

Coloniality, the Bane of Peace and Development in Africa

Douglas Munemo

Midlands State University, Zimbabwe

*Corresponding author: munemod@staff.msu.ac.zw

ABSTRACT

The struggle against colonialism and the attainment of independence in Africa raised hopes that Africa would industrialise and develop alongside other parts of the global community. This has however not come to pass as most parts of the Global North are in the Fourth Industrial Revolution Era while Africa remains mired in violent conflict, poverty, ethnicity, dictatorship and corruption that are retarding peace, security and development despite the fall of formal empire. This paper examines the dilemma of peace and security in Africa. Many conflict theorists and peace builders in the South advance neo-colonialism, neo-liberalism and globalisation as sources of conflict and factors blocking peace on the African continent. The paper, apply a qualitative study employing decolonial analysis and drawing data from relevant documents argues that the continuation of colonial patterns of domination in the realms of power, knowledge and being in spite of the end of juridical – political domination is the raison d’etre for the seemingly unending conflicts that have engulfed the African continent to the detriment of peace and development. The paper reveals how coloniality has produced a ‘postcolonial’ leadership that has continued to practice politics in a violent, repressive, corrupt and unaccountable manner informed by colonial logic that breeds inimical practices such as racism, tribalism, regionalism and patriarchy. Finally, the paper advocates for decoloniality for peace and development to be achieved in Africa.

Keywords: *Coloniality, Peace, Development*

Received: February 2019

Accepted: May 2019

Published: July 2019

INTRODUCTION

After protracted struggles against colonialism there were high hopes that the African societies which had been fissured by years of quarrel, oppression, racism and tribalism would finally be reconciled and live in peace and harmony. However, more than half a century since most of Africa gained independence the continent is largely mired in poverty, violence, civil wars, internecine conflicts, corruption and racism that continue to blight and underdevelop the continent. This explains Africa's failure to not only industrialize but to also achieve the recently lapsed Millennium Development Goals and newly inaugurated Sustainable Development goals. Many peace building researchers and conflict theorists have advanced various arguments ranging from neo-colonialism through neo-liberalism to globalisation to explain this but none have been able to proffer solutions to enable Africa to not only industrialize but to be part of the Fourth Industrial Revolution alongside other countries in the global community. This paper does not refute that the above mentioned variables are important explanations for the absence of peace and development in Africa but privileges coloniality, an invisible global power matrix produced in the pursuit of modernity as the bane of Africa's peace and development conundrums.

The paper begins by discussing the notions of peace and development before unpacking the concepts of coloniality peace and development. Thereafter it outlines the study's research methodology. This is followed by a sustained discussion that unmasks how colonial matrix of power generates conflict and presents obstacles to the achievement peace and development in Africa. The paper also demonstrates how coloniality has been reproduced at the domestic level to the detriment of peace and development. Finally, the paper advocates for decoloniality as a mode by which to confront and dismantle coloniality for peace and development to be achieved in Africa.

CONCEPTUAL ISSUES

Coloniality

Coloniality is an analytical concept developed by Anibal Quijano and other radical Latin American scholars such as Mignolo, Escobar, Maldonado-Torres and others to explain the origins of the contemporary capitalist world created by Western modernity that is based on the racial categorisation of the global population (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2012). Their primary aim was to

develop a new understanding of modernity based on colonial difference from the perspective of the ex-colonized that experienced its dark side (Mignolo, 2011). According to Quijano (2000), with the conquest of the Americas in 1492, Europeans created a new global social structure in which humanity was ranked primarily on the basis of differences in race and also in the control of labour. The lighter skinned peoples were perceived to be closer to full humanity while the darker races had their humanity doubted. In the social realm the Christian, capitalist, patriarchal white race was ranked as superior to the darker races that were perceived to be inferior, primitive, uncivilized and thus placed at the bottom of the social ladder where they were virtually dehumanized. The construction of a new way of classifying people based on the codification of differences between the conquerors and conquered that mainly centred on the idea of race was used to justify the slave trade, imperialism and colonialism, neo-colonialism and globalisation.

To Maldonado-Torres (2007, p. 243) coloniality is more than a stratification system based on race. It refers to “long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, that define culture, labour, inter-subjective relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations.” Coloniality allows the continuity of colonial forms of domination after the end of formal colonial administrations. Although colonial administrations have virtually been eradicated the world over, the majority of the developing world is still experiencing colonial situations as they are living under a racialized global hierarchy that privileges European people over non-European people, and embraces Euro-American exploitation and control of the rest. This state of affairs in which the West continues to dominate the Global South despite the end of juridical-political control prompts Mignolo (2000) to refer to coloniality as a new form of colonialism: colonialism without territoriality, while Quijano (2000) alludes to it as “independence without decolonization”. Colonialism at a global scale was thus replaced by global coloniality. It should be highlighted that coloniality is not only found at the global level but also at the local level. Local rulers in the ex-colonized parts of the world have since independence developed a new understanding of modernity based not on colonial difference as in global coloniality but based on class difference from the viewpoint of the ruling elite that inherited colonial states. In domestic coloniality the power matrix is constituted by ethnicism, regionalism and the “Big Man syndrome” (Mutunga cited by Matinenga 1999 in Mandaza, 2016). The executive engages in the stratification and hierarchization of society with the

intention of fragmenting and assuming dominance over state citizens that that it calls “My People”.

Coloniality is closely related to and interwoven with the concepts of colonialism and neo-colonialism. According to Maldonado-Torres cited in Mignolo (2005, p.9) “colonialism denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation, which makes such nation an empire.” Neo- colonialism is a policy of political and economic domination of a less powerful country by another without necessarily taking over territorial control. The central focus in neo-colonialism is the economy and its relationship with the state (Mignolo, 2000). Of note in the differences between colonial and neo-colonialism is that coloniality does not require the existence of formal colonial administration systems to survive nor does it require economic modes by which to dominate another territory. Coloniality persists because of the continued existence of invisible tentacles of power, knowledge and being that hook the ex-colony to the former colonial power.

There are three main contours of coloniality namely; coloniality of power, the coloniality of knowledge and the coloniality of being. According to Martinot (undated) the coloniality of power explains how the current global political order was constructed and constituted into the asymmetrical and modern power structure. To Taylor (2013,p.598), the coloniality of power is a structuring process in the modern world system in which the US and Europe have created a power structure that privileges the white race and enables them to dominate not only the global political economy but to be epistemologically and culturally hegemonic. Closely linked to the coloniality of power is the concept of the coloniality of knowledge which is useful in any understanding of the modern/colonial world we live in. The coloniality of knowledge to Maldonado-Torres (2007, p. 242)) is concerned with the impact of colonization on the different areas of knowledge production. It is a power structure that entails the control and monopolization of epistemology by the West. It privileges knowledge from Europe and holds in high esteem knowledge produced by the white race while undermining, ignoring, silencing, oppressing and marginalizing knowledge from the Global South This has resulted in the West’s epistemic hegemony in the modern/colonial capitalist world-system we live in (Grosfoguel, 2009).

The coloniality of being is a useful analytical tool developed by Mignolo to analyze the relationship between power and knowledge in the

framing of being. According to Maldonado –Torres (2007, p.242) while the coloniality of power concerns itself with the interrelation between modern forms of exploitation and domination and the coloniality of knowledge has to do with the impact of the different areas of knowledge production, the coloniality of being is primarily concerned with what Escobar (2004) refers to as the ontological dimension of coloniality that emphasizes ontological difference. It explains the processes of the dynamics of power that discriminate the different races of the world through the ranking of humanity according to ontological conceptions of the sense of being.

Peace And Development

For a better understanding how coloniality impedes peace and development in Africa it is prudent to explain the concepts of peace and development. It should be noted that the concepts of peace and development are relative, transient and abstract and therefore contested. An understanding of them depends on subscribed values and standpoint. In acknowledgement of the contention and ever changing perceptions surrounding the terms, the paper uses them reservedly and conveniently. Peace is defined by Galtung (1990) as a political condition that ensures justice and social stability through formal and informal institutions, practices, and norms. Galtung (1989) further identifies two main notions of peace, negative peace and positive peace. He explains the distinction between the two. To him, negative peace refers to a situation when something undesirable has stopped happening such as when oppression ends. Imposed peace accords and the deployment of peace keeping troops are associated with this type of peace. Positive peace describes a situation where there is the building and restoration of healthy relationships amongst parties to the conflict and the creation of social systems that serve the needs of the whole population and the constructive resolution of conflict. Galtung (1990) identifies several conditions that must be met for peace to be attained and maintained. These include a need for recognized and valued interdependent relationships among groups, thereby fostering long-term cooperation during periods of agreement, disagreement, normality and crisis. The paper adopts this functional definition of peace as it is positive peace and a developmental kind of peace that recognizes that global and domestic social justice and interdependence are integral for peace to prevail. The absence of these conditions in a global order dominated by Western Europe and America and on an African continent in which local agents are colluding with the global north to perpetuate colonial like relations has compromised peace and development in Africa. With regard to the concept of development the study adopts Suhrke and Chaudhary's

(2009, p.384) view of development in economic terms as sustained high growth rates or the transformation of agrarian economies into industrialized systems of production. In social terms they perceive development to mean poverty reduction and improving the socio-economic conditions of people by providing adequate food, livelihoods and employment and achieving development goals while in political terms development to them refers to a combined process of national integration, state and nation-building and social modernization embraces inclusivity in decision making and broad based citizen participation that are thought to produce effective institutions and political stability.

The paper acknowledges that development is relative and the conceptualization of development by Suhrke and Chaudhary (ibid) cannot be universalized. In spite of this the paper adopts their Cartesian view of development in recognition of the fact that the politically and economically powerful and epistemologically dominant Europe and America have over the decades largely been successful in using their hegemonic positions to foist their view of development on other parts of the world.

METHODOLOGY

The paper employed qualitative research methods couched in decolonial analysis to explain how coloniality breeds conflict and presents obstacles to peace and development in Africa. Decolonial analysis is appropriate for this study because the Global North is experiencing the fourth era of industrial revolution while Africa is yet to industrialize. This is a consequence of the current hierarchized global political and economic power structure that peripheralizes the ex-colonized parts of the world and perpetuates colonial relations to the detriment of peace and development in Africa and the rest of the Global South. It draws data from what Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014) refers to as epistemologies of the South with reference to the pool of the epistemologies of the subalternized that question traditional imperial methodologies of the ex-colonizers that have emerged and being universalized consequent upon coloniality. Critical in the decolonial examination was document analysis of various conflict events and peace processes on the African continent and how coloniality impacted on them. This way the study managed to navigate how coloniality is the bane of peace and development in Africa.

COLONIALITY, A SOURCE OF CONFLICT AND AN OBSTACLE TO PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

With the end of juridical political in most parts of there were high hopes that conflict and underdevelopment would be eradicated in Africa. This has not come to pass because colonial powers did not sever tentacles of power, knowledge and being instrumental to the subjugation dominance and control of the ex-colonies. Global capitalist and imperialist powers presided over a flawed and incomplete decolonization process that resulted in the birth of Africa as a neo-colonial continent. Most Africa states particularly Zimbabwe, South Africa and Namibia were forced to postpone critical issues such as land ownership to capitalist/imperialist elements that interfered to safeguard capitalist and settler interests. The unfinished business of land in these countries remains a thorny issue that is responsible for conflict and reversals in development. For instance, in Zimbabwe a significant number of whites did not emigrate at independence owing largely to Mugabe's policy of racial reconciliation. Racial reconciliation allowed the retention of a racialized social structure that privileged the whites and oppressed the blacks. This was evident in the skewed ownership of land at independence where 8.500 black small scale and commercial farmers owned 1.6 million hectares whilst 4500 white large scale commercial farmers owned 12 million hectares (Nyawo, 2012, p.178). As a consequence of this the wide socio-economic disparities between the privileged whites and marginalized blacks persisted triggering the land reform conflict that has been ruinous to Zimbabwe's development. It should be noted that the land reform programme of 2000, was an attempt by the Zimbabwean government to unshackle itself from debilitating coloniality. The action however invited the country the wrath of the West. It has been ostracized and punished through sanctions and other measures for embarking on a land redistribution exercise that in part sought to eradicate remnants of colonialism. It is therefore because of coloniality that a subaltern state like Zimbabwe has been punished for attempting to break ranks with global capitalist powers. The consequences of defying the West have been hunger, economic decline, sanctions and civil strife.

Although most African states, save for the Morocco occupied Saharawi Arab Democratic Republic are no longer under colonial rule. They however remain in a colonial situation because the life force of colonialism endured the end of colonial rule. This is evident in current oppressive structures and exclusionist relations between ex-colonizers and ex-colonized that bear similarities with the colonial past. The coloniality of

power explains the current asymmetrical global power structure. Most power is located in the western hemisphere amongst the “fairer” races of the world. Britain and the United States control the global political system and use their economic, political and diplomatic muscle to dominate smaller and weaker nations (former colonies) that are dependent on them for various forms of assistance. Their dominance of the global political system has been responsible for conflict and the absence of development in most parts of the Global South and stable peace and development in Global North.

African countries today live under the regime of global coloniality imposed by the Euro-American alliance through the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank (WB), North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and their domination of the United Nations (UN) (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). These multi-lateral institutions have been financially and economically imperial in their relations with peripheral states on which they dictate terms and conditions. For instance, the French intervention in Cote d’Ivoire in 2010 and the United Nations Resolution 1973 that permitted NATO’s invasion of Libya in 2011 were unilateral actions opposed by most countries in Africa, As a consequence of this these countries are unable to chart development trajectories capable of bringing development as they are still shackled to global capitalist exploitative machinations that promote dependence and underdevelopment in the South. Euro-American political and military strength has also enabled the West to control the ruling elite in other parts of the South that rely heavily on Western diplomatic and military support for regime survival. For a long time Mobutu Sese Seko’s regime in Zaire and Hosni Mubarak’s regime in Egypt and a number of African countries have had their budgets subsidised by the Americans resulting in their pandering to the dictates of the American government (Weiner:1991). This prompts Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013, p.13) to agree with (Spivak: 1990) that as a consequence of the failure to completely decolonize the periphery the people of the Global South remain in a “postcolonial neocolonized world”. He argues that Africans live under the coloniality of power in which their leaders have no power and freedom to decide on the course of any development of their countries without approval from Washington, London, Paris and other Western capitals. This is in spite of the fact that political colonialism has been eliminated. The relationship between the West and the developing world continues to be one of colonial domination. While Kwame Nkrumah would perceive neo- colonialism as a source of conflict and underdevelopment in Africa this paper is of the conviction that coloniality is an obstacle to peace and development.

With independence Africa was sucked into the global capitalist system. It continues to be dependent on Western state support and assistance from western dominated institutions like the IMF and WB that facilitate the exploitation of resources from the marginalized parts of the world for the benefit of the industrialized countries. This has culminated in the weakening of the economies of countries in the Global South. When traced most conflicts in Africa have economic roots as a consequence of the domination of the international political economy by the US and Western Europe and financial and multilateral imperialism of institutions and organisations they control. Africa remains underdeveloped and conflict ridden because capitalist global political and economic powerhouses have stratified global society based on race. This is classification based on race to Santos (2007) is concomitant with coloniality and is accentuated by what he refers to as Western abyssal thinking. Abyssal thinking he argues is all about making distinctions between peoples. To him an imaginary abyssal line distinguishes the subalternized darker races from the privileged whites. Those considered to live above the abyssal line are seen as belonging to the zone of being, while those that live below the line to be in the zone of non-being. On the privileged side of the abyssal line, (Western Europe and the US) one finds superiority, development, knowledge, peace and democracy, while on the oppressed side, (Africa) there is underdevelopment, violence, invisibility, darkness, heathens, inhuman practices, savages, dictatorship, inferiority and a host of other negations and deficiencies.

Furthermore, in a world marked by the coloniality of being, the humanity of the darker races of the world is doubted. Fanon (1968) argues that the “*damné*” (the black race – the wretched, the condemned and the oppressed) emerges in the eyes of the white race as a race perceived to be distant from humanity when compared to light skinned persons. Whiteness in this world is considered to have greater ontological density than blackness. Lighter skinned races are regarded as closer to humanity (Maldonado –Torres 2007, p. 244). To Fanon (1968) the blacks occupy the zone of non-being while the privileged white race endowed with full humanity is seen as occupying the zone of being. By ascribing superiority to the ex-colonizer and “fairer” races and inferiority to people of colour and the ex-colonised coloniality accentuates racial and cultural differences. The ex-colonized darker races are treated as dispensable lesser beings; and little is done to protect them against violence. To Moya (2011), the situation described above has resulted in the differential treatment of races that explains why the global capitalist powers were slow to react to the Rwandan genocide but were quick to avert genocide in Serbia in the 1990s.

Under colonial rule the Africans were indoctrinated into believing that they were inferior thus accepted oppression and exploitation. Decades after independence many Africans still perceive Europeans as a superior racial class and as long as they believe it they will embrace western exploitation and injustice. The above is noted in West Africa where countries like Mali and Cote d'Ivoire have practically surrendered their security to their former colonial power. This is in spite of the persistence of exploitative arrangements that the former French territories entered with its France that allows Paris to continue to siphon from its former colonies. The idea that France and not fellow African states can guarantee security is a notion embedded in colonial thinking that has to be confronted as a path way towards restructuring the asymmetrical power structures that are blocking peace and development in Africa. More than three decades after the end of empire former British colonies remain ensnared in the clutches of coloniality. The countries employ colonial templates and frameworks in various spheres of life. Their governance *modus operandi* is more British than it they are African as they resemble the Westminster form of administration. The British culture, traditions and values dominate societal life. Christianity remains the dominant religion and the English language is still the official language of the country and is official medium of instruction in schools and universities that still make use of British curricula. The failure to indigenise and localise governance and education militates against development owing to the reliance on alien systems of governance that are not suited to the African context and reality. Colonial powers did not only impose on the blacks their culture, values, traditions and knowledge systems but also pushed to the margins those of the Africans. For instance, the colonial education system was structured along western canon of thought while Christianity brought by western missionaries and evangelists was privileged over traditional African religions. The effect of this was to alter and erode the Africans sense of identity and being. The corruption and alteration of the African subject and his identity to assume a European identity planted seeds of identity related conflict. Various parts of Africa have experienced conflict between groups resisting the erosion of their culture by Africans who have embraced western practices such as homosexuality that are inimical to social cohesion, peace and development in African social structures.

In an epistemologically unequal world the control of knowledge by the Global North in various domains of human existence has led to the development of weak, ineffectual strategies, theories and methodologies to deal with conflict and to build peace. What is exposed is the continuation of colonized

epistemologies that curtail the development of models likely to extricate the South from snares that hold back development and the attainment of peace. Coloniality of knowledge therefore exposes the influence that former colonizers still have with regard to methodologies and knowledge production. Although colonialism in many parts of the world has come to an end, its effects linger; western tools of analysis, methods and theories are still employed in the realm of knowledge. This has been noted in the domain of peace in the post-independence period of the ex-colonized world where European models of conflict resolution have been preferred ahead of indigenous modes of conflict resolution that have been sidelined. For instance, Thabo Mbeki, the Southern Africa Development Council (SADC) mediator in the Zimbabwe crisis, adopted quiet diplomacy. This conflict resolution philosophy is rooted in western diplomacy and was thus alien and unsuitable for the Zimbabwean context as a conflict resolution strategy. The consequences of employing it were an escalation and extension of the Zimbabwe crisis, the violent 2008 elections, a flawed Global Political Agreement, a polarized GNU and the contested 2013 elections which have not offered Zimbabwe prospects for sustainable peace. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2012, p. 423) is skeptical of the appropriateness and sincerity of western driven conflict resolution pedagogies. He surmises that “powerful people benefitting from the lack of peace will not teach you how to be peaceful lest their power is eroded.” The liberation war could have been stopped by the British before it claimed many lives. Since Britain was benefitting from the war it was not in a hurry to resolve the conflict in a way that was likely to compromise its political and economic interests. This did not make the British best placed to deliver pedagogies of peace in Zimbabwe. Its resolution of the Zimbabwean conflict in the year 1979 did not produce durable peace but rather papered over the cracks as conflict re-emerged not long after independence as evidenced by the violence in Matabeleland and the Midlands provinces in the 1980s and farm invasions from the year 2000. British actions were informed more by imperial political and economic interests more than a desire to bring peace and stability to Zimbabwe.

The problems of peace and development in the ex-colonized parts of the world are not only a consequence of machinations of foreigners and their local puppets but are also a reflection of the workings of local coloniality that created its own domestic power matrix. In this local power structure things are considered from the point of view of the politics of constitution of an ethnically hierarchized, region- centric, elite- centric, “Bigman-centric” and patriarchal state power structure. Concomitant with end of empire was

a transition from colonialism by foreigners to a capture of the state by local ruling elite that replaced the retreating settler state. What fundamentally changed were the forms of domination, but not the structure of horse-and-rider relationships that characterized colonial rule. The consequence is that most ex-colonies and citizens of these states remain colonial in relation to the hegemonic elite nationalist bourgeoisie that filled the shoes of the former colonizers. The control of the state political system by the elite has been responsible for conflict and the absence of development in the countryside and for those living on the margins of society in urban areas while those in power live in affluence. Local coloniality has ensured that most state citizens have remained in colonial situations even though they are no longer under any particular colonial juridical-political administration. This has been achieved through the nationalist elite domination of the political economy and securocratization of the state. Mandaza (2016) refers to a securocrat state as one in which the military-security apparatus is a dominant factor in the power complex and rules without or despite popular will. In Zimbabwe apparently decisions made by the nationalist elite hold sway over those made by the rest of the populace. For instance the Economic Structural Adjustment Programme was adopted in the early 1990s against the wishes of a significant proportion of the population and so was a 2005 slum clean-up campaign launched that violated over 700 000 citizens' rights to habitation.

In local coloniality unlike in global coloniality ontological differences go beyond race. They have been modified by the ruling elite of ex- colonies to socially classify of the country's population around the idea of ethnicity and region. Ethnicity and region are placed at the centre of the structuring of the state order where those that come from the region where the executive hails and belong to his tribe enjoy privileges over other ethnic and regional groups. The dynamics of power discriminate the different ethnicities and regional groups and rank them. The non- ruling ethnic groups are seen as less national and dispensable populations. The prime objective in all this is the quest to be hegemonic but it comes with dire consequences for peace and development. This is because the ontological hierarchization of society that accompanied the end of formal colonialism brought violence and underdevelopment in the zone uninhabited by the ruling ethnic group and development and peace in the zone where it resides. In domestic coloniality the ruling elite of ex-colonies have created national and community structures that associate the privileged ruling elite with superiority and the underprivileged marginalized groups with inferiority. They use the idea of class and history as an efficient instrument of social

domination. Liberators of the colonies are privileged over non-liberators culminating in the liberators assuming dominance over the rest of the state citizenry. The situation has resulted in the differential treatment of national classes and this explains the high number of intractable conflicts that engulf the continent.

The ruling elite in the former colonized parts of the world have also created a new national social structure in which the sense of belonging to nation is primarily based on one having participated in the decolonization of the state and the degree to which one adopted the former colonizers way of life. Those with links to nationalist struggles and dress and pursue the hobbies of the colonizer, as well as speak the former colonizers language fluently have been perceived to be closer to full nationhood while those that do not have the same qualities have had their nationality doubted. The perception of the latter as lacking full nationality by the local ruling elite resonates with abyssal thinking. In the eyes of the ruling elite an imaginary abyssal separates them from the subalternized commoners seen as living in the zone of non-being. The ascription of superiority to the ruling elite based on the class categorisation of the national population while inferiorizing other social group's (domestic coloniality) accentuates national and historical differences and therefore hampers prospects of peace and development. Contributions of the rural inhabitants and urban poor to issues of national development have been ignored and frowned upon as they are seen by the ruling elite as lesser beings lacking sophistication and ontological weight. They have thus been placed at the bottom of the social ladder. The consequences of this action at various levels have been to generate conflict, foment division and underdevelopment between and amongst the marginalized and exploited communities.

DECOLONIALITY FOR PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA

This paper advocates for decoloniality as a pathway towards the achievement of peace and development in Africa. To Quijano (2007) decoloniality is a response to the relation of direct, political, social and cultural domination established by Europeans. It should be conceptualized as any intervention from the subalternized, colonized, dehumanised and marginalized that understand colonial difference. It is a project directed at unmasking and dismantling the modern colonial world that has produced an asymmetrical power structure that privileges the Global North while

oppressing, marginalising exploiting and under developing the global south. Decoloniality seeks to shake the very foundations of global imperial designs. Its mission is the decolonization of knowledge, power and being as well as those institutions that create the contemporary asymmetrical world order. Through decoloniality it is possible to explain how the coloniality of power, knowledge and being has contributed to conflict and violence in Africa. Decoloniality unravels how the global power structure has allowed colonial forms of domination to persist long after the end of colonialism in Africa.

The starting shot in the battle for peace and development through decoloniality is to overthrow hegemonic modern/colonial Euro-centred epistemologies that have not only pushed to the margins epistemologies of the subalternised but have perpetuated mental colonization of the ex- colonized. Grosfoguel (2013, p.89) argues that decolonizing structures of knowledge can be made possible by shifting the geography of knowledge from the hegemonic Western Europe and America to the Global South (Maldonado –Torres 2007, p.262) through epistemic disobedience (Mignolo, 2013) and what Ngugi wa Thiong’o (1986) refers to as the decolonization of the mind. They argue that there is a need to reject imperial epistemologies and to turn away from the colonial epistemic path in pursuit of epistemic diversity. Departing from the imperial colonial epistemology liberates the subalternized from Eurocentric knowledge. It allows the underprivileged marginalized peoples of the Global South to comprehend articulate and address issues from a subaltern perspective. Alcoff (2007) argues that it is because of a lack of understanding of the subaltern’s way of life and thinking that has culminated in the West employing what Mills calls “epistemologies of ignorance” to deal with problems in the Global South. The West’s failure to understand the nature and dynamics of conflict among the subalternized peoples has resulted in it misdiagnosing conflict and prescribing peace models unsuited to the African context. It is because of epistemologies of ignorance that the US failed to resolve the crisis in Somalia in the 1990s and fuelled the Zimbabwean crisis in the new millennium. Decoloniality permits the employment of epistemologies of the subaltern to address challenges faced by peoples in the marginalized parts of the world as they are more likely to understand the context and realities of problems experienced in the South. It also allows for the deployment of decolonial epistemicides to kill persisting colonial/modern knowledges that obliterated indigenous knowledge values that were crucial to societal unity, peace and development (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2012). It should be noted that

decolonizing knowledge is merely the beginning of a long process that seeks complete decolonization which also entails decolonizing power and being. Decolonization of the being to Maldonado-Torres (2014, p.30) is the liberation from the dominance of the euro-centred being, knowledge, power and politics. Maldonado-Torres (2004) argues that an ontological turn is required so that a rehumanization process can occur for the subalternized so that they perceive themselves as human and not what imperial powers ascribed to them. The ontological turn allows for the restructuring of the topology of being in which the white race and the darker races of the world see each other as equals. This is invaluable to the establishment of a world that allows for the proper recognition of human difference and the rejection of exploitation, alienization, marginalization and oppression which is critical for peace, unity and development.

For the decolonization of being to be achieved for peace and development the focus must fall on the locus of enunciation. The locus of enunciation is the geo-political and body-political location of the subject that speaks (Grosfoguel, 2007). The subalternized people of the world who despite having gained political independence but continue to articulate issues and think as though they are in Europe and belong to the white race must learn to speak from where they are situated both physiologically and geographically. Doing this does not only free the subaltern but also emancipates them. They are able to articulate issues from the perspective of the marginalized on the underprivileged darker side of colonial difference. This enables them to make effective intervention in peace-building, conflict resolution and development. Such interventions to Mignolo (2007) do not only raise the doubted ontology of the subalternized but are also envisaged to result in the redrawing of the global cartography of power in pursuit of global justice and dismantling the existing coloniality of power matrix that privileges the North and underdevelops the South. They also have the potential to not only alter the terms but also content of conversation within global power relations, thus possibly paving the way for the racially inferiorized to push for the decolonization of the exploitative and oppressive metropolitan centre.

Decoloniality seeks to decolonize power by undoing the current imperialistic global political and economic relations between the North and the South that have allowed the dictatorial tendencies of the US, Britain and the EU to choke peace and development Africa. It aims to achieve this goal through pushing for global political and economic justice and equality (Mignolo, 2013) and opening vistas to alternatives of the hegemonic capitalist world

system that has deposited underdevelopment and violence in many parts of the Global South. Decoloniality calls for the ex-colonized peoples of the world to start perceiving themselves and the world in a different light. The ex-colonized are challenged and encouraged to reorder the world in a fashion that enables them to speak, think and act as equals in global interactions so that colonial matrices of power that impinge on peace and development are destroyed. Decoloniality also permits Africans to visualise and identify the invisible matrix of coloniality and to plot ways of extricating the continent from its entanglement and entrapment. It does not only expose the negative ramifications of a western dominated order that subalternized the population of the Global South but also unmasks the consequences of replicating and modifying coloniality despite the end of juridical-political rule within independent states of the developing world. This way we are able to analyse challenges to peace and development not only from without but also from within. Decoloniality is a unifying philosophy that acknowledges and respects the humanity of others as opposed to the hierarchizing and divisive philosophies bequeathed by colonialism that doubt the humanity of others. It confronts injustice and seeks to restore the ontological density of the dehumanized darker subalternized races experiencing hellish existential conditions under coloniality. It therefore embraces *Ubuntu/hunhu*, an African indigenous philosophy that emphasizes humanness and conceptualizes the life of the being as defined by relationships with other being and that happiness and fulfilment is in relations between individuals (Nabudere, 2008). The *ubuntu/hunhu* philosophy acknowledges the existence of one as a consequence of relations with others around them which is crucial for peace and development.

Decoloniality allows us to understand that the authoritarian modes of governance employed in Africa are a continuation of oppressive colonial rule. Many amongst the current political leadership that is at the centre of generating political conflict in Africa are products of coloniality. They were born under colonial rule, schooled by it, oppressed by it, were brutalized by it and even fought against it. This militates against them effectively combating coloniality. They, by commission or omission, find themselves working in the service of coloniality. This makes a decolonial turn in Africa is therefore imperative for peace and development. Decoloniality also facilitates the unmasking of racism/ethnicism, oppression, and economic, knowledge and power inequities as global peace problems. As a thinking and perspective decoloniality inculcates ontological egalitarianism despite differences in race, religion, gender, wealth and power. It is in this space that the underlying causes of the Africa's conflict can be addressed. Peace, unity

and reconciliation stand a better chance of being achieved through decoloniality because it advocates for redistributive justice and the respect of human rights as key ingredients for the cultivation of a deeper form of democracy. Decoloniality should be seen as having the potential to establish a new economic and political system/order rooted in Africa's own culture, history, tradition and orientation that allow African subjects to cut the surviving colonial tentacles that are still clutching the country and thereby preventing it from attaining genuine and full independence (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Mignolo (2007) buttresses this view by arguing that decoloniality advances the agenda of achieving peace and development since it advocates for delinking from the colonial matrix of power. Delinking is to Mignolo decolonial epistemic shift that allows the marginalized to detach from the prevailing global matrix of power.

CONCLUSION

It has been the contention of this study that coloniality is the bane of peace and development as it has permeated its way into governance, politics, society, identity, epistemology and economy with the resultant effect of weakening institutions and processes that promote peace and development . The study revealed that coloniality, thea global power matrix centred on race that explains the current racially hierarchized, patriarchal, Western-centric, Euro-American-centric, capitalist, contemporary modern/colonial world order explains the dilemma of achieving peace and development in Africa. The paper recommends the adoption of decoloniality as a strategy towards the achievement of peace and development in Africa.

REFERENCES

- Alcoff, L.M. (2007). 'Mignolo's Epistemology of Coloniality'. *The NewCentennial Review*, Vol. 7, No. 3, Winter, pp. 79-101.
- Escobar ,A. (2004). 'Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality and Anti-Globalisation Social Movements'. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol 25, No. 1, pp. 207-230.
- Fanon, F. (1968). *The Wretched of the Earth*, Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Galtung, J. (1989). *Peace and Development in the Pacific Hemisphere*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Institute for Peace.
- Galtung, J.(1990). 'Cultural Violence', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 27. No.3, pp 291-305

- Grosfoguel, R. (2007). 'The Epistemic Decolonial Turn.' *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 21:No. 2-3, pp.211-223.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2004). 'The Typology of Being and the Geopolitics of Knowledge: Modernity, Empire, Coloniality', in *City*, Vol.8, No.1. pp. 1-33.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). 'On Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the Development of a Concept' in *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2-3, pp. 240-270.
- Mandaza, I. (2016). "Introduction" *Zimbabwe The Challenges of Democratization and Economic Recovery* in I. Mandaza (ed), Harare: Sapes Trust
- Martinot, S. (undated). 'The Coloniality of Power: Notes Towards Decolonization'. Unpublished Paper, San Francisco State University.
- Mignolo, W. (2000). *Local Histories/Global Designs: Essays on the Coloniality of Power, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The Idea of Latin America*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2007). 'Delinking', *Cultural Studies*, Vol.21, No.2-3, pp.449-514.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2011). 'The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options', *Latin America Otherwise*, London : Duke University Press.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2013). 'Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (de) coloniality, Border Thinking, and Epistemic Disobedience' *Confero Essays on Education Philosophy and Politics* Vol. 1, No.1, pp.129-150.
- Moya, P.M.L. (2011). 'Who We Are and From Where We Speak Transmodernity', *Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of The Luso-Hispanic World*, Vol.1. No.2, pp.79-94.
- Nabudere, D.W. (2008). Ubuntu philosophy: Memory and reconciliation. <http://repositories.lib.utexas.edu/handle/2152/4521> Retrieved on April 26 2016
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2012). 'Beyond the Equator There are No Sins, Coloniality and Violence in Africa', *Journal of Developing Societies*, Vol.28, No. 4 : pp.419-440.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2013). Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa Myths of Decolonization Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa.
- Dakar Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-Colonialism the Last Stage of Imperialism*, New York: International Publishers.

- Nyawo-Viriri-Shava, V. (2012) *Mayibuye : Dilemmas of Agrarian Reform in Independent Zimbabwe and South Africa*, Mambo Press, Gweru, 2012.
- Quijano, A. (2000). 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America'. *epantla*, Vol.1 No.3. pp. 533-580.
- Santos, B. S. (2007). 'Beyond Abyssal Thinking: From Global Lines to Ecologies of Knowledges' *Review*, Vol. XXX, No.1. pp.45-89.
- Santos, B. S. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South Justice against Epistemicide*, Boulder, Paradigm publishers.
- Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, London: Routledge.
- Suhrke, A. and Chaudhary, T.W. (2009). 'Conflict and Development in P A. Haslam, J. Schafer and P. Beaudet (eds.): *Introduction to International Development. Approaches, Actors and Issues*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press pp. 384-405.
- Taylor, L. (2013). 'Decolonizing Citizenship: Reflections on the Coloniality of Power in Argentina', *Citizenship Studies*, Vol.17, No.5, pp.596-610.
- Wa Thiong'o, N. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in frican Literature*, London: James Currey.
- Weiner, T. (1991). 'America's Ally Mobutu Thrives On Corruption as His Nation Crumbles' *Inquirer* Washington Bureau Accessed 13 February 2015