain underwent when dealing with its colony India caused it to doubt education. The fact that the leaders of Indian movements expressing political discontent were mostly students in British-established universities of India, and the fact that some explanations link the Sepoy Rebellion of 1857 to the British education conducted in English, warned the British about the potential "harms" of education that might backfire. Thus, the British, reflecting upon the events of the past century, had to be more careful in reaching decisions in terms of educational policies in the 20th century. People feared that enlightenment of the natives might beget instability and be a threat to their authority. Nevertheless, based on the analysis of the development of the education sector in the Gold Coast, it seems that fear did not obstruct education in the colony so as to hinder its expansion significantly (Yeonhwa, 2009).

CHAPTER V

5.1 Decolonization, Final Discussions and Conclusion

Chiriyankandath states that until relatively late in their history, colonial states had a poor record of investment with barely a tenth of total British overseas investment in the Victorian era going to the non-white colonies (Chibber, 2005). Davis (2001: 311) damningly notes that India recorded no increase in its per capita income in 190 years of British rule, with the colonial regime operating a policy of deliberate neglect when it came to development (Tomlinson, 1993: 217). Lord Lugard, the Indian-born first governor-general of Nigeria credited with introducing the policy of indirect rule to British Africa, admitted that 'European brains, capital, and energy have not been, and never will be, expended in developing the resources ofAfrica from motives ofpure philanthropy' (1965: 617). The fact was that the philanthropic element was not readily evident. The widespread consequence of cheap colonialism was uneven development and wide disparities between small, more or less Westernized elites and the rest (Chiriyankandath, 2007).

In some ways the Empire was a strategic burden during the Second World war, stretching British resources and tying up troops who might have been better employed closer to home. The loss of Malaya, Singapore, Burma and Hong Kong to Japan by 1942 changed perceptions of Britain’s ability to maintain its empire. There were strikes and uprisings against British rule in India, Egypt, Kenya and Northern Rhodesia. For ideological and economic reasons in the United Sates, which entered the war in 1941 and whose support was vital to Britain’s survival, opposed imperialism. Washington’s voice could scarcely be ignored. Under the ‘Lend-Lease’ programme the United States provided Britain with $26 billion worth of aid, twice that from the dominions and colonies. Yet despite such challenges the empire staged what was on the whole an impressive show of strength and unity, providing nearly 5 million troops, almost as many as Britain itself. In 1940 London set aside £

20 million for colonial development and welfare, suggesting that in the event of victory the Empire might have a secure and economically viable future. When Japan surrendered in August 1945 the British were able to reclaim the Asian territories that had previously been lost, many quite undamaged (Colman, 2006: 30).

The end of the British Empire came in two waves: in Asia 1945-48, and in Africa and the Caribbean in the late 1950s and mid 1960s. However, one of Britain's larger colonies – Southern Rhodesia – remained within the imperial circle until 1980, at least nominally. Rather than introduce universal suffrage, Ian Smith's white settler regime declared independence from Britain in 1965. London rejected the declaration, because of the Smith regime's unwillingness to give vote to the blacks, and decided to impose economic sanctions. The Smith government finally conceded a new, compromise constitution in 1979 and the emergence of Zimbabwe in 1980 represented a delayed end to the second run of decolonization. The main reason for decolonization was increasing pressure within the Empire, often accompanied by violence, for self-rule. During the war London had pledged itself to Indian independence and that development came about as early as 1947 because of the growing evidence between Hindus and Muslims. Violence against British forces as well as American pressure in favour of the establishment of a Jewish state led to the abandonment of Palestine and the creation of Israel and Jordan in 1948. British policy-makers were reluctant to permit further withdrawals under pressure because they feared that such withdrawals would undermine British prestige and enable the Soviet Union to extend its influence at British and American expense. There was a campaign waged against communist guerillas in Malaya 1948-57 (Colman, 2006: 30).

Yet the Suez crisis of 1956, in which British and French forces tried to reclaim the newly-nationalized Suez Canal only to be pushed out as a result of international revulsion to 'gunboat diplomacy', indicated that even in relation to

weaker states British power had clear limits. The humiliation bolstered nationalist sentiment throughout the Empire. African intellectuals such as Julius Nyerere in Tanganyika and Kwawe Nkrumah in Ghana were part of the nationalist awakening that Prime Minister Harold Macmillan described in 1960 as the 'wind of the change'. Between 1957 and 1966 Britain gave independence to 22 colonies, mainly in Africa and the Caribbean. Certain economic developments provided the second reason for decolonization. In 1945 Britain owed foreign creditors nearly $40 billion, but the Cold War made it necessary to maintain high levels of defence spending. Instead of decolonizing, the decision was taken to make the Empire pay. This policy, embodied in various Colonial Development and Welfare Acts, was designed to produce cheap food and export earnings, but there were scant resources available for colonial economic development, and by the late 1950s British exports were increasingly focused on prosperous Western Europe and America rather than on the Empire. A third reason for decolonization was international. Despite a rhetorical commitment to anti-colonialism, American policy reflected the practical concern that newly independent states should not, in the context of the Cold War, succumb to the influence of the Soviet Union or its allies. There was also a view that some of Britain's military basis across the world were valuable in supporting American defence policy, which is why in 1967-68 American policy-makers opposed the withdrawals from East of Suez. The most significant aspect of the postwar world for the British Empire was that dominance of the United States and the Soviet Union gradually made it clear that owing a traditional colonial empire was no longer essential to remaining a major player in world affairs (Colman, 2006: 31).

Africans had opposed the European domination of their continent from the beginning. However, whenever this opposition gained momentum, the superiority of European military technology typically prevented any long term success. One European writer, in a satirical poem on the Scramble for Africa, wrote:

"Whatever happens we have got
The Maxim Gun, and they have not."

The Maxim gun was a semiautomatic rifle with which Europeans confronted Africans armed with spears or muskets. While the African resistance movements had certain advantages in these conflicts, including the strategic value of fighting on their own soil, they could not ultimately overcome the Maxim gun (Sellen).

In 1900 the first pan-African conference was held in London. The majority of the delegates were American or West Indian blacks, part of the African diaspora that viewed with horror the imperialistic domination of their ancestral homeland. At this conference the African American leader, W.E.B. DuBois, framed the situation in Africa as an issue of race: "The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line." As much as Europeans attempted to maintain this color line, they were forced to administer their colonies with the assistance of black Africans themselves. This assistance required education of African leaders, and the educational experiences of these leaders would ultimately seal the fate of the imperial system (Sellen).

In addition, the experience of Africans in World War I would also help to galvanize an effective resistance to European domination. Over 2 million Africans participated in the war, either as soldiers or laborers. Some 200,000 died. One of the strategies of the European powers was to take the African colonies of their European enemies so that when peace came they could use these colonies as bargaining chips in post-war negotiations. One of the unintended consequences of this strategy was the development of new attitudes among the African participants, who recognized that Europeans did not present a united front. Furthermore, as Africans gained a broader international understanding as a result of World War I, they noted the obvious discrepancies between the European ideologies of democracy and civilization and their actual practices in the colonies. At the end of

the war, the League of Nations, which had pledged itself to freedom and self-determination in a new post-war international order, in fact merely handed over the African colonies of a defeated Germany to the European victors, principally England and France. The League repeated the ideological justifications that had originally been developed for colonial rule, pointing out that the African colonies should be governed "as a sacred trust of civilization" until the time that they were capable of standing "on their own feet in the arduous conditions of the modern world." For many Europeans the day when Africans would be capable of standing "on their own feet" was a very long ways off (Sellen).

A second pan-African conference was held following the war in Paris in 1919. The delegates to this conference recognized that the international situation was ripe for change, and they hoped to secure some measure of self-determination for the African colonies. Pan-Africanism developed a distinct nationalist flavor at about this time, with Marcus Garvey, a Jamaican who had emigrated to the United States, leading the way. Garvey argued for "uniting all the Negro peoples of the world into one great body to establish a country and Government absolutely their own." Garvey was a master at turning imperialist propaganda back upon the colonial powers: "When Europe was inhabited by a race of cannibals, a race of savages, naked men, heathens and pagans, Africa was peopled with a race of cultured black men, who were masters in art, science and literature." Meanwhile in Africa, a newly educated elite class was beginning to argue for independence (Sellen).

This rising nationalism would slowly evolve until a second World War offered new opportunities for freedom in Africa. The sixth Pan-African conference, held in 1945 in Manchester, England, was notable for its lack of participation by non-Africans. For the first time a Pan-African conference was dominated by Africans. The statement of purpose adopted at that conference offered a blunt message to the colonial nations:

> "We are determined to be free. We want education. We want the right to earn a decent living; the right to express our thoughts and emotions, to adopt and create forms of beauty. We demand for Black Africa autonomy and independence, so far and no further than it is possible in this One World for groups and peoples to rule themselves subject to inevitable world unity and federalism.
>
> "We are not ashamed to have been an age-long patient people. We continue willingly to sacrifice and strive. But we are unwilling to starve any longer while doing the world's drudgery, in order to support by our poverty and ignorance a false aristocracy and a discarded imperialism. . . . "Therefore, we shall complain, appeal and arraign. We will make the world listen to the facts of our condition. We will fight in every way we can for freedom, democracy and social betterment."
>
> (Sellen)

The British recognized that change was in the air and developed plans to transfer power to Africans. They intended for this process to be peaceful, well-controlled, and slow. The Africans were in a much greater hurry, however. In the Gold Coast riots in 1948 convinced the British to allow elections. These elections, held in 1951, were won by the socialist Convention People's Party, and its leader, Kwame Nkrumah, was released from prison where he had been held as a political prisoner, to lead the new government. Nkrumah became the first prime minister of the newly formed nation of Ghana in 1957. He envisioned independence for the Gold Coast as the beginning of a movement that would sweep across Africa: "Freedom for the Gold Coast will be the fountain of inspiration from which other African colonial territories can draw when the time comes for them to strike for their freedom." This statement turned out to be prophetic. The scent of nationalism was in the air throughout the continent, and it was fast becoming a philosophy embraced by all segments of the population (Sellen).

The most difficult transformations to self-rule in Africa occurred in those colonies where there were large European settler populations. In Kenya, for example, British farmers had taken over the highland areas and driven out the

Kikuyu people. These white settlers viewed the possible independence of Kenya with alarm. In the early 1950s a Kikuyu rebellion, the Mau Mau uprising, threatened the stability of the colonial system, and the British reacted with overpowering military strength. The rebellion was crushed, and one of Kenya's most promising black leaders, Jomo Kenyatta, was imprisoned, though his role in the uprising was ambiguous. After his release from prison, Kenyatta became the first president of the new nation of Kenya in 1963 (Sellen).

Ironically, South Africa had been the first of the African colonies to gain independence in 1910. However, political power was not transferred to black Africans but to the white settler minority. The result of this development was that black South Africans would actually be the last on the continent to actually control their own destiny. Very few blacks were given the vote, and by 1948 even these few had lost that right. South African whites instituted the policy of apartheid, designed to keep the races separate. Thus, while the rest of Africa was moving towards freedom and self-determination for majority black populations, in South Africa the opposite was occurring. Not until 1994 would the majority of South Africans be able to vote. In that election, the African National Congress won an overwhelming majority, and a multi-racial parliament was formed. The new president, Nelson Mandela, had been released from a South African prison in 1990 after spending 27 years in jail (Sellen).

The period after World War II, (1945), is considered a turning point in the writing of African History. During the era of the Slave Trade, Africa was not considered as a historical part of the world and the African was regarded as sub-human. In the colonial period, the Europeans academics recognized the humanity of the Africans but still considered them an inferior and primitive without a history worthy of study. Hence, the African history that existed was "the history of Europeans in Africa" i.e. is colonial history. However, with the struggle for

independence after 1945, the reconstruction, decolonization, and rehabilitation, of African history began, and are still progressing (Tadesse).

Raymond F. Betts indicates how the Second World War hastened profoundly the process of decolonization and “forced the change” of power in an unprecedented way, causing a kind of “disastrous result for all of the colonial powers” in the Western world. Due to the wind of change across the world, the national consciousness, whether great powers liked it or not, grew politically in Asia and Africa, bringing about the exchange of power and relationship and demanding freedom the shackle of imperialism, and colonizing powers were, indeed made to be lost; they lost not only their prestige but also their control over distant territories one by one. As for this new condition, for example, Parsenjit Duara argues that “ the colonial powers transferred institutional and legal control over their territories and dependencies to indigenously based, formally sovereign, nation-states”, so that “decolonization”, in Duara’s view, “represented not only the transfer of legal sovereignty, but a movement for moral justice and political solidarity against imperialism” (Gunes, 2009: 22).

The end of the 18th century saw the first era of decolonization when most of the European colonies in the Americas gained their independence from their respective metropoles. Spain and Portugal were irreversibly weakened after the loss of their New World colonies. But Britain , France and the Netherlands turned their attention to the old world , particularly South Africa. During the 20th century , the overseas colonies of the losers of World War I were distributed amongst the victors as mandates , but it was not until the end of World War II that the second phase of decolonization began in earnest. In many European colonies the first visitors from the metropolitan state were missionaries, venturing out into the wilderness in order to convert and ‘civilise’ the natives. The mission stations established by these missionaries often started as small communities consisting of a church, a school and some houses. Most of these communities gradually developed into villages and

towns which subsequently started to attract more and more settlers from the metropolitan state. It is the metropolitan state which brings development and progress to the dependent and underdeveloped colonies. Skilled labor tends to be performed by experts recruited from the metropolitan state, whereas the unskilled labor is performed by locals. The aftermath of World War II had destroyed the African belief that the Caucasian was invincible. The loss of France to Germany further reinforced this. African soldiers who were shipped abroad and Africans who studied abroad gained increased awareness about the nature of the world and contemporary international opinions. The British had convinced the Africans they were fighting against the aggression of fascism for the sake of democracy. In return, Africans also expected some form of independence and increased standards of living. African leaders realized that Africa was key to winning World War II. Some major nationalist leaders were Kenyatta (Kenya), Nkrumah (Gold Coast,Ghana), Senghor (Senegal), and HouphouÃ«t-Boigny (CÃ´te d'Ivoire). From the African viewpoint, the colonies were helping their colonial masters fight against an unknown enemy without any mention of independence. Some leaders like Verwoerd and Vorster of South Africa supported Hitler while most French colonial governors showed loyalty to the Vichy government until 1943. German wartime propaganda had a part in this defiance of British rule. Because Japan had began its imperial quest in the Far East, there was a shortage of raw materials such as rubber and various minerals. Africa was therefore forced to compensate for this shortage and greatly benefited from this change. Another key problem the Europeans had were U-boats patrolling the Atlantic Ocean. This reduced the amount of raw materials being transported to Europe and prompted the creation of local industries in Africa. Local industries in turn caused the creations of new towns and existing towns to double in size. As the urban community and industry grew in size so did trade unions. In addittion to trade unions, urbanization brought about increased literacy, a plus towards independence because this allowed for mass spreading for pro-independence newspapers. (Nosotro).

In 1941, United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met to discuss the postwar world. The result was the Atlantic Charter. One of the provisions in this document that was introduced by Roosevelt was the autonomy of imperial colonies. Therefore after World War II, there was pressure on Britain to abide by the terms of the Atlantic Charter. When Winston Churchill introduced the Charter to Parliament, he purposely mistranslated the colonies to be recently captured countries by Germany in order to get it passed. After the war, African colonies were still considered "children" and "immature" therefore democratic government was only introduced at the local levels. By the 1930s, the colonial powers had carefully cultivated a small elite of leaders educated in Western universities and familiar with ideas such as self-determination. These leaders, including some major nationalists, were Kenyatta (Kenya), Nkrumah (Gold Coast, Ghana), Senghor (Senegal), and Houphouët-Boigny (Côte d'Ivoire) came to lead the struggle for independence (www.worldlingo.com).

Over the course of several hundred years, those regions had been colonized by various European powers, mainly Spain in Latin America and Britain and France in Africa. However, three basic issues instigated decolonization in Africa and Latin America-the indigenous peoples' desire for independence, European distraction with global affairs, and popular resentment against racism and inequality. According to dictionary.com, decolonization is "the action of changing from colonial to independent status." In addition to the causes which led to Latin American decolonization were Allied promises after World War II, limited higher education for a few individuals, and the unstoppable forces of nationalism. In strikingly similar long term effects, Africa and Latin America lost their indigenous heritages, natural resources, economic stability and political autonomy. Plunged into debt and torn by civil war, both faced similar consequences in the aftermath of decolonization. Although differing in unique application of process, Latin America and Africa were mostly similar in overall comparison of decolonization. Of course, the colonizations of Africa and Latin America preceded and led to their separate

decolonizations. After Columbus discovered San Salvador in 1492, European colonialism led to the subjugation of Latin America during the sixteenth century. Using religious conversion as an excuse, Catholic expansionism engulfed the land and consumed the resources of the native population. Draining indigenous assets for European benefit, colonization in Latin America eventually led to civil unrest and a push for independence after the American, Haitian and French revolutions. A later facet of the same colonialism, called imperialism, occurred in Africa during the late nineteenth century. Earlier, European greed had ruined Africa by a filthy exploitation of African people as a cheap means of slave labor. During the Scramble for Africa, European imperialistic powers carved up Africa and its resources into political partitions at the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. By 1905, African soil was completely controlled by European might, mainly Britain, France, Portugal, Germany, and Italy. As a result of colonialism and imperialism, Latin America and Africa suffered long term effects, such as the loss of important natural resources like gold and rubber, economic devastation, cultural confusion, geopolitical division, and political subjugation. However, European domination also brought better roads, railways, harbors, hospitals, education, and modern agricultural methods." (Nosotro).

A combination of three similar circumstances and three different trends of Allied promises, better education, and the forces of nationalism led to African emancipation. Comparative to Latin American decolonization, African desire for independence was based on witnessing the successful revolution and subsequent self rule of its neighbor nation, India, led by the exemplary pacifist Mahatma Gandhi. Secondly, African decolonization occurred with the international confrontation of the Cold War. Because the Soviet Union was attempting to promulgate its Communist ideology, major European powers feared that their desperate colonies would turn to Communism as a radical means of obtaining independence. Although in a different form from Latin America, racism was the third circumstance which affected the decolonization of Africa. Unlike Latin

America, Africa did not have the racial mixture in the colonies, since Europeans had not settled and intermixed with the natives. Instead, the racial prejudice was rooted in European belief of the inferiority of Africans based on cultural differences, lack of political involvement and lower education (Nosotro).

African decolonization was merely a fulfilling of promises. Desirous of discarding the economic burden of maintaining huge empires, Allied powers promised independence to Africa after World War II. In a second differing aspect, the better education of a few people played a huge part in informing and activating the multitudes. Lending a voice to the people of Africa, the support of intellectuals and well educated individuals united the masses by a surge of nationalism. This desire for change, for national awakening, for throwing off the colonial rule, became the final element which enabled Africans to push for independence through intellectual appeal, political campaign and bloody uprisings. In 1957, Ghana became the first African nation to become independent. Further African decolonization occurred with the independence of Guinea, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tanzania, Congo, Uganda, Kenya, Zambia, Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria, Malawi, Gambia, Botswana, Swaziland, Cameroon, Chad, the Central African Republic, CÃ´te d'Ivoire, Gabon, Madagascar, Mali, Senegal, and Niger. By the end of the 1970s, almost no African soil remained constricted by colonial rule (Nosotro).

In the aftermath of decolonization, Africa displayed four results. Political instability occurred with the introductions of Marxist and capitalist influence, along with continuing friction from racial inequalities. Inciting civil war, black nationalist groups participated in violent attacks against white settlers, trying to end "white minority rule" in the government. Further violence occurred with disagreements over the partitions made during the colonization. Despite widespread acceptance of these partitions, border disputes such as those between Chad and Libya, Ethiopia and Somalia, and Nigeria and Cameroon are nursed even today. In another result of colonialism followed by decolonization, the African economy was drained of

natural resources with no opportunity to diversify from its colonial export of cash crops. Suffering through famine and drought, Africa struggled to industrialize its poverty stricken work force without sufficient funds. In an attempt to influence the Third World to adopt the ideology of either capitalism or Communism, the United States and the Soviet Union loaned food and money to Africa. In this fourth circumstance of post decolonization, debt was a result of the poor economic set up of colonialism. To feed, educate, and modernize its masses, Africa borrowed huge sums of money from various nations, bankers and companies. In return, the lenders tried to exert political power over Africa, even though technically not in charge. Sadly, the borrowed money did not fix the devastated economy. Since the massive loans in both Africa and Latin America have been squandered by mismanagement and corruption of dictators, social issues such as education, healthcare, and political stability have been ignored (Nosotro).

In conclusion, three main phenomena led to decolonization: colonial desire for independence based on the successful emancipation of other nations, European distraction with international affairs, and native resentment against racial discrimination. Three additional aspects, including the Allied promises of independence after World War II, better educational opportunities, and a wave of nationalism, separated African decolonization from that of Latin America. In a direct comparison, the four main results of decolonization proved similar in generality, but unique in application. Finally, the results of decolonization including political instability, border disputes, economic ruin, and massive debt continue to plague both Africa and Latin America to this present day (Nosotro).

In 1922 Britain granted Egypt limited independence, ending its protectorate status and creating a sovereign state with Sultan Ahmad Fuad as king. In actuality, however, Egypt only achieved the same rights as British dominion states like Australia, Canada, and South Africa. Egyptian foreign affairs, the defense of Egypt against foreign aggressors, the protection of foreign interests in Egypt, the

protection of minorities (ie Europeans, who formed only 10% of the population, albeit the wealthiest part), and the security of communications between the rest of the British Empire and Britain itself through the Suez Canal, were still under direct control of Britain (Evans).

Although Egypt was ostensibly ruled by King Faud and his prime minister, the British high commissioner was a significant power. Britain intention was for Egypt to achieve independence through a carefully controlled, and potentially long term, timetable. 'Decolonized' Egypt suffered the same problems that later African states encountered. It's economic strength lay in it's cotton crop, effectively a cash crop for the cotton mills of northern England. It was important to Britain that they maintained control over the production of raw cotton, and they stopped Egyptian nationalists from pushing the creation of a local textile industry, and gaining economic independence (Evans).

World War II postponed further confrontation between British post-colonialists and Egyptian nationalists. Egypt represented a strategic interest for the Allies – it controlled the route through north Africa to the oil rich regions of the middle east, and provided the all important trade and communications route through the Suez Canal to the rest of Britain's empire. Egypt became a base for Allied operations in north Africa. After World War II, however, the question of complete economic independence was important to all political groups in Egypt. There were three different approaches: the Saadist Institutional Party (SIP) which represented the liberal tradition of the monarchists was heavily discredited by their history of accommodation for foreign business interests and the support of an apparently decadent royal court. Opposition to the liberals came from the Muslim Brotherhood who wished to create an Egyptian/Islamic state which would exclude Westernized interests. In 1948 they assassinated the SIP prime minister Mahmoud an-Nukrashi Pasha as a reaction to demands that they disband. His replacement, Ibrahim `Abd

al-Hadi Pasha, sent thousands of Muslim Brotherhood members to detention camps, and the Brotherhood's leader Hassan el Banna, was assassinated (Boddy, Evans).

A third group emerged amongst young Egyptian army officers, recruited from the lower middle-classes in Egypt but educated in English and trained for the military by Britain. They rejected both the liberal tradition of privilege and inequality and the Muslim Brotherhood Islamic traditionalism for a nationalistic viewpoint of economic independence and prosperity. This would be achieved through the development of industry (especially textiles). For this they needed a strong national power supply and looked to damming the Nile for hydroelectricity. On 22-23 July 1952 a cabal of army officers, known as the 'free officers', led by Lieutenant Colonel Gamal Abdel Nasser overthrew King Faruk in a coup d'état. Following a brief experiment with civilian rule, the revolution continued with the declaration of a republic on 18 June 1953, and Nasser becoming Chairman of the Revolutionary Command Council (Evans).

The 20th century brought an incredible challenge to the British Empire in the form of the First World War (1914-1918). In the beginning, the British colonies were willing to send troops to aid the British, but as the war continued, and the casualties mounted, the British government had to begin conscripting troops from their colonies. However, with the end of the war and the signing of the treaty of Versailles in 1919, the British Empire was the largest it had ever been, absorbing a huge potion of Africa, and the areas of Palestine and Iraq. However, though the Empire gained territory, the war left Britain overextended and under managed. In this state, Britain could no longer hold all of its territories. It released Egypt in 1922, Iraq in 1932, and after a rebellion, Ireland was released in 1937. India was another matter entirely. Throughout the 20th century, tensions continued to mount until the Amritsar Massacre, where British soldiers fired into a group of protesting Indians, causing the deaths of 400 people. After this, British rulers continually proposed changes in the government, hoping to ease the tensions. Anger ebbed

slightly, but remained never far beneath the surface. Chamberlain's appeasement of Hitler was the beginning of the end of Britain’s empire as WWII devastated Europe from 1939 to 1945. A number of its possessions, such as Hong Kong and Burma, were temporarily conquered by Japan. Those territories still in the British Empire went to war in conditional support of Britain with agreements towards self government at the war's end. As promised, after the war, many of the possessions received statehood, entering into a “commonwealth” state with Great Britain. Under the British Commonwealth, the King or Queen is the figurehead, but has little political power over the other nations in the commonwealth. It is mainly a group of former British colonies who have come to gather to expand economically, and democratically. Following Gandhi's non-violent protests, Pakistan and India became independent in 1947; followed by Ceylon and Burma in 1948 (although Burma did not join the commonwealth). The dream of Cecil Rhodes to have a British railroad running the length of Africa fully dissolved by 1968, as Sudan, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Tanganyika, Uganda, Kenya, Zambia, Malawi, The Gambia, Botswana, and Swaziland all became independent. The Caribbean territories followed the same timeline (Nosotro).

During the Scramble for Africa in the late nineteenth century, European powers divided Africa and its resources into political partitions at the Berlin Conference of 1884-85. By 1905, African soil was almost completely controlled by European governments, with the only exceptions being Liberia (which had been settled by African-American former slaves) and Ethiopia (which had successfully resisted colonization by Italy). Britain and France had the largest holdings, but Germany, Spain, Italy, Belgium, and Portugal also had colonies. As a result of colonialism and imperialism, Africa suffered long term effects, such as the loss of important natural resources like gold and rubber, economic devastation, cultural confusion, geopolitical division, and political subjugation. Europeans often justified this using the concept of the White Man's Burden, an obligation to "civilize" the peoples of Africa (www.worldlingo.com).

World War II saw the colonies help their colonial masters fight against an unknown enemy, but with no mention of independence for African nations. Future Prime Ministers Henrik Verwoerd and B.J. Vorster of South Africa supported Adolf Hitler while most French colonial governors loyally supported the Vichy government until 1943. German wartime propaganda had a part in this defiance of British rule. Imperial Japan's conquests in the Far East caused a shortage of raw materials such as rubber and various minerals. Africa was therefore forced to compensate for this shortage and greatly benefited from this change. Another key problem the Europeans faced were the U-boats patrolling the Atlantic Ocean. This reduced the amount of raw materials being transported to Europe and prompted the creation of local industries in Africa. Local industries in turn caused the creation of new towns, and existing towns doubled in size. As urban community and industry grew so did trade unions. In addition to trade unions, urbanization brought about increased literacy, which allowed for pro-independence newspapers (www.worldlingo.com).

In the aftermath of decolonization, Africa displayed political instability, economic disaster, and debt dependence. Political instability occurred with the introductions of Marxist and capitalist influence, along with continuing friction from racial inequalities. Inciting civil war, black nationalist groups participated in violent attacks against white settlers, trying to end "white minority rule" in the government. Further violence occurred with disagreements over the partitions made during the colonization. Despite widespread acceptance of these partitions, border disputes such as those between Chad and Libya, Ethiopia and Somalia, Ethiopia and Eritrea, and Nigeria and Cameroon are nursed even today (Nosotro).

Decolonized Africa has lost many of its social and economic institutions and to this day shows a high level of informal economic activity. In another result of colonialism followed by decolonization, the African economy was drained of

natural resources with no opportunity to diversify from its colonial export of cash crops. Suffering through famine and drought, Africa struggled to industrialize its poverty stricken work force without sufficient funds (Nosotro).

In an attempt to influence the Third World to adopt the ideology of either capitalism or Communism, the United States and the Soviet Union loaned food and money to Africa. To feed, educate, and modernize its masses, Africa borrowed large sums of money from various nations, bankers and companies. In return, the lenders forced the African countries to devalue their currency and attempted to exert political influence within Africa. The borrowed money, however, did not rehabilitate the devastated economy. Since the massive loans were usually squandered by the mismanagement of corrupt dictators, social issues such as education, health care, and political stability have been ignored (Nosotro).

Decolonization refers to the undoing of colonialism. The term generally refers to the achievement of independence. Decolonization can be achieved by attaining independence, integrating with the administering power or another state, or establishing a “free” association status. Africa has been through this decolonization process and in the end gained independence. What brought about this decolonization idea to the African people was outcomes of colonizers’ referring them some specific terms such as “othering”, “superior”, “inferior” and “backward”. Being the colonized, the black are enslaved and regarded as the pre-determined inferior ones under the violence of colonialism (Lee, 2006).

A notable British geographer, James MacQueen, arrogantly proclaim, “If we really wish to do good in Africa, we must teach her savage sons that white men are their superiors”? He did. British colonizers thought they were developed and well educated. According to Aime Cesaire, there are no equal relations but the ones of domination and submission between the colonizers and the colonized. The colonizers thought their level of education and life-style were high so they referred

the colonized people as “the peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world’ and the ‘advanced nations”. The African was drawn toward Christianity in his desire to learn more about the white man’s world. The mission’s educational objective was to expose Africans to a superior culture, but also to instruct pupils in the word of God (Urch, 1971). Various missionary groups were continuing to use education as a tool for expanding religious activities and enlarging their own sphere of influence (Urch, 1971). While the Africans were developing an interest in Western-style literary education, the colonial government began to realize the necessity of training Africans for service to the white man. The demand for skilled native labor by the white settlers and commercial leaders caused the colonial administrators to reevaluate the educational program of the missions (Urch, 1971). Much of the criticism about British education system in Africa focused on the concept of adaptation and the claim that it was a means of keeping indigenous people in their place and the British were accused of deliberately pursuing forms of cultural and ideological domination to destroy the cultures of African people (Whitehead, 2005). After colonized people had education, this superiority and inferiority issues received some criticism from African people. Though being educated, colonizers still referring them as “inferior”, or “backward” was no longer acceptable by African people. As the people in Africa became self-reliant via education they had, they became aware of colonial power imposition. The authority colonizers established began to weaken. The more the community in Africa bonded together, the more trust on the colonizers and the colonial power diminished. The colonial power credibility was challenged, colonized people began to lose faith and respect for colonizers because colonizers despised their culture and referred them as “inferior and backward”.

REFERENCES

Adhikari, Mohamed. “British Colonialism and Its Opponents” Journal of African History, 42.3 (2001): -523-25

Albert, Memmi. The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.

Basil, Davidson. Africa in Modern History. New York: Penguin Books, 1985.

Bhabha, Homi. The Location of Culture. London: Routledge, 1994.

Blanton, Robert, Mason David, and Brian Athow. “Colonial Style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa” Journal of Peace Research, 38.4(2001): -473-91

Bleich, Erik. “The Legacies of History? Colonization and Immigrant Integration in Britain and France” Springer Publishing, 34.2(2005): -171-95

Brown, N. Godfrey. “British Educational Policy in West and Central Africa” The Journal of Modern African Studies, 2.3 (1964): -365-77

Brownfield, Josh. “ Britain in Africa”
2 June 2010 <http://www.cusd.chico.k12.ca.us/~bsilva/.../brownfield. html>.

Burchill, Shirley. “The ‘Scramble for Africa” 2010
3 August 2010 <http://www.saburchill.com/history/chapters /empires/ 0048.html>.

Cesaire, Aime. Discourse on Colonialism. Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review, 2000.

Charton, A. The Social function of education in French West Africa, in: W.B. Mumford(Ed). Africans Learns to be French. London: Evans Bros Ltd, 1930.

Chris, Bunting. “A Tale of a Language Lost and Then Found” Times Higher Education 1539 (2002): 23-26

Christian, Mark. **“**An African-Centered Perspective on White Supremacy**”** Journal of Black Studies, 33.2 (2002): -179-98

Chiriyankandath, James. “Colonialism and Post-Colonial Development” 2007
22 July 2010 <http://www.oup.com/uk/orc/bin/9780199296088 /burnell_ ch02.pdf.html>.

Colman, Jonathan. “The Expansion and Contraction of the British Empire, c.1870-1980” History Review (2006): 28-31

“Colonial Transformations and African Responses.” <http://www.sahistory.org. html>.

de Blij, H.J, and Peter O. Muller. Geography: Realms, Regions, and Concepts. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1997. The National Geographic Desk Reference. National Geographic, 1999. Decolonization of Africa: Encyclopedia II - Decolonization of Africa – Causes 14 June 2010 <http://www.experiencefestival.com /decolonization_of _africa _causes**.** html>

“Decolonization of Africa.” <http://www. worldlingo.com. html>

Delavignette, L. Robert. ‘French Colonial Policy in Black Africa, 1945 to 1960’, in Lewis Gann, Peter Duignan, eds. Colonialism in Africa 1870-1960:Volume 2, The History and Politics of Colonialism 1914-1960. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Duignan, Peter, and Lewis Henry Gann. The United States and Africa a History. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.

Evans, Alistair Boddy. “Key Events in the Decolonization of Africa: Suez Crisis Part 2 – The Suez Crisis”. 18 August 2010 <http://www.africanhistory.about. com/od/.../a/SuezCrisis_2. html>

Falola, Toyin. “The Amistad’s Legacy: Reflections on the Spaces of Colonization” Fourth Annual Distinguished AMISTAD Lecture, Central Connecticut State University 24 June 2010 <http://www.ccsu.edu/afstudy/upd14-2. html>.

Fanon, Frantz. Black Skins White Masks. London: Pluto Press, 1991.

Favel, Adrian. Philosophies of Integration: Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain. London: MacMillan, 1998.

Foucault, Michel. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977. Colin Gordon (ed). Brighton:Harvester, 1980.

“French and British Colonial Styles” <http://www.bbc.co.uk. html>.

Furnivall, J.S. Progress and Welfare in Southeast Asia. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1941.

Geoffrey, Wheatcroft. “The Anguish of Africa” New Republic, 190.1 (1984): 18-23

Gail. P. “Learning to be marginal: schooling in interwar French West Africa and Indochina, 1918-1938” Journal of Asian and African Studies, (1986)

Gailey, A. Harry. “The Turning Point in Africa” American Historical Association, 88.2 (1983): -445-47

Gebrewold, Belachew. (n.d.) Deconstructing the Civilizing Process. IPS-6011 Conflict Analysis and Management Theory and Practice (2008), Reader. Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, International Peace Studies. University for Peace.

Getahun, Solomon. “Studying Africa through the Social Studies” 5 August 2010 <http://exploringafrica.matrix.msu.edu/.../activity2.php.html>.

Goldberg, David Theo. “In/Visibility and Super/Vision: Fanon on Race, Veil, and Discourses of Resistance. “Fanon: A Critical Reader. Eds. Lewis R. Gordon and Etc. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1996. 179-200

Goodman, Joyce, and Jane Martin. Gender, Colonialism and Education. London: Routledge Publishing, 2005.

Gore, W.Ormsby. “Educational Problems of the Colonial Empire” Oxford University Press, 143.36 (1937): -162-9

Goucher, Candice. Leguin, Charles, and Linda Walton. In the Balance: Themes in Global History. Boston: Mcgraw-Hill, 1998.

Gunes, Ali. “The Illusion of Freedom in South Africa: Post-colonialism, Exploitation and Identity Crisis in Alan Paton’s Cry, the Beloved Country” Journal of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, ISSN 1840-3719/ No:2 Spring (2009): 20-42

Habib, M.A.R. A History of Literary Criticism and Theory: From Plato to the Present. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2008.

Hargreaves, John D. The End of Colonial Rule in West Africa: Essays in Contemporary History. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1979. Print.

Hilde Antsen, The Battle of the Mind: International New Media Elements of the

New Religious Political Right in Zimbabwe. Oslo:University of Oslo, 1997.

Hyam, Ronald. Britain's Declining Empire: The Road to Decolonization, 1918-1968. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Iliffe, John. Geschichte Afrikas, Munchen 1997.

Johnston, Harry Hamilton. A History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races. New York: BiblioBazaar Publishing, 2009.

Joppke, Christian. Immigration and the Nation-State: The united States, Germany, and Great Britain. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Kehinde, Ayo. “Post-Colonial Literatures as Counter Discourse: J.M. Coetzee’s Foe and the Reworking of the Canon” Journal of African Literature and Culture 22 July 2010 <http://www.africaresearch.org/Papers/J07/J072Khn.pdf.html>.

Kelly, Gail P, and Philip G. Altbach. "The Four Faces of Colonialism." 1984 3 Oct. 2010 <http://www.englishmemory.edu/Bahri/Education.html>.Kelly,

Kemp, Arthur. March of the Titans: A History of the White Race. Ostara Publications, 1999 Sep. 2010 <http://www.white-history.com/hwr46. html>.

Khanna, Raniana. Colonial Rescriptings Dark Continents: Psychoanalysis and Colonialism. London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Kohn, Margaret. “Colonialism” May 2006 7 July 2010 <http://www.plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism.html>.

Lamont, Michele. The Dignity of Working Men: Morality and the Boundaries of Race, Class, and Immigration. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2000.

Lee, C. Sui. “Riot of the Confined Darkness: The Return of the Repressed in Doris Lessing’s The Grass is Singing” A Thesis for Master of Arts Graduate Institute of Foreign Languages and Literature, National Cheng Kung University, January 2006.

Lorcin, Patricia. Imperial identities: Stereotyping, Prejudice and race in Colonial Algeria. London: I.B. Tauris, 1995.

Mann, Micheal. “Torchbearers Upon the Path of Progress”: Britain’s Ideology of a

"Moral and Material Progress" in India. An Introductory Essay. In Colonialism as Civilizing Mission: Cultural Ideology in British India, edited by H. Fischer-Tine and M. Mann. London: Wimbledon Publishing Company, 2004

Mendonsa, Eugene L. West Africa: an Introduction to Its History, Civilization and Contemporary Situation. Durham, N.C.: Carolina Academic, 2002.

Meredith, Martin. The First Dance of Freedom: Black Africa in the Postwar Era. New York: Harper & Row, 1984.

Metz, Steven. "American Attitudes Toward Decolonization in Africa." Apr. 2010. <http://www.jstor.org/pss/2149946>.

McGarvey, A. Jason. "Conquest of the Mind" Research/Penn State, 18.2 (1997)

Migdal, Joel. Strong Societies and Weak States: State-Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World. NJ: Princeton University Press, 1988.

Miller, Charles. Battle for the Bundu, The First World War in East Africa. New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1974

Nosotro, Rit. "The Long-Term Effects of Colonization in the Americas" Oct. 2003 5 August 2010 <http://www.hyperhistory.net/cw27colonizationeffects.html>.

Nosotro, Rit. " The Rise and Fall of the British Empire" 12 August 2010 <http://www.hyperhistory.net/.../t2w22britishgrowth.html>.

Omolewa, Micheal. "Educating the 'Native': A Study of the Education adaptation Strategy in British Colonial Africa, 1910-1936" Journal of African American History, 91.3 (2006): -267-87

Palmer, Eustace. Studies on the English Novel. Ibadan:African University Press, 1986.

Panikkar, K.N. Colonialism, Culture, And Resistance. London: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Paton, Alan. Cry, The Beloved Country. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1982.

Pedler, Frederick. Main Currents of West African History, 1940-1978. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1979.

Pennycook, Alast. English and the Discourses of Colonialism. London: Routledge

Publishing, 1998.

Prior, Christopher. " Writing Another Continent's History: The British and the Pre-colonial Africa, 1880-1939" 14 September 2010 <http://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_64283_en.pdf.html>.

Reddy, E.S. "Martin Luther King." African National Congress Home Page. Apr.2010. <http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/history/solidarity/mlking01 .html>

Rodney, Walter. "Colonial Education in Africa" 14 June 2010 <http://www.ipoaa.com/colonial_education_africa.html>.

Rooney, Sean. "The Differences in Colonization in Africa and India" 2008

<http://www.associatedcontent.com/.../the_differences_in_colonization_in.html>.

Sellen, Jeff. "Modern Africa: Scramble" 19 September 2010<http://www.wsu.edu/~dee/modafrca/post.html>.

Said, Edward. The Pen and the Sword. Monreo, ME: Common Courage Press, 1994.

Sanneh, Omar. "Brief History of Western Education in the History of the Gambia" May 2009

Sembene, Ousmane. Xala. Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books, 1976. 9 July 2010<http://www.foroyaa.gm/modules/news/article.php?storyid.html>.

Serequeeberhan, Tsenay. "Africa in a Changing World: An Inventory" Monthly Review: An independent Socialist Magazine, 61.8 (2010), 26-38

Shillington, Kevin. History of Africa. New York: Palgrave Macmillan Publishing, 2005.

Smith, L.Young, and Nima Poovaya. "Culture, Resistance, Freedom" Publisher Routledge, 36.1 (2007), -133-37

Snyder, E. Daniel. "Brief History of the Berlin Conference" 2000 July 2010 <http://www.teacherweb.ftl.pinecrest.edu/snyderd/History. html>.

Southard, John. "Colonial Education." Fall 1997 2 Jan. 2010 <http://www.englishmemory.edu/Bahri/Education.html>.

Susan, Van Zyk. "The Other and Other Others: Post-colonialism, Psychoanalysis

and The South African Question" American Imago, 55.1 (1998), 77-98

Tadesse, Debay. "The Origins of Racism" 2 July 2010 <http://www.afgen.com/africa_history.html>.

"The Gambia." <http://www.worldover.com.html>.

"The History of the Gambia." <http://www.accessgambia.com.html>.

"The History of the Gambia." <http://www.historyworld.net.html>.

"The History of the Tanzania" <http://www.ponudebiz.com.html>.

Thiong'o W. Ngugi. Decolonizing the Mind. Harare: Zimbabwe Publishing House, 1981.

Urch, E. George. "Education and Colonialism in Kenya" History of Education Quarterly, 11.3 (1971), -249-64

Von Albertini, Rudolf, and Albert Wirz. European Colonial Rule: 1880-1940. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1982.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. Africa: The Politics of Independence. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

Weil, Patrick. Lifting the Veil of Ignorance. Progressive Politics 3 2004: 16-22

White, Bob. "Talk about School: education and the colonial project in French and British Africa (1860-1960)" Comparative Education, 32.1 (1996), 9-25

White, Nicholas. Decolonization: The British Experience Since 1945. London: Longman Publishing, 1999.

Whitehead, Clive. "The Historiography of British Imperial Education Policy, Part II: Africa and the Rest of the Colonial Empire" Routledge, 34.4 (2005), -441-54

Whitehead, Clive. "The Historiography of British Imperial Education Policy" History of Education, 34.4 (2005): -441-54

Wilson, Henry. African Decolonialism. London: Edward Arnold, 1994.

Windel, Aoron. "British Colonial Education in Africa: Policy and Practice in the Era of Trusteeship" Blackwell Publishing, 7.1 (2009), 1-21

Windon, John. "Colonial Policies of the British and French in Africa" June 2007 <http://www.associatedcontent.com/colonial_policies_of_the_british. html>

Whittlesey, Derwent. “British and French Colonial Technique in West Africa” Foreign Affairs, 15.2 (1937), -362-73

“Wolof.” <http://www.imp.ucla.edu.html>.

Yeonhwa, Lee. Comparative History of Education in West Africa British Gold Coast Ghana and French Cote D’Ivoire, Fall 2009

Young, Crawford. The African Colonial State in Comparative Perspective. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994.

Young, Crawford. ‘The African Colonial State and Its Political Legacy’ in Donald Rothchild, Naomi Chazan, eds, Precarious Balance: State and Society in Africa. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1988.