



# CALABAR JOURNAL OF POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION

ISSN: 1595 - 0107

Vol: 1

No. 1

June, 1999

- The Armed Forces in Nigerian Politics: An Assessment - **S.P.I. Agi**
- Problems And Prospects of Implementing Development  
Plans in Third World Countries - **J. A. Agabi**
- The Diplomacy of Dependence: A Critique of Nigeria's  
Relation with Great Powers (1960 - 1998) - **Dr. C. O. Bassey**
- Nigeria's External Debt Crisis: Implications for the  
Economy - **Okon E. Akpan**
- Sanctions And the International Isolation of Nigeria, 1993 - 98  
Consideration of Conceptual Issue - **Dr. Okon Eminue**
- Leadership Pathology and Democratic Experiment  
in Africa - **Felix Akpan**
- Imperialism in Africa: A Theoretical Critique of some  
Unresolved Issues - **Patrick A. Anibong**
- The Politics of International Assistance To Population Research in  
Developing Countries - **Emmanuel C. Ihejiamazu**
- Organized Labour in the Interventionist Era: A Discourse on the  
failure of the "No-Strike" Injunction of Military Decrees - **Eucharika Nwabugo Nwagbara**
- Oil Wealth and the Derivation Principle: The need for a New Fiscal  
Imperative Towards Oil - Producing States - **Christopher O. Orubu**
- Military Spending, Savings And Economic Development in A Less  
Developed Country - **Michael O. Nyong**

# CALABAR JOURNAL OF POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION

Published by: Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences,  
University of Calabar, P.M.B. 1115, Calabar, Nigeria.

## EDITORIAL BOARD

### Editor-in-Chief

Dr. S. P. I. Agi

### Editor

Dr. C. O. Bassey

### Associate Editor

Dr. O. Adedokun

### Business Editors

Mr. P. A. Assibong

Mr. F. Akpan

## EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Prof. S. Olugbemi**  
Public Administration

**Prof. T. Imobighe**  
Strategic Studies

**Prof. A. Sessay**  
International Organization

**Prof. B. Ate**  
International Relations

**Prof. V. C. Uchendu**  
Public Policy

**Prof. T. Shaw**  
Political Economy

**Prof. A. T. Gana**  
International Economic  
Relations

**Prof. E. Okolo**  
Foreign Policy

**EDITORIAL**

Rethinking prevailing Theoretical And Methodological Assumptions .....iv

**ARTICLES**

The Armed Forces in Nigerian Politics: An Assessment **S. P. I. Agi** ..... 1

Problems And Prospects of Implementing Development  
Plans in third World Countries **J. A. Agabi** ..... 18

The Diplomacy of Dependence: A Critique of Nigeria's  
Relation with Great Powers (1960-1998) **C.O. Bassey**..... 36

Nigeria's External Debt Crisis: Implications for the Economy  
**Okon E. Akpan**..... 56

Sanctions And the International Isolation of Nigeria,  
1993 - 98: Consideration of Conceptual Issues **Okon Eminue**..... 85

Leadership Pathology and Democratic Experiment in Africa  
**Felix Akpan** ..... 116

Imperialism In Africa: A Theoretical Critique of some  
Unresolved Issues **Patrick A. Assibong**..... 131

The Politics of International Assistance To Population Research in  
Developing Countries **Emmanuel C. Ihejimaizu** ..... 151

Organized Labour in the Interventionist Era: A Discourse on the failure of the  
"No-Strike" Injunction of Military Decrees **Eucharia Nwabugo Nwagbara**..... 174

Oil Wealth and the Derivation Principle: The need for a New Fiscal Imperative  
Towards Oil - Producing States **Christopher O. Orubu**..... 182

Military Spending, Savings And Economic Development in A Less  
Developed Country **Michael O. Nyong**..... 212

# IMPERIALISM IN AFRICA: A THEORETICAL CRITIQUE OF SOME UNRESOLVED ISSUES

P. A. Assibong

## PREAMBLE

This paper examines copious extant and current theoretical perspectives on the highly vexing and contentious issue of imperialism in Africa highlighting the marxist, Neo-marxist and the Orthodox theoretical directions.

Although the critique took exceptions with these contending explanations of the phenomenon of imperialism, it, nevertheless, inclines towards the economic theory of imperialism as proffered by the marxist or radical Scholars.

The primary reason, the critique contends, resides in the nature and dialectics of capitalism; that capitalism by its very nature is expansionist, immoral, despicable and racists.

From this basic premise, the critique concludes, it is now left for the orthodox liberal scholars to "manufacture" or develop the moral courage to accept the fact that:

- (i) the search for raw materials ready markets and free labour initially precipitated European unwarranted incursion into or scramble for Africa.
- (ii) Some Europeans gained racist satisfaction by colonising defenceless Africans around the 1830s.

It is the writer's conviction that once this incontrovertible facts are accepted, a redefinition of the problematic of imperialism in the dominant orthodox literature is expected to follow.

## INTRODUCTION

Generally, the concept "imperialism" which predates and postdates the period (1870) of European expansionism overseas, including the African Continent, posed intricate current theoretical complications which have not been resolved to this day. These byzantine complexities are made even more complicated by some scholars who regard imperialism merely as "any" type of "more or less sustained aggressive" behaviour of any "political system towards another." (Daalder, 1962:P.142).

In a related study, Schumpeter (1951:7) saw imperialism as “the objectless disposition on the part of a State to unlimited forcible expansionism” (emphasis mine). Scholars who assumed that imperial nations had no objectives when they started the Voyages of discovery and later acquired colonies in Africa are mere apologists to monopoly capitalism. If imperialism is not as Schumpeter posits, what then is its proper meaning? Is it the jingoistic policy of establishing a “Greater Britain through the expansion of England into an imperial federation?” (Dilke, 1885:P. 18) or was it the French struggle for “La France Autre Mere?” Is imperialism Germany’s search for “a place in the sun?” or her quest for “Drang nach Osten”, i.e. imperialist drive towards the East? (Peacock, 1971:P.281).

On the contrary, is any scholar justified to christen the former colonies in Africa which were acquired by fraud and force of arms “the Whiteman’s Burden?” (Kipling, 1925:P. 4) which were to be administered with blood and iron using the despicable “Dual Mandate”(Lugard, 1922:614) stratagem? Are the Euro-Centric Political Scientists correct when they call on African academics and patriots to eulogize imperialism because according to them, the “Dark Continent” became automatically “Bright” bringing civilisation to the backward peoples of Africa? Are there other races in the world who were never colonized and never passed via the humiliating and traumatic experiences of imperialism?

Did imperialism foster flawless globalisation as asserted by Ian Clark (1997:P.24)? Was there any harm done by political historians or” historicists to our understanding of the concept when they restricted and situated imperialism within the context of the period after the 1870 European expansionism?

Apart from the explanations posited by orthodox or liberal scholars like (Lange, 1935), (Daalder, 1962), (Clark, 1936), (Schumpeter, 1951), are there other genres which have made their positions known on the issue of imperialism? Has the Marxist response adequately addressed the complicated and vexing concept of imperialism as it relates to the African continent? Should academics accept previous discussions on imperialism which focused on the goals pursued, the methods the imperialists used and the activating forces as sacrosanct or a concept to be “protected” from further “bombardment-” or critical analysis? Or should we simply accept with Hobson (1902)—the political economic heretic of radical

persuasion-that imperialism is merely British colonialism? What about viewing imperialism as “a pseudo-concept which sets out to make everything clear and ends by making everything muddled ... a word for the illiterates of social Sciences” (Hancock, 1950:P. 17).

With the United States previous attacks on Grenada, Panama and her recent attacks on Iraq and the U.S.-led North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO's) recent air strikes on Kosovo (with some world leaders and some native population shouting “down with American imperialism”) the concept does not suit Hancock's exposition. Hence these unresolved issues must be identified, analysed and a new theoretical interpretation which does not lose contact with concrete political, social and historical realities proffered.

More specifically, the paper which will examine extant and current theoretical perspectives on imperialism in Africa, will state the origin of imperialism, attempt an acceptable definition of the concept and review related literature in the first part.

The second trajectory will present a critique of some unresolved issues by the orthodox and Marxist genres while the third part will treat the Pathology and Taxonomy of imperialism subsumed under the subsequent subtypes:

- (i) The objectives pursued by imperialists.
- (ii) The “modus operandi” or method of operation, and
- (iii) The propelling forces behind imperialist ventures.

The above subtypes would however be cast in the orthodox and radical “moulds” during our critical exposé. The fourth section will treat the theoretical interpretation of the critique; while the fifth and last part would deal with the precis, the prognosis for- action and conclusion of the paper.

### **IMPERIALISM: ORIGIN AND DEFINITIONAL POLEMICS**

The word “imperialism” is both anachronistic and a recent term especially when we try to grapple with the idea of understanding its political economy in Africa before and after the conquest of the “Dark Continent” by European Colonialists in the early 1830s. Since empirical and policy questions motivate modern scholars to pursue both lines of research, it would be pertinent for us to take as a point of departure the extant literature concerning the origin of imperialism.

The term imperialism originated from France in 1830, where

Napoleon was busy acquiring colonies for his country and became acceptable in academic circles when British radicals used the word to refer to British Colonialism in Africa and other less Developed Countries (LDCs). Since then, the word has been "over-flogged" by both the former Soviet Union now the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the United States who "mutilated" the word beyond recognition especially during the cold war propaganda era. In Africa, the word gained currency during the decolonialisation period when nationalists adopted the slogan "Down with European Imperialism" as their war cry. Perhaps the most recent "cry" against imperialism in the world scene is that of Yugoslavia against American-led F.117 Missile air strikes in Kosovo. After each attack, President Yeltsin - now reduced to a toothless bull-dog - is said to be shouting "Clinton, you IMPERIALIST swine: You will pay for this. You hear me? You will pay." (Yeltsin, 1999:P.9).

In Africa, we have Nigerian imperialism in Liberia and later Sierra -Leone while the United Nations (UN) led imperialism in Somalia ended in a fiasco.

Although any attempt to explain the word imperialism would take us to many definitional polemics, some point of congruence can be reached after treating them discretely. Schumpeter (1981:P.7) defined imperialism as "the objectives disposition on the part of a State to unlimited forcible expansionism" while O'Connor (1970:P 102) had this to say about imperialism- "It is the formal or informal control over local economic resources in a manner advantageous to the Metropolitan power, and , at the expense of the local (African) economy" (emphasis mine).

In The Diplomacy of Imperialism, Langer (1925:P.67) defined imperialism as "the rule or control, political or economic, direct or indirect, of one State, nation or people over other similar groups, or ... the disposition urge or striving to establish such rule".

In whatever perspective one tries to define imperialism, the definitional polemics notwithstanding, imperialism is a shameless and ravenous quest by stronger nations to exert political, economic, social and cultural control over weaker nations to the advantage of the stronger nations, and to the disadvantage of the smaller States.

With the recent developments in Iraq, Kosovo, Liberia, Somalia and Sierra -Leone, the concept of imperialism is fraught with many unresolved issues especially when one tries to critically analyse it in the

context of the contribution of the liberal and radical genres-

### **SOME UNRESOLVED ISSUES:**

The orthodox prescription that capitalism by its very nature needs a peaceful environment both at home and abroad to operate; hence capitalists could not have sponsored or supported wars has not been adequately treated nor has the Schumpeterian claim that the whole exercise had no aim, a reasonable response to the vexing issue of imperialism in Africa. The theory of imperialism in Africa being the end-product of a very high "organic composition of capital" in Europe finding a virgin terrain (Africa) for investment has not been properly explained nor has the Marxists dialectical theory of "Economic determinism" helped us in our quest in understanding the dialectics of imperialism in Africa.

In other words, the Marxist intervention of clinging to the economic motive which was precipitated by capitalism, colonialism, search for raw materials and cheap labour and the orthodox rebuttal has not been resolved to this day.

Commenting on the most current concept in political science-globalization-Ian Clark (1997:P.24) established a dialectical link between imperialism and globalization thus "... globalization has been shaped by major international trend of the past several centuries, namely Westernization. It was the economic and military incorporation of the world by Europe that created the precondition of an integrated global system".

Although Bull and Watson (1984:P.2) saw globalization and imperialism via the same periscope with Clark, the above school, failed woefully to recognize the fact that some countries like China - an emerging "super-power" (Gibney, 1999:P.44) and Japan were never Westernized (Palmer and Colton 1979:P.134). This knotty contradiction has not been resolved in the recent past.

It is also difficult for one to situate the Nigerian intervention (imperialism) in Liberia and Sierra Leone in the context of "searching for raw materials" or that of U. S. in Kosovo and Iraq. Are these examples of "imperialism" quest for or an extension of nationalism?

### **RADICAL AND LIBERAL GENRES: A CRITIQUE**

The radical or Marxist Scholars hold the opinion that the economic motive fostered by Capitalism, Colonialism, the quest for cheap labour,



raw materials, favourable terms of trade, job opportunities and new lands suitable for exploitation or settlement forced die-hard capitalists to engage in imperialist ventures.

Exponents of the above genre, see imperialism as a particularly profitable though not inevitable-policy of powerful capitalist groups or nations to "overcome the alleged similar tendency of profits to fall ... or to achieve the largest possible protected markets which trusts and cartels could exploit and use as a basis for their future struggle for the world market" (Daalder, 1972:P.102).

The marxists went further to state that it was the negative domestic factors which forced capitalists to engage in imperialist policies like the continued accumulation of capital by capitalists which later "forced" them to look for non-capitalist groups to pump in money for investment. With the above, the bourgeois class believed that the periodic depressions which were endemic in Europe would be upset.

The Marxist explanatory matrix in our understanding of imperialism seems to focus unduely on the economic motive but with our understanding of the dynamics of world politics, Marx's interpretation of history:

*is antiquated at best. The explanation of everything by economic causes alone is never exhaustive in any sense whatsoever in any sphere of cultural phenomena not even in the "economic" sphere, itself... The one-sidedness and the unreality of the purely economic interpretation of history is in general only a special case of a principle which is generally valid for the scientific knowledge of cultural reality.*  
(Hindess, 1977: P.71).

The above approach has no explanatory relevance to the theory of imperialism because it has neglected the catastrophic and ruineous effects on the political and social growth of the African continent. Lenin and Hobson seem to have fallen into the same trap as Marx fell into because both agreed that imperialism was precipitated by economic interests and is related to the process of primitive capital accumulation. The Hobsonian-Leninian thesis was similar in character but different in content in that

Lenin failed to see imperialism as a relationship between two countries or two economies but merely as a stage in the developmental history of capitalism; characterised by the dominance of monopolies and capital, the repatriation of capital to the core countries, the formation of global monopolies (Multinationals) and the partition of the world by major imperialist countries, (Lenin, 1947:p.60). Roxborough (1983:p.56) summarized the above position as "monopolisation plus colonies". Hobson on the contrary, identified the economic motive as the principal cause for the scramble for colonies overseas by European powers. This subtle difference between Lenin and Hobson was also identified by Ake (1992:p.20) thus: "But they differ in their accounts of the precise nature of the character and manifestations of these interests, and the precise nature of the relationship between capitalist accumulation and imperialism".

However, Hobson (1902) asserted that the most important single fact which forced the Western Europeans to initiate and consummate imperialist ventures was economic because the capitalist had a ravenous appetite for external markets as well as avenues for higher returns on investments. He paid very small attention to the possibilities of other causes being responsible for imperialist projects like national pride, aggressiveness and national glory because he rated their contribution negligible when compared to the economic motive. The Hobsonian thesis maintained that because of the rising standard of living in Europe, precipitated by capitalism, Europeans needed raw materials for factories and more food was needed for the urban proletariat. Africa was looked upon as one of the most important theatres where their aspirations could be satisfied. Again, they claimed that since production in Europe outstripped consumption resulting in under-consumption, the only outlet to sell these surpluses was a continent different from Europe - Africa. In their quest to secure new markets, foreign lands had to be colonised.

Hobson later felt imperialism would not benefit the British people because they have to pay taxes to maintain British staff in the colonies. At that time, Hobson did not envisage the use of African Chiefs to rule the people via the British indirect rule system; neither did he see any connection between imperialism and industrialisation. In the final analysis, Hobson equates capitalism with imperialism as Lenin, Baran, Rodney, Luxemburg and Bukharin did to mention but five neo-Marxists, who saw the economic motive as being the paramount reason for European expansionism in Africa.

To buttress the above point, Cecil Rhodes of the British South African Company opined that British national economic interest should be protected and retained in all oversea countries including those in Africa. In other words, Europe was to invade and conquer Africa and seize her resources and trade. This was finally concretised by the 1885 Berlin Treaty which partitioned Africa.

James O'Connor's approach which saw imperialism as the formal and informal control over colonial economic resources in a manner beneficial to the core countries and at the detriment of the peripheral countries shows that the mechanisms of imperialism are many, while the relationship may take many forms. The above exposition is different because it did not equate imperialism with capitalism. Viewed critically, O'Connor's approach to imperialism also assumes that imperialist relationships may exist between non-capitalist countries also: like Cuba in the Caribbean serving as a surrogate to former USSR.

If O'Connor's presentation is a major departure from the widely held view that economic motives forced Europeans to scramble for colonies in Africa and beyond, then the Schumpeterian theory of imperialism is even more controversial and paradoxical because he failed dismally in defining imperialism when he stated that it was "the objectless disposition on the part of a State to unlimited forcible expansionism" (Schumpeter, 1951:P.7). Rather, he saw military expeditions as being the only means of European expansionism. Schumpeter's theory of imperialism is the most naive and obscure for any meaningful academic evaluation, hence perhaps his contribution has become important today because his definition projected him to the fore as one of the most important capitalists apologists and a custodian of the status quo even ante imperialism.

Marx on the other hand, is direct about his explanation of imperialism whom he stated bluntly that imperialism emanates from the base of capitalism which accumulates surplus value which has to find a terrain for reinvestment to generate more profit. To find new markets for European manufactured goods, capitalists must penetrate other economies.

In support of the above postulation on imperialism Lenin had this to say:

*Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established;*

*in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun, in which the division of all territories of the globe amongst the biggest capitalist powers has been completed. (Quoted in Pilling, 1980:P.94).*

From the above postulation, it is evident that Lenin was one of the few scholars who explained the multifarious peculiarities of the latest phase of capitalism; emanating from competitive capitalism, producing a very volatile situation where monopoly capitalism became decisive and where finance capital became the most important form of capital in the world.

Kautsky saw imperialism as a product of higher developed industrial capitalism. It consists in the striving of every industrial capitalist nation to bring under its territory, pre-industrial nations to serve as the source of raw materials for their industries (Pilling, 1980:p.94). Kautsky's approach is essentially abstract, opaque and superfluous. It is manifestly and latently abstract because it failed to identify the relationship between the highest phase of capitalist development and the lower forms from which it sprang. He succeeded only to show the annexation tendency - which is a political not an economic phenomenon common to all imperialists. His exposition was worthless because it was blind while approaching the relationship between imperialism and capitalism. In other words, Kautsky believed erroneously that there was no historical relationship between capitalism and imperialism because the whole exercise was nothing but a reactionary policy initiated and executed by the predatory wing of the European bourgeoisie.

However, Kautsky's approach had some relevance in Africa when we examine critically the common characteristics of the colonial predatory state throughout Africa where development policies in agriculture, industrialization, education, transport and politics had the scars of imperialism. Ake (1982) calls it "the disarticulation of the transport ... systems".

Characteristically emphasizing the need for industrialization in Ghana in 1951 when he became leader of government business, Nkrumah (1963:xiii) had this to say:

*... it was when they (the colonial masters) had gone that we were faced with the stark realities ... there were slums and squalor in our towns ... there was much ignorance and few skills ... of industry we had none ... we make not a handkerchief, not a match.*

This master-servant relationship and scourge-earth policy by the European imperialists, was exacerbated in Ghana by the 1922 Governor-General - Guggisberg - when he shamelessly stated:

*Unless the Gold Coast (now Ghana) spends every penny it can justifiably afford on extending its present lamentable inadequate facilities for transport, education and sanitation, its progress must, and will, be so hopelessly retarded as to give real cause for discontent, unrest and failure. (Guggisberg, 1922) (emphasis mine).*

The above despatch to London was a cross-continental position by the colonial governments. Perhaps Guggisberg must have lived in a fool's paradise because little did he know that at the tail-end of the second millennium, African academics would identify the hypocritical streak in his despatch, namely: his selfish recommendation to the Ghanaian people to spend the last 'penny it can justifiably afford...' so that he can embezzle same and cart to Britain at the end of his tenure.

Elsewhere in neo-colonial Africa, imperialism infiltrated politics, because Presidents gain or lose their seats via the whims and caprices of the imperialist Western powers. On the above, Chinweizu (1978:P.165) has this to say:

*In the Cameroons Andre-Marie Mbida was their first candidate for the Job of administering the colony for them. But when they (the colonial government) decided that Mbida was basically too nationalistic and not Pro-French enough, they ousted him and installed (their surrogate) Ahmadou Ahidjo as their man in the Cameroons (emphasis mine),*

The aftermath of imperialism in Africa saw nationalists being victimized by Europeans for being too nationalistic, a vexing situation which had no replica in Europe.

Another unresolved issue of imperialism having no objective was stripped naked when despite the fact that there is abundant wealth in Africa, the African children of Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) had no access to education because the *metropolitan* governments and their administrators in the Satellites, claimed that there was not enough money for education. In 1885, the British colonial office had this to say of Rhodesia: "Until more money becomes available for the building of schools, no rapid progress can be expected and the practical prospects of providing full primary education for all children therefore, remains fairly remote" (Rodney, 1972: p. 264)

It is however unbelievable that former Rhodesia with her stupendous copper wealth did not have "enough money" to educate the Africans but had enough to sponsor the autocratic regime of Cecil Rhodes, the imperial Master of Rhodesia who was replaced by Robert Mugabe via free and fair elections in 1980.

Perhaps some of the unresolved issues would be clearer if we revisit the postulations of neo-Marxists like Luxemburg, Claude Ake, Paul Barn, and Bukharin.

Following the Marxian tradition, Luxemburg (1951:P.60) opined that the central point of imperialism is "the transfer of value between modes of production". Accordingly, she went further to state that 20th century imperialism was mainly the expansion of the capitalist mode of production into the pre-capitalist mode of production and when this was completed, the pre-capitalist economies became the dumping ground for bourgeois surplus capital and goods, precipitating dependency.

With the advent of European Imperialism into Africa, unequal exchange took place in the field of circulation and production, hence the high wages of the proletarian class in Europe are partly responsible for the low wages in Africa. This is How Europe-Underdeveloped Africa. (Rodney, 1972)

From the above, imperialism was more than the "Jingoistic policy of greater Britain" and not the "Whiteman's burden" rather it was a deliberate despicable, expansionist, immoral and racist European policy to underdevelop Africa and develop Europe. The defence put forward by

the liberal scholars is at best speculative.

### **PATHOLOGY AND TAXONOMY OF IMPERIALISM**

Since the term "imperialism" is often at the mercy of the user, had been blunted as an intellectual instrument and it has over the years been mutilated by frequent emotional and unreasonable usage, there is the need to identify the remote and immediate causes of this strange "disease" (Imperialism) and to classify or arrange the exponents of the issues according to their approaches to the problematic.

If we conduct a post-mortem on the objectives pursued by imperialists, the method of operation and the propelling forces behind imperialist ventures in Africa, we are bound to "exhume" the racist content among the labyrinth of objectives. On the surface was the economic motive made and propounded by Karl Marx and made popular and acceptable in academic circles by neo-Marxists as late Claude Ake, Paul Baran and Rosa Luxemburg, to mention but a few.

It is on record that slave trade started in some parts of West Africa after Africa's incorporation into the capitalist world system (Wallerstein, 1972). It was precisely as a result of Capitalist penetration of Africa via imperialism, that constant raids for slaves became the order of the day, thus precipitating a sense of insecurity among the Africans from Cape to Cairo. With this type of tense atmosphere, economic progress could not take place in Africa where "slave raiding and kidnapping made it very unsafe to mine and to travel with gold, and raiding for captives proved more profitable than gold mining" (Rodney, 1972:P.107).

Similarly, the refusal of Cecil Rhodes - the "Mighty Conqueror" of former Monomotapa Kingdom, nicknamed Rhodesia after the above imperialist - to provide basic facilities for the education of the native population in present day Zimbabwe is manifestly racist.

Apologists of the orthodox genre, may try to point at the pathological weaknesses inherent in the body-politic of African nations and Africa's over-dependence on Europe as an excuse for the open inequality existing between Europe and Africa. We can agree that for Africa to be chronically dependent on Europe's productive capacity, sometimes even for food, is to say the least, incompatible with "continental respect" for a continent whose leaders - before independence -promised the people good government and all the good things of life. It was sad to notice that, all over Africa, the politics of rising expectations turned to that of depressing

frustration after independence. It is however pertinent to note here that the above bleak picture is not enough Justification for the Colonisation of Africa by Europe.

An empirical analysis of the above scenario, will reveal that when nations are classified into two categories, i.e. countries/continents which were "Westernized" thus tasted the pangs of imperialism like Africa, Latin America and India and those that were never "Westernized" hence not "Imperialized" or colonized, the truth is that India has never recovered from the bastardization of her cotton industry (Baran, 1970, 1973), and Latin Americans had wished the "Latifondi" were not established-for their institutionalization impoverished millions of African slaves in South America.

In Africa, Claude Ake (1981) recorded "road blocks" to the development of Africa which included the "monetisation of the economy", "disarticulation" of the transport, educational, political, social and cultural systems, "imperialism of trade" where Multinationals controlled the economy and discriminatory charges were given to African traders for shipping goods to Britain and Europeans shipping their goods from Britain to U.S.A. For instance, in shipping goods from Liverpool to West Africa, shipping companies in Britain collected (35s) thirty-five shillings per ton, while to transport the same amount of goods from Liverpool to New York City which is the same distance as West Africa from Liverpool, Americans were charged only (7s:6p) Seven shillings, six pence (Rodney, 1972:P.176).

There is abundant empirical evidence (Deutsch, 1988: P.294) to prove that countries like Japan, China, Thailand, Korea and Taiwan to mention but a few, are enjoying a relative high economic production and growth as compared to the catastrophic and ruineous effects of imperialism on all the continents/countries where imperialism reared her ugly head.

The above position was made clear when Ejiofor (1981:P.3) opined that "... it was nevertheless clear to all that the Master-servant relationship was basically an adventurer - victim affair. Colonies were worth their while only as long as they could feed the metropolitan countries with raw materials and unskilled labour".

The above evidence was corroborated by Arendt (1968) and Lugard (1923:P.612) when Lugard succinctly stated thus: "The partition of Africa



was due primarily to the economic necessity of increasing the supplies of raw materials and food to meet the needs of the industrialized nations of Europe”.

From the above pathological and taxonomic exposition of imperialism in Africa, we can conveniently assert that the motives, “modus operandi” and the propelling forces behind capitalism were all master-minded by and the machinations of die-hard capitalists who benefited from the whole exercise either by unequal “legitimate” trade or by the illegitimate trade on human beings which has left an indelible scar on the psyche of the Black race the world over.

### THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CRITIQUE

All the pieces of evidence presented above by the Marxists notwithstanding, the bourgeois scholars here represented by the orthodox genre still managed a lame, obscure and speculative type of defence by claiming that capitalist *Europe*, through the avenues of colonialism and imperialism, came to Africa to “civilize” her inhabitants. Proponents of this idea - Schumpeter and Auguste Comte - saw capitalism as a “democratising, individualising and rationalizing force in Africa and the rest of the world.”

Liberal scholars and their apologists claim that capitalism functions well only in a peaceful environment -hence the capitalists rather than sponsor wars, would do all in their power to avoid them. This position was supported by Morgenthau (1966) and specifically Daalder (1962:P.134) who held that “a careful review of all the wars fought between 1920-1929 shows clearly that only 29% of those wars -were due to economic reasons”.

Based on the face-value, the above revelation renders the Marxist economic motive inadequate in explaining the problematic of imperialism but when viewed critically, the orthodox scholars missed the point because they based their analysis on a few isolated cases and completely ignored the period 1800-1900 which covered the epoch of uncontrollable imperial ventures particularly in Africa. For example, “the Boer war of 1899-1902 was a war fought mainly to protect British mining interest in South Africa” (Morgenthau, 1966:P.50).

In spite of the fact that the Liberals asserted that “It was ... the middle classes who were the supporters of pacifism, of internationalism (Viner, 1951:P.255), the upper classes sponsored the middle classes who

were directly engaged in "pacifism".

### PROGNOSIS FOR ACTION

Understanding therefore that imperialism was a lopsided operation which benefited Europe and impoverished the African continent, it is left for the Europeans to "manufacture" the moral courage to accept the fact that, the search for raw materials and ready markets propelled by the desire of some die-hard capitalists to subjugate the "Inferior Black Race" precipitated imperialism.

To buttress the above claim, perhaps Deutsch, s (1988:Pp.293-294) exposition - a Liberal Scholar of Marxist persuasion? -more than electrifies the issue thus:

*Most of these territories were turned into colonies within the empire of this or that European power. The colonial people - Africans then became its subjects, ruled and most often exploited by their new "Mother Country", often with the help of a small number of colonists of European stock and/or a small native elite of local ... chieftains collaborating with the imperial power (Emphasis, Mine).*

From the above quotation, one can clearly see that even European scholars who are not racists, accept that Europe is at fault when we try to understand "imperialism", one of the most controversial word in Political Science literature.

### PRÉCIS AND CONCLUSION

It is pertinent to note here that there is no standard theory which explains imperialism in Africa nor can we accept the Schumpeterian position which saw imperialism as an "objectless" mission into Africa. What can satisfy us here perhaps is the conclusion that imperialism was not initiated solely for economic gains neither did the Europeans colonise Africa for "Democratisation", "Modernisation" or "Institution Building" or what other galvanising euphemisms they may trump-up!

The point is that, a crooked system of foreign bandit enterprise,

that gives the Europeans too much advantage over the Africans is not, and cannot satisfy the interest of Africans. It is important to state here that, had the Europeans not raped the African continent via imperialism and slave trade; had they not institutionalized the master/servant relationship between themselves and Africans, and had they not exploited Africa's natural resources, a "third way" to development according to Fanon would have been realized.

As we have seen in the paper, "imperialism" in Africa is not simply British Jingoism nor is Africa "the Whiteman's Burden". "Imperialism" was the "pioneer of capitalism" (Warren, 1982). Capitalism precipitated the search for virgin lands to invest surplus capital.

Perhaps all the prescriptions - by prominent Europeans like Disraeli and Beaconsfield in Britain, Jules Ferry in Conservative France and President William McKinley in U.S. - were unconscious because the inequality, unequal exchange, frustration, exploitation and inferiority complex which was experienced in the "imperialized" countries was not envisaged by the above reactionary conservatives. Unconsciously, they were subverting the Western nations because in the later part of the close of the second millennium, Europeans have come to the painful conclusion that poverty and conflict in any part of the world, adversely affects their own security and economy. It stands to reason that they should develop the moral courage and accept full responsibility for their mess by trying to "reduce" the inequality, exploitation, inferiority complex they nurtured in Africa during the epoch of imperialism. Perhaps the cancellation by the G.8 nations of all the debts owed by African Nations would be a good starting point.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ake, Claude (1979) Social Science as Imperialism. Ibadan: University Press.
- (1982) A Political Economy of Africa. New York: Longman Press Inc.
- Arendt, Hannah (1968) Imperialism. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Baran, A. Paul (1970) "On the Political Economy of Backwardness". In R. I. Rhodes (ed.) Imperialism and Underdevelopment: A Reader. New York & London: Monthly Review Press.
- (1973) The Political Economy of Growth London: Cox & Nyman Ltd.
- Barrat, Brown (1974) The Economics of Imperialism. London: Harmondsworth.
- Brewer, Anthony (1990) Marxist Theories of imperialism: A Critical Survey. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bukharin, N. (1970) Imperialism And The World Economy. London: Merlin Press.
- Chinweizu, (1978) The West And The Rest of Us. London: Nok Publisher.
- Clark, Grover (1936) The Balance Sheet Of Imperialism: Facts and Figures on Colonies. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Clark, Ian (1997) Globalization and Fragmentation: International Relations in the Twentieth Century. New York. Oxford University Press.

- Daalder, Hans (1962) “Capitalism, Colonialism and the Undeveloped Areas: The Political Economy of Imperialism” in Egbert de Vries (ed.) Essays on Unbalanced Growth. A Century of Disparity And Convergence The Hague: Mouton Press.
- (1972) “Imperialism” in David Sills (ed.) INTERNATIONAL ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES VOL. 7 New York: Macmillan Publisher.
- Deutsch, W. Karl (1988) The Analysis of International Relations Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall International Inc.
- Dilke, Sir Charles W. (1885) Greater Britain: A Record Of Travel in English Speaking Countries During 1866 and 1867 London: Macmillan Press.
- Ejiofor, L. U. (1981) Africa in World Politics. Onitsha: Africana Educational Publishers Limited.
- Gibney, Frank (1999) “Birth of a Superpower” in Time International Magazine, Inc., S1-S2, Vol 153, No. 22. Amsterdam: Time Warner Publishers B.V.
- Guggisberg, (1922) Despatch from Governor Guggisberg To The Secretary of State Colonial Affairs. London August.
- Hancock, William K. (1950) Wealth of Colonies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hindess, Batty (1977) Philosophy and Methodology In The Social Sciences. Sussex: The Harvester Press Ltd

- Hobson, John A. (1902) Imperialism: A Study. London: Allen and Urwin.
- Kemp, T., (1967) Theories of Imperialism. London: Macmillan Press.
- Lange, W. L. (1935) The Diplomacy of Imperialism. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc.
- Lenin, Vladimir (1947) Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism. Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House.
- Lugard, Sir Frederick D. (1922) The Dual Mandate In British Tropical Africa. London: William Blackwood & Sons.
- Luxemburg, Rosa (1951) The Accumulation of Capital London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Morgenthau, Hans (1966) Politics Among Nations: A Struggle For Power and Peace New York: Alfred Knopf Inc.
- Nkrumah, Kwame (1963) Africa Must Unite. New York: International Publishers.
- (1965) Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism New York: International Publishers.
- O'Connor, James (1970) "The Meaning of Economic Imperialism" in R. I. Rhodes(ed.) Imperialism and Under-Development. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Peakcock, Herbert L. (1971) A History of Modern Europe. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.
- Pilling, Geoffrey (1980) Marx's "Capital": Philosophy And Political Economy. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- Rodney, Walter (1972) How Europe Underdeveloped Africa. London: Bogle L' Ouverture Press
- Roxborough, Ian (1983) Theories of Underdevelopment. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1951) Imperialism and Social Classes. New York: Alfred Knopf Inc.
- Viner, Jacob (1951) Peace As An Economic Problem. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Warren, mill (1982) Imperialism: Pioneer To Capitalism. Norfolk: The Theford Press Limited.
- Yeltsin, Boris (1999) "C 1999 Ariail - The State"; "Special Report: War in Kosovo" in Newsweek: The International News Magazine Vol. CXXXIII, No. 14, April.5, 1999, New York: Newsweek Inc.: 251 West 57th Street.