

# IDWRG

Innsbrucker Diskussionspapiere zu  
Weltordnung, Religion und Gewalt

Nummer 16 (2007)

*The Civilizing Process of Globalization and Integration*

von

**Belachew Gebrewold**  
(Universität Innsbruck)

## Innsbrucker Diskussionspapiere zu Weltordnung, Religion und Gewalt

Die IDWRG (*Innsbrucker Diskussionspapiere zu Weltordnung, Religion und Gewalt*) verstehen sich als unregelmäßige Reihe zur Veröffentlichung von wissenschaftlichen Arbeiten, die im Umfeld der **Forschungsplattform „Weltordnung – Religion – Gewalt“** an der Leopold-Franzens-Universität Innsbruck entstanden sind.

Diese Reihe soll dabei helfen, aktuelle Fragen in diesem Spannungsfeld auf wissenschaftlichem Niveau zu diskutieren. Wie die gesamte Plattform möchte sie unterschiedliche Forschungsansätze im Blick auf große gesellschaftliche Probleme der Gegenwart zueinander in Beziehung bringen, und das sowohl ergänzenden als auch konfrontativ.

Themen und Methode sind daher grundsätzlich offen und frei. Beiträge aus dem Themenfeld in verschiedenen Stadien der Erarbeitung und Reaktionen auf Arbeiten sind jederzeit in der Leitung der Plattform oder der Redaktion der Reihe willkommen. Nur so kann dem Wesen einer Reihe von „Diskussionspapieren“ auch entsprochen werden.

Die in den Arbeiten geäußerten Meinungen geben freilich jeweils die der Verfasser/innen wieder, und dürfen nicht als Meinung der Redaktion oder als Position der Plattform missdeutet werden.

---

**Leiter der Forschungsplattform:** Wolfgang Palaver, Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät,  
Karl-Rahner-Platz 1, A-6020 Innsbruck, [wolfgang.palaver@uibk.ac.at](mailto:wolfgang.palaver@uibk.ac.at)

**Redaktion:** Andreas Exenberger, Fakultät für Volkswirtschaft und Statistik, Universitäts-  
straße 15, A-6020 Innsbruck, [andreas.exenberger@uibk.ac.at](mailto:andreas.exenberger@uibk.ac.at)

**Homepage:** <http://www.uibk.ac.at/forschung/weltordnung/idwrg>

# *The Civilizing Process of Globalization and Integration*

Belachew Gebrewold\*

## Introduction

The terrorist attacks against the US Embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, in August 1998, and the events of 9/11, 2001 have dramatically determined the future of international security policy cooperation. Since then the international security policy cooperation with the African states is focusing increasingly on the consolidation and coordination of global security policies. “Peace”, “development” “the war against terror” are considered to be feasible only in a united world known as the “international community”. Unity and unification are accordingly the pillars of the contemporary civilizing process. State building and regional integration have become priority areas of national, regional and global political decisions and actions.

The African states created in 2002 the “so-called” African Union, with the aim to consolidate their political cooperation and integrate their economic activities. The Constitutive Act of the African Union, established in 2002, has specified its objectives that strengthen its attempt to materialize this unification. According to Article 3, some of the objectives are to: achieve greater unity and solidarity between the African countries and the peoples of Africa;

---

\* Belachew Gebrewold (geboren 1968 in Kambatta, Äthiopien) ist seit 2005 wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter am Institut für Politikwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck und seit 2002 Lektor an diversen Universitäten (Hamburg, Frankfurt, München, Salzburg, Innsbruck) im Fach Internationale Beziehungen. Sein Forschungsschwerpunkt ist internationale Konflikt- und Friedensforschung. Demnächst erscheint im Verlag Ashgate (Aldershot) das von ihm herausgegebene Buch *Africa and Fortress Europe*.

defend the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of its Member States; accelerate the political and socio-economic integration of the continent; promote and defend African common positions on issues of interest to the continent and its peoples; promote peace, security, and stability on the continent; and to promote democratic principles and institutions, popular participation and good governance.

In the same way the UN Charter Article 1 (1) states that: the purposes of the UN are to maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective *collective* measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace, and to bring about by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace. Unity, unification and universalisation become more and more the only way towards peace. Peace is possible only through unity of countries, whereas unity cannot be materialised without security, therefore involving a military presence. Hence peace and security mean more or less the same thing.

This chapter deals with some central questions regarding the issue of unity: what is unification about? Who is being unified? What are the causes and consequences of unification? It is important to discuss the cultural and psychological consequences of colonisation in the post-colonial era, in the time of globalization and international and intercontinental cooperation. It is the aim of this chapter to discuss the consequences of cultural globalization and international and intercontinental cooperation, which can be described as the civilizing process. This civilizing process is preceded by three important phenomena: the inferiority complex, aspirations of coequality, and (paradoxically) the superiority complex that the colonized African intellectual feels. The phenomenon this paper attempts to underline is that the conflict, as well as the dialogue, between the West and Africa remains on a privileged level, that of the African intellectual and political class and the West, whereas the majority of Africans are excluded from the entire process of political and cultural events that have ultimately a radical impact on their lives. The key idea of this chapter is that the epistemic community in its present structure is creating preconditions for cultural violence, structural violence

(economic injustice) and physical violence (killing, displacement, rape, mutilation) of the marginalized African majority.

Therefore, this text puts special focus on the repercussions of the colonial intolerance for the colonized cultures. After discussing a *disintegrating integration*, this paper deals with the *civilizing process as negation of the other in colonial relations*. The colonizer considered the Africans as inferior beings. On the one hand he considered them inferior, therefore, justifying their exploitation and subjugation; on the other hand, the colonizer maintained it was his ethical and Christian responsibility to civilize them. The colonizer negated their values as human beings.

## A disintegrating integration

For nations, states, and regional, continental and global political organizations, peace is an outcome of this political civilizing process. The civilizing process of the current political system is the creation of a collective identity by imagining it as a structure outside individuals or groups, an abstraction (Elias 1978). In the face of geographical and numerical expansion, the civilizing process and the abstraction, demand professionalization of politics and culture. This means politics is like any other job, an office to be administered by politicians, a task of experts or representatives, an academic and political heritage of Max Weber's concept of *politics as profession*; in Lyotard's words, the representative attempts to present the *unpresentable* (Lyotard 1999). Through his pre-established rules, the representative predetermines the particular and undermines its creativity and unpredictability. Similarly, Derrida has pointed out that the signified or represented concept is never present in and of itself, in a sufficient presence that would refer to itself (Derrida 1991:63). The attempt of the representative in the civilizing process is to signify or present the unpresentable. This is a process of de-politicking the political individual as well as its group and its culture. This critical appraisal of universalism does not plead for ethnocentrism. Ethnocentrism is nothing but pre-establishing rules for certain political groups or cultures by political professionals or experts. This critical reflection on universalization and homogenization shows that by its teleological approach, the civilizing process alien-

ates the peoples from their cultural and political responsibilities. This alienation is the beginning of peripherization, geographically as well as politically. Peripherization means neglecting the majority in the civilizing process. In the face of geographical and numerical expansion, the administrative centres and politicians pre-establish the political rules. Paradoxically, this peripherization happens only in the process of integration. The civilizing process moulds and imposes history from the outside.

The African Union, following the example of the European Union, attempts to achieve “development and peace” through continental unification. Its basic concept is the materialization of *civilization* of Africa through integration, and its ultimate aim is humanization of the African people. The “white man’s burden,” the re-humanizing and civilizing process of the colonial period is now transformed into the “burden of black intellectual”. The burden of the black intellectuals is to carry on the civilizing mission started by the colonizer. The majority of the Africans who are not yet integrated into the global civilization will be born again through a new civilizing mission. From off-loading the burden (implementing the civilizing process) the colonized black intellectual has learnt to imitate his colonizer and to follow his footsteps. As his master has done, he exercises violence while civilizing the peripherized and de-politicked majority.

The negated (existentially denied) and colonized intellectuals began to defend themselves against the negation of their values. They began to prove to the colonizer that they can achieve what the colonizer has achieved, that they possess culture and philosophy. They began to show that they are not inferior to the colonizer. The colonization of mind, as Frantz Fanon says, inculcated in the colonized, that the colonized is restless unless he has proven to the colonizer that he can achieve all that the colonizer has achieved materially and immaterially. Materially, the economic and industrial achievements of the colonizer were the ultimate goal of the colonized. Immaterially, the philosophy, culture and political system of the colonizer are the benchmark of the colonized to measure the level of his humanness. Hence, in order to materialize his ambitions the colonized has to do nothing else but to follow the civilizing process by which the colonizer oppressed him. He continues the oppression of himself. He wants to testify that there is no alternative to the thinking of the colonizer. The local philosophies in the colonized ter-

ritories will be replaced by a single continental African philosophy so that it is comparable to western philosophy. However, this overlooks that there are different understandings of politics, peace, conflict resolution, and conflict transformation, depending on the cultural understanding of the surrounding human society and nature.

On the global level “just war” is considered nowadays as a civilizing process. Michael Walzer (2004), political philosopher, argues that “just war” is morally defensible and universalisable. In cases of genocide, like Rwanda, an intervention from outside is morally justifiable. At first glance I think nobody would disagree with it, considering the brutality of genocide. Curiously, however, Walzer does not even mention a word to reflect upon the root causes of genocide, not only to halt it, but also to prevent it from the very beginning, by addressing the issue of system failure in societies that wage war against one another.

### **The civilizing process as the negation of the other in the colonial relationships**

Colonisation is the manifestation of the attitude of the coloniser 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 coloniser, is the beginning of exploitation. To exploit means to alienate. The coloniser alienated himself from the rest of the humanity by being coloniser; he alienated himself from nature by subjugating it mercilessly. However, this is not a complete negation of the non-Self (the colonised) and the subjugated nature. The coloniser is an ambivalent being, who distances itself from its object (the colonized) and is 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 colonised being the coloniser gains its own identity; by negating the counterpart the coloniser 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.

The desire of the colonial powers was to make their countries strong by exploiting other countries (Illiffe 1997:251). King Leopold II of Belgium, for example, had invested his private property in the construction and expansion of trade, based in Africa since the 1880s. Those colonial powers which went to Africa first and established themselves, enabled free trade for the late comers (for example Portugal enabled the free trade of Great Britain in the lower Congo). For some colonial powers the protection of trade interests in Africa was a political obligation. In order to materialise this, Germany established its protectorates in Namibia, Cameroon and Togo in 1884. Besides the trade interests and protectorates, the elimination of 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 Italian dominance in the region). Under the disguise of “stabilising” the government and finances of the country, Egypt was occupied by Great Britain in 1882.

During the so-called conference of Berlin, colonialism was agreed upon under international law. The future European demands for African territory began to be more substantial than the informal supremacy enjoyed by Great Britain, because of its maritime dominance and trade power, for example in India and Nigeria respectively (Illiffe 1997:254). The politics of protectorates enabled Germany in 1886 to occupy Tanzania. Because of the agreement at the Berlin conference, Great Britain could take up Uganda as its colonial territory in 1890. In 1886 the right to a 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 French occupation in the region. Towards the end of the 19th century the French succeeded in occupying the territories at the upper course of the Niger and at Lake Chad.

The competition for colonisation continued also in 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 1898 Sudan was controlled by Great Britain. Since Great Britain was stubborn in its demand for



Egypt, France was allowed to occupy Western Africa, and the Italians could march into Libya. In 1885 Great Britain declared Botswana as its protectorate. The gold deposit in the South African Republic increased Great Britain's interest to expand its colonial territory to the north. Even though 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 between Mozambique and Angola (Illiffe 1997:256).

The colonial occupation was based on hope for 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 the Congo; French dreams of an *eldorado* in Timbuktu and British fears of exclusion from the colonies under French control (Illiffe 1997:257). The territories and properties owned by colonial division had to be regulated. This regulation was nothing but violence against nature and against human beings. The maintenance of an established order demands the implementation of violence. One of the aspects of the violence against human beings began with tax collection from the oppressed. It happened very often that the colonised could not pay the demanded taxes and consequently committed suicide. Forced labour, such as carrier, construction worker, soldier etc., was a kind of animalisation (dehumanisation) of the colonised Africans. The French were forcing each man to work 12 days a year for them as unpaid labourers (Illiffe 1997:264). In 1903 the people of the Belgian Congo were forced to work 40 hours per month for free. 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 spiritual annihilation or immaterial colonization.

## **Immaterial colonization as negation of communication in the civilizing process**

Since the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised is based on oppression and intimidation, colonialism is a relationship without communication. This brutality was enhanced by merciless experts or scientists. “Psychological treatment” and brainwashing are not modern inventions. In spite of all these attempts the aim was not met anywhere: not in the Congo where they chopped off arms, nor in Angola where they made holes in the lips of the revolting Africans to tie them together. To animalise a human being, i.e. to dehumanise him, is not impossible, but it needs attrition. The coloniser knew that just beating the colonised would not suffice to oppress him. Therefore, he kept him undernourished. The beaten, undernourished, ill, frightened colonised becomes – in the eyes of the coloniser – lazy, cunning, thievish and violent (Sartre 1966:14).

Colonisation is an act of denying the Selfness of the Other. This denial is caused by the consciousness of one’s 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 him 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.

Universalism stands for superiority of the subject (Silverman 1999:40). The colonial soldiers rejected the ideology of the universalism of their countries. Since no one who believes in the universal equality of human beings exploits others without perpetrating atrocities, the principle of the coloniser and his soldiers are that the colonised is not a human being, but merely an animal. This animalisation had to be obvious. The colonised had to be pressed down to the level of the apes. This dehumanisation permits the coloniser to use the colonised as animals for labour. Denial of respect and dehumanisation go hand in hand. The tradition of the colonised has to be annihilated, the language replaced by that of the oppressor, culture destroyed, and the colonized made lifeless and exhausted (Sartre 1966:13).

By trying to dehumanise human beings, the coloniser dehumanises himself: he degrades himself to mere scourge and rifle. In his world of communication he has replaced language by violence. Before dehumanising the other, the coloniser has to dehumanise himself. In this state the communication of the colonizer is nothing but negation. The colonised reply to the denied communication saying, “we became what we are only by radical internal negation of what the coloniser has made out of us”. This is an ontological fight. The fact that the coloniser has denied communication is an ontological negation, an extermination of existence. The other is not real, inexistent. The own being is dependent on the non-being of the other: becoming through negation.

The effect of colonialism is carved in the mind of the colonised. The eternal attempt of the colonised is to demonstrate to the coloniser his 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 anti-thesis 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.

The Ego of the colonised is positioned as opposition (Fanon 1991:141). The colonised moves from negative identity to 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 reclaim itself through the negation of the Other, by which the colonized even believes to be superior. A superiority complex is the outcome of the inferiority complex. What causes the black man to revolt is chiefly because he has socially and historically felt the inculcated inferiority. Fanon says that since the black was for centuries an inferior being, he tries to react with a 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)

The coloniser understands himself as the subject of history. According to him decolonisation is a granted freedom. For example, in the political and historical literature of German speaking countries it is very common to find phrases like ‘set them free into independence’ (in die Unabhängigkeit entlassen), which implies that the colonizer sets the colonized free or is even “expelling” the unwilling colonized into freedom, since the German word “entlassen” actually means “to expel” or set free. To set the colonised free, means graciousness of freedom and passivity of the colonised. The dehumanised blacks are – thanks to the generosity of the coloniser – elevated to the level of the human being, the coloniser. This gracious and generous attitude of the coloniser demands gratefulness from the colonised. Only the coloniser robs the freedom of the colonised and gives it back to him, recognises his humanity and says “there is no difference between us” (the colonised and the coloniser) (Silverman 1999:41).

The coloniser loves the colonised, not because he is his equal, but because he is inferior to him. His being is the non-being of the colonised; his non-being is the being of the colonised. The existence of the colonised guarantees him his being. The colonised has saved him from nothingness. He is a human being through negated human beings. However, by his attempt to decolonise himself, the colonised jeopardises the existence of the colonised. The colonised wants to eliminate the difference between the colonised and the coloniser, to annihilate the coloniser by humanising himself. What is the being of the human being without consciousness of the difference? The superior ones want to maintain their being based on the difference; the inferior ones want to attain their being that is blocked by the difference. Fanon says, the view of the colonised on the cities of the coloniser is nothing but of jealousy and of dream for possession of what the colonizer possesses: to sit at the table of the coloniser, to sleep in the bed of the coloniser, if possible with his wife. The colonised is jealous and the coloniser knows exactly that. He knows that

the colonised wants to supersede him. At least once a day the colonised dreams of sitting at the place of the coloniser (Fanon 1966:33).

The true being of the colonised will be recognised if the animalisation (dehumanisation) of the colonised cannot be sustained forever, and if the colonised is in the process of liberation from the externally imposed dehumanisation. In this process of decolonisation, as Fanon asserts, the coloniser suddenly appeals to the rationality of the colonised (Fanon 1966:36). As a sign of the beginning of new communication a dialogue will be conducted with the colonised elite, which has internalized the universal rationality of the colonizer (Fanon 1966:33).

The re-humanisation is the negation of the dehumanisation and animalisation of the colonised by the coloniser. This new creature needs the creation of an identifying substance. The colonised had to create an identity. On this identity the identity of the former is dependent. The first identity in this act of creation is the identity constructed by all those who are colonised. This being reminds the colonised of the common “colonisedness” and the collective process of humanisation (liberation). This new entity exists as long as consciousness of colonisedness and the memory of colonization exist. This entity, i.e. the common identity, is the negation of the common enemy. It is not only the negation, but also the maintenance of the common enemy. This entity exists as long as this enemy exists. Its identity is dependent on the identity of the opponent. Therefore, paradoxically, the enemy (in this context the coloniser) is the creator of the self-liberating subject. The Africans had a more solid collective identity during the independence struggle in the 1960s than they did afterwards. The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) had better theoretical and ideological basis than the current African Union. One of OAU’s main objectives was to fight against the coloniser. It had clear objectives of fighting the colonising enemy. This has constituted its identity. This process of identity construction is also true for the European identity. Through its colonial racism, Europe constructed its identity in a dialectical play of oppositions with their native Others (Hardt/Negri 2001, 103).

The second indispensable entity for the construction of identity is the land where the colonised are settled. The fact that this land was occupied by strangers, endows it with a special nature and quality. The enemy is the being, whom simultaneously has consecrated as well as desecrated the land. He

has desecrated it because he is a stranger; he has consecrated it because through him the land has given the colonised a common identity. The land that has to be freed liberates the colonised. The colonised liberate themselves by liberating the land: the land creates the humans and the humans create the land. This act of creation would be impossible without the existence and inclusion of the enemy, the colonizer. The being is a relative being: the being of the coloniser is dependent on the humiliated being of the colonised. Similarly, the oppressed want not only to be treated equally, but also (or rather) to replace the oppressor.

The coloniser looks for values that characterise him and make him the only true being. Essentially, he has to substantiate his economic development, industrialisation and “civilisation”. He is not like the colonised. He is the one who has created democracy and human rights; his principles are based on rational choice. Non-democratic governments and violation of human rights in the developing world certify moral superiority of the coloniser and constitute his being. In every moment of fear to fall into the negating equality, the coloniser has to glorify his culture, values and civilisation and universalises them. Negating equality takes place when the colonised is set free. In this freedom the superiority of the coloniser is negated and the colonised becomes his co-equal.

The ontologically insecure coloniser can universalise his values only when he proclaims them openly and universally that these values are exclusively his. He can repress his anxiety of non-being only by proclaiming and universalising the extraordinariness of his being. The universalisation of the values is first preceded by the particularisation (monopolization) of human values as if they were values of the ‘civilized’ western world. The colonizer believes that he alone possesses the human, superior and universal values, though basically the colonised is not better or worse than him. Both opponents are not playing pre-destined roles but accidental ones. The colonised could be the coloniser. As Fanon says, “the colonised is a pursued who permanently dreams to be pursuer” (Fanon 1966:44). Nevertheless, in his attempt to fight the colonizer, the colonized constructs a collective identity.

Constructed collective identity is the origin of dehumanising destruction. In the process of humanisation (decolonisation) the colonised has constructed his own destruction through his optimism. He has constructed “brothers”,

“sisters” and “comrades”: Re-humanization through Re-Africanization. He believed in an illusionary unity of the Africans which is unrealisable. The colonized has created an unreal world of *brotherliness* and *sisterliness* with his colonised co-humans, in adoration and abhorrence of the coloniser at the same time: adoration because the memory of the colonizer sustains his Africanity as identity; abhorrence because the colonizer has dehumanized him.

The colonized believes he can attain his salvation by imitating the colonizer. “To the lies of the colonial situation the colonised replies with the same lies. His behaviour is transparent towards his own people, but tense and opaque towards the colonisers. Truthful is that which decomposes the colonial regime and causes a new nation. Truthful is that which protects the indigenous people and expels the foreigners. In the colonial context there is not an unconditional principle of truth. 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 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, he said, “When we go away, everything is lost, this land will fall back 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 it is, 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 he is right in his perception that the colonised blacks are animals because they kill each other in almost all parts of Africa.

The factors that constitute the colonised identity are: the common struggle, the national destiny and the collective history. The nation of the colonised is a bond created in blood and anger, says Fanon. When the coloniser was expelled the colonised had thought it would be the end of violence; Africanity, communality, hospitality were proclaimed. Many national parties were named as African parties (in Kenya, Tanzania, Zimbabwe, etc.). The colo-

nized African tries to imitate and consequently perpetuate the colonizer by all means: by maintaining the African borders drawn by the colonizer, by copying his political and economic culture, by appropriating the African Union from the European Union, etc. The creation of the African is considered as the milestone to materialize peace, security and development (Francis 2006). The African is attempting to show by all means that he was colonized, he can imitate the colonizer, and he possesses the same cultural values as the colonizer. In his apologetics he attempts to prove that he is not inferior to the colonizer.

### **The apologetics of the colonised**

The human being is a competing and emulating being. This fact negates the assertion of the coloniser that the black is less of a human being. The coloniser believed in the animality and 'dehumanisability' of the black. But the black proved by his level of emulation that he is not a mere animal but a rational human being. The colonised wants not only to emulate the coloniser, but also to become the master. The colonised black wants to achieve what his coloniser has achieved. The coloniser has created values, a level of richness, development, luxury, etc. The coloniser has made himself the origin and the aim of humanisation. The coloniser will be removed from his position of absoluteness by the colonised in the process of economic and industrial development of the latter, first by being equal to the coloniser and then by overtaking him. Fanon says, "the Europeans have, as it is believed, attained their development goal by their own efforts. Therefore, we have to prove to the world and ourselves that we are capable of achieving the same thing" (Fanon 1966:78). The proof of equality of the blacks with the whites, exceeds the goal of assimilation and envisages superiority. By trying to defend the blacks and their culture against the colonial prejudices and discriminations, Léopold Sédar Senghor (president of Senegal from 1960 to 1980) says the following: "Land and everything on it is a collective property which is divided under the members of the family [in Africa]. Everyone is insured, he has the minimum to live according to his necessities. When the harvest is ripe, it belongs to all" (Senghor 1967:18).



The colonizer is the benchmark of the values, wealth, development and culture of the colonized. Through Africanity the colonized has to destroy not only the colonizer, but also all forms of values monopolized by the coloniser, since they remind him of the coloniser. It is from this background that President Mugabe of Zimbabwe in his 2005 elections campaign, designates the opposition groups fighting for more democracy and human rights as “men of black skins with white blood”. He considers himself as personified Africanity, discards outside appeals for human rights and democracy as a perennial desire of the Europeans to colonize and universalize their values. He himself propagates that he and his ZANU-PF party are pro democracy and human rights. He hates democracy and human rights as long as they are demanded from international actors and by the Zimbabwean opposition, but he professes that he is pursuing democracy and human rights. This is not a mere contradiction between words and deeds, rather the product of colonization which engraved in the colonized mind the ambivalence between inferiority complex (isolating the Self in the name of Africanity) on the one hand, and receptivity for the universal (colonial) values in the civilizing process on the other.

As the political behaviour of the African political elites shows us, Africanity is the offspring of an inferiority complex. Pan-Africanism, after the end of the Apartheid era, is simply the engine of violence and homogenization of African cultures in the name of state-building or African Unionism. Africanity is basically an invention of the colonizer whose will is a perennial destruction of the blacks. “To be black was conceived as to possess no revolutionary consciousness. By carrying in ourselves the inferiority complex of lacking culture and civilisation, we believed that we can attain civilisation and culture only by defining ourselves in comparison with those who have alienated our personality. By doing so we endowed them with racism that we wanted to avoid. We have maintained, if the ratio is Hellenistic, the feeling is black” (Doppelfeld 1994:211). Because, according to the philosophy of the colonizer, the *ratio* (reason) is higher than sensual *feelings*, he attributed this ‘lower’ human quality to the colonized black.

The relationship between the colonised and the coloniser is an unending mutual negation. Negation is destruction. The negated and colonized being wants to stand up since he cannot come to terms with his state of non-being

given to him by the colonizer; he wants to survive. To survive means to demonstrate one's own identity, to defend the non-*destroyedness* and the indestructibility. In the black-white-relationship of colonisation, this is the capacity to prove and to defend the "black's whiteness". "It is contended that the black has invented nothing new in the areas of religion; no Dogma or morals, but just a small religiosity. But if one considers that, the fundamental point lies not in this ridiculous assertion, but instead in the matter itself. Therefore, I would like to analyse the dogma and the moral of the blacks ..." (Senghor 1967:13). Facing the religious inferiority complex, in order to prove African monotheism, Senghor maintains as follows: "The black is monotheist everywhere. If one studies his history carefully, there is only one God who has created everything and who is almighty and who wields all power. All powers, all will-powers of the spirits and ancestors are just emanations from him." (Senghor 1967:13)

Colonisation is an existential destruction. It is very simple to make a colonised person happy: one needs only to praise him. He does not bear any criticism, since his existential wounds are not yet cured. Every criticism exacerbates the pain. One has to caress the colonised mind and praise and talk about his fascinating family culture on which his hospitality and communalism are based. Many black intellectuals are more deeply colonised than the uneducated ones; the black intellectual loves and hates the coloniser at the same time; he tries to prove his equality and even superiority. Concerning this issue, Senghor asserts: "We would like to illustrate those elements, which the black families have to cherish so that they can be in line with the modern humanism by enriching it at the same time ... If the African succeeds in this transition period to protect themselves from any kind of external pollution and deformation, there is no need to worry about the African future" (Senghor 1967:16). The coloniser watches how the colonised is staying at the shore of nothingness in searching for identity and constructing 'Africanity' and 'Pan-Africanism', and how he tries to prove his religious dogmatism. What Senghor does is nothing else than this in his "Negritude and humanism".

The coloniser has maintained that the black man does not have culture. By doing that he has privatised the power of judgment for himself to define culture and art. Hence, the colonised man, who does not have culture, has to

learn the culture and art of his coloniser and has to create his own culture and prove that he is capable of creating culture. In this situation the colonised man begins to distance himself from his own culture, since he first of all – as a competing being – has to observe and admire the culture and art of his coloniser. He underlines and explains the possible similarities between his culture and that of his coloniser, or justifies the difference and emphasizes special elements of the African culture. Concerning the peculiarity of black culture, Senghor writes: “it is a practical but not a utilitarian art, and it is in this original sense classical. Particularly it is a spiritual art – some have unjustly called it idealistic and intellectual – since it is religious. The central function of sculptors consists of presenting the dead ancestors and spirits in sculptures, which are at the same time symbols of their spirits and their place of dwelling.” (Senghor 1967:23)

As a further sign of the peculiarity of the blacks’ culture, Senghor highlights the aspect of rhythm. In order to emphasize this peculiarity of the African music, Senghor criticises the music of the coloniser as lacking stimulation (Senghor 1967:25). According to him African music can enrich the “deficient” European music. “It gives the lacking flavour to the impoverished western music that is based on narrow rules” (Senghor 1967:26). Senghor understands the black as having an incarnated rhythm. “Because of the purity, power and nobility of their sound, instruments like Xylophone are predestined to convey the style of the blacks” (Senghor 1967:27). Furthermore, Senghor says, “the contribution of the black consists of recreating with other peoples the unity of man and world; reconciling the body and spirit, human beings among each other and the stone with God” (Senghor 1967:28).

It is the African intellectual who is suffering from an identity crisis. The constructed identity does not save him from the colonialism brought upon him, the nothingness. In order to overcome this nothingness the African intellectual underlines the otherness: “the white reason is utilitarian and analytical, whereas the black reason is participative and intuitive” (Senghor 1967:157).

The anxiety about the nothingness is the first cause of the dualistic worldview. Since the being of the coloniser is based on the non-being of the colonised, the coloniser has to perpetuate the colonised in his nothingness. White colonial art depicts the colonised black as artless. The black is without religion, or in an ideal case he is polytheist. Senghor defends the African religion

and monotheism against the colonial assertions that the African does not have them.

The long-lasting and dangerous effect of colonialism on the colonised black is that he has developed an African apologetics: to show the colonizer the “high African culture”. He has to react to the dehumanising history of the trauma of colonisation; to defend himself and to negate the white coloniser. Senghor quotes what Jean Paul Sartre has written about the colonised black intellectual “when a black in the US discovers in himself the talent as a writer then he also discovers his material: he is a person who observes the white from outside and who assimilates himself with the white culture, and in his works he shows the peculiarity of the black race in the American society. His subject matter is not ‘objective reality’ as realists think, but it is the emotional aspect of the African that disgraces the [white] readers” (Senghor 1967:157).

The coloniser constructs, *essentialises* and universalises his culture. Since the colonial world is dualistic (differentiating between the morally superior whites and inferior blacks), the colonised tries to disprove his nothingness constructed by the colonizer. His apologetics against the colonial negation develops the same procedure as that of the colonizer, in order to negate the negation. The colonized constructs, essentialises and universalises his culture: the Africanity. “... The capitalist attitude of mind which was introduced into Africa with the coming of colonialism is totally foreign to our own way of thinking. In the old days the African had never aspired to the possession of personal wealth for the purpose of dominating any of his peers. He had never had labourers or ‘factory hands’ to do his work for him. But then along came the foreign capitalists. They were wealthy. They were powerful. And the African naturally started wanting to be wealthy too” (Nyerere 1968:6).

“The foundation, and the objective, of African socialism is the extended family. The true African socialist does not look on one class of men as his brethren and another as his natural enemies. He does not form an alliance with the ‘brethren’ for the extermination of the ‘non-brethren’. He rather regards all men as his brethren – as members of his forever extending family.” (Nyerere 1968:11) In spite of Julius Nyerere’s, former Tanzanian president, assertions about African socialism, the collective unity and identity, and along with it Africanity, are mere constructs for a certain period of time. Indirectly, Nyerere admits that there is no continental African culture which all

Africans would identify themselves with. “It was in the struggle to break the grip of colonialism that we learnt the need for unity. We came to recognise that the same socialist attitude of mind which, in the tribal days, gave every individual the security that comes of belonging to a widely extended family, must be preserved within the still wider society of the nation. But we should not stop there. Our recognition of the family to which we all belong must be extended yet further – beyond the tribe, the community, the nation, or even the continent – to embrace the whole society of mankind.” (Nyerere 1968: 2).

In order to show the African idealism and its apologetics, it is interesting to reflect on some of the works of some statesmen of Africa, during and after the struggle of independence. Kenneth Kaunda, the former president of Zambia, in his “humanism” says the following: “high respect for human dignity, is the legacy of our tradition that should not be lost in the new Africa. How modern and progressive – in the western sense – the young nation might be, we are ardently determined not to let this humanism be darkened by anything. In African society man is the centre of everything. It has to be like that.” (Doppelfeld 1994:189) Sekou Touré, the former president of Guinea, says the following “each individual must go back to African culture and moral origins, he must rediscover his consciousness, must convert himself in his thoughts and deeds to the values, conditions and interests of Africa” (Doppelfeld 1994:208). Similarly, Kwame Nkrumah, the former president of Ghana, says: “In the traditional African society no group interests were regarded as the highest; neither the executive nor legislative authority supported any group. The general welfare of the society was the foremost interest” (Doppelfeld 1994:219). The main reason of African idealism is colonial negation. In Western culture philosophy is an integral element. It is a colonial assertion that the black does not possess philosophy. Through this assertion the coloniser opposes the spirit of philosophy.

The offended black intellectual begins to prove the African philosophy. He has to try to show his abstract thinking to the coloniser, in order to be able to belong to the right and noble humanity, to be part of the universal. The problem, however, is that the coloniser is not interested to know, if the black man has philosophy or not. His main motivation is to differentiate himself from the colonised and colonisable, and to feel better by doing that. His being is dependent on the non-being of the other. The offended black lets him-

self be provoked by the coloniser and undertakes all possible attempts to prove his philosophy. In order to prove African philosophy some African philosophers maintain that Greek philosophy has a strong Egyptian influence.

By attempting to prove his cultural coequality and his philosophy, the colonized intellectual suffers from an inferiority complex (Fanon 1991). The black race fights for recognition and rehabilitation of its otherness by internalizing the Western construction of Africa (Kebede 2004:179). How does the African intellectual overcome his philosophical inferiority complex? The first step is to describe the North Africa of ancient times using the ideas of African philosophers. “Little do some of us know that the first woman philosopher, Hypathia, was from Alexandria and was murdered by Christians. Names like Saint Augustine, Origen, Cyril, Tertulian are not unfamiliar to you; they are black Africans. More pertinent to our subject is the fact what today we call Greek or Western Philosophy is copied from indigenous African philosophy of the ‘mystery system’. All the values of the mystery system were adopted by the Greeks and Ionians who came to Egypt to study, or studied elsewhere under Egyptian-trained teachers. These included Herodotus, Socrates, Hippocrates, Anaxagoras, Plato, Aristotle and others ...” (Onyewuenyi 1998:250).

The offended colonized tries, instead of studying his philosophy peacefully, to work out the similarity of his philosophy with that of his coloniser. “... Several other authors could be quoted to show what I would regard as a concerted effort on the part of Western scholars to deny Africa any contribution in the field of Philosophy” (Onyewuenyi 1998, 245). If it seems difficult to create a similarity between Western and African cultures, the colonised intellect becomes proud of his constructed peculiarity. “We must construct an African Philosophy with categories that are typically African and where these categories do not correspond with those of either East or West; we dare to be different” (Ruch 1998:267).

The first step in the process of liberation is self-consciousness. This self-consciousness presupposes the recognition of the Other. Self-consciousness means nothing but re-integration of the self. The divided self is not conscious of itself (Fanon 1991). There is a fundamental unity between: the thinker; thought; thinking; and the thing which is thought about. This mental act is

the unification of the thinking subject with himself and the object of the thought. The liberation process of the African society followed the same procedure: unity of the thinkers, singularity of the object thought about, and the way of thinking. In other words, ontologically there is only one thing to think about (African liberty); epistemologically there is only one way to think (a one and closed continental-Africa-wide cooperation). Therefore, during the liberation movement of the continent of Africa it was more or less forbidden to establish a multi-party political system, because multiparty was seen as an antithesis to collective African identity.

The construction of African personality, Negritude and Pan-Africanism, is based on self-consciousness, which is in political terminology called self-government. This self-consciousness includes: the economic, social and cultural development; the avoidance of conflict among African states; and the promotion of African unity and influence in world politics (Esedebe 1982:1). Pan-Africanism was a protest and a refusal (Esedebe 1982:2). V. Bakpetu Thompson declares that Pan-Africanism is “a campaign to rehabilitate the value aspects of African culture and that the phenomenon means the political unification of the continent” (Esedebe 1982:3).

As we have seen above, there are two ways to liberate oneself: either by assimilating oneself with the negating being (the coloniser) and adapting his values, which is the process of ingratiating; or – where this ingratiating does not seem to be possible – by construction of his own identity, which is the process of dissociation. This was the case of many black Americans in the 18th and 19th centuries. After they have tried – in vain – to integrate themselves into the land of strangers, by adopting their culture and assimilating themselves, they began to mobilise the blacks of the US to come back to Africa in order to create Pan-Africanism. This consisted of: “the homeland of African persons of African origin, solidarity among men of African descent, belief in an African personality, rehabilitation of Africa’s past, pride in African culture, Africa for Africans in church and state, hope for a united and glorious future Africa” (Esedebe 1982:3).

Some white scientists began to substantiate the impossibility of ingratiating of the blacks and their innate inferiority because of two reasons: evolution and teleology. In the first case, some maintained that in the evolutionary process of the human being, culture and civilisation, modern history as the

last (highest) step was inherited from the Greeks by the Romans and from the Romans by the Northern Europeans. Since the latter not only received these Greek and Roman civilisations, but also created modern history, any race which did not participate in these evolutionary acts is less human. Whereas, the teleological school maintains that “God deliberately made men unequal. He gave intelligence to the whites to enable them to direct the activities of others wisely. To the non-whites, this usually meant blacks, he gave strong backs fortified with a weak mind and an obedient temper so that they might labour effectively under the supervision of the white masters” (Esedebe 1982:19).

The above quotation and similar examples show two aspects: definitions of the identities of whites and blacks. More than a clear distinction between blacks and whites this definition is very significant for the liberation of the oppressed and despised blacks. That means, by *anamnetically* reiterating the discriminatory and prejudicial contention of the coloniser, the blacks paradoxically intensify their consciousness of the Self. The definition of the colonised by the coloniser is the beginning of the self definition of the black. This means the existence of the coloniser intensifies the identity of the colonised. It was during the colonial oppression and occupation of Africa, that the African leaders founded the Organisation of African Unity. The main aim of this organisation was to liberate Africa by constructing a collective identity. The coloniser and oppressor became the best unifying factor. The African liberation policy was seen as an internal policy of the continent. The boundaries between the countries were blurred by this identity. The decisive factor was to see Africa as a single unit, and to liberate the whole of Africa, as was said during the establishment of the Organization of the African Unity in 1963 in Addis Abeba: “I ask your Imperial Majesty [the Ethiopian Emperor Haile Sil-lase I] and my brothers assembled here that we collectively should now view the continued occupation of Africa by any foreign power with the same gravity and in the same seriousness as each one of us would have viewed the occupation by a foreign power of a part of the country that he has the privilege and the honour to lead. We can no longer go on saying that Angola is not free or Mozambique is not free etc., and that we are helping Angolans or Mozambicans to free themselves. Such statements are hiding the truth. The real humiliating truth is that Africa is not free; and therefore, it is Africa



which should take the necessary collective message that should go from here to the security council of the United Nations” (Ansprenger 1975:31).

The direct and indirect consequences of 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 an African Union in order to universalize and homogenize the fictitious common African values and a 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’. This means the death of various cultures, their world views and interpretations, and the death of each individual’s political creativity and responsibility. Without plurality of cultures it cannot be possible to mould suitable form of politics and contextual cultural self expression.

## **The de-politicking of cultures**

As has been discussed above, the beginning of the death of many cultures in the colonized world began when the colonizer started to subdue the blacks and their environment. In his destruction and exploitation the colonizer euphemized colonization as civilization. By destroying the nature and social structures of the colonised, the coloniser started to blackmail the colonized, either by starvation or by promising high wages for those working in his exploitation departments. The “great transformation” of the civilizing process began for African societies during colonization and continued after independence. The common factor of both historical events is that the destruction of the socio-cultural structures started. However, these socio-cultural systems have been indispensable for coping with particular socio-economic problems. Since exploitation, civilizing process, universal values, and state-

building through territorial integrity became overarching political rationale, ordinary people lost their political creativity and responsibility. As a consequence, the political profession disregarded the existing socio-cultural structures and systems that worked for small political and cultural groups. But for the political profession, whose aim is state-building and national identity, these small political cultures and systems seemed not only irrelevant, but also an impediment to the identity of the state. In these small political groups, the individual was not anonymous; the individual cares for the community, and vice versa. However, in the modern mega state system, the individual has become anonymous, society grew quantitatively but not qualitatively, and community (organic society) ceased to exist anymore. The new mega state society began to liquidate the organic society which refused to permit the individual to become anonymous and to starve (Polanyi 1957:165). In the modern state concept the protection of society falls not to the community where the individual is not anonymous, but to the rulers who directly enforce their will and represent numbers not persons.

The civilizing process of the African intellectuals introduced the system of representative democracy. The groups and cultures that used to actively and personally participate in the political activities prior to the mega state formation, are now represented by intellectuals and elites. In this professionalization of politics, the elites of ethnic or minority groups represent them in national parliaments in the capital cities. However, they are too far from the hinterland, and they become too mighty to be influenced by the people they represent (Kohr 1995:65-66). In this civilizing process the state and political representatives determine what is legitimate and what is prohibited. The Good or Bad is predetermined by the state apparatus. The individual tends to act or omit not out of conviction, but rather out of duty. Laws of the state including human rights politics alienate individuals from their natural sense of responsibility. Their moral judgements are mediated. The state takes away the sense of responsibility from the individual and gives it back to exercise this responsibility. Through this process it alienates and weakens the immediacy of the moral consciousness and judgement of the individual.

Security, stability and unity are the pillar and means of the formation of collective identity and the civilizing process. The unifying, stabilizing and securing actor is the state, and its apparatuses neutralize the citizens. It enacts

the laws that substantiate this stability, security and unity. The individual is no longer an active creator of life and mobility in a manageable quantity, but a mere anonymous being.

In spite of this de-politicking of the individual, the civilizing process has been successful by constructing a collective sense of belongingness. The state owes this success to its violent alienation of the pre-state political and social groups and their cultures. The culturally alienated groups and individuals sought something vicarious to compensate the new state of oblivion. The mega states and its architects began to form nations, as a new giver of identity and sense of belongingness.

The civilizing process maintains that the world is full of dangers, therefore, a mega organization, the African Union, the European Union or supra-national institutions will be required to secure security, unity and stability. The civilizing process's point of departure is that unity is an indispensable prerequisite for progress. Unity in the modern state form and – in the larger context – in the form of globalization, creates a new world. A world of *everything-is-everywhere*, hence there is no elsewhere; the *here* becomes the *everywhere*, since everything is here. There is only one culture, one language, one technique, one system. In the monoculturalism of the system which assimilates and absorbs all that is small, small cultural groups cease to exist, and their desires will not be fulfilled as unique beings or entities. They disappear in the world of the average, the universal (Kohr 1995:67).

The aim of the civilizing process, state-building and extensive unity is to create good organizations. Good organization presupposes totalitarian uniformity, not democratic diversity (Kohr 1995:68). Global organizations such as the United Nations, the African Union, and the European Union, are the constituent elements of the civilizing process.

Almost all states in the world are integrated and interconnected economically or politically to fight threats collectively. But meanwhile there is no significant “outside” anymore. The world is becoming more or less a single entity. The fight of nations against nations is becoming less and less probable. The only remaining enemy (probably forever) is the individual. The paradox of the mega state and the civilizing process is that on the one hand it consists of the individual, the citizen, and on the other hand it sees in every individ-

ual, a potential threat to its principle of unity, security and stability. Its very nature, i.e. its size makes it paradoxical.

A question raised by Kohr is fundamental for understanding and dealing with the problem of tension between modernism and cultures of peripherized peoples. “What are the advantages the individual owes the community and would miss, if he were alone?” (Kohr 1995:128) Kohr, in his *Small is Beautiful* (1995), discovers in the modern political system of the mega states the danger of de-politicking the people, mobilizing them for war, and the emergence of totalitarianism and expansionism. Through this transcendental illusion the civilizing process and its pre-established rules attempt to create a totalizing unity (Lyotard 1999:81).

In his strategy of dehumanization and negation of communication the colonizer despised and destroyed the indigenous cultures and universalized his values in his civilizing process under the banner of cultural and economic development. The colonized intellectual, in his attempt to demonstrate that he has philosophy and culture similar to that of the colonizer, is attempting to be integrated into the universal culture designed by the colonizer as a new world order.

## Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to show the problem of epistemic globalization. Epistemic globalization has brought epistemic communities together. Because of the very low number of educated elites, epistemic globalization has been taking place between an African minority (African intellectualists) and the western world. Because of epistemic heterogeneity in the economic, political and cultural integration of the West and Africa, there is a division of Africa rather than integration. Integration of one group is disintegration of the other group. Within the African continent as well as within African politics, economic and epistemic elites are uniting themselves, whereas, in almost all African countries economic and political systems are rather disuniting the population instead of uniting it. Modern state institutions do not allow taking into account the local epistemologies, political, cultural and economic sys-

tems anymore. African political and epistemic elites decided to unite themselves with their intra-continental and western colleagues, while creating intrastate institutions that disunite the people. This pathological unification has its background in the inferiority complex that developed during colonization. To overcome this inferiority complex it is indispensable to be part of the Western civilizing process of the New World Order.

But in the long run this process is counterproductive. Africa has to deconstruct the antithetical Africanity which is based on constructing and negating the enemy. Moreover, the Western world still colonises Africa as long as the human values are monopolized as Western values, manipulated and enforced again on African cultures. Peace means to respect, accept and understand the Other. Various cultures have various concepts of peace. It is a challenge but an important step to acknowledge the plurality of societies and their truths. The civilizing process of universalism based on a single objective truth is more culturally detrimental than the benefits it brings. Development concepts and strategies of the educated and westernized colonized blacks will keep on undermining the cultural contexts of peacemaking and conflict resolution. If peace is considered as the foundation for development and stability then cultural 'contextuality' and sustainability of peace has to be taken seriously. The integration process in Africa is bringing forth more disintegration and violence rather than hope for peace and development.

## References

Ansprenger, Franz (1975), *Die Befreiungspolitik der Organisation der afrikanischen Einheit (OAU) 1963-1975*, München, Kaiser.

Best, Steven/Kellner, Douglas (1997), *The Postmodern Turn*, New York, Guilford Press.

Camilleri, Joseph A. and Falk, Jim (1993), *The End of Sovereignty? The Politics of a Shrinking and Fragmenting World*, Aldershot, Elgar.

Derrida, Jacques (1991), *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*, ed. By P. Kampuf, Brighton, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Doppelfeld, Basilius (1994), *In der Mitte der Mensch*, Münsterschwarzach, Vier-Türme-Verlag.
- Elias, Norbert (1978), *The civilizing process. The History of Manners*, Oxford, Blackwell.
- Esedebe, Olisanwuche P. (1982), *Pan-Africanism. The Idea and Movement 1776-1963*, Washington/DC, Howard University Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (1991), *Black Skins, White Masks*, London, Pluto Press.
- Fanon, Frantz (1966), *Die Verdammten dieser Erde*, Frankfurt am Main, Suhrkamp.
- Francis, David J. (2006), *Uniting Africa: Building Regional Peace and Security Systems*. Aldershot, Ashgate.
- Galtung, Johan (1993), "Peace", in: Krieger, Joel u.a. (ed.), *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*, New York, Oxford University Press, 688-689.
- Gebrewold-Tochalo, Belachew (2002), *The Impact of the Socio-Cultural Structures of the Kambata on Their Economic Development*, Wien, ÖFSE.
- Hardt, Michael/Negri, Antonio (1997), *Empire*. Cambridge/MA, Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Illife, John (1997), *Geschichte Afrikas*, München, Beck.
- Kebede, Messay (2004), *Africa's Quest for a Philosophy of Decolonization*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- Kohr, Leopold (1995), „Small is beautiful“: *Ausgewählte Schriften aus dem Gesamtwerk*, Wien, Deuticke.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois (1999), *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester, Manchester University Press.
- Nyerere, Julius K. (1968), *Ujamaa. Essays on African Socialism*. Dar es Salam, Oxford University Press.

Onyewuenyi, Innocent Chilaka (1998), “Is There an African Philosophy”, in: Sumner, Claude (ed.): *African Philosophy*. Addis Abeba, Addis Abeba University Press, 243-259.

Polanyi, Karl (1957), *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*, Boston, Beacon Press.

Ruch, Ernest A. (1998), “African Philosophy. Regressive or Progressive?”, in: Sumner, Claude (Hg.): *African Philosophy*. Addis Abeba, Addis Abeba University Press, 21998, 261-275.

Senghor, Léopold Sedar (1967), *Négritude und Humanismus*, Düsseldorf, Diederichs.

Silverman, Max (1999), *Facing Postmodernity*, London, Routledge.

Walzer, Michael (2004), *Arguing About War*, New Haven, Yale University Press.

## Bisher erschienene Nummern

### 2007

- 16 **B. Gebrewold** (Innsbruck): *The Civilizing Process of Globalization and Integration*  
15 **R. Lohlker** (Wien): *Islam und Gewalt*  
14 **W. Guggenberger** (Innsbruck): *Flucht aus der Freiheit. Ein kritischer Blick auf Ökonomik und Strukturethik aus der Perspektive christlicher Gesellschaftslehre*

### 2006

- 13 **S. Hartmann** (Innsbruck): *Historische Betrachtung des Kongo im globalen Handel – Eine Geschichte kompromissloser Gier*  
12 **W. Dietrich** (Innsbruck): *Energetische und moralische Friedensbegriffe als paradigmatische Leitprinzipien der Friedensforschung*  
11 **M. Delgado** (Fribourg): *Theologie und Volkssouveränität Oder vom Nutzen der Theologie für die Politik*  
10 **H. Hinterhuber** (Innsbruck): *Besessenheit und Exorzismus: Gedanken zu einem psychiatrisch (und theologisch) obsoleten Thema*  
09 **R. Schwager, R. A. Siebenrock** (Innsbruck): *Das Böse / Der Teufel. Theologische Orientierungen*  
08 **W. Guggenberger, W. Palaver, W. Sandler, P. Steinmair-Pösel** (Innsbruck): *Ursprünge der Gewalt: Eine kritische Auseinandersetzung mit der Theorie matriarchaler Gesellschaft aus Sicht der mimetischen Theorie*  
07 **C. von Werlhof** (Innsbruck): *Das Patriarchat als Negation des Matriarchats: zur Perspektive eines Wahns*  
06 **R. Rebitsch** (Innsbruck): *Glaube und Krieg. Gedanken zur Antriebsmotivation zum Krieg bei den Hussiten und in der New Model Army*

### 2005

- 05 **A. Assmann** (Hildesheim): *Gewalt und das kulturelle Unbewußte: eine Archäologie des Abendmahls.*  
04 **J.-P. Dupuy** (Paris, Stanford): *The Ethics of Technology before the Apocalypse.*  
03 **A. Exenberger** (Innsbruck): *Welthungerordnung? Eine Topologie des Hungers im Zeitalter der Globalisierung.*  
02 **J. Becker** (Solingen, Marburg): *Die Informationsrevolution frisst ihre eigenen Kinder: Internationale Medienpolitik zwischen Terror, Militarisierung und totaler Entgrenzung.*  
01 **R. Schwager** (Innsbruck): *Jean-Pierre Dupuy als möglicher Referenzautor für das interfakultäre Forschungsprojekt „Weltordnung-Religion-Gewalt“.*