

Advances in African Economic, Social and Political Development

Series Editors

Diery Seck, CREPOL—Center for Research on Political Economy, Dakar, Senegal

Juliet U. Elu, Morehouse College, Atlanta, GA, USA

Yaw Nyarko, New York University, New York, NY, USA

Africa is emerging as a rapidly growing region, still facing major challenges, but with a potential for significant progress—a transformation that necessitates vigorous efforts in research and policy thinking. This book series focuses on three intricately related key aspects of modern-day Africa: economic, social and political development. Making use of recent theoretical and empirical advances, the series aims to provide fresh answers to Africa's development challenges. All the socio-political dimensions of today's Africa are incorporated as they unfold and new policy options are presented. The series aims to provide a broad and interactive forum of science at work for policymaking and to bring together African and international researchers and experts. The series welcomes monographs and contributed volumes for an academic and professional audience, as well as tightly edited conference proceedings. Relevant topics include, but are not limited to, economic policy and trade, regional integration, labor market policies, demographic development, social issues, political economy and political systems, and environmental and energy issues.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/11885>

Everisto Benyera
Editor

Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa

Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths

Editor

Everisto Benyera 

Department of Political Sciences

University of South Africa

Pretoria, Gauteng, South Africa

ISSN 2198-7262

ISSN 2198-7270 (electronic)

Advances in African Economic, Social and Political Development

ISBN 978-3-030-25142-0

ISBN 978-3-030-25143-7 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25143-7>

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To the Daughters and Sons of the great continent of Africa and its ecologies that had to endure the odious struggles against poor leadership, injustices and various abuses of state power. It is dedicated to those that continue to search and fight for an Africa rooted in endogenous forms of understanding justice, political leadership as well as development. It seeks to bring close focus into the state project in Africa for purposes of breaking with Eurocentric notions of state power in order to bring in the marginalized indigenous understandings of power, human rights and justice. This work urges Africans to imagine a decolonized human-centric African where Africa's development takes on new Afrocentric discourses that are anchored in Africa's people and liberatory paradigms. This book is for those who strive for African's self-determination, autonomous development and equality, just and noble governance, leadership and fairness in seeking and applying human rights.

This book also goes out to our families. They supported us in this ongoing decolonial journey of discovery, fraught with lugubrious contradictions and inconsistencies, and help us navigate our way through this treacherous terrain of life. Without you, the journey will be all the more difficult, perhaps impossible. Thank You!

Everisto Benyera
Romain Francis
Ahmed Haroon Jazbhay

Pretoria, South Africa
June 2019

Contents

Part I Conceptualizing Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa

- 1 Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths: Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa 3**
Everisto Benyera, Romain Francis and Ahmed Haroon Jazbhay
- 2 The Colonial State is the Problem in Africa 21**
Everisto Benyera

Part II Justice

- 3 The Tyranny of the Coloniality of Nature and the Elusive Question of Justice 39**
Romain Francis
- 4 Don't Develop Us Without Us! Inclusion of Indigenous Ethnic Minorities in Sustainable Development Goals in Africa 59**
Paul Mulindwa

Part III Human Rights

- 5 Theorising the Direct Effect Doctrine of International Law in Human Rights Enforcement 77**
Torque Mude
- 6 Getting Beyond the Somalia Syndrome? Revisiting the United States' Intervention in Liberia 15 Years Later 103**
Raymond Kwun Sun Lau
- 7 NATO's 2011 Invasion of Libya: Colonialism Repackaged? 123**
Chidochashe Nyere

Part IV Leadership

**8 When Mandela Meets Rousseau: An Exploration of South Africa’s
Civil Religion 159**
Ahmed Haroon Jazbhay

**9 Pharaoh Let My Children Go: Meditations on Blackness Under
Democratized Whiteness 179**
Hlulani Mdingi

Editor and Contributors

About the Editor

Everisto Benyera is Associate Professor of African Politics in the Department of Political Sciences at the University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa. He is a decolonial reader and holds an M.Sc. in International Relations from the University of Zimbabwe and a Ph.D. in African Politics from the same university. He researches on transitology and transitional justice focusing on indigenous, traditional and non-state reconciliation, peacebuilding and healing mechanisms. He is the editor of the journal *Politeia, Journal of Political Sciences and Public Administration and Management*, and his publications are accessible via: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2706-9097> and <https://independent.academia.edu/EveristoBenyera>

Contributors

Everisto Benyera Department of Political Sciences, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Romain Francis Department of Political Sciences, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Ahmed Haroon Jazbhay Department of Political Sciences, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Raymond Kwun Sun Lau Department of History, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Kowloon, Hong Kong

Hlulani Mdingi Department of Philosophy Practical and Systematic Theology, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa

Torque Mude Department of Politics and Public Management, Midlands State University, Zvishavane, Zimbabwe

Paul Mulindwa Department of Politics and International Relations, SARCHI: African Diplomacy and Foreign Policy, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

Chidochashe Nyere Department of Political Science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

Chapter 7

NATO's 2011 Invasion of Libya: Colonialism Repackaged?



Chidochashe Nyere

Abstract Global coloniality privileges the Euro-North American-centric form of humanity, at the expense of diminishing, dismissing and obliterating anything else other than the Euro-North American-centric civilisation, in the process making Euro-North American-centric modernity a global empire. The politics of empire are problematic because they set precedence, justify and perpetuate global coloniality. This is the conundrum that confronted and enveloped Libya in 2011 with the NATO-led invasion and which continues to entangle and disenfranchise the Libyan polity today, hence the need for a decolonial epistemic approach that seeks to re-humanise and affirm all forms of humanity. The current socio-economic-political world order is a creation and direct result of modern European thought and civilisation (modernity) and European colonialism. In turn, colonialism produced global coloniality. The turning point is that global coloniality entraps humanity to a predetermined reality modelled on Euro-North American-centric modernity. Thus, coloniality is limiting to and eliminates 'other' epistemological creativity; it hinders 'other' ontological expressions of what humanity is and could be other than the predetermined Euro-North American-centric form of being and knowledge. Modernity negates, forcibly condemns forms of humanity found in the peripheries of Euro-North American civilisation, to non-humanity. Non-human beings are of less ontological value than beings of Euro-North American ancestry.

Keywords NATO · Libya · Invasion · Coloniality · Euro-North American modernity · Humanity

C. Nyere (✉)

Department of Political Science, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pretoria, Office 24,
7th Floor Theo van Wijk Building, UNISA Main Campus, Pretoria 0003, South Africa
e-mail: chidonyere@gmail.com

© Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2020

E. Benyera (ed.), *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa*,
Advances in African Economic, Social and Political Development,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-25143-7_7

Introduction

Global coloniality privileges a Euro-North American-centric form of humanity, at the expense of diminishing, dismissing and obliterating anything else other than the Euro-North American-centric civilisation, in the process making Euro-North American-centric modernity a global empire. The politics of empire are problematic because they set precedence and justify and perpetuate global coloniality. This is the conundrum that confronted and enveloped Libya in 2011 with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)-led invasion and which continues to entangle and disenfranchise the Libyan polity today (2019), hence the need for a decolonial epistemic approach that seeks to re-humanise and affirm *all* forms of humanity. This chapter seeks to disentangle and strips bare the asymmetrical global power structural configurations that the current world order rests upon and which are camouflaged in the so-called objectivity of science and the skewed universality of knowledge. The current socio-economic-political world order is a creation and direct result of modern European thought and civilisation (modernity). It was scattered across the world through the violence of colonialism. In turn, colonialism produced global coloniality. The turning point is that global coloniality entraps humanity to a predetermined reality modelled on Euro-North American-centric modernity. Thus, coloniality is limiting to and eliminates 'other' epistemological creativities; it hinders 'other' ontological expressions of what humanity is and could be 'other' than the predetermined Euro-North American-centric form of being and knowledge.

This logic results in the social, political, economic and epistemic creation and definition of the human and the non-human by 'other' human beings. Modernity negates, forcibly condemns forms of humanity found in the peripheries of Euro-North American civilisation, to non-humanity. Non-human beings are considered beings of a lesser ontological value than humans of Euro-North American ancestry. Because there is no humanity in the peripheries of the Euro-North American-centric world, any enterprise or innovation from the zone of non-being cannot be good enough (Fanon). Libya could have not been successful, it could not have been an example of a decolonial state, hence it had to fail because it threatened the established Eurocentric world order.

Coloniality of Power and the Global Power Structural Configuration: Unmasking the Politics and Philosophy of Empire

Epistemologically, this chapter seeks to unmask the fault lines of the philosophy of the European-centric empire as implicated in the generation of problems epitomised by the invasion of Libya in 2011 by NATO forces. It seeks to do so, by exposing some myths that informed, fueled and continue to precipitate global coloniality in the absence of physical colonialism. Current international relations (IR) theories have

proven to be limited and unable to solve and eradicate this epistemic challenge, partly because dominant and traditional IR theories are located in the very European modernity that they disguise and camouflage in the purported objectivity of science. The philosophy of the Eurocentric empire universalised these particular theories of IR by force (violence of colonialism) as they are part of the modernity project of colonisation (Howe 1990: 677). The chapter further aims to demonstrate the deficiency and bankruptcy that foregrounds traditional IR theories' assumptions, assertions and proclamations particularly that Western-centric IR theories are scientific, objective and universally applicable or replicable. Such proclamations overlook the fact that these IR theories are located in particular ecologies of Europe and therefore, are subjective. All knowledge is particular and subjective to its ecology or locality.

Since 1919, the official initial academic inquiry of IR as a discipline, IR theories have not adequately addressed what the discipline initially set out to do—to curb and liquidate international conflict. This suggests that the epistemologies (particular epistemic ecologies and localities) that have informed IR theories to date are inadequate and have reached some sort of cul-de-sac, or a dead-end. These epistemologies beg the question and engage in circular reasoning. This necessitates an alternative frame of reference. Contingent upon Albert Einstein's idea that insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result each time, this chapter opts to engage a non-conventional theory in the discipline of IR. As such, this work advances the decolonial perspective as a possible solution to problems caused by epistemologies located in the ecologies and localities of Western, Euro-North American-centric modernity that purport themselves as objective, scientific and universal. The chapter will unmask the inadequacies of Euro-North American-centric modernity in the face of mounting and current global problems, particularly those played out in the field of international relations.

IR as an academic discipline started in 1919 at Aberystwyth, University of Wales (now Aberystwyth University), a year after the end of World War I (Ziegler 1987). This, however, as Nyere (2014: 18) argues, “does not mean that intellectual origins of political realism and liberalism only started in 1919”. The main objective and aim of IR theorising was solely to find peaceful solutions to international disputes and therefore avert a similar conflict to World War I. IR failed in that regard because just barely after a decade, World War II started. Like the predecessor of the United Nations, the League of Nations, IR as an academic discipline has failed in achieving what it set out to do in the first place. Since 1945, the end of World War II and the signing of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco, USA, there has not been a single decade that the world has not witnessed an international conflict or war (Bennet 1998: 7).

Rational theories in the discipline of IR, such as realism, liberalism, feminism, Marxism and constructivism, are expressive of ideas, concepts and views located in modernity. The ideas expressed in IR rational theories are embodied by scholars that are mainly located in modernity, particularly from the Global North and reflect the rationale of European modernity. The major problem of modernity is the inexplicable discrepancy and inconsistency between its rhetoric and its lived reality, its illusion vis-à-vis its essence, particularly from the experience of people of the Global South

in general, but by Africans in particular. As such, this chapter intends to unmask the inadequacy of mainstream theories and lenses in explaining the ghosts and blind-spots of empire because these ghosts and blind-spots are born within the empire. The European-centric empire is not sufficiently able to be reflexive on its theories and to see beyond its assumptions and assertions. As such, this chapter suggests the need to explore outside the lenses of established theory.

The Masquerade of Colonialism in the Peripheries of the Eurocentric World

Throughout history, there have been different colonial establishments, for example the Spanish colonial order of Latin America (Grosfoguel 2000: 355); the Islamic colonial order of Africa (North Africa particularly), Asia and the USA (Kissinger 2014: 5), and the British colonial order of the whole world (Quijano 2000: 533; Grosfoguel 2000: 360). As far back as the seventeenth century, the Islamic civilisation and the European (Western) civilisation competed for dominance and each sought to define itself and the other, around itself. The two civilisations each thought of itself as a legitimate standard of ordering human society. Each civilisation imagined that all it knew and was conscious of, was all of humanity; imagining that by ordering its immediate locality, it was governing the entire world (Kissinger 2014: 4). In relation to these civilisations (Islamic and European) and their conceived or established orders of the world, Africa was afflicted and assailed by the European order of the world the most, which arguably has affected the whole world. Hence, the European colonisation of Africa is the most immediate one in the African experience. As such, colonialism, in this work, is to be understood as phenomena that affected Africa specifically. Physical colonialism in relation to Africa refers to the invasion and occupation of spaces and places in Africa, among other spaces/places, by European imperial powers that included, but were not limited to, Belgium, Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Portugal; from the 1800s (Pakenham 1992), to their departure from the late-1950s to the mid-1990s (Chamberlain 2010). European colonialism of Africa centred Europe to Africa's psyche, being, epistemology, religion, spirituality, the arts and imagination. The self-imposed centring of Europe in Africa through the violence of colonialism, and by extension, Europe's central positioning of itself to the whole world, reveals the attitude of Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism perceives itself as superior and therefore, has a right to order, control and name everything around it.

Eurocentrism

European modernity and empire tended to centre itself as a measure and standard with which everything else is judged. It centred itself as the focal point of all inquiry as well as the centre that contains all knowledge. By doing this, it negated the fact that

it was just one among other civilisations and orders of the world. European modernity pathologised anything else other than itself, or anything else that was different to it (Pillay 2018: 33). This resulted in Eurocentrism. Eurocentrism, in this sense, became the attitude of superiority of being, epistemology and the standard therefore, of being and epistemology. Hence, Eurocentrism in its epistemic enquiry, centred itself as a doyen of scientific enquiry and knowledge, thereby dismissing any other form of knowledge as opinion or perspective, but not knowledge, and therefore, as inferior. Eurocentric scientific enquiry gave rise to epistemological enterprises that produced current IR theories that centre Europe and its standards. Current IR theories cannot stand without Europe at the centre of their enquiry. This limits the lenses through which IR could be conceived and conducted and renders IR theories limited.

Theory and International Relations Theories

The very idea of theory is Eurocentric and compels some attention. Theorising and epistemic enterprises that emanated from the European civilisation regarded themselves as the standard and measure with which every other theorising or epistemic enterprising ought to refer to. This further entrenched Eurocentrism. Consequently, Eurocentrism justified and gave rise to European colonisation. If Europe was the standard with which all being and knowledge was to be modelled on, this then justified, and suggested to Europeans, that they ought to control and order the whole world. This was the onset of colonialism. Kissinger notes that the contemporary world order, which is Eurocentric and a creation of modernity, has attempted to circumscribe the anarchical structure in which international relations are conducted. It does so through international relations theories and international legal networks (international law), international organisational structures (chief among them is the United Nations), international financial systems such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank Group (WBG), these two endorse and sustain capitalism, and through establishing conflict/dispute-resolution mechanisms as well as codifying the conduct in war of warring parties, should war occur (Kissinger 2014: 7). In other words, there is an acceptance of the status quo in relation to the current world order, such that it is codified, legislated and institutionalised. But, why not abolish wars in the first place or stop the domination of one civilisation by another civilisation? The paradigm that presents war as an acceptable means of dispute-resolution is problematic because the solution to this paradigm is violence. One wonders therefore that, is the UN perpetuating coloniality of power in itself, or is the UN used as an instrument to perpetuate coloniality of power by the Euro-North American-centric modernity that has captured this institution for its own agenda of domination? Worse still, was there ever a time when the UN was not captured by the Euro-North American-centric modernity?

Colonialism

Colonialism resulted in the establishment of the European empire. Although one could also argue that empire actually invented or created colonialism. For the purposes of this argument, it suffices to note that the two are mutually defining and therefore could very well be the proverbial case of ‘egg and chicken’. Valentine Mudimbe, an African scholar, born and raised in the then Zaire, now the Democratic Republic of Congo, wrote a book, *The Invention of Africa*. In it, he submits that the term colonialism is derived from the Latin word *colere* which means to “cultivate or to design” (Mudimbe 1987: 1). Mudimbe notes that despite the noble meaning of the word *colere*, the experience of European colonialism in Africa is far from the semantics of the word. The lived experiences of colonialism by the colonised populations in general, but by Africans particularly, were dehumanising and often violent experiences. The experiences and encounters of colonialism in Africa, specifically in the perspectives and views of Africans, were of a condescending and imposed monolithic European culture and civilisation. This points to the ambivalent character of modernity contained in colonialism; its rhetoric means one thing and its lived reality, quite another, as evinced by Gould (2010: 112).

To better clarify this point, Mudimbe highlights two major myths about Africa by drawing the readers’ attention to Hodgkin (1957: 174–175), who identified the first myth as the Hobbesian picture which is informed by the writings and imagination of the English philosopher, Thomas Hobbes. The myth speaks of an Africa prior to European encounters, where “there was no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continued fear, and danger of violent death” (Quoted in Mudimbe 1987: 1). To Hodgkin’s credit, it could be argued that he was right as evidenced by reflections and thoughts of a Lord Macaulay, a British explorer and Member of Parliament who once visited India in the 1800s and made some very condescending remarks that nonetheless disproved this myth. While it can be argued that what Lord Macaulay stated was in relation to India, it is the attitude that Europeans embodied that is of merit in this case and is relatable to the European settlers’ attitudes in Africa. Lord Macaulay stated the following observations, while addressing the British Parliament on 2 February 1835:

I have travelled across the length and breadth of India and I have not seen one person who is a beggar, who is a thief, such wealth I have seen in this country, such high moral values, people of such calibre, that I do not think we could ever conquer this country, unless we break the very backbone of this nation, which is **her** spiritual and cultural heritage and therefore I propose that we replace **her** old and ancient education system, **her** culture, for if the Indians think that all that is foreign and English is good and greater than their own, they will lose their esteem, their Native culture and they will become what we want them, a truly dominated nation. (Ghosh 2016: 64)

Lord Macaulay’s statement speaks of an organised civilisation that existed in India prior to its encounters with European civilisation. Yet, European literature and discourse want to portray spaces and places it colonised as though they were tabula rasa, empty slates that got discovered and civilised by European modernity. Without doubt, Lord Macaulay’s observations expose the first myth of a civilisation

without any form of account of time and organisation or order. Further, his address reveals vacancy, ignorance, arrogance and misogyny of patriarchy that is located in the European-centric worldview, by referring to India as a gendered place. This work notes that Lord Macaulay used the pronoun *her* while referring to India, by that he demonstrated the inherent patriarchisation of the world by European civilisation and thought. His speech, to the British parliament, reveals how European thinking has always been geared towards the ascribing of the female gender to that which it considered inferior or weak, to the superior or strong male, such as India and Africa were, and still are, regarded by Europe. In protest to, and combat of, the patriarchisation of the world by the Euro-North American-centric civilisation's worldview, this chapter asserts that India and Africa particularly are places and spaces without gender; they should be referred to as "it" respectively (McFadden 2016).

The second myth that Hodgkin (1957: 174–75) draws the reader's attention to is the "Rousseauian picture", named after Jean Jacques Rousseau, the French philosopher. The Rousseauian picture speaks "of an African golden age of perfect liberty, equality and fraternity" (Quoted in Mudimbe 1987: 1). Lord Macaulay's address to the British Parliament again exposes the second myth. His beautiful and wonderful experience of India paints a picture of a golden age in a space undisturbed by European colonial encounters. His experience of India in the 1830s cannot have been representative of all of the experiences of India's localities of the time. If anything, it was Lord Macaulay's particular experience of India, and therefore cannot be equated to all of Indians' experiences of their localities. Meaning his reading or perception of India, glorious and flattering as it sounded, was limited to a particular local space or place in India. Yet he universalised and absolutised his experience of a particular locality of India, Bengali specifically, to represent all of India. So, deducing from Lord Macaulay's reading of India as a singular country, and not a continent, what is revealed by that assertion is the attitude of naming, and thus controlling the named, that is located in the Eurocentric civilisation. In relation to Africa, therefore, the point that Mudimbe succinctly makes is a call to exercise caution by avoiding an over-romanticising of experiences of African ecologies and localities before colonial encounters with Europe and also challenging and correcting the idea that Europe discovered Africa and that Africa was devoid of civilisation. Put differently, the second myth is that of thinking that Africa lived in harmony and perfect liberty before European colonial encounters. There may very well have been places in Africa that lived in harmony, but that cannot have been true of all of Africa at that time.

Mudimbe goes further to note that colonialists in Africa "tended to organise and transform non-European areas into fundamentally European constructs" (Mudimbe 1987: 1). Africa, as a non-European area, suffered the same fate of being forcefully transformed into a resemblance of Europe. It is also important to note that the two philosophers that Mudimbe draws the readers' attention to are Europeans; an English man and a French man. Both men had no lived experience of any ecology or locality of Africa, neither had they had any contact or encounters with Africans and yet they pronounced on Africa as authorities on Africa. This reveals the Eurocentric nature of epistemology and theory. African scholars such as Mudimbe have to make reference to Europe and its epistemology for them to make a point of to be understood,

almost as if to appeal for validation and approval. European colonialism entailed the “domination of physical space, the reformation of Native’s minds, and the integration of local economic histories into the Western perspective” (Mudimbe 1987: 2). This phenomenon is what Mudimbe identified and called the “organising structure” of European colonialism and domination (ibid.). The idea of the organising structure is what this work identifies as representative of coloniality. In other words, Mudimbe identifies that Eurocentrism tended to re-order and re-organise spaces and places they invaded to suite their European order. Eurocentrism negated the local orders of spaces and places they imposed themselves on.

Similarly, Ngũgĩ wa Thiongó, in his book, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* (1981), speaks of what he called the “organising principle” that European literature taught in African schools and universities in Africa in general, but in particular Kenya—wa Thiongó’s Native birth place. European literature, the likes of Shakespear, was used in Kenyan universities, as a standard with which all writings on experiences of Kenyan ecologies and localities were judged (wa Thiongó 1981: 94). European literature spoke of experiences located in the ecologies and localities of Europe and thus it made sense to Europeans. This imposition of European literature on Kenya meant that Natives were made to imbibe values, information and education that was foreign to them and often unrelatable to their experiences. In that process, their minds and psyche, as Natives of Africa, were captured by the minds and psyche of Natives of Europe. This Western-centred education taught Africans to order their lives, thoughts and subsequently, action around European thought and action (wa Thiongó 1981: 94). This intones coloniality and control of knowledge produced in African ecologies by foreign forces, in this case, European.

The organising principle that wa Thiongó speaks of is that of methods of inquiry, organisation and presentation of Kenyan literature according to European standards and ideals. This idea of the organising principle is what this work isolates as representative of coloniality. Whereas wa Thiongó’s idea of organising principle relates to literature, what is of value to this work is the very idea of transplanting theory that is particular to European reality to Africa and trying to get Africa to conform to European theory and standards. The centring of Europe in Africa is the gist of colonialism and, as such, problematic. This is one of the fault lines of European theorising in general, but equally a fault line of IR theorising as well, that it seeks to control all knowledge by centring itself in the enquiry. This produces no new knowledge or information; what Eurocentrism does is that it simply galvanises what could have been new knowledge to what it already knows.

Colonially Established Relationships

The other myth that came with colonisation is the natural acceptance of the hierarchical order of colonially established race relationships. If to colonise is to design as revealed in Mudimbe (1987: 1), then there must exist a designer, and by extension

the designed. Eurocentrism ascribes itself the position of designer, and it designs everything and everyone else around it. Europe claims to have discovered the world and therefore entitles itself to naming its discoveries. The discoverer implies the discovered. The designer is European, and the discoverer is European; this narrative reinforces Eurocentrism. The centring of Europe in the world is the beginning of coloniality.

The idea of coloniality, i.e. the rationale and ultimately, the reinforcement of colonialism, can be traced as far back as 1492; the year it is claimed Christopher Columbus discovered America (Otfinoski 2011: 2). Mamdani argues that the year 1492 signalled the beginning of European Renaissance and the nativity of political modernity (2004: 4). Columbus, an Italian explorer, was headed west on route to the West Indies, Asia for mercantile pursuits, that included gold and oriental spices, when he got lost and landed in the present-day vast area of the islands of Trinidad and Tobago, Porta Rico and Dominican Republic, in the territory under South America (Cohen 1969: 7). Columbus sailed for the “New World” as an emissary of the King, Ferdinand and Queen, Isabella, the conquerors of the City-State of Granada, which was perceived as the last Muslim citadel in the Western-centric Christian stronghold (Mamdani 2004: 4). When Columbus landed in America on 3 August 1492, he thought he had landed in the Indies (India), hence the erroneous ascribed reference of Native Americans as Indians (Cohen 1969: 9). One can deduce the arrogance that accompanies Columbus’ positionality. This same arrogant tendency accompanied many European voyagers and explorers who purported to discover the already existing ecologies and localities outside of Europe’s consciousness. For example, David Livingstone, a British explorer, maintained that he discovered the Victoria Falls between 1852 and 1865, one of the eight natural wonders of the world (Udeze 2009: 604). Natives of that ecology, located in present-day Zimbabwe, were aware of the gorge and called it *Mosi oa Tunya*, meaning the “smoke that thunders” referring to the mist and showers created as the water gushed down the more than 100-m-deep falls, for example (Udeze 2009: 604). Eurocentrism negates the existence of local orders and imposes itself in other spaces and places. This suggests that Eurocentric modernity cannot live with other civilisations in one and the same space/place at the same time. Competition is inherent in this civilisation. Hence, annihilation of the other is seen as progress, control and influence.

The very idea of discovering an already existing ecology or locality suggests the very problem of coloniality and, by extension, European modernity. This idea of discovering something centres the discoverer as the agency of consciousness over the discovered. One can only discover what is hidden, or one can discover what is not in one’s consciousness. Columbus’ position of discovering America negates the ontological being, agency and consciousness of the Natives of America who already were occupying that space when Columbus discovered it. That position totally negates and pathologises the existence of people in that so-called discovered space.

The colonisation of the Americas resulted in the colonised Natives assuming an inferior position to that of the White colonisers of British descent. This domination of Native Americans signalled the beginning of “legitimising the already old ideas and practices of relations of superiority/inferiority between dominant and dominated”

(Quijano 2000: 535). This relationship of the conquered and the conquerors produced social relations that were based on race and subsequently, class. The conquering race apportioned itself a superior status to that of the conquered. The Natives of America who were erroneously referred to as Indians occupied the bottom position in the hierarchy of the new world order. It is argued, therefore, that modernity ordered human society in a hierarchy where the White race occupies the top position in the hierarchy. The Europeans who had conquered the Natives of America—Indians—naturally assumed a position of subservience to Portuguese, Hispanics or Spanish and other white-looking races. Modernity is also credited for the creation of the capitalist system. The conquering race structured a new world order in such a manner that they controlled the means of production. The conquered race, Indians and *Mestizos* (children born of Spanish men and Indian women), were made to work as labour for the conquering race. From the onset of the colonisation of America, “Europeans associated non-paid or non-waged labour with the dominated races because they were ‘inferior’ races” (Quijano 2000: 538). Europe was centrally located to the sites of mercantile activity and hence Europe became the “central site of the commodification of the labour force” (ibid.).

Grosfoguel (2000: 349) submits that in Latin America, following the nineteenth-century revolutions of independence, White elites “maintained after independence racial hierarchy where Indians, Blacks, *Mestizos*, *Mulattoes* and other racially oppressed groups were located at the bottom”. Grosfoguel points the reader to Quijano (1993) who called this hierarchisation of races “coloniality of power” (2000: 349), and it is this hierarchical ordering of humanity that is of relevance to this chapter.

Partitioning of Africa: European Modernity’s Double-Standards

Another myth that festers and perpetuates modernity is the idea of accepting present-day Africa as an organic and natural occurrence. Europe is organised mainly along kinship ties, one speaks of the French who are located in France, the English or British who are located in England and or Britain, the Germans who are located in Germany, the Swedish who are located in Sweden and so forth. European modernity saw the value of maintaining kinship ties, and they formed states organically. Yet, Europe denied Africa the same kinship and organic structures by partitioned Africa according to European interests. The contemptuous partitioning of Africa by imperial powers (1885/6), followed by the “unjust wars of colonisation” of Africa, particularly (1890s onwards), disposed Africans—the rightful owners—of their land (Ramose 2003: 2). These two injustices—the distribution of Africa to European imperial powers and the colonial violent takeover of Africa by Europeans—were in direct contrast to the principles of sovereignty that Europe had recognised and adopted in 1648. Imperial conquests over Africa meant the loss of sovereignty of Africans, thereby

institutionalising European empire in Africa. What this also reveals is that sovereignty and universal human rights, including property rights, were never meant for the beneficitation of Africans. When these so-called principles were crafted and designed, they did not have in mind the African, as a part of humanity.

There is a consistent inconsistency of European modernity; at one point, it says one thing [state sovereignty that presumes equality of states, 1648] and at another point, it does the opposite [Africa is Europe's property and can be divided according to Europe's whims, 1885/6]. In other words, the rhetoric of European modernity is seemingly consistent; it is the reality or lived experience of modernity that is unequivocally inconsistent. For example, while Europe ascribed universal human rights including property rights to all of humanity, it by the same token denied those rights to non-Europeans and in particular, the Black African race. The dispossession of Africans of their land by Europeans signalled the expansion of European empire. Kissinger speaks of European expansion that came with the "blueprint of their [Europe's] international order" (Kissinger 2014: 6). What is of interest is the very idea of European expansion. The concept of expansion reveals the problematic nature of European domination of other civilisations. How does Europe expand, and into what? Expansion speaks of matter and space; how could Europe possibly expand? It is this expansion that controlled where Europe expanded into, how it expanded and subsequently how it sustained the expansion that resonates with the concept of coloniality. This is Eurocentrism par excellence.

Universal Human Rights

The other myth that is at the foundation of Eurocentrism and European modernity is the veneer of universal human rights. The so-called human rights are applicable and ascribed to everyone when it suits European modernity. The rights can be easily denied other races particularly the Black race when it is convenient for Europe. This epitomises Eurocentrism. Europe seemingly is the only civilisation that dictates what goes and for who it goes. In convergence with this notion, Ramose (2003: 2) speaks of an intrinsic link between land and human life. Life exists and is located somewhere; the attachment and location of human life to land are unquestionable. In other words, life is geographically located. The colonisation of Africa—"losing land to the conqueror"—therefore, was tantamount to losing a "vital source of life" for the Africans (Ramose 2003: 2). Hence, European colonial conquests not only entrenched its domination in foreign spaces and places, it literally killed and murdered other civilisations that occupied those spaces and places it invaded and conquered. So far, this work has noted the inconsistency of the lived experience and reality of European prescription of modernity to other civilisations. The inconsistency lies in that the rhetoric speaks of ideals presumably ascribed for, and on, everybody. The reality proves the rhetoric to be untrue.

The United Nations was created in 1945 following the so-called World War II, formed to liquidate and obliterate "international wars" (UN 2018). The irony is that

when the UN was formed, colonialism was at its peak in Africa. The formation of the UN, therefore, did not include Africa because it was just Europe's extension, if not property. In other words, Africa was forcibly incorporated into the international system without its involvement, consultation, consent and ascent. Not only was Africa forcibly incorporated into the international system, it was also forcibly incorporated into the capitalist market system (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 485). Ramose concurs with Ndlovu-Gatsheni's view and submits that Africa's loss of sovereignty meant that:

[T]he African was compelled to enter into the money economy. Having been thus rendered poor by the stroke of the pen backed by the use of armed force, the African was compelled to find money to assure not only individual survival but also to pay tax for owning a hut, for example. In this way, the African's right to life—the inalienable right to subsistence—was violated. (Ramosé 2003: 2)

The assumption of sovereign equality bequeathed on all states in the 1648 Westphalian Treaty, and the de-recognition of Africa as a sovereign space and place in 1886 by European imperial powers, and the re-incorporation of Africa in 1945 into the European international system, proves the consistent inconsistency and the absurdity of European modernity. Ramosé (2003: 2) asserts that human rights “revolve around the recognition, protection and respect of the right to life”. As such, the continual violation of human rights by the current world order is problematic and unjust, which renders the rhetoric of human rights meaningless to Africans. If the rhetoric about human rights is to arouse or evoke any meaning in Africans' experiences and consciousness, it must reinstate and rehabilitate materially and bestow recognition of, and uphold Africa's “inalienable right to subsistence” (Ramosé 2003: 2).

The UN, a perceived global authority that seeks to champion universal human rights by some states and actors, and if at all well-meaning, should it not then seek to revisit the colonial question for redress especially to victims of the greatest crime against humanity—colonialism? It cannot be that Africa's human rights continue to be trampled on and left unchallenged. Kissinger (2014: 7) draws the readers' attention to the current “world community” modelled on the European Concert of State which was formed as a result of the Westphalian Treaty of 1648. The modelling of the entire world on the European Concert of State is representative of Eurocentrism and the idea of coloniality.

In August 2001, the United Nations held a Conference on Racism in Durban, South Africa. At that Conference, the USA withdrew its delegation together with Israel, in protest of demands put by Africans that the rights of Africans particularly be recognised and that crimes against humanity committed by colonial masters be accounted for and recognised for what they are. Ramosé observed that:

The majority of the Western countries present at the conference insisted that the prevailing inhumanity of the global structural violence and poverty should be maintained. This they did by ensuring that the conference would adopt resolutions that would absolve them from both the moral and the legal guilt of the violence of colonisation and the inhumanity of racism. (2003: 3)

Accounting for colonial injustices would mean acknowledging the dispossession of Black people of their land, among other elements; a thorny issue that capitalism

cannot admit to, seeing that the dispossession was covered up by property rights—a fundamental principle of capitalism—and contained in a façade of legal documents including international law and National Constitutions of various countries. Colonialism and capitalism are thus protected by law, particularly the Roman Law and the Roman–Dutch Law. Needless to note that the Roman Law and the Dutch Law are European and naturally seek to entrench Eurocentrism.

Modernity and the Global Power Structural Configuration

A study of European history, especially the histories of Britain, France and Germany, reveals that the seventeenth-century Reformation, the Enlightenment period and the French Revolution are commensurate with what has come to be known as the beginning of the modern era (Escobar 2007: 181; Grosfoguel 2000: 348; Mamdani 2004: 4). In the words of Escobar (2007: 181), “historically modernity has identifiable temporal and spatial origins in seventeenth-century Northern Europe”. Modernity is the corollary of colonialism because the former was scattered across the world through the latter. Hence, a discussion of one necessitates the interrogation of the other. The problem with colonialism is that, while it could be argued that, in Africa, it ended when European countries embarked on decolonisation in the 1960s, it was survived by coloniality. In the same fashion as modernity outlived the modern era, coloniality outlived colonialism as it produced, among other things, patterns of thought, being, culture, epistemology and consciousness modelled on European thought and standard. As such, Ndlovu-Gatsheni correctly argues that:

[T]he problem is not colonialism, [today], but coloniality, which emerged from colonialism and has assumed global proportions to the extent of being best understood as global coloniality. This global coloniality is a leitmotif of the current existing empire, that of the United States of America. (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013: viii)

This chapter acknowledges Ndlovu-Gatsheni's position that noted that coloniality emerged from colonialism. However, this chapter makes further observations and departs from that position, and advances the argument that coloniality preceded colonialism. In other words, this work asserts that, it is coloniality that produced colonialism. Colonialism was informed by some rationale—coloniality. What Ndlovu-Gatsheni's position reveals is that had it not been for colonialism, anyone outside the positionality of Euro-North America-centric modernity, would have not been aware of coloniality. Borrowing from Nyere (2015: 95), an analogy can help put this point across succinctly. If one is in a house or room, one cannot see the car parked outside unless they look through the window. Yet the car would be there in spite of one who is not aware of its presence. Put differently, the glass window (colonialism) allows one who is in the house (peripheries of modernity) to see the parked car outside (coloniality).

According to Quijano (2000: 533), modernity can be specifically traced to the constitution of America. America was constitutionally founded on 4 July 1776, by

a Europe-based religious order, the Puritan Order who are known as the “Founding Fathers” of America. America’s founding was based on Christian principles. So, Britain was an instrumental signatory to the US Declaration of Independence of July, signalling the beginning of the colonisation of America (Lambert 2003: 2). What is noteworthy is that America, unlike Africa, was colonised by negotiation. The founding (a fancy word meaning colonisation) of America by Europeans resulted in the current global power structural configuration. Quijano avers that “America was constituted as the first space/time of a new model of power of global vocation, and both in this way and by it became the first identity of modernity” (Quijano 2000: 533). Grosfoguel concurs and submits that by the nineteenth century, Great Britain had positioned itself as the central power and the prototype of ‘modern’ civilisation. He argues that in “the nineteenth century, Great Britain had become the new core power and new model of civilisation” (Grosfoguel 2000: 349). Kissinger equally evinces the centrality of Europe to modernity and submits that “Europe loomed as a geographic designation, as an expression of Christianity, ... centre of enlightenment of a community of the educated and of modernity” (Kissinger 2014: 11). Hence, Europe purports itself as the centre of civilisation, knowledge and geopolitical power.

Modernity is clouded with, and equally credited for, the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’ wars and violence. Mamdani (2004: 3) argues that the “world wars and colonial conquests; civil wars, revolutions and counterrevolutions” attest to that. Modernity is violent and is tolerant of violence because it sees violence as a necessary means to progress. Mamdani (2004: 4) observes that “the modern sensibility is not horrified by pervasive violence”. Implying that, modernity is accepting of violence and it reinforces it in its operationalisation of the developmentalist agenda.

The modern era’s conception evolved and resulted in the production of patterns and soft-structures that predetermine, control and regulate being and epistemology modelled on European thought and standards. Those patterns and soft-structures that continue and perpetuate the dictates of seventeenth-century European culture and thought are what identifies modernity. The main idea that came with modernity is an implied “idea that everything new is necessarily good and desirable” (Grosfoguel 2000: 348). This idea of esteeming anything new was mistakenly believed to represent progress and development.

Escobar further defines modernity from a sociological perspective and asserts that modernity is “credited with the creation of modern institutions such as the nation-state and basic features such as self-reflexivity” (Escobar 2007: 182). The concept of nation-state is modelled on the European Concert of State, which is still the prototype of statehood to date. Habermas (1973; 1987 quoted in Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013: vii) avers that from a cultural perspective, modernity is accredited for the “substitution of folk-knowledge by expert and techno-scientific knowledge”. To its credit, modernity valued literature—the written word—and the advantage of that is it is better kept and preserved, almost in its original state. Of course, the written word can always be interpreted and re-interpreted. The problem with modernity is that in its quest for ‘scientific knowledge’, it negated orature—the spoken word—a value and practice that is ancient and sacred in African ecologies and localities. Modernity

substituted orature for literature in African ecologies and localities particularly, and relegated orature to 'folklore' or 'folk-knowledge' (Zondi 2017). Modernity is further accredited with the creation of the "Cartesian subject as the fountain of all knowledge about the world" from a philosophical perspective (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013: vii).

In affirmation of the aforementioned views, Biakolo (2003: 14) advances the argument that "Western civilisation owes its origin to writing". The invention of the alphabet by the Greeks proved to be an unprecedented catalyst to the organising and storage of information and subsequently knowledge production. The point that Biakolo makes is that the archival and retrieval of information in Western civilisation meant that access to knowledge and information was unrestricted, save for those that were illiterate perhaps, whereas in oral traditions such as most cultures in Africa, "the poets, sages, and thinkers depend on poetic rhythm and narrative structure to ensure the remembrance of past utterances" (Biakolo 2003: 15). Admittedly, memory may not always accurately preserve the details of phenomena as it happened and this could be correctly argued to have been somewhat cumbersome. Information and knowledge storage and retrieval that depended on memory was not always accurate in the oral traditions and so remembering alone sets the limitation to knowledge production in oral cultures. The inscribing of information and knowledge on manuscripts—the art of writing—made for easier "storage and retrieval of knowledge" (Havelock 1963 quoted in Biakolo 2003: 14–15). Kissinger converges with Biakolo's (2003) assertions and notes that, fifteenth-century Europe saw the "invention of movable type printing ... [which] made it possible to share knowledge on a hitherto – unimaginable scale" (Kissinger 2014: 19). This speaks to the lever of control of knowledge and subjectivity that the industrialisation of knowledge production came with, mass printing that allowed the dissemination of accounts and views from a Eurocentric perspective (*ibid.*).

Biakolo (2003) evinces Kissinger's (2014) view, while noting that the change in the presentation of knowledge, that is, the mass printing of writings and accounts, resulted in the "dominance of discourses that were more and more definitional, descriptive, and analytical" (Biakolo 2003: 15). What remains is that, whatever description or qualifier that the accounts were ascribed, they were written from the perspectives of their writers, which essentially were European. Hence the Eurocentric domination in literature, and "the origin of Western science and philosophy" (*ibid.*). Havelock (1991: 24 quoted in Biakolo 2003: 15) argues that "without modern literacy, which means Greek literacy, we would not have science, philosophy, written law, nor the automobile or the airplane". Havelock's view is problematic because it assumes that if something is not written down, it does not exist or will never exist. Yet, writing down ideas presumes their existence in the first place.

Biakolo (2003: 15) is of the view that the cultural invention of print media by Europe became its currency of its domination of literature. He argues that "the transformation of the mode of codification and structuration of knowledge led to a cultural regimen which placed greater premium on innovativeness, inventiveness, and objectivity" (*ibid.*). Biakolo further highlights that the narratives that came from this cultural regimen of literature tended to be "analytic, syllogistic, and definitional, and their immediate context of production is generally privatist", whereas oral cultures

took the form of a traditionalist and conservative outlook (Biakolo 2003: 15). The accumulation of knowledge in the oral cultures entailed a participatory and pragmatic realm where its members interiorised communal knowledge (*ibid.*). This is arguably the bone of contention between ontology and epistemology; the Western civilisation tended to separate the episteme from the ontology of the knowing subject. This does not give the literature tradition superiority over the oral African ecologies and localities that valued the participatory and practical accumulation of communal knowledge. Communal knowledge is valued in African ecologies and localities, and the Western civilisation espoused a privatist episteme. It is a matter of difference of modes of accumulating knowledge and information, rather than superiority and inferiority of one mode over another.

The knowledge that is valued by modernity is that which it considers scientific—abstract, objective, rational, logical and syllogistic. As evinced by Grosfoguel (2000: 348), modernity valued scientific knowledge over religious knowledge, thereby peripherising religion and its values and virtues. Grosfoguel's observation highlights an implied attitude by Western 'scientific' knowledge's conception. It implies that if knowledge is primitive, it is illogical, irrational and unscientific. Western knowledge, therefore, puts itself as the standard by which all other forms of knowledge are judged. It gives the illusion that only it is valid and true. However, Biakolo (2003) reveals that, despite what Western modern knowledge wants to purports, it is only just but a façade. He argues that the so-called primitive thought is at worst "rational but illogical and not scientific", or at best primitive thought is "rational and logical and scientific within its own cultural context" (Biakolo 2003: 18). What Biakolo manages to succinctly reveal is that Western knowledge purports itself as objective, yet in actual fact, it is subjective to its own cultural context.

Therefore, from the subaltern perspective, what Western modern science calls 'primitive thought' is in fact rational and logical in the oral traditions' view; very much in the same fashion as 'science' is to the literary traditions. If Western modern 'scientific' thought seeks order, unity, regularity underneath the seeming diversity, and simplicity, the African oral traditional thought "also seeks this through the structure of the pantheon and the categorial relations of its spiritual forces" (Biakolo 2003: 18). This means that, just as Western modern scientific methods, the African oral traditions seek to explain causal connections between phenomena, for example between "dis-ease states and social conduct" (*ibid.*). Western modernity expressly names one thing and ascribes particularly meaning to the named thing; and by the same token implies the opposite to that which it views as opposite to the named thing. For example, the description of one society as civilised implies that the opposite is savagery; or, framing an argument or writing as logical implies the illogical of the other. Now, in relation to Africa particularly, the written tradition's opposite is oral, and the scientific's opposite is magical (Biakolo 2003: 20). In the conception of Western modernity, one cannot live or survive as one and the other, it is always an either, or, scenario. Modernity always distinguishes between being and non-being and never being together with 'non-being'. This is yet another of modernity's myths.

The Irrationality of Modernity's 'Rationality'

The Enlightenment period (eighteenth-century Europe) emphasised rationality. Aristotle argued that “man (*sic*) is a rational animal” (Quoted in Ramose 2001: 2). In the words of Ramose, this means that “those animals whose being or nature includes reason as their distinctive characteristic fall within his definition” (ibid.). Rationality, therefore, sets apart man (*sic*) from animal. Suffice to note that this definition of “man (*sic*)” as a ‘rational animal’ is proffered by a Greek, and therefore White European man who, unwittingly, entrenches Eurocentrism. Ramose interprets Aristotle’s definition of man (*sic*) to mean that “any other animal which might look like a human being but be without reason does not qualify as a human being” (Ramose 2001: 2). Non-human beings are defined by lack and therefore precast as victims of the human beings because they are disadvantaged and without reason. Ramose highlights that the demarcation between reason and unreason “established the nature of the relationship between those inside and those outside the line of reason” (Ramose 2001: 2). This is similar to the “Abysmal lines” that Maldonado-Torres (2002: 998) speaks about. They are imaginary lines such as the line of Capricorn or the Equator. They represent false demarcations that are socially constructed and are only a reality to those conscious of them. Eurocentrism thrives on imaginary lines that do not really exist ontologically.

Aristotle’s legacy or tradition is what informed European conquerors of Africa, this European-centric definition of humanity excluded animals without reason (Ramose 2001: 2). The definition of man (*sic*) as a rational animal proffered by Aristotle excluded the African, among others. The conundrum of this definition lies in that the conqueror applied it religiously when they came into contact with the “African, the Amerindian and the Australasian” (Ramose 2001: 2). This speaks of a Eurocentric definition of humanity that is limited to a geographical location of the Northern Hemisphere; any other human being not located in the geography of Europe is deemed to be with “unreason” or without reason (ibid.). This is a myth that is based on imaginary lines that demarcates humanity from non-humanity. Geography then becomes manipulated to make believe that the imaginary demarcations of humanity from non-humanity are actually real. The manipulation of imaginary demarcation lines is aimed at furthering the myth that Europe embodies humanity and that anything else that exists outside Europe is of a lesser ontological value and could be used and manipulated by humanity located in Europe.

The exclusion of the African, and other non-European races, in Aristotle’s definition of man (*sic*) as a rational animal, gave grounding for treating the African “only as an animal” (Ramose 2001: 2). This definition provided justification, therefore, for the enslavement and subjugation of Africans among other non-European races, as it was in the African’s nature to be without reason. If unreason defined the African, what would be the reason to not conquer the African? In this line of thought, it was “necessary and proper” for the conqueror to subjugate the African; after all, this was contingent upon the practical application of Descartes’ “I think therefore, I exist”, only it practically meant “I think therefore, I conquer” (Ramose 2001: 3). This is

the very problematic fabric of thought that justified, and continues to perpetuate, coloniality of power. Ramose quips therefore that it is of no surprise that European conquests of Africa, and the slave trade particularly, are conspicuous features that defined the asymmetrical relationship between the conquering Europeans from the West and Africans, but specifically Africans from sub-Saharan Africa (Ramose 2001: 2–3). Even the imaginary demarcation of sub-Saharan Africa exists only in mind and not in reality. Material power is then used to perpetuate the framing of conditions that exist in the so-called sub-Saharan Africa.

In the European conquerors' framework, civilisation was possible only in so far as the agent of progress, or the recipient of progress, was capable of rationality. Since Africans were equated to animals without reason, they were deemed incapable of progress. The incapability to progress meant that Africans could not attain civilisation to the European standard or to the satisfaction of the European. Ramose adds that "this line between civilisation and barbarism was an extension of the boundary between reason and unreason" (Ramose 2001: 3). Europeans' self-claim to the exclusive possession of civilisation was contingent upon a belief that they were superior or possessed superior civilisation to that of the African or any other non-European civilisation. As such, they encountered non-Europeans, particularly Africans, with a predetermined attitude that negated, belittled and inferiorised non-Europeans. Hence, the European conqueror thought of himself and herself as civilised and the African as barbaric, with the latter's rights, competences and obligations predetermined by the former (Ramose 2001: 3).

The European conqueror thus determined and established a gulf between civility of the self and barbarity of the other, and thus, between superiority in the self and inferiority in the other. The othering of others was thus established and secured. This imaginary chasm meant that the relationship between the European conqueror and the conquered African was devoid of reciprocity. It was a unilateral relationship where "the African had only obligations towards the conqueror but no rights" (Ramose 2001: 3). This could be argued as the genesis of hierarchisation of human beings according to race, reason and civilisation according to a particular European-centric standard projected as universal in Africa. This is the crux of coloniality of power, the ordering and organising of all civilisations according to a particular, Eurocentric standard. The very idea of centring Europe in the development of every civilisation speaks of Europe's insatiable thirst of controlling humanity.

The Façade of Modernity

America was the first space to have been colonised by Britain and turned out to be the prototype of modernity and the new world order. It follows then that Britain, located in Europe, has become the centre of the world; hence, this chapter's assertion that the current world order reflects a Euro-North American-centric conception. Kissinger submits that America idealises and projects itself as a "city on a hill"; America thinks of itself as an ideal possessing values that are universally applica-

ble and relevant (Kissinger 2014: 16). To evince this observation, in 1961 the then American President Harry S. Truman in response to Kissinger's question on "what in his presidency had made him most proud", quipped, how Americans had entirely annihilated their nemeses and in turn brought their former enemies to the "community of states" (Kissinger 2014: 1). American Presidents have over the years urged other governments to accept the conservation and consolidation of universal human rights (Kissinger 2014: 2). Yet, while making that call to the world, the USA at that time was simultaneously embarking on what it called the "role back strategy" that was meant to fester destruction in the Soviet system. Does it mean then the so-called universal human rights were not applicable to the Soviet Union? This reveals the double-standards embedded in the Euro-North American-centric civilisation and modernity. This further reveals the centrality of Europe to humanity. Eurocentrism perpetuates the myth that only in Europe is located humanity and therefore, human rights apply to where humanity is located, Europe.

The destruction of the Soviet system was to compel the Soviet Union to renegotiate a settlement on America's terms (Chomsky 2011: 10). America had the upper hand in the negotiation. Besides the unmatched economic and military power of America, it enjoyed a perceived legitimacy in the negotiation owing to the mass media and propaganda machinery that propped America up as a legitimate party to the negotiations. At the time of the end of World War II, 1945, America had 50% of the world's wealth, yet its population was a mere 6.3% of the world's population (Chomsky 2011: 11). This statistic speaks of an uneven and asymmetric economic and power balance when America is compared to the rest of the world. Making America an empire as such, and will do anything to maintain that status quo as evinced by this declaration from the National Security Council (henceforward NSC) Document 68 attributed to an US Planner of post-world war strategy, George Kennan, 1948:

Our real task in the coming period is to devise a pattern of relationships which will permit us to maintain this position of disparity... We should cease to talk about vague and unreal objectives such as human rights, the raising of the living standards and democratisation... The day is not far when we are going to deal in straight power concepts. The less we are then hampered by idealist slogans, the better. (Chomsky 2011: 12)

The problematic nature of Euro-North American-centric modernity is that it condemns one thing, in this instance, and does the same thing, in the next. For example, the Central Intelligence Agency's (CIA) core objective is to conduct secret activities that are not in line with legal norms for the US' executive branch. The executive does not want these secret activities to be known, as they are potentially disastrous to their reputation, popularity and acceptance from the general public. What this reveals is that, contrary to populist propaganda of the USA, within its government machinery, the USA notably goes against democratic principles (Chomsky 2011: 162).

At the height of the Cold War, America was devising a plan that sought to dominate what was to be a 'new world order'. The plan was called the "Grand Arena" (Chomsky 2011: 13). The Grand Arena plan included:

[T]he Western Hemisphere, Western Europe, the Far East, the former British Empire (which was being dismantled [through Britain's decolonisation]), the incomparable energy resources

of the Middle East (which were then passing into American hands as we pushed out our rivals France and Britain), the rest of the Third World and, if possible, the entire globe. These plans were implemented as, as opportunities allowed (*ibid.*).

The Grand Arena entailed that every part of the world, meaning every geo-locale in the new world order, was allocated a particular purpose. The industrialised or developed countries—developed on the basis of unpaid labour provided by the Black race particularly, but by non-European races generally—were to be led by Germany and Japan, the so-called great workshops (Chomsky 2011: 13). Germany and Japan were revered as the great workshops following their show of military superiority during the Cold War, this bearing testimony to the Euro-North American-centric civilisation's esteem of war; violence is used as a tool that brings honour and prestige. The two great workshops were to work “under US supervision” (*ibid.*).

The Northern and Western Hemisphere were placed at the apex of the hierarchy of this new world order, with the rest of the world—labelled as “the Third World”, at the very bottom and peripheries of the Euro-North American-centric civilisation's world order. The periphery was meant to meet its primary function of providing labour, raw materials and the consumer market of finished products. The periphery was meant to be “exploited” to the benefit of Europe and Japan (Kennan quoted in Chomsky 2011: 13). Kennan worked as a US State Department Official in 1949, and is credited to have drafted the memo that exposed the US's plans (*ibid.*). It can be deduced from Chomsky's analysis that the USA, as the architect of the “Grand Arena”, determined and controlled who did what, when and how, the ‘why’ rested with the USA itself. This speaks to coloniality of power at a global level; hence, this chapter's assertion that the Euro-North America-centric modernity continuously pursues global coloniality. Anything or anyone that stands antithetical to this new world order becomes a threat that is violently dealt with. Saddam Hussein of Iraq, Thomas Sankara of Burkina Faso, Patrice Lumumba of the Congo, and Muammar Gaddafi of Libya are cases in point. The common element that the aforementioned figures shared is their locality in the peripheries of the Euro-North American-centric civilisation.

Modernity's Creation of Zone of Being and Zone of Non-being

In the Euro-North America-centric worldview, the accident of geography is esteemed more than the essence of humanity. There is more value placed on the geography of where human beings originate from, than the actual humanity. This worldview perceives two distinct zones; zone of being and the zone of non-being based on the exclusion that emanates from geography and subsequently, race. Kissinger highlights the fact that, despite the global power structural configuration that was created and is perpetuated by the Euro-North American-centric global domination, it is in fact a European accident that was realised and now purports itself as an essence;

the realisation was, and is, maintained by force and aggression. He argues that the “international relations” of the 1490s were a mere European regional undertaking which was to be globalised through the violence of colonialism (Kissinger 2014: 18).

The Euro-North American-centric new world order was born out of imagination. The socially constructed borders of what determined humanity and non-humanity were realised by force and are consistently consolidated by either the use of aggression or the threat thereof. The demarcation is not only imaginary, it was materialised. Ramose (2001: 5) submits that the “amity lines” that enveloped the Euro-North American-centric civilisation while isolating the rest of the “overseas zone” were geographically located “along the equator or the Tropic of Cancer in the South, along a degree of longitude drawn in the Atlantic Ocean through the Canary Islands or the Azores in the west, or a combination of both”. This demarcation, that separated the Western Meridian from the Azores, was to not be shifted under whatsoever circumstances.

In other words, this Western Meridian separated the Western Hemisphere and the overseas zone signalling the end of Europe and the geography that existed beyond the “amity line” signalled the beginning of the “New World” (Ramose 2001: 5). The overseas zone was not governed by Europe and hence no law applied there, except for the “laws of the stronger”; this meant civility was curtailed to exist only in the Western Meridian, beyond that lay a territory of barbarity. Kissinger (2014: 18) quips that as far back as 1550–1551, King Charles the V, a Christian, summoned a council of theologians for deliberations and that council concluded that “people living in the Western Hemisphere were human beings with souls—hence eligible for salvation”. That pronouncement implied that people who lived beyond the Western Hemisphere were therefore, non-human beings and without souls. In fact, that conclusion justified “conquest and conversion” (Kissinger 2014: 19). This then speaks to the audacity with which Europeans imposed their religion, even forcefully at times, on people in spaces and places they colonised and conquered. Coloniality of power was henceforth geographically and asymmetrically constituted in favour of the Western Hemisphere. This was the creation of the European-centric “zone of being” and the “hellish zone of non-being” for non-Europeans, but Africans particularly.

What is noteworthy of the amity lines is that, unlike the “*Rayas*” lines, they represented a zone that was subject to conflicting interests arising between a duo of “contractual parties” that sought to seize land and commandeer the inhabitants of that land. The conflicting parties only shared consensus on the “freedom of the open spaces that began beyond the line” (Ramose 2001: 5). This speaks of the condescending attitude that engulfs the Euro-North American-centric civilisation. It ascribes humanity to itself and, beyond the geography of what it knows and the proximity to it, denies *other* humans of their humanity. The interaction between the conflicting parties in the zone of being are amicably resolved through a contract, and beyond the zone of being, the barrel of the gun, aggression and violence become the order of the day—the “hellish zone of non-being”.

In the ‘hellish zone of non-being’, “force could be used freely and ruthlessly” because there existed no humanity in those spaces and places (Ramose 2001: 5). This meant that anything that happened outside the Euro-North American-centric

world did not have legal merit nor consequence and had no moral or political merit. Hence, John Tully's observation that "there is no sin beyond the equator" (2011: 85). Sins and transgression are only committed in the zone of being, where civility, legality, morality and reciprocity are located and enforceable. In the hellish zone of non-being, chaos, pandemonium and disorder are the norm. To this effect, Mamdani (2004: 4) argues that "when violence does not cross the boundary between 'the west' and the rest—it is called 'communal conflict', as in South Asia, or 'ethnic conflict', as in Africa" (Mamdani 2004: 4).

Chossudovsky (2015) evinces what he terms the "hegemonic project" of the "globalisation of war" by the USA. He submits that there are major US-sponsored military and undercover intelligence operations that are run concurrently in regions such as, but not limited to, the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, Eastern Europe, the Far East and Central Asia. These covert operations are designed to destabilise sovereign states, particularly those states that defy the global power structural configuration of the Euro-North American-centric world view. The USA and its allies, Western Europe, do this to consolidate its grip on the control of the 'new world order', and by so doing, continuously defines and sustains global coloniality through the control of colonial power matrices—coloniality of power.

Coloniality as a Framework for Theorising Africa

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013: 7) defines coloniality as the "dark side of modernity" that has been consistently packaged to camouflage the inconsistency and discrepancy between the rhetoric of modernity and the lived experience thereof. While modernity esteems values of democracy, human rights, progress and development, the implementation of these values is often violent and disastrous when outside the Western Hemisphere—the Euro-North American-centric space and geography. One wonders if this rhetoric of the universal human rights covers spaces and places outside Europe and North America—the epitome of the Western world.

Coloniality is therefore the rationale that gives rise and justifies colonialism. Coloniality is the software of colonialism; the latter being the physical and violent conquering of a people/civilisation by another, arising from the former. Coloniality could also be understood as the after-effects of colonialism; it refers to "long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism" (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 487).

The concept of coloniality of power is a particular strand that lies within the broader decolonial theory; it is informed and attributed to Peruvian national and Professor of Sociology Anibal Quijano who identified four levers of coloniality. The first is "control of the economy". The second is "control of authority". The third is "control of gender and sexuality". The fourth is "control of knowledge and subjectivity" (quoted in Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2015: 487). Mignolo (2001: 424) submits that, it is the "colonial experiences" that "outlived decolonisation" and thereby continue to provide a template of thought and action that reproduces colonial-like forms that

is problematic; and these patterns or structures constitute coloniality of power. The patterns that emerged as a result of colonialism and continue to fester and consolidate modern empire and its operations are constitutive of coloniality of power.

At the centre of control is power, hence the concept of coloniality of power. "As the centre of global capitalism, Europe not only had control of the world market, but it was also able to impose its colonial dominance over all the regions and populations of the planet, incorporating them into its world-system and its specific model of power" (Mignolo 2001: 424). It is this concept of coloniality of power that this study will appropriate in analysing the application of Right to Protect (R2P) in the NATO invasion of Libya in 2011 mindful that this study seeks to establish and determine whether or not, the Libyan invasion was linked to the dynamics of coloniality of power. According to Quijano (quoted in Grosfoguel 2000: 368), coloniality of power is the classification of people through "historical process of colonial/racial domination".

Coloniality of power is manifested especially after the independence of former colonised countries in the form of the continuation of "control of economic, cultural, and political structures of society" (Quijano 1993 quoted in Grosfoguel 2000: 368). Grosfoguel adds that the continuation of "power relations from colonial to postcolonial times allowed the white elites to classify populations and to exclude people of colour from categories of full citizenship in the imagined community called the 'nation'" (2000: 368). Civil liberties, rights and privileges of citizenship were never truly extended to colonial subjects such as Blacks, Indians, *Mulattoes* and *Mestizos*. The control of the internal grouping of populations by colonialism is the perpetuation of colonialism in *abstentia*. This is the essence of coloniality of power.

Kissinger (2014: 2-3) echoes what Mignolo (2001) observed that coloniality of power is represented by the long-standing patterns that emerged as a result of colonialism; he argues that "what passes for order in our time was devised in Western Europe nearly four centuries ago, at a peace conference in the German region of Westphalia, conducted without the involvement or even the awareness of most other continents or civilisations", such as Africa. Yet, the so-called world wars involved Africans as foot soldiers who were used as proxies of the global powers. They required of Africa cheap (military) labour for the industrialised and capitalist world. South Africa, under the apartheid regime, sent its contingent comprising of more than 600 Black men who were to perish at sea when their ship, the *SS Mendi* sunk on route to participating in World War I on 21 February 1918, yet South Africa, as part of Africa,¹ had nothing to do with World War I, for example (South African Navy 2014).

Europe is unquestionably the originator and epicentre of the crafting of colonial conditions that were to be "approximated" globally to what is now understood as the contemporary world order. In other words, a particular, subjective, shallow

¹Admittedly, South Africa under the apartheid regime did not identify with Africa's quest for decolonisation and political freedom of the Black race particularly; this could very well explain its participation in World War I and its insistence of sending Black men to war for its self-serving interests probably as sacrificial lambs.

and narrow perspective, and to use Kissinger's words, "an accident" of Europe's imagination of order "became the hallmarks of a new system of international order" (Kissinger 2014: 3). This is essentially where coloniality of power lies, in Europe's accident that "shaped and prefigured the modern" times of Europe into a universally pertinent structure (ibid.: 4). It is this universally/globally appurtenant structure that determines the global power structural configuration. It is prefigured and can only be re-configured by the originator—Europe and its allies, particularly the USA and much of the Western world. Europe's allies often endorse and never are opposed to this global power structural configuration that is inherently asymmetrical in favour of the Euro-North American-centric alliance' perspective. Anyone/entity that dare oppose the global power structural configuration is dealt with violently, including death, as was President Muammar Gaddafi. This makes Europe an empire. In other words, Europe's accident was scattered across the globe in an intentional and malicious manner that sought to expand Europe's influence and territory.

Contemporary global society is ordered around the patterns that emerged from British colonialism of America and the rest of the world. America, hence, became the prototype of a colonial state. Kissinger (2014: 6) points out that "in time, the US would become the indispensable defender of the order Europe designed". The USA will defend the system that Europe designed because it was included in the prefiguring of the global power structural configuration based on the imagined superiority of race, and hence races were ordered hierarchically with the White race occupying the apex of the hierarchy. The influence that Britain and America have in the contemporary world order is unparalleled. The Euro-North American-centric orientation is thus monolithic and imposing. Today's society is dominated by Europe and North America as the two protagonists of the current world order or the global power structural configuration.

Kissinger further reveals that "in the American view of world order, peace and balance would occur naturally, and ancient enmities would be set aside – once other nations were given the same principles say in their own governance that Americans had in theirs" (Kissinger 2014: 6). But, who are 'they' that give other nations those so-called American principles? What Kissinger reveals here is that America sees itself as part of the design team of the global world order. It too, is above the world system as it is the designer of the current world order. The Euro-North American-centric modernity hence is supra the global power structural configuration because it prefigured it. It cannot be that the designer of a thing will be governed by the same rules that govern the designed thing.

In 1648, the doctrine of sovereignty was officially codified and conferred sovereign rights and autonomy to all states. All states were to be treated as equal in authority as sovereigns in their domains and in relation to other sovereigns, regardless of economic stature or arsenal power. Yet in 1815–1886, this sovereignty was denied to Africa. Kissinger intones the double-standards of Europe in the haphazard and spurious application of the principle of sovereignty; he argues that "they [Europeans] often neglected to apply concepts of sovereignty to the colonies and colonised peoples" (Kissinger 2014: 6). Since the current global power structural configuration was an idea of Europe, it is only the Euro-North American-centric modernity that can

reconfigure the design because this modernity is outside the design. To evince this assertion, it is argued that “Europe has set out to depart from the state-system itself designed and to transcend it through a concept of pooled sovereignty” (Kissinger 2014:7). The European Union (EU) is the case in point; ironically, Gaddafi was calling for a United Africa (UA) at the time of his assassination.

Admittedly, the utility value of these institutions (EU, AU, UN, etc.) lies in that they have potency to provide an even-handed and impartial framework for the engagement of a diverse community of states, if handled fairly, justly and with symmetrical influence of the involved parties (Kissinger 2014: 7). The current global power structural configuration was an invention of Europe, and as the architect of this system of world governance, Europe championed the “balance of power concept” with itself as the author and adjudicator of that system (Kissinger 2004: 7). This reveals the genesis of the asymmetrical power configuration in this ‘new world order’ system. This means that the rationale of colonialism is coloniality. Coloniality propelled the Europeans to conquer other civilisations in order to impose their sense of order on every ‘other’ civilisation.

The Westphalian Peace Treaty was signed in 1648, indicating the official codification of the doctrine of state sovereignty. The Berlin West Africa Conference, known for the slogan ‘Scramble for Africa’ occurred in 1885–1887 (Iliffe 1979; Pakenham 1992; Chamberlain 2010). The Versailles Treaty was signed in 1919 signalling the end of World War I (Kissinger 2014: 24) demonstrating the European double-standards and asymmetrical power relations. This also speaks of the inconsistencies of European modernity. The double-standards applied by Europe in its interactions with the rest of the world are conspicuous. Another example of this is that the same European-centric worldview developed international law. International law entailed that “if a state would accept these basic requirements, it could be recognised as an international citizen able to maintain its own culture, politics, religion and internal policies, shielded by the international system from outside intervention” (Kissinger 2014: 27).

Europe as the self-appointed architect, arbiter and adjudicator of states’ behaviours considered international law “as an expandable body of agreed doctrine aimed at the cultivation of harmony, with the Westphalian treaties themselves at its heart” (Kissinger 2014: 27). It can be deduced, therefore, that international law was designed for Europe and had only Europe at the centre of its creation and intended application, which then explains why international law was not upheld at the Berlin West Africa Conference, Africa was partitioned to the whims of European imperial powers without any consequence. This renders international law whim some as it is selectively applied, revealing the impunity of international law.

International law speaks of recognition as the precondition for the acceptance of a state in the fold of the international community of states. It consequently speaks of being shielded and protected from external intervention. Recognised by who? Shielded from who? This is problematic for the African polity. How can an imposed order maintain a culture, politics and internal processes of African ecologies and localities, when an outside imposition has already been put? If a state does not accept or conform, it is not protected from outside intervention. Is this not colo-

nality of power at its highest expression? Europe is the recogniser of states and therefore the guarantor of political independence of states; Europe is the power that recognises states, protects states and policies states into conformity and order. The European civilisation is the ordering state, from which all order is derived. Such is the control that Europe has on the current global power structural configuration. This undoubtedly makes Europe an Empire.

A British Statesman, Lord Palmston, once quipped that “our interests are eternal and perpetual, and those interests it is our duty to follow” (quoted in Kissinger 2014: 29–30). Europe prescribes what order is and what it is not, if a state conforms to the prescribed order it is insulated from Europe’s wrath, but a deviant state is meted with violence. The problem with the order of Europe is that it is foible and it varies and changes depending on whom is in question. The Euro-North American-centric modernity is not even apologetic about this matter. Kissinger evinces the rationale behind this arrogance; he notes, “we mean to do what may seem to be best, upon each occasion as it arises, making the interests of our country one’s guiding principle” (Kissinger 2014: 30). This, in fact, is not a principle because it is whim some, always depending on circumstances; should a principle not be mandible depending on circumstance(s)?

Coloniality and Control of Africa’s Economies

European colonialism and the capitalist ‘market system’ are intrinsically linked. The definition of one is constituted in the other, thereby making colonialism and capitalism mutually defining. Capitalism was a result of the colonial system to control labour; and it maximised profits of Whites at the expense of non-Whites’ labour force. Capitalism is an instrument of colonial domination of other races by Europeans. As expounded by Quijano (2000:539), “capital’s specific social configuration was geographically and socially concentrated in Europe, and above all, among Europeans in the whole world of capitalism”. The Black labour force was imported from Africa to Europe for unwaged or non-paid labour. Arguably, this move signalled the beginning and legitimatising of slavery and subjugation of the Black race as “slavery was assigned exclusively to the ‘black’ population brought from Africa” (Quijano 2000: 539). The conceptual link of colonisation, racism and slavery can be traced to capitalism; Ramose (2003:3) avers that capitalism provides a “conceptual link between colonisation, racism, and slavery”. In the grand scheme of things, Africa’s only utility value was to provide unpaid and unwaged labour for the Eurocentric world.

Therefore, cheap labour in the view of the Euro-North American-centric colonial project is a necessary component of the organisation and control of the labour market. Put differently, capitalism is by design meant to consolidate the modern system of power distribution and maintaining and preserving the social structures of the dominated and the dominant; the conquered and the conquerors. Capitalism is embedded in, and sustains, coloniality which safeguards the perpetuation of colonial-

ism, in the physical absence of the conquerors and colonisers. Quijano (1993 quoted in Grosfoguel 2000: 368) argues that modernity is responsible for the social and historical construction of classifications of “labour and capital; ... between Europeans and non-Europeans”. These classifications perpetuate the colonial order. In other words, the global power configuration is such that capital resides with Europeans, and labour with non-Europeans. This asymmetry is a construction of the European-centric capitalist system. This epitomises coloniality of power through the means of the economy, means of production and financial resources. The Brenton Woods Institutions such as the World Bank Group (WBG) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are vanguards of European modernity that control and regulate the global economy today.

Since the colonisation of the Americas, European colonisation was expanded to the rest of the world from the eighteenth century and progressively controlled what has been the world order since (Quijano 2000: 536). Essentially, and because of the capitalist configuration, “Europeans were enabled to increase their wealth” at the expense of non-European civilisations but particularly the unwaged and enslaved Black race (Kissinger 2014:19). The start of capitalism was never on a just basis, this was the beginning of asymmetrical economic relations, and capitalism enabled economic superiority of European, the beginning of control of the economy. Hence this study's position on combative ontology, in combat of the monolithic Euro-North American-centric civilisation.

The Power to Control Other Countries

Authority speaks of legitimacy, whereas legitimacy speaks of the rightfulness of that which is said to be legitimate (Ramose 2003: 3). The Euro-North American-centric modernity claims universal legitimacy to existence, and it further claims legitimacy to ordering other existences modelled on its own. The authority of the Euro-North American-centric modernity is geographically derived from the Western Hemisphere. It is specifically derived from five European countries, namely Britain, France, Germany, Italy and Greece. In all ‘classic’ European writings, one finds that they either are informed by the thoughts and works of writers that include, inter alia, Aristotle, Plato, Locke, Hobbes, Kant, Giddens, Rousseau, Machiavelli and Marx, or they make reference to authors that are located in the five aforementioned European countries.

It is this citation of these so-called authority figures in various academic disciplines, especially the humanities and social sciences, that is an appeal to the European ‘authority’ for the endorsement of individuals’ research, knowledge production or opinion pieces for that matter. While this could be viewed as coloniality of knowledge, it is equally coloniality of authority as the Euro-North American-centric modernity views itself as the only legitimate authority of knowledge and truth, and hence the only legitimate authority to produce knowledge and order ‘other’ civilisations (Ramose 2003: 5).

European modernity is also responsible for creating institutionalism as a way of controlling global affairs. Institutions such as state, citizenship and democracy are products of European modernity. Institutionalism, both as a theory and practice, emanates from the Euro-North American-centric discourse and rhetoric of accountability that seek legitimacy. On the international level, institutions such as the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organisation WHO), International Law (IL), the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) are used to camouflage coloniality of power by the Euro-North American-centric civilisation, which makes these institutions nothing more than representatives of coloniality of authority.

Control of Gender and Sexuality

Coloniality of gender and sexuality speak to the broader concept of coloniality of being. It has to do with the role geography plays in sustaining coloniality. It speaks to the actual and physical space, time and the subjection that these aspects impose on human beings, particularly colonial subjects. It further speaks of the objectification of beings in the colonised spaces and places. In turn, the objectification of the colonial subject results in the self-objectification of the colonial subjects themselves, hence coloniality of being. Humanity is divided into the zone of being, which is located in Europe and North America, and the zone of non-being which is all of the Global South. Being is apportioned to Europe and North America and anything that is non-European and non-North American has no ontological density in the framework of coloniality.

In most African localities and ecologies, the colonial 'order' established colonial societies that were based on the illusory 'superiority' of the male gender over the illusory 'inferiority' of the female gender, modelled on European male chauvinistic and bigoted society. Europe transplanted its society to colonial places and spaces, and Africa was not spared. Europe imported its hierarchised and patriarchised society and infiltrated the fabric of African societies. Men provided labour in colonial settlers' towns and more often than not, would leave their families in their natural localities and migrate to settler towns hence there was a creation of townships (Turino 2008: 28). Before colonialism, there was no concept of township in African localities and ecologies. Colonial establishments forcibly evicted Black people from their homes and forcibly relocated them to "townships" and "ghettos" (Desai and Vahed 2013: 14). What the colonial establishment did in the psyche of the conquered and colonised Africans is that it taught African men particularly to treat their women with disregard. Men, as labourers and latter earners of a merge income, became breadwinners in a fast-changing world where labour replaced subsistence farming due to the loss of land of the Africans to colonial settlers. The colonial establishment taught the African what it was to be a man or a woman in the colonial order. It hierarchised race and gender, with Whites as 'superior', to the 'inferior' Black, and male as 'superior' to the 'inferior' female. The 'inferiority' of the female probably emanated from the fact

that men were stronger physically and could provide the commodified labour much better than women.

Control of Knowledge and Subjectivity

Ramose (2003) argues that the rationale that European colonialism operated on was an unsubstantiated belief that Africans, among other non-European races, were not rational beings hence, they were not entitled to what rational beings claimed as their entitlement and rights. He argues that:

One of the bases of colonisation was that the belief 'man is a rational animal' was not spoken of the African, the Amerindian, and the Australasian. Aristotle's definition of man was deeply inscribed in the social ethos of those communities and societies that undertook the so-called voyages of discovery—apparently driven by innocent curiosity. But it is well known that these voyages changed into violent colonial incursions. It seems then that the entire process of decolonisation has, among others, upheld and not jettisoned the questionable belief that 'man is a rational animal' excludes the African, the Amerindian, and the Australasian. (Ramose 2003: 1)

What Ramose manages to reveal is that the imaginary right and exclusive claim to rationality by Europe(ans) is only realised because of material power fashioned to guard and preserve the myth that Africa is unable to rationally construct knowledge. The power of the gun is what Europe used to scatter its patterns, templates, designs and standards across the globe. Power in European terms is tantamount to instruments of control emitted by violence. This imaginary exclusive right to rationality by Europe(ans) has wide-ranging and extensive implications for knowledge production about Africa by Africans. This is meant to cast doubt and reinforce the modern bias on Africa and other non-European races; it is also meant to make the non-European doubt themselves as to their capacity to rationalise, think and philosophise. European imagination, and hence modernity, "is doubtful [that] Africans are wholly and truly human beings" and it questions the Africans' capacity to philosophise (Ramose 2003: 5). The pattern that European imagination implanted in the mind of the African is to doubt herself and himself. This pattern is relatable to what Mudimbe (1987: 2) called the "organising structure" and what wa Thiongó (1981: 94) called the "organising principle". This chapter adds the 'ordering structure' to the long-standing patterns of control that European civilisation subjected Africa to. The self-doubting African cannot and is not meant to know or produce knowledge about herself and himself, let alone her/his surroundings and localities.

Europeans, as are self-acclaimed exclusive recipients of rationality, have thus put themselves on a pedestal of knowledge production, and at the apex of correct and therefore truthful knowledge. There is an underlying attitude that exudes itself as though Europeans were the only race and civilisation that holds and embodies the truth. As a result, an African's right to knowledge is contingent upon a "passive as well as uncritical assimilation" of the knowledge produced in Europe for Europeans and the whole world (Ramose 2003: 2). Africans are then supposed to faithfully imple-

ment the knowledge that is constructed, defined and designed “outside Africa” (ibid.). Coloniality of knowledge therefore refers to the Euro-North American intellectual thought as the referral point upon which all other epistemologies and knowledges are judged against. As an epistemological movement, “it has always been overshadowed by hegemonic Euro-north American-centric intellectual thought and social theories” (Ramose 2003: 2). Knowledge production, and the capacity to think and generate is a preserve of Euro-North American-centric modernity resulting in the creation of “border thinking” (Arturo Escobar in Mignolo 2001: 179). The thinking is located in the Euro-North American civilisation, beyond that geography, there exist no rationality. Such is the thinking of Euro-North American-centric civilisation.

Contextualising Coloniality of Power

To control is to induce/evoke in another a reaction/response, or take a course of action that they would not otherwise willingly choose. As such, control is the essential and primary currency of empire. Coloniality of power is a unit of analysis that unmasks the control patterns and of modernity. The architects of modernity and colonialism had in mind, control of the world, for the survival of their colonial project. The coloniser and the colonised are by design unequal. An inherent asymmetrical power relationship exists between the two. The design cannot be greater than the designer, neither a creation greater than the creator. A creator cannot be part of the creation or created. The creation is a product of the creator, so is the design a product of the designer. What (cause) limits and regulates (control) the design is the designer (agency). As such, the rules that apply to the design may not be applicable to the designer. The creator is above and beyond the creation. This scenario places the creator in an asymmetrical power relation with its creation, the two are incomparable.

What are the implications of the asymmetrical power relations? The Euro-North American-centric civilisation is outside the global power structural configuration. It created this configuration, and it is the force that does the configuration. All other civilisations are the ones to be configured. Any deviant civilisation or perspective to the established ‘global order’ becomes a threat to the functioning of this global imperial design. In this paradigm, there can never exist more than one centre of power; the Euro-North American-centric civilisation views itself as the only legitimate seat of power and control.

The designer regulates and controls the design. The design could have not existed without the designer. This is the bone of contention; since the design could have not been without the designer, how then can the same rules that regulate the design be applied to the designer? As such, coloniality of power perpetuates the patterns and designs of Euro-North American-centric modernity. The perpetuation of modernity’s designs, patterns and structures is the essence of coloniality. Coloniality is the vehicle that transports and transplants modernity. Coloniality of power is the vehicle that transports and transplants control of institutions of authority, the markets, sexuality

and gender as well as what is acceptable as knowledge, from Europe to the rest of the world.

What would be of value to the analysis that this chapter embarks on is the four levers of control that Quijano identified as core to understanding and unpacking the concept of coloniality of power. In analysing and assessing the events that occasioned the NATO invasion of Libya in 2011, this chapter will analyse how Libya was a threat to the current global power structural configuration on four levels—control of authority, control of knowledge and subjectivity, control of the economy and control of gender and sexuality.

Going forward, this chapter will analyse how Libya's stance on, and call to, forming a United Africa, as evinced by Koenig (2017: Online), went against the authority component of the current global power structural configuration. This work will also go on to demonstrate how Libya's proposal for African countries to develop and adopt their own monetary currency that was to be backed by gold reserves, as submitted by Koenig (2017: Online), went against the economy and markets component of the Euro-North American-centric power structural configuration. Libya's quest to develop a communication satellite that was to improve communication technologies in Africa, as averred by Bowen (2006: 14), went against the knowledge and subjectivity component of the global power structural configuration. At the time of Gaddafi's demise, Libya was increasingly beginning to be seen as a good example of a decolonial state, as opined by Bowen (2006: 15), and that was a threat to the gender and sexuality component of the global power structural configuration. It is therefore conceivable that the NATO-led UNSC acted to consolidate the global power structural configuration. As such, this work will now go on to demonstrate and evince these assertions and convictions in the subsequent chapters.

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated the conundrum of European colonialism to today's society, particularly in the view of African ecologies, localities and civilisations. It also evinced how modernity has continued to perpetuate colonial orders, particularly in African societies and localities. This chapter discussed the concept of coloniality of power and demonstrated how coloniality of power particularly has thwarted African ontology and epistemology and keeps Africa at the bottom of the hierarchy that was socially constructed by European architects of modernity. The chapter highlighted how modernity favours the male gender over the female and privileges masculinity over femininity, and the White race over the Black race and other non-White races; thereby modernity presented itself as superior to and all other civilisations as inferior.

This chapter also highlighted how the Euro-North American-centric modernity convolutes appearance and essence; it deliberately presents an attractive appearance of universal human rights, sovereign equality and yet the essence of implementing those universal human rights is marred by violence, inequality, impunity, underdevelopment and barbarity. This chapter also evinced how capitalism is intrinsically

linked to modernity and coloniality of the global power structural configuration. At the centre of the control of global socio-economic-political affairs is the Euro-North American civilisation that has potency to act unilaterally to pursue its own agendas that are particular and subjective, but purported as universal and objective.

Bibliography

- Achebe, C. 1994. In Williams, J. *Chinua Achebe and the 'bravery of lions'*. [Online]. Available <https://artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/03/22/chinua-achebe-and-the-bravery-of-lions/>. Accessed 15 March 2018.
- Bennet, C. 1998. *Maritime Defence in South Africa*. Cape Town: South African Maritime Interest CC.
- Biakolo, E. 2003. Categories of Cross-Cultural Cognition and the African Condition. In *The African Philosophy Reader*, 2nd ed, ed. P.H. Coetzee and A.P.J. Roux, 9–21. New York: Routledge.
- Boron, A.B. 2005. *Empire and Imperialism: A Critical Reading of Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Bowen, W.Q. 2006. *Libya and Nuclear Proliferation: Stepping Back from the Brink*. London: Routledge.
- Chamberlain, M.V. 2010. *The Scramble for Africa*. New York: Longman.
- Chomsky, N. 2011. *How the World Works*. New York: Soft Skull Press.
- Chossudovsky, M. 2015. *The Globalization of War: America's "Long War" Against Humanity*. Montreal: Global Research Publishers.
- Coetzee, P.H., and A.P.J. Roux (eds.). 2003. *The African Philosophy Reader*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, J.M. (ed.). 1969. *The Four Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. London: Penguin Books.
- Comaroff, J. 2002. Governmentality, Materiality, Legality, Modernity: On the Colonial State in Africa. In *African Modernities: Entangled Meanings in Current Debate*, ed. J.G.D.P. Probst and H. Schmidt, 107–134. Oxford: James Carrey.
- Comaroff, J.L., and J. Comaroff. 1997. *Of revelation and Revolution: The Dialectics of Modernity on a South African Frontier*, vol. 2. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Desai, A., and G.H. Vahed. 2013. *Chatsworth: The Making of a South African Township*. Durban: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press.
- Diop, C.A. *The African Origin of Civilization: Myth or Reality?* New York: Lawrence Hill & Company.
- Escobar, A. 2007. Worlds and Knowledges Otherwise. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 179–210.
- Ghosh, S. 2016. *Transitions and Civics*. New Delhi: Madhubun, Vikas Publishing House, Private Ltd.
- Gould, E.H. 2010. Liberty and Modernity: The American Revolution and the Making of Parliament's Imperial History. In *Exclusionary Empire: English Liberty Overseas, 1600–1900*, ed. J.P. Greene, 112–131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2000. Developmentalism, Modernity, and Dependency Theory in Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (2): 347–374.
- Grosfoguel, R. 2007. The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political Economy Paradigms. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 211–223.
- Hardt, M., and A. Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Howe, G. 1990. Sovereignty and interdependence: Britain's place in the world. *International affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944)* 66 (4): 675–695.
- Iliffe, J. 1979. *A Modern History of Tanganyika*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kissinger, H. 2004. *Ending the Vietnam War: A History of America's Involvement in and Extradition from the Vietnam War*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Kissinger, H. 2014. *World Order: Reflections on the Character of Nations and Course of History*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Koenig, P. 2017. *Let's Never Forget Why Muammar Gaddafi Was Killed*. [Online]. Available: https://www.pambazuka.org/pan-africanism/let%E2%80%99s-never-forget-why-muammar-gaddafi-was-killed?utm_campaign=shareaholic&utm_medium=email_this&utm_source=email. Accessed 15 November 2017.
- Lambert, F. 2003. *The Founding Fathers and the Place of Religion in America*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. On the Coloniality of Being. *Cultural Studies* 21 (2–3): 240–270.
- Mamdani, M. 2004. *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim*. New York: Jacana Media (Pvt) Ltd.
- McFadden, P. 2016. *Inaugural Alumnae Conference*. Thabo Mbeki African Leadership Institute. [Online]. Available: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A8uAhUkRD7k>. Accessed 9 February 2018.
- McKeown, G. 2014. *Essentialism: The Disciplined Pursuit of Less*. Croydon: The Random House Group.
- Mignolo, W. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Mudimbe, V.Y. 1987. *The Invention of Africa*. [Online]. Available: https://libcom.org/files/zz_v._y._mudimbe_the_invention_of_africa_gnosis_pbook4you_1.pdf. Accessed 26 November 2018.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. 2013. *Empire, Global Coloniality and African Subjectivity*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. 2015. Decoloniality as the Future of Africa. *History Compass* 13 (10): 485–496.
- Nyere, C. 2014. *Sovereignty in International Politics: An Assessment of Zimbabwe's Operation Murambatsvina, May 2005*. Master's Dissertation. Pretoria: University of South Africa. [Online]. Available: http://uir.unisa.ac.za/bitstream/handle/10500/18531/dissertation_nyere_c.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y. Accessed 11 July 2019.
- Nyere, C. 2015. The Continuum of Political Violence in Zimbabwe. *Journal of Social Science* 48 (1,2): 94–107.
- Otfinoski, S. 2011. *The Voyages of Christopher Columbus*. New York: Benchmark Education Company.
- Pakenham, T. 1992. *Scramble for Africa*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Pillay, K. 2018. The 'Indian' Question: Examining Autochthony, Citizenship and Belonging in South Africa. In *Relating Worlds of Racism: Dehumanisation, Belonging and the Normative of European Whiteness*, ed. P. Essed, K. Farquharson, K. Pillay, and E.J. White, 63–88. Palgrave MacMillan [eBook]. [Online]. Available: <https://books.google.co.za/books?id=ml5qDwAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Pillay+2018&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjC6fHsyqzjAhVsRxUIHVeQCPM4ChDoAQhHMAY#v=onepage&q=Pillay%202018&f=false>. Accessed: 5 March 2019.
- Quijano, A. 1993. Modernity, Identity and Utopia in Latin America. *Boundary 2: An International Journal of Literature and Culture* 20 (3): 140–155.
- Quijano, A. 2000. Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from South* 1 (3): 533–580.
- Ramose, M.B. 2001. An African Perspective on Justice and Race. *Polylog: Forum for Intercultural Philosophy* 3.
- Ramose, M.B. 2003. The Struggle for Reason in Africa. In *The African Philosophy Reader*, 2nd ed, ed. P.H. Coetzee and A.P.J. Roux, 1–9. New York: Routledge.
- Schmitt, C. 1996. The Land Appropriation and the New World. *Telos* 109: 36–37.
- South African Navy. 2014. *The SS Mendi: A Historical Background*. [Online]. Available: http://www.navy.mil.za/newnavy/mendi_history/mendi_hist.htm. Accessed 7 March 2018.
- Tully, J. 2011. *The Devils' Milk: A Social History of Rubber*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Turino, T. 2008. *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Udeze, B. 2009. *Why Africa? A Continent in a Dilemma of Unanswered Questions*. New York: Xlibris Corporation.
- United Nations (UN). 2018. *Overview*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.un.org/en/sections/about-un/overview/index.html>. Accessed 16 June 2018.
- Wa Thiongó, N. 1981. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. [Online]. Available: <https://www.uibk.ac.at/anglistik/staff/davis/decolonising-the-mind.pdf>. Accessed 26 November 2018.
- Ziegler, D.W. 1987. *War, Peace and International Politics*, 4th ed. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Zondi, S. 2017. *Pointers on Shifting the Geography of Reason in the Classroom: A Decolonial Turn in Pedagogy*. South African Association of Political Science First Limpopo/Gauteng Regional Colloquium, 13 August 2018.