

University of the Witwatersrand

Faculty of Humanities

Political Studies

Masters Research Thesis

FROM LIBERATORS TO OPPRESSORS:

“From Liberators to Oppressors: How does Political Psychology analyse the effects of colonialism in post independent Kenya leadership

by

Lerato Moyaba

(911562)

Final Submission Date: 28 July 2017

Supervisor: Joel Quirk, PhD

ABSTRACT

From liberators to oppressors chooses to open a new door by focusing on the psychological impact of Africa's history, employing political psychology as the arguing point with the example of Kenya. Using desktop techniques, we will try to answer the question: why former liberators became the new oppressors. Political psychology, a much under researched field, both employs political science and psychology in the attempt of understanding political behaviour , and, in doing so, it brings the individual back at the centre of study. When applied to Africa, political psychology theories will be heavily interrelated to colonialism. This thesis also focuses on depicting the continent political and social structure before colonialism, as well as the colonialism impact on society's long-term development. The whole spectrum of variables is discussed (economic, cultural, political, religious) along with psychological focus. We explore the decolonisation process as well as the post-independence era in Kenya, particularly through the study of the two first post-independent leaders, Jomo Kenyatta and Daniel Arap Moi. It aims to show that the psychological state left by colonisation has contributed to shaping the Kenyan political landscape. Indeed, as much as colonialism affected African society as a whole, we found out that the individual psyche was the most harmed in the long run. Colonialism created a psychological state that insured generational submission referred in the thesis as metacolonisation. The use of political psychology applied to the Kenyan decolonisation has shown us that the suppression of cognitive abilities indeed limits the decision making of the individual. The delve into political events that followed the independence has shown the psychological dimension of the political decision making as well as linked political psychology theories (imitation, Big man syndrome). Political psychology brings a non-negligible dimension in studying the state current of Africa. By placing the individual variable at the centre of the research, we manage to uncover an emotional, personal side to the current state of Africa. Whilst not exempting the leaders from their responsibilities, political psychology gives us a different hindsight into the African political world.

ACRONYMS

GCA	Gikuyu Central Association
INWC	International Negro Workers Conference
KADU	Kenyan African Democratic Union
KANU	Kenyan African National Union
PAC	Pan-African Congress
YKA	Young Kikuyu Association

DECLARATION

I, Lerato Moyaba, declare that this is my own work and that all the sources I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledge by complete reference.

_____ **Date:** _____

Lerato Moyaba

Table of contents

Abstract	II
ACRONYMS	III
DECLARATION	IV
Table of contents	V
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Political Psychology	6
Introduction	6
Imitation	7
The Frustration-Aggression theory	7
Conclusion	8
Chapter 3: Pre-colonialism and Colonialism	9
Introduction	9
Kingdoms and Leadership	10
The beginning of colonialism in Africa	10
The importance of the utility of Psychology in enforcing colonialism in Africa	14
Religion, Culture and Education	14
Christian Evangelism and Missionaries	14
Conclusion	15
Chapter 4: Decolonisation in Kenya	16
Introduction	16
World War 2 and the Atlantic Charter	17
The First Post-Colonial Kenyan President: Jomo Kenyatta (12 December 1964 – 22 August 1978)	18
The attendance of The Fifth Pan African Congress in Manchester by Kenyatta	18
Second Post-Colonial Kenyan President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi (8 November 1979 – 30 December 2002)	19
The Decolonisation of Kenya	21
Conclusion	24
Chapter 5: Post-Independence Kenya	26
Introduction	26
Post-Independence	26
Corruption	27
The Big Man Syndrome	28

Tribalism	30
The handling of Human Rights	32
Conclusion	34
Bibliography	37

Chapter 1: Introduction

There is no doubt that whenever we speak of Africa and of Africans, we speak of a continent and a people that have undergone major historical and generational events. From pre-colonial to slavery, to colonial occupation and now post-colonial Africa, Africa has experienced some of the most societal and political changes and yet remains seen as underdeveloped and somewhat “backward”. Without assuming that political change means the eradication of underdevelopment, yet, one would assume that these major changes could have stimulated the development of African states by those leaders who fought in the struggle for freedom of the people from oppression. Much about colonialism and its legacy in Africa has been researched and spoken about countlessly. From the political, to economical and to social impacts of colonialism, however, when compared to the other researched areas for instance, the psychological impacts of colonialism in Africa and on post-colonial leaders still needs more expansion. In this thesis a focus is made majorly on the psychological impact of colonialism, employing political psychology as my arguing point. My reason for opting to take this view point to attempt to explain some of the challenges that were experienced in Africa is because, according to political psychology “the mental categories we use to make sense of the world- are the product of experience.” (Houghton, 2009, p:6). From Liberators to oppressors as a chosen thesis, will look at the post-colonial leadership of Kenya particularly, the two first presidents of post-independent Kenya namely: Jomo Kenyatta and Daniel arap Moi, who through colonial experience attempted to make sense of their world and their newly assumed positions as leaders. I chose Kenya as my case study because firstly, like many other African countries who equally were victims of colonial statecraft and state building, Kenya also has a rich pre-colonial history that indicates the different tribes and kingdoms that were organised not in a country-like manner but community/ tribal style for the purposes of self-sustenance. Colonial occupation forced these tribes to come together under one identity as the Kenyan people. This will also explain the level of tribalism that was revealed in the early years of independence. Secondly, there are resemblances between the colonial rule and post-independence rule on the Kenyan people which need to be explained in more depth employing psychological tools and explanations. This resemblance is as a result of psychological unconscious imitations of the colonial rule that post-independent leaders portrayed while taking over positions of leadership in their various countries. This imitation is best described by Bartlett's Schema Theory in cognitive psychology, where he says schemas are “an active organization of past reactions, or of past experiences, which must always be supposed to be operating in any well-adapted organic response” (Brewer and Nakamura, 1984, p: 3).

Therefore, much of this thesis is devoted to attempting to understand the impact colonialism had on the mind of post-colonial African leaders and leadership styles. This thesis observes how those who were once hailed as heroes soon became tyrants by using the same colonial tactics in order to gain complete obedience. According to Bulhan, what the new leaders experienced is what he refers to as “metacolonialism”, which is “the latest and most pervasive of colonialism.” (Bulhan, 2015, p: 241). Metacolonialism is the residue of classical colonialism which started in the nineteenth century. With metacolonialism came the metacolonised (former oppressed) and the metacolonizer (former oppressor) and this thesis will speak about how metacolonialism continued and its mental effects long after colonialism “left” Africa and how it continued its service in the interest of the former colonisers. Metacolonialism is not physical colonial occupation, but mental colonial occupation that persisted through generations.

This is a qualitative study using a desktop method to acquire data. I have employed Frantz Fanon's work as my primary reference because of his extensive work he did while in Algeria as a psychiatrist and revolutionist, uncovering the gruesome psychological impacts of colonialism on the Algerian. He makes a point that "and for many years to come we shall be bandaging the countless and sometimes indelible wounds inflicted on our people by the colonialist onslaught." (Fanon, 1963, p: 181).

This thesis is divided into Five chapters: Chapter One, Introduction of the Thesis, Chapter Two, Political Psychology, introduces the inter-disciplinary as a relationship between psychology and politics and using it to explain the impact of historical events mainly colonialism on post-colonial African leaders' minds. Chapter Three addresses the Pre-Colonial, Colonial and the Decolonization in the context of the political evolution of the African continent. This chapter begins with a brief description of what Africa looked like before colonial occupation. Chapter Four focuses on the decolonisation process of Kenya. This chapter includes the Mau Mau rebellion and activities that occurred leading up to the rebellion such as the 5th Pan-African Congress (PAC) meeting in Manchester in 1945. This conference was attended by Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, amongst other African leaders in attempting to voice out their unhappiness against colonialism in Africa and to demand the independence of African states from colonial occupation. In this chapter, the first two post-independent presidents of Kenya, Jomo Kenyatta and Daniel arap Moi's leaders are discussed. This chapter will focus on their political involvement and leadership, how each one mimicked their predecessors and how difficult it proved for them to remain democratic in the handling of the state affairs. Chapter Five, focuses on Post-Independent Africa and the Big Man Syndrome. This chapter considers similarities between colonial and post-colonial Africa (the corruption, autocratic, one-party system, human rights, authoritarianism, totalitarianism and tribalism).

Most African leaders who took over from colonial masters were born during the colonial occupation. Therefore, one can argue that although many such as Jomo Kenyatta, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana or Léopold Sédar Senghor of Senegal, had travelled to Europe before ascending to positions of power in their respective countries where they witnessed first-hand how societies and the leadership in those countries governed their societies, their post-independent actions still revealed that mentally, regardless of exposure, they were still largely influenced by the fact that in their own country, they had not seen or experienced any other type of rulership that made their people obey and easily subdue under authority in the same manner such as colonial methods. If they could comprehend that the system was wrong in its nature and operation within their country and go on to lead successful liberation movements against it, what then changed in the long run as soon as they occupied office? In its entirety, colonialism was brutal and authoritarian not only to the body but towards the mind also. Colonialism did not advocate for human rights and it eliminated anyone who dared to challenge its power either through incarceration or death. Most post-independent leaders were also incarcerated by colonial rulers for organizing or taking part in organisations that planned to overthrow it. Henceforth, colonialism would rely largely on mental control and the conditioning thereof, in order for it to survive for as long as it did.

The application of psychological methods to explain the thesis is meant to stretch the argument a little further from the common explanations regarding the causations of problems in the current state of Africa. Many researchers have casted "blame" regarding the underdeveloped state from post-colonial Africa to date on the climate, backward and primitive cultures and traditions, extreme religions or on the assumption that Africans simply cannot self-govern. (Acemoglu and

Robinson, 2013, p: 3). Although Acemoglu and Robertson, go to great lengths to justify their claim that some of these factors cited above are of considerably less significance as compared to the institutional legacy of colonialism, the emphasis on psychology as an important route to take is more convincing as cognitive psychology reveals that our schemas appear to be “unconscious mental processes” (Brewer and Nakamura, 1984, p: 4). Whatever our past experiences may have been, they get locked up in our unconscious level, and revealed in how we later make decisions and relate to our environments. Bartlett stated that "schemata are active, without any awareness at all" (Bartlett, 1932, p. 200). This may even suggest that African leaders were not fully conscious or aware that they had turned into tyrants because their behaviour was based on an unconscious operation tightly linked to colonial experiences. Therefore, this thesis is adding a new dimension to what is already researched by the likes of Acemoglu and Robertson.

Many accounts of Africa independence struggles and post-colonial histories give little or no weight to psychological legacies, however, the application of political psychology in this thesis will assist in explaining how some colonial activities (such as the provision of education, religion, etc.) were psychologically designed to meet political ends. Colonialism divided African countries internally and made those living in them believe that somewhat they were different in order to achieve a political end, those affected by this division internalized this practice psychologically which influenced their relation to their external world.

Because the mental categories that we use to comprehend the world surrounding us are as a result of experience as argued by political psychology, the one-party state advocated later by post-independent leaders seemed like a nostalgic action resembling the totalitarian and authoritarian rule of the colonial state that eliminated any opposition. For example, Kwame Nkrumah’s argument about neo-colonialism, which posits that the problems in the independence era can be traced to a variety of external forces relating to the continuation of patterns of economic and political influence. It is not to say that there was an absence of alternative systems to imitate. As already mentioned already, most of these leaders had travelled to Europe and engaged with European leaders before, the problem may have lied with the fact that they simply thought the colonial system that was used against their people was going to bear the same positive fruits it bore for the colonial masters but this time for the entire population if imitated to the tee. However, as we know, this ended up in post-colonial leaders imitating, perfecting and taking further the ruthless colonial rulership to the benefit of former colonial masters. Although one could suggest that post-colonial leaders could have looked at pre-colonial African rule as guide to govern their own people, the issue is, none of them lived during pre-colonial Africa for them to have something to imitate. They were either born at colonialism’s inception or during colonialism and before coming into power, the colonial rule in their country was all they knew and had seen operating. The only time we can suggest they witnessed African rule, would be in the way tribal leaders led their local communities, yet, even they were influenced by colonial masters to keep communities in check for the purposes of ensuring that the local people do not revolt against colonial occupation. This same system would later also be imitated by post-colonial leaders.

Post-colonial African politics has for a long time been surrounded by tribal politics not only in Kenya, but Africa as a whole. People often vote, support or decline a candidate either because of the tribe he was from and the language he spoke. For example, the appointment of the Kalenjin Daniel arap Moi as vice-president in the largely Kikuyu saturated Kenyatta administration by Jomo Kenyatta still made some of his tribesmen and fellow colleagues uncomfortable because he was from a different tribe. This “sense of identification with a group of people who share a common history,

language, territory, culture,” (Houghton, 2009, p: 169) has been the major characteristic of Kenya’s ethnic politics for years. This mentality was also largely supported by colonialism. During the colonial regime, unity amongst the people was not encouraged. Therefore, the divide and conquer strategy had to be maintained to keep people from mobilising against the system. When post-colonial leaders took over, not much was done to reverse this colonial division (though the researcher does not imply that Africans were united before colonialism), however, instead, post-colonial leaders continued within the system.

When People who had no language, culture or lifestyles in common were forced to live together as one and identify themselves as one nation, conflicts and tensions were bound to rise. When Jomo Kenyatta published his first book in 1938 called *Facing Mount Kenya*, Kenyatta speaks mainly about the supremacy and greatness of his tribe; the Kikuyus. How people lived before colonial occupation and how he longs for his tribe’s supremacy to be returned. However, like Celarent claims, “it is his tribe and its practices that Kenyatta discusses and defends here, not African customs in general.” (Celarent, 2010, p: 724). Similar arguments and perceptions of pre-colonial life can be found in the many of the African nationalist leaders in this period, particularly Kwame Nkrumah and his policy of *Ujamaa*, whom although tried to explain his reasons for advocating for a one-party state as an attempt to eradicate tribalism, critics argued that, it was equally culpable in transforming a vision of pre-colonial harmony into a motivation for a one-party state devoid of artificial distinctions and divisions. A one party state which would later resemble the colonial state.

Bulhan suggests that “effective and sustainable change can come only when those within the centre of the metacolonised world jointly reconstruct a more just world on the ruins of the old.” (Bulhan, 2015, p: 253). During colonialism people had to be kept under mental oppression because if they were left mentally liberated, they would unite, organize themselves and realize their true self-worth. After colonization, the former liberators advanced and kept this system alive to prevent their own people from mobilizing against them.

It must also be said however, that this thesis is in no way removing or exempting any level of accountability from African leaders regarding any form of poor leadership they have portrayed on their side. Political leaders also acted out of their own will in order to stay in power for a long time. This thesis is not implying in any way that colonialism and its impact on the mentality of the African is the only blamed factor and that post-independent African leaders in their own capacity as leaders cannot be held guilty for their actions. This thesis is mainly highlighting the psychological impact that colonialism left behind, and adding a new dimension to explain the problems faced in African leadership. It is the exploration of another reason amongst many others of why former liberators turned into oppressors through the usage of political psychology and psychological methods.

Methodology

A desktop method was used in this thesis. This is a very sensitive topic that would not necessarily get people engaging freely in admitting that perhaps there is a chance psychological disorders may have played a role in the post-leadership of their countries; therefore, the only viable means of getting information was from internet sources, journals, and documents concerning the research question. Secondly, the absence of the two main interviewees to collect information from through interviews played a role in this choosing this method of research. Travelling to Kenya to collect primary data would be close to impossible, especially on a non-tangible “grey” area such as Political Psychology. Primary researching which would involve conducting interviews would also have financial implications which would be costly to the researcher at this level hence the opting of a financially viable method such as desktop researching was more feasible as an option. The political psychology field is fairly new to the mainstream and to a large extent in Africa almost non-existent. Therefore, the documents and data used in this study is based largely on studies executed in Western countries relating to political psychology. Those used in the study of African states are, mainly books about African leaders which as the researcher took advantage of to drive the point of this thesis in studying their behaviour.

Psychology is not a very popular field in Africa, and therefore applying it to the political context might even seem offensive as it may come across as being too direct in insinuating that certain individuals had psychological disorders. This made fieldwork impossible. It would seem rather easier and more practical to take psychological methods and apply them to political information and research that is readily available and was thoroughly conducted on the individuals concerned.

This research method had also been adopted because information that is readily available to the public domain means that it has undergone public scrutiny. This does not suggest by any means that the information will be entirely correct, but by it being in the public, it means it has been challenged and refined, which leaves it up to the researcher to make the final judgement on its accuracy. Given the time provided to complete this work and the country chosen as a case study, a desktop research method is the most practical method that will assist the researcher to reach the required deadline without spending too much time on the field while collecting information but instead using information that is readily available for the researcher to use.

Chapter 2: Political Psychology

Introduction

Political Psychology is still an under-researched area of study more especially in Africa, because researchers and people in society in general don't yet understand how the two disciplines (politics and psychology) come together. Although some literature has been written and is currently available to be used, most of this literature is still largely applicable only to Western societies. There is very few or close to none available that address Africa's political problem apart from the work of some few famous writers such as Frantz Fanon and Steve Biko. However, for us to understand political behaviour portrayed in the form of for example, terrorism, voter behaviour, and decisions taken by leaders and media propaganda, it is important to employ psychology to bring understanding into human behaviour towards socio-political issues that affect our lives. According to Deutsch, "political psychology is the child of political science and psychology, having been conceived in the ambivalent mood of optimism and despair which characterized the scientific age." (Deutsch and Kinnvall 2002, p: 221). Political psychology employs both psychological and political means to get understanding into political behaviour. The application of political psychology historically has been crucial in shaping the understanding towards the events that occurred. For example, we understand that former enslavers and colonialists employed psychological (education and religion) tools to achieve their political, social and economic dominance which in return brought forth cooperation from their oppressed.

Harold Lasswell, who is the founding father and great contributor in the field of political psychology, stated that "political science without biography is a form of taxidermy." (Nethercote, et al, 2006, p: 101). Lasswell makes a point that when political scientists study only institutions and structures to which an individual exist within but not the individual himself, they miss a very crucial point in the outcome because the individual is the one who determines the institutions and structure. Studying the individual in a political set up is the application of political psychology.

Therefore, Political psychology brings the individual back at the center of politics as the main subject and as the one who holds the power to determine institutions and structures. He or she is the one who makes decisions and influences policies that steer a society in a certain direction and therefore an important point of studying the political arena. In this thesis, Political psychology is used to assist in taking us back to post-colonial leaders in Kenya being Jomo Kenyatta and Daniel arap Moi. Political Psychology attempts in this thesis to explain the effects of colonialism on their minds and behavior while trying to answer the questions of leaders who once fought in the struggle against colonialism but later on turned out like their former colonial masters. It is important to view colonialism as a psychology tool because "colonialism from the very beginning was therefore economic, political, cultural, and psychological. Its economic and political motives were most obvious at the beginning; the cultural and psychological motives integral to it all along became more intense and manifest later." (Bulhan, 2015, p: 240).

Frantz Fanon, played a major role in bringing the two disciplines together especially in uncovering the effects of racism and colonialism on the African psychology or the metacolonised. According to Derek Hook, Psycho- politics is, "an understanding of how both politics impacts upon the psychological and how personal psychology may be the level at which politics is internalized and

individually entrenched.” (Hook, 2004, p: 85). This is an indication that post-colonial leaders ‘mental categories were shaped by the colonial system they lived in. This mental category later on shaped their behavior and determined how they respond to challenging situations. Political psychology “focuses on the elite behaviour and how elite perceptions shape government policies and the impact of personality on leadership.” (Houghton 2009, p: 22).

Imitation

To analyze the impact of the colonial leadership on the post-colonial leadership, it is important to make a comparison between the two regimes. Post-colonial leaders came into leadership with the energy and intention of bringing democracy to the people, however in a short while they started to imitate the behavior of the former colonizers. The Law of Imitation, according to Tarde Gabriel the French sociologist and criminologist is when “development is not achieved through general innovation or impersonal attributes, but rather by “individual renovative initiatives”, which could be described as inventions, discoveries or innovations.” (Djellal and Gallouj, 2014, p: 3). Imitation is a psychological phenomenon which can either be intentional or non-intentional. In the case of post-colonial leaders, imitating the colonial system in the way they handled human right abuses, corruption and disregard of the rule of law shows the presence of a psychological impact that affected the thinking process and thereby the behavior later exhibited. Their initial desire, however, for democracy in their countries and of which formed the base of their struggle also indicate that this imitation of the colonial system was an unconscious effort they found themselves entangled in. ofcourse, there was also the undeniable greed that they portrayed which they had to replace the White master with themselves by accumulating the wealth and power that was once held by the colonial ruler.

During colonialism, colonial masters were fond of divisions amongst the Africans in which they ruled over. They benefitted from a divided society out of fear of mass mobilization that may occur if Africans unite against it. This type of ruler-ship was repeated and even perfected by the post-colonial leaders as their own way of staying in power. “Strengthening ethical political leadership is trepiditious, given the deeply engraved status quo that appeals to political elites who command power and benefit from the system through semi-democratic, semi-authoritarian and authoritarian regime types.” (Mayanja, 2013, p: 1).

The Frustration-Aggression theory

According to Houghton, “aggression occurs when an individual's goals are frustrated or are blocked, moreover, that frustration always leads to aggression, and aggression is always the result of frustration.”(Houghton, 2009, p: 203). Applied to African leadership, during the colonial period, the African often experienced frustration emanating from the abuses of their human rights and the disregard of their humanity. This frustration-aggression was interpreted by the European colonists as the “Algerian Criminality”, suggesting that the Algerian was a “was a born criminal, slacker, born liar and born robbers.” (Fanon, 1963, p: 296). Whenever an African became violent, his actions were hardly attributed to the mental effects of colonialism which caused his frustration- aggression towards other Algerians or even those oppressing him. Instead he was mentally conditioned to believe that indeed he is a criminal by colonial masters who also “claimed that only their classifications, their diagnoses, and their treatment of physical and psychological disorders are most scientific and effective yet they turned a blind eye to the oppressive social conditions that caused or contributed to hunger, disease, premature death, depression, trauma, violence and psychosomatic

disorders.”(Bulhan, 2015, p: 247). In addition to Frantz Fanon’s explanation of the “Algerian Criminality”, Gurr & Moore, describe rebellion as “a concerted campaign of violent action used by organisations claiming to represent an ethnic group to make claims against the state.” (Gurr and Moore, 1997, p.1082). However, as mentioned before, instead of interpreting this rebellious behaviour as frustration, colonial masters would interpret it solely as criminality in order to suppress any level of revolt that may further occur. Despite the fact that colonial masters were drastically few in number in the lands they occupied, yet, they still managed to rule with great and absolute power. They held on to both political and economic power, in return, depriving the native of any rights to participate effectively in society further causing an immense amount of frustration.

In post-colonial Africa, the same frustration-aggression still existed. When a leader saw that he has failed in executing the principles of democracy onto his people “if the ruler believes he is not either respected or feared by the public, then he is likely to view them as a threat to his rule. Thus, he strategizes for this eventuality by either manufacturing legitimacy or ruling violently.”(Watson, 2010, p: 2). The frustration and annoyance that comes over the leader when he realises his failure remembering what he had already promised those who placed him in power led them to committing violent acts in order to stay in power. The same strategy was used by the colonial masters to remain in power, using fear to maintain control of the population. Fanon goes on to say, “Today every one of us knows that criminality is not the consequence of the hereditary character of the Algerian, nor of the organization of his nervous system. The Algerian war, brings to the fore the true protagonists.”(Fanon, 1963, p: 304). The African frustration-aggression is linked to the events that occurred during colonialism which is the true protagonists. During colonisation, the African had to suppress his negative emotions, but now in post-colonial Africa, where he is now a leader and has to handle various challenging situations, his psychology or mental category/schema did not allow him to rule any different from the previous leaders, therefore, instead his previously suppressed frustration and aggression now becomes directed unconsciously towards his own people.

Frantz Fanon made his conclusion about this frustration-aggression in the African or Criminality by stating “The Algerian's criminality, his impulsivity, and the violence of his murders are therefore not the consequence of the organization of his nervous system or of characterial originality, but the direct product of the colonial situation.”(Fanon, 1963, p: 307).

Conclusion

Political psychology used in this context is focusing on the individual and not on the structures around the individual (leader). It places the individual at the centre of the situation which was colonialism and reveals the effects that affected his psychology which later impacted his leadership or behaviour. We cannot speak of African leadership without referring to the psychological impact that took place to affect it rendering it in the state that Africa finds itself today. The frustration-aggression/ Algerian criminality of which Fanon has already spoke of is a theory that prevailed for years on end, used even by scientists including psychologists and psychiatrists to justify that the African is an inborn criminal without any regard for the possible effects of colonialism that have affected his mind, sending him into a frustration-aggression space which determined his behaviour.

Chapter 3: Pre-colonialism and Colonialism

Introduction

Africa bears an interesting history commonly unknown to not only outsiders but also to those who also reside on the continent. It boasts a great history of civilisations that changed the world, structured and organised trading, an active political life and social activity that have formed the foundations of most what we see today in modern Africa. Africa has been viewed by some as one country, yet, it is a big continent (second only to Asia). The seeing of Africa as a country is determined by the view many Western countries speak of Africa as the Dark Continent, which erases other countries that are progressing and taking the lead in development such as Botswana, South Africa amongst others. These generalisations have resulted in the oversimplifying of African pre-colonial civilisations, cultures and the continent's great diversity. The main focus of this chapter will be to explore Africa before Europeans. I want to explore how African culture has an impact on modern day politics. It is very important to understand how power was handled in pre-colonial Africa as well as colonial Africa, in order to understand the politics of post-colonial Africa.

“Pre-colonial communities interacted through commerce, marriage, migration, diplomacy and warfare. Their fertile land, trade routes, cattle forced interaction with other communities. Commerce was instrumental in state formation.” (Falola and Fleming, 2009, p: 3). Tribal life in Africa has always formed the basis of society. It meant something to Africans, to belong to a particular tribe as this was the pride and the sense of identity. When we observe tribal life from pre-colonial Africa and how important it was for Africans to maintain it, we are made aware also of the current situation in Africa of the importance of tribal life. Tribes were often distinguished by their specialities economically and socially, politically and how they ran their chiefdoms or kingdoms. Pre-colonial Africa was quite an organised sector which was divided into two types of states, Centralised and Decentralised. According to Kasumba, the difference between Centralised and Decentralised state is: “Centralised states were chiefly states. They were highly organized and with well-developed political, social and economic institutions. They had organized political authority centred on a chief or a King. The King or chief promoted law and order and he was sometimes assisted by lesser or minor chiefs to ensure effective administration. Example; in East Africa-there was Buganda, Bunyoro, Toto, in Central Africa, there was Ndebele, Gaza and Lozi empires, in South Africa there was the Zulu state while in West Africa there was Asante, Dahomey and Benin.” While “decentralized states (segmentary) were characterized by lack of chiefly institutions, they lacked single and accepted political authority. They were mostly divided into several clans. The clan elders were used to maintain law and order in such societies. Example also include; the Iteso, Nyamwezi and the Ibo.” (Kasumba, 2011, p: 2).

Historically, religion and culture helped to distinguish different tribes from each other. This is why spirituality has always held high meaning in African culture till today. For the sake of this thesis, I will document some of pre-colonial Africa and activities, to give a more in-depth meaning that showcases how Africans lived before and after colonialism. Due to a limitation of archaeological documentation available on pre-colonial Africa, we have tended to rely on researchers who begin documenting our history from when they arrived. It is also vital to understand that most of “the documentation about the history of Africa was done by outsiders such people as explorers, traders,

missionaries, colonial officers and others, who did not understand what they observed and were often prejudiced in their assessment of it.” (Connah, 2001, p: 7). As a result of this, we had to rely on what the outsiders reported on Africa which was not entirely the whole story. “Unlike most Euro-Asian civilisations, African civilisations favoured oral tradition and few possessed written languages. Stories and oral histories documented the past, and were handed down from generation to generation.” (Falola and Fleming, 2009, p: 2).

Kingdoms and Leadership

The “most prominent pre-colonial African civilisations were Egypt, Nubia, Ghana, Mali, Carthage, Zimbabwe and Kongo. In West Africa, the empire of Sudan, Ghana, Mali and Songhai all flourished. In Southern Africa, Great Zimbabwe emerged as the most complex civilisation throughout Southern Africa. In East Africa, plateau regions were suitable for cattle grazing.” (Falola and Fleming, 2009, p: 2). Africa was hardly an empty space that lacked civilisations, development or sustainable life. Africa had systems of rulership that governed her people and determined their way of life. With this type of past, although we cannot make concrete conclusions, it would be close to accurate to suggest that had it not been for colonialism, perhaps, Africa would have also found her own civilisations and sophisticated developments that would have contributed to today’s modern life.

There was a great deal of organisation in the structure of African leadership even though kingdoms and states were constantly replacing each other. “By the nineteenth century immediately before European division of the continent, many African states had already begun expanding in their numbers. Much more growth was occurring because of their ability to participate in international trade generated by the growing European presence on the coasts of Africa.” (James, 2002, p: 49-50). Africans expanded in various ways using their own means of knowledge in order to enlarge their territories and build greater civilisations, for example they used iron tools to make weapons and to clear forests, used the tools for farming as well. The iron tools were used for maintaining everyday life which indicates a great moment of African civilisation. The organisation of African states was such that “in centralised societies often run by monarchs or rulers, authority was often in the hands of the elite few that decided the laws, collected taxes, etc.” (Falola and Fleming, p: 4). This is a very interesting discovery as we can see the same pattern taking place in modern African rulership. The elite few that are often close to the president are the main rulers, though in modern Africa, they may not be as obvious as they were in previous times, this pattern is still quite prominent in operation.

The beginning of colonialism in Africa

In Kenya, British settlers “began to arrive in numbers in 1903 in what was then the British East Africa Protectorate; within the year they had formed their first organisation, the Planters and Farmers Association. “ (Bennett, 1957, p: 113). The British were mainly attracted to Kenya’s highly fertile highlands and getting access to Uganda which at the time was a strategic source of the Nile River. Kenya was rich and had opportunities in terms of farming, which attracted the British farmers. This made the White settlers to fight against the native for what was his using guns which obviously at the time the native lacked causing them to be defeated. The first aim of the Planters and Farmers was not colonialism, but “to export potatoes, but it was not long before it was voicing political demands. Rename the Colonists’ Association in 1904 under the leadership of Lord Delamere.”(Bennett, 1957, p: 120). With this intent of exporting potatoes, the local Kikuyu tribesmen “gave the Europeans building rights in places like Dagoretti, Fort Smith and others, with no idea of the motives which were behind the caravans, for they thought that it was only a matter of

trading and nothing else.” (Kenyatta, 2015, p: 31). Colonialism thus became a system that was evil and which contributed heavily to the development of the modern West while for others it is a system that contributed to globalisation and a sharing of cultures that led to modern civilisations. “The changing morality of colonialism contributes to our lack of understanding. People feel strongly about colonialism- it has either been a dirty business engaged in by evil people or a praiseworthy endeavour undertaken by fine gentlemen for the noble purpose of saving the wretched, the savage and the unfortunate. We can hardly speak about colonialism without speaking about how people feel about it, because this feeling has given the word myriad connotations.” (Horvarth, 1972, p: 2). The “Scramble for Africa” was the 1884/1885 Berlin Conference, which set the rules of colonial occupation. Together with the 1886 Anglo-German and other inter-European territorial arrangements, the conference was instrumental in not only erecting artificial boundaries around Kenya, but also in wresting diplomatic initiative from African people.” (Ndege, 2009, p: 2).

As discussed already, these artificial borders that never used to exist before colonial occupation in turn became psychological borders. Where Africans used to be one thing and enjoyed communal living amongst their very own, now they were forced to live together under the umbrella of Kenya without proper integration. This type of force led to tribal and civil wars way after colonialism withdrew, because psychologically, everyone still wanted to claim their original heritage, of which each one believed to have been superior. “When we consider the resources deployed to achieve the cultural alienation so typical of the colonial period, we realize that nothing was left to chance and that the final aim of colonization was to convince the indigenous population it would save them from darkness. The result was to hammer into the heads of indigenous population that if the colonist were to leave they would regress into barbarism, degradation, and bestiality.” (Fanon, 1963, p: 149). Not only was it essential for European settlers to keep Africans from being united, but also historically, they positioned themselves as needed by Africans. This led to Africans ending up being convinced that they right to hate on each other and to see each other as different and not capable of being one thing unless if they are being ruled by Europeans for the benefit of Europe.

“Its (colonialism) driving motivation was and is not only pursuit of material exploitation and cultural domination, but also European self-aggrandizement to compensate for gnawing doubts on the wholeness and integrity of the self that, in different ways and intensity, assail people everywhere.” (Bulhan, 2015, p: 240). Colonialism promoted Eurocentric beliefs which created an inferiority complex within the African mind. Everything that was White was aggrandized while everything that was Black was despised. This mental conditioning also ensured that Africans believed everything Europeans taught them as correct while disregarding their own histories and backgrounds. Colonial masters also understood that there is power knowing where one comes from and who their people are, hence much effort was placed during this time to discredit any African legacy while promoting the idea that Africa was a non-developed continent until the European came through. Fanon goes on to say “reclaiming the past does not only rehabilitate or justify the promise of a national culture. It triggers a change of fundamental importance in the colonized's psycho-affective equilibrium.” (Fanon, 1963, p: 148).

The conquering of the native people led to “the demarcation of Kenya's boundaries were without the consultation of the Kenyan's people. They arbitrarily brought together over forty previously independent communities into one territorial entity.” (Ndege, 2009, p: 3). The establishment of colonialism saw separate clans, tribes and cultures being forced to adopt a larger identity. Indeed, “when marking out the boundaries of their new territories, European negotiators frequently resorted to drawing straight lines on the map, taking little or no account of the myriad of

traditional monarchies, chiefdoms and other African societies that existed on the ground.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 1). The chiefs and kings of the clans being stripped of their power and in some cases being used as mediators of means of controlling the vast population were now subjects to colonial masters. Getting rewarded for ensuring that a revolution does begin amongst the natives in their tribes was not their only duties, but also to keep natives believing that indeed what is White is good and should not be challenged. Keeping their own people psychologically bound also into believing that they are indeed different from one another and therefore, need to maintain tribal independence worked in the favour of Europeans. Colonialism entailed a particularly brutal psychological social engineering, a psycho-politics that left its legacy well after colonial powers had withdrawn. The withdrawal of colonialism in Kenya did not come with mental freedom. Even to date, what is White is still considered highly favoured, civilised and better. Africans are still struggling to get their minds out of this belief. Corruption and greed in and amongst African leaders in an effort of catching up with hundreds of years of looting and stealing by Europeans in Africa, was practiced by post-colonial leaders and is still being practiced today. This is the mental conditioning that came with colonialism.

“With so few men on the ground, colonial governments relied heavily on African Chiefs and other functionaries to collaborate with officials and exercise control on their behalf. The British especially favoured a system of 'indirect rule'. Using African authorities to keep order collect taxes and supply labour that involved a minimal of staff and expense.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 6). Most people who were appointed to these functions were often from the chief bloodlines, who would later on do these duties out of self-interest. Instead of looking out for the greater good of the other Africans who were not appointed due to their not belonging to royal families, Africans from royal families were already exhibiting what we are currently seeing in modern Africa, a system of self-service' because it now our time to eat.

Europeans depended mostly military conquest to win over land. For example, in Francophone countries, “the French were most active in pursuing this policy of military conquest. Of course Britain’s military imperialism was equally spectacular and bloody, the African response, was also resolute and often prolonged.” (Uzoigwe, 1985, p: 36). When this many tribes are forced to live together as “one big tribe”, one can expect that the colonial masters experienced vast difficulties with this arrangements as the different tribes still wanted to maintain their identities in relation to each other and which later on, which would result in frequent inter-tribal wars. “Nigeria for example, contained as many as 250 ethno linguistic groups. Officials sent to Belgium Congo eventually identified six thousand chiefdoms there.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 2). Falola and Fleming, 2009, adds that, “colonisation was achieved in Nigeria either by the use of war or by surrender because of the threat of war. The loss of war and the removal or death of a king translated into one major outcome: loss of independence and incorporation” (Falola and Fleming, 2009, p: 1).

With loss of independence, meant that the natives had no choice but to be governed and ruled by the brutal force of colonialism which eventually resulted in occupation. “The divide and conquer tactics used by the colonists even during the Scramble for Africa is one that literally played with minds of its victims countries and has left them confused ever since.” (Abdulai, 2009, p: 1).

Over the years since independence, the subject topic surrounding colonialism has attracted many scholars world-wide including its effects on Africans. Studies on the effects of colonialism on Africa’s political and socio-economic development are countless. However, not much has been said on the psychological effect of colonialism on Africans. Colonialism is defined by Rashid as, “the establishment and exploitation of colonies in the territory by people from another territory. A set of

unequal relationships between the colonial power and the colony and often between the colonists and the indigenous population.”(Rashid, 2014, p: 8).

The system of segregation practiced everywhere in Africa made it easy for the few Europeans that settled and conquered the land to rule. Where the European lived, he built better infrastructure to ensure his comfort, while leaving the Africans in absolute poverty. “On a global scale there are colonial mother-lands and their colonies; in a colonised country there are European zones and 'African' areas. This Manichean geography exposes itself most dramatically in colonial cities, where clean, well-built, brightly lit foreign quarters adjoin dirty, ramshackle, dark African quarters.” (Wyrick, 1998, p: 116).

The European settlers were aware that this divided space was not only meant to register as an only a type of physical space but also a type of mental condition. The European took the best land for himself and most of it, while subjecting the African to small bits of unproductive land which would force them to later fight for survival. Land that Africans once owned and inherited from their forefathers was taken away from them through conquest and Africans were driven into small lands which started becoming smaller as the African population continued to grow. “Indirect rule kept governance away from the people. The colonial state centralises, racialised and ethnised power. As a result, the colonial state remained alien and governed through authoritarianism.” (Ngege, 2009, p: 4&8).

In the colonial states, some Africans occupied low administration positions such as clerks, messengers and interpreters. Africans were slowly and carefully introduced to administrative work in the political arena of the colonies without giving away power or any ideas that they could ever have power or independence. “Each of Britain's fourteen African territories was governed separately. Each had its own budget, its own laws and public services. Each was under the control of a governor powerful enough in his own domain to ensure that his views there prevailed.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 11).

The two types of rule existed during the colonial era: Direct and Indirect rule. The direct rule involved “the comprehensive sway of market institutions, the appropriation of land, the destruction of communal autonomy, and the defeat and dispersal of tribal populations.” While indirect rule meant “land remained a communal customary possession. The market was restricted to the products of labour, only manually incorporating land or labour itself. Political inequality went with civil inequality.” (Mamdani, 1996, p: 117).

The difference between French rule and British rule was that the British colonies were considered separate from the mother-land while the French considered their colonies an extension of the bigger France, much more like an extra province of France. “This political advancement thus means according Africans a higher number of representatives in the French parliament.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 12). This explains the behaviour of modern citizens of Francophone and Anglophones. It seems more that Francophonians are happy to identify and call themselves French, but Anglophonians are far from identifying themselves as English.

Colonial Africa was a profit engineering machine used to enrich the West and all that represented it. Although the different colonies were run differently, the more West African colonies were more advanced also in the production of African intellectuals who would later on become doctors and engineer, even occupy high ranked positions in state institutions. With the development of railways and roads, Africans began to move to the cities for a better life.

The importance of the utility of Psychology in enforcing colonialism in Africa

“Psychology, like all other disciplines and human endeavours, has emerged, developed and today operates in economic, social, cultural and political contexts. Neglect of these contexts by established psychologists and their role in oppression generally and European colonialism particularly has been one of the hidden and not often recognised dangers of a discipline that claims to specialise in the science of the human mind and behaviour.” (Bulhan, 2013, p: 240). It would rather be careless for one to address the relationship between psychology and colonialism without bringing in the enlightening writings of Frantz Fanon who was a professional psychiatrist as well as a revolutionist. Steve Biko the advocate and founder of the concept of Black Consciousness and Fanon wrote about what is known as psycho-politics.

Psycho-politics is “a critical awareness of the role that political factors play within the domain of the psychological. An understanding of both how politics can have an impact upon the psychological and how personal psychology may be the level at which politics is internalised and individually entrenched.” (Hook, 2004, p: 85). During colonisation, half of the work that did not involve physical force in order to achieve total cooperation would not have been achieved if there was no use of psychological methods. It became important for the European to study the mind of the human and how it functioned. “Colonialism from the beginning was therefore economic, political, cultural and psychological. Its economic and political motives were most obvious at the beginning; the cultural and psychological motives integral to it all along became more intense and manifest later.” (Bulhan, 2013, p: 240). To learn the African's culture and what was important to the African and later on use it against him to rule over him.

Religion, Culture and Education

The usage of Christianity to enforce obedience and fear of eternal damnation if the white master was not revered was a psychological phenomenon. For as long as the African was taught that the white man is closer to God and superior and that disobedience will lead to absolute destruction, the African had no other choice but to obey. A lie told over and over again and for a longer period of time will eventually become truth to its recipients. Scriptures such as , “ Slaves, obey your earthly masters with respect and fear, and with sincerity of heart, just as you would obey Christ.⁶ Obey them not only to win their favour when their eye is on you, but as slaves of Christ, doing the will of God from your heart. ⁷ serve wholeheartedly, as if you were serving the Lord, not people, ⁸ because you know that the Lord will reward each one for whatever good they do, whether they are slave or free.” (*New International Version*, Ephesians 6: 5-9). Basing their arguments and emphasis on scriptures such as these and ensuring everyone believed in the supremacy of the Bible as a Holy book written by God Himself, colonialism was then infiltrated from that angle as well.

Christian Evangelism and Missionaries

“It had been argued therefore, that the partition of Africa was due in no small measure, to a broader missionary and humanitarian impulse which aimed at the regeneration of the African peoples. It has been asserted moreover that it was the missionaries who prepared the ground for the imposition of colonialism in East and Central Africa as well as Madagascar.” (Uzoigwe, 1958, p: 22). Christianity indeed played a big role in the changing of African culture which formed the basis of the African identity. The modification or purification of the African people from unbelieving savages who needed to be purified through European religion as well as the demonising of African cultures which were already imbedded within the African religions caused a big mind shift that created an inferiority complex within the African as he considered himself evil and in need of purification.

“Similarly, Christian missionary destroyed African culture through the gospels of salvation, obedience and work. Christian missions preached against African cultures. They were empathic that the African's salvation must be gauged on the extent to which traditional cultural practices abandoned.” (Ndege, 2009, p: 6). This method also trained Africans to look down upon those Africans who still practiced their African religions as primitive and uncivilised. This psychological method was so powerful that the European managed to convince that as the African served him, so he served God. “Gaining access into the 'savage mind' made it easier to gain access to cheap labour, land, and natural resources. On the other hand, producing the colonised other as the object of Western study furthered the illusion of scientific and intellectual superiority that justified colonialism as a helpful, civilising mission.” (Wyrick, 1998, p: 55). Through education given to Africans and also research done on Africans through medical help, Europeans could further their beliefs and spread the hypothesis that indeed the African is indeed inferior.

The educational system during colonialism was created to brainwash the Africans and wipe away any pre-colonial history that Africans could possibly be holding on to. The purpose was to make Africans and to psychologically condition them to believe that they have been saved by the European from savagery and civilisation, prior to the European there was chaos in Africa and no organisation. “Colonial education therefore, fostered the emergence of quiescent and obedient elites. They served the colonial state and economy as semi-skilled workers, clerks and chiefs.” (Ndege, 2009, p: 6). Psychology has always been used by Europeans even during the slavery days, where “they declared severe psychopathology in slaves who ran away from plantations. Soon after emancipation, others declared that emancipation would bring their extinction with 'unerring certainty.' while others insisted that emancipation brought former slaves severe and manifest deterioration in mind and body because they were incapable of living freely” (Bulhan, 2015, p: 249). Arguments made were counter-emancipation of slaves and even ending colonialism and were meant as brainwashing tools to also convince the Africans that freedom from the father figure (European) was not going to do them good.

Conclusion

Pre-colonial Africa gives us an indicator that life in Africa already existed in its own form. Africa had systems and organisations as well as leadership that led and governed its own people. This is a system that should have continued from here in post-colonial Africa. Colonialism in Africa was an invasion of the system that was or could have evolved into something that would have functioned in the modern world. Colonialism invaded not only land but also the mind of the metacolonised through the disfiguring of the metacolonised mind, culture and language. Colonialism was not a civilising system but a dominating system meant to convince the colonised that the European and everything he represents is superior. Colonialism created a psychological state that ensured that the colonised remained in a state of increasing and expanding the interest of the West (we will see this in the last chapter of post-colonialism). The psychological impact of colonialism ensured that the colonial master maintained the upper hand and convinced the colonised that everything said and done by him represented the truth.

Chapter 4: Decolonisation in Kenya

Introduction

The following chapter is divided into two sections: firstly, it will firstly take a brief look at the two post-independence leaders Jomo Kenyatta and Daniel Arap Moi's leadership and political profiles. The reason why I chose to begin with their profile is to introduce them as my main subjects whom I will be using to compare with the colonial rule and how colonialism may have had a psychological impact on their own leadership later on when they took over. In this chapter I will also speak on human rights abuses under both leaders as one of my comparisons with the type of rulership that was shown by colonial masters. Splitting the two leaders in the chapter allows me to compare Kenyatta with the colonial rulers, and then Moi with both Kenyatta and colonial rule and see the similarities. The purpose of this chapter is to show that the two post-colonial Kenya leaders, when taking over power, had a desire for democracy, but somehow, along the way failed to implement it due to psychological effects left behind by the colonial legacy in Kenya. The usage of tribalism will also be spoken of as a tool that was used to further divide the people of Kenya, in order to maintain power. Tribalism was also used during colonialism as a tool to divide and conquer the people of Kenya. Keeping them apart was the only way to retain power because it kept the people from mobilising as a nation. Later on, in post-colonial Kenya, we will see how ethnic politics play a role in who gets what and who does not get what. This is a system that was first and foremost will cover their desires for democracy but yet their failures and frustration in implementing it. In this chapter, I will also speak of tribalism as a tool used both by the colonial and post-colonial Kenyan politicians to retain power and to centralise it further amongst them.

The second unit will provide a narrative of the decolonisation process that took place in Kenya which led up to their independence on 12 December 1963. I have used Morton Deutsch's political psychology to defend when he says, "just as cognitive capabilities limit and affect the nature of political decision-making so, also the structure of political decision-making affects cognitive capabilities." (Deutsch, 2002, p: 222). The colonial system was a system that oppressed the minds of the Africans in Kenya psychologically and politically. There in the absence of reasonable political activity and representation, the decision making of the Kenyans became affected and was influenced by this mental suppression to revolt against the injustice system of colonialism. This chapter uses Frantz Fanon's explanation of what the Algerian criminality was deemed to be by the French colonials as a naturally born instinct that they all had, whereas, Fanon believed that "The Algerian's criminality, his impulsivity, and the violence of his murders are therefore not the consequence of the organization of his nervous system or of characterial originality, but the direct product of the colonial situation." (Fanon, 1963, p: 309). Therefore, the process of decolonisation was a psychological activity of wanting to release the emotional and mental oppression forced upon the African by the colonialist.

World War 2 and the Atlantic Charter

Prior to World War 1, political activism and involvement by the African community not only in Kenya but throughout the African colonies was not available, even though there may have existed an interest to participate in politics. In fact, political participation was limited thus only to the white settlers who lived in the highlands of Kenya and who had economic power as well. World War 2 saw a lot of deployment of African soldiers who were sent to fight in Europe. It was after World War 2 that many Africans realised the importance of political participation hence the expectations that afterwards. "African leaders had expected that as a post-war reward, they would get proper employment and same living standard as their European counter-parts." (Meyer, 2015, p: 2).

When Africans were fighting in World War 2, they were fighting a war they knew nothing about. They were not told about the freedom that France and Britain were fighting the for. However, once this knowledge reached their ears, it changed everything and created great expectations as stated by the Nigerian servicemen to Nigerian Nationalist leader Herbert Macaulay in 1945: "We all overseas soldiers are coming back home with new ideas. We have been told what we fought for. That is 'freedom'. We want freedom. Nothing but freedom!" (Philpott, 2001, p: 194). This demand of freedom is a strong demand as it shows that it stems from one who was formerly oppressed and now finally realises their worth and who they really are. This is when they psychologically realise their humanity as Fanon describes in his book what, "and it is precisely at the moment he realizes his humanity that he begins to sharpen the weapons with which he will secure its victory." (Fanon, 1963, p: 43). The Europeans cannot be fighting for freedom and yet continue to subject Africans for to colonialism.

This same act was done in August 1789, when the French demanded that in their country, every person should be viewed as equal under the the Declaration of Human rights which "delineates for individuals a generous range of personal rights and freedoms." (Johnson, 1990, p: 6). However, when word reached the island, Haiti, which was a French slave colony at the time, the Haitian slaves at the time had a mental shift, their psychology made them realise their humanity and therefore demanded it as well. This demand for freedom was not met with the expectations of the enslaved; the French refused them their freedom, obviously leading up to the historical Haitian revolution that took place in August 1791.

The demand for freedom by Africans or anyone else for that matter who was enslaved by the West could have never been met with a favourable response as Europeans did not believe in the same humanity that the African now believed about himself. For, for the European, in order to exploit and take control, it became important for them to use psychological tools that will force the African or the metacolonised to see himself as inferior.

In 1941, a document was drafted after the war called the Atlantic Charter. The purpose of this document was to address post-war reconstructions, in other words how Europeans are going to move on from the war and rebuild their countries. The Atlantic Charter is a document that was adopted, released and agreed upon by the president of the United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill in their historic meeting on 14 August 1941. The document was drafted in an effort to amend the destructions caused by the war. Amongst the eight principles mentioned in the charter was number three which stated that, in order for countries to love on from the war, there will be a need to "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them." (Rai, 2002, p: 199). Obviously when the African soldiers knew about this, they too wanted the freedom to choose their own government

without being forced to live under anyone's oppression. When the African soldiers returned home in Kenya, they found the same segregation and the same degree of racism still thriving in their countries. Jobs were even more scarce and they were competing with immigrants for jobs.

In 1944, the political activism ban was lifted in Kenya which led to the formation of the Kenya African Study Union (KASU) founded in October 1944. Jomo Kenyatta also became the president of Kenya African Union (KAU) upon his return from London shortly after the war in 1946. The party was joined by some soldiers who were also coming from war overseas but others decided to join the Mau Mau violent means to gain independence which was to use because they believed that their freedom had to be taken by force and violence from the colonial masters and that KASU's way was not sufficient enough.

The First Post-Colonial Kenyan President: Jomo Kenyatta (12 December 1964 – 22 August 1978)

Jomo Kenyatta was born Kamau wa Ngengi to his parents Ngengi wa Muigai and Wambui in North Nairobi in a village called Gatundu. After his father died while he still very young, Kenyatta went to live with his grandfather who was an African traditional healer and of which he became very close to. However, "after an illness brought him into contact with missionaries, he ran away to the mission and undertook Western education." (Celarent, 2010, p: 722). Upon completing his education at the mission house school, Kenyatta became an apprentice in 1912 and in 1914; he was baptized and was soon converted to Christianity, taking up a new name Johnstone Kamau.

After studying, Kenyatta moved to Nairobi where he started working in various jobs. "In 1922, Kenyatta joined the fledgling East African Association (EAA), the first political protest movement in Kenya against White domination. However, government pressure soon caused this group to disband, only to come back later as the Gikuyu Central Association (GCA) where Kenyatta became the general secretary in 1928." (Sowards, 1995, p: 296). In 1934; Kenyatta got accepted to study at University College London, where he studied social anthropology. In 1938 he attained a new name, Jomo Kenyatta when he published his first book *Facing Mount Kenya* which revealed that Kenyatta was a man passionate about his Kikuyu heritage.

When the British colonial commission proposed a merge of Uganda, Kenya and Tanganyika, his tribe's interest were immediately threatened and as a result he made a trip to London in the 1920s to make his plea against the merge, but was unsuccessful. Kenyatta used the GCA as his platform to defend his people's right of ownership of the Kenyan land, Kenyatta also travelled to Moscow as well to the International Negroes Workers' Conference (INWC) in Hamburg. His trips to Moscow and Soviet Union would later make him a suspect in the rebellion that would erupt in his country in the following years to come. Kenyatta's sole purpose however, with these overseas trips was to be the mouthpiece of his own people back at home who couldn't voice out their frustrations against the British colonial administration. Kenyatta has been described as a charismatic leader who loved being an African, "a man who always insisted on the African point of view, but made enough concessions to remain in dialogue with his opponents." (Celarent, 2010, p:722).

The attendance of The Fifth Pan African Congress in Manchester by Kenyatta

When India got its independence from the British in 1947, this news became a catalyst for other colonies to take up arms and start fighting against the colonial regime. At this point the only thought running through the African's mind was freedom and Fanon supported that "There is one duty to be done, one end to achieve: to thrust out colonialism by every means in their power." (Fanon, 1963, p: 21). The inspiration and adrenaline that many colonies received from the independence of India spread the same way the freedom of the Haitian former slaves spread to the

other islands, including the USA. “Throughout the African colonies, nationalism was taking hold and independence was being achieved, first by Kwame Nkrumah’s Ghana in 1957, inspiring hope across Africa.” (Meyer, 2015, p: 2). This achievement saw strength (both physical and mental) being provided to the rest of people who were still under the yoke of colonialism. The mental break away from accepting the inhumane identity that stemmed from colonial masters unto the Africans saw the average African finally deciding to take up arms and fight for his own humanity.

But before this independence, after World War 2, in 1945, African leaders met in Manchester for the Fifth Pan-African Congress. The purpose of this meeting was for African leaders to meet and discuss the independence of their countries from imperialism. The same way the European countries were making post-war plans, African also wanted to discuss post war Africa. Amongst those who attended along with Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya was Ras Makonnen, Amy Garvey, W.E. Du Bois, Kwame Nkrumah (Ghana) who later on like Kenyatta would also become leaders of their own countries in post-independence Africa. During the Pan African Congress, the leaders justified the use as violence as a means that will be used to overthrow colonialism if no efforts are made from colonial powers to withdraw their rule in Africa. Kenyatta also participated in Fabian Society conferences and prior to the Manchester conference, in 1926 and “In 1923, he went with two others to London to present the Gikuyu Central Association case for land return. He stayed 18 months, during which he visited, among other places, the Soviet Union.” (Celarent, 2010, p: 722).

The Pan African Congress was regarded a peace-maker and a solution congress especially in Africa for decolonization. The most important matters discussed at this congress was to end colonialism in Africa, the respect of human rights, the end of racial discrimination and to open up economic opportunities equally for everyone. This conference was a big mark in Jomo Kenyatta’s political career and earned him a lot of points as he contributed towards the liberation of his own people.

The Pan African Congress was about Africans achieving their political independence and finding their true identity in the world. Their strategy however, may not have scored points with Fanon as he was not one to entertain the idea of round-table freedom negotiation meetings. According, to Fanon, freedom is not negotiated, but taken by force. Upon returning to Kenya, “Kenyatta found it too difficult to control the surge militancy. He favoured constitutional means to oppose colonial rule but was outflanked by militant activists prepared to use violence.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 84). Yet for Fanon, the real process of decolonization is the one the Mau Mau was embarking on.

Second Post-Colonial Kenyan President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi (8 November 1979 – 30 December 2002)

Daniel Arap Moi was born on 2 September 1924, in a village called Kurieng'wo in Sacho Location. Unlike Jomo Kenyatta, his predecessor, when Arap Moi was born, Europeans had already taken over Kenya. Arap Moi Studied teaching at “Tambach Teachers Training College in the Keiyo District. He worked as a teacher from 1946 until 1955’s college where he trained to become a teacher” (softkenya.com).

Moi was encouraged to go to school by his elder brother who became his guardian after his father died. His elder brother wanted him to get an education so that he can use it as a tool to fight against poverty and the oppression exerted by the colonial rule against Black people. Moi later continued to further himself in education and knowledge and in, “1950, he attended a course at the Jeans School (Kenya Institute of Administration) and was posted to Government African School,

Kabarnet where he taught Teachers up to 1955 when he joined politics.” (Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi Profile- April, 2011).

Through The Jeans School Moi became even more interested in politics as many African post-independence leaders; joining politics for them had more to do at time with fighting against colonial oppression than any other factor at the time. “In 1955 Moi entered politics when he was elected Member of the Legislative Council for Rift Valley. In 1960 he founded and became the leader of the Kenya African Democratic Union (KADU) with Ronald Ngala to challenge the Kenya African National Union (KANU) led by Jomo Kenyatta.”(History of President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi).

While he was leader of KADU, Moi rallied behind Kenyatta’s release and in 1960, June, he was amongst those who were delegated to visit the then detained Kenyatta in Lodwar, London. This meeting was known as the for the London Constitutional talks meeting. Arap Moi continued to move up the ranks in the pre-independence politics as in 1957, “he was re-elected Member of the Legislative Council for Rift Valley. He became Minister of Education in the pre-independence government of 1960–1961.”(History of President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi).

When Kenya achieved its independence in 1963 and Moi was still leader belonging to the opposition party KADU, Kenyatta approached with a proposal to join KANU to which Moi agreed. Kenyatta, who was a Kikuyu and Moi a Kalenjin, believed that the move will demonstrate and encourage Kenyans towards a more united nation by bringing someone from a different tribe into his close circle. This new collation did not go without opposition. A party called the Kenya People’s Union became an opposition party, but due to the nature of Kenyatta’s politics back then, Kenyatta also did tolerate opposition, therefore, the party was banned and he made Kenya a one state party which believed was the only way to curb and destroy tribalism in the country. Although, Kenyatta justified his appointment of Moi as his vice-president as motivated by anti-tribal efforts to eliminate tribalism in Kenya, for some researches,”Kenyatta appointed Moi because he was eyeing the fertile lands of the Rift Valley populated by members of Moi’s Kalenjin tribe and Kenyatta secured their support by first promoting Moi to Minister for Home Affairs in 1964, and then to vice-president in 1967.” (History of President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi).

Even though Arap Moi was appointed by Kenyatta himself to be his vice-president and was somewhat regarded by most Kenyans as the right person who will later take over the country towards democracy without any ethical boundaries and into a new era of social, political and economic success, “he was never accepted into Kenyatta’s inner circle because he is a Kalenjin.” (Adar and Munyae, 2001, p: 1). His loyalty towards Kenyatta did not matter as long as he was a Kalenjin and therefore was often side-lined.

The presidency of Moi began in 1978 when Jomo Kenyatta, his predecessor died. When Arap Moi first took the presidency office, like most African leaders that came before and after him, hopes of a better tomorrow were raised and people were always left high in spirit. He took important political decisions that convinced people he was steering the country in the right direction. “In December 1978 Moi, released all twenty six political detainees across the ethnic spectrum, reassured Kenyans that his administration would not condone "tribalism", corruption, and smuggling, problems already deeply entrenched in Kenya.” (Adar and Munyae, 2001, p: 1). The Kenyan people started to believe that the once Kikuyu “owned” government was now becoming a multi-ethnic government. With regards to corruption, Moi made a public demonstration in 1989 when he burnt “ivory tusks worth US \$2.5 million in a grand gesture against ivory trafficking which

had decimated Kenya's elephant population." (Meredith, 2011, p: 371). These were positive signals that showed the end of corruption and ethnic politics in Kenya.

The Decolonisation of Kenya

The decolonisation transition refers to "the transfer of political power from the colonial government to the government of an independent Kenyan state managed by indigenous Africans." (Oyugi, et al, 2003, p: 17). The psychological shift that occurs in an individual for them to begin to see themselves as human and not just as an object of exploitation may at first have been a doubtful and very slow process to reach the individual, however, when it eventually reaches them, they are anxious to do something about their current situation. When one has grown up under the "The Burden of The White man" which was to make all the people in their colonies believe that their supreme mandate was to civilise and save humanity from barbarism that psychological imbedded belief becomes the cause of the delay towards decolonisation.

The Mau Mau Rebellion

According to Skocpol, "once successful, a revolution marks the transition from the previous mode of production and form of class dominance to a new mode of production, in which new social relations of productions, new political and ideological forms, and, in general, the hegemony of the newly triumphant revolutionary class, create appropriate conditions for the further development of society." (Skocpol, 1979, p: 8). The Mau Mau rebellion was a revolt that took place between 1952-1960. The Mau Mau was largely made up of the Kikuyu people and it was a "rebellion that grew out of anger and resentment at the mass expulsion in post-war years of Kikuyu peasants from the White Highlands." (Meredith, 2011, p: 79). With the years that proceeded during colonialism in Kenya, more Black people continued to be expelled out of their land and moved up to areas where they became too concentrated. The Kikuyu people continued to grow in numbers and as a result needed more space to live, of which the British were not willing to provide. However, prior to the Mau Mau Rebellion, the ill treatment of the British on the local people where they were treated with enormous amounts of racism, land and labour exploitation eventually in the 1920s, also ended up leading to the formation of "The Young Kikuyu Association which attempted to unite the divided Kikuyu and promote nationalism." (Meyer, 2015, p: 30).

The Young Kikuyu Association (YKA) was disbanded by the colonial masters as it was in the culture of the colonial system not to entertain any opposition and made sure no one (suspected enemies or real enemies) challenged or planned to overthrow it. This suppression did not stop the feelings of dissatisfaction from the people, instead, "there was strong anti-colonial sentiment, as increasing influxes of Europeans continued to restrict African access to land and resources, and the desire for self-determination increased." (Meyer, 2015, p: 3). With the best land only reserved for White farmers and Black people given the most infertile land, this created a dependency for Black people to depend on the crops and food produced by White farmers on the land that was once theirs, causing even more tensions amongst the members of the Kikuyu tribesmen.

When the Mau Mau rebellion took place in the 1950s, its scale was big as it "spread to other sections of the Kikuyu people to the Kikuyu reserves where longstanding grievances over land, were already festering, and to Nairobi where militant activists set up a central committee to direct the violence." (Meredith, 2011, p: 79). Although the scale of this rebellion took the colonialists by surprise, the colonial rulers in Kenya declared it an emergency throughout the country, back in London, "the government was little perturbed. Kenya never topped the cabinet's agenda and had little intention of paying the insurgents the compliment of treating them as rebels, and denied the political aspect of the Mau Mau, considering them nothing more than atavistic, antimodernist

terrorists.” (Nissimi, 2006, p: 5).” The rebellion was eventually soon destroyed due to lack of arms, proper military training and mass incarceration on the part of those rebelling thereby restoring back law and order by the British rulers by 1955. The process of decolonisation was not going to be interpreted the same way from the African to the European point of view. The European never suffered psychological effects which rendered him completely paralysed mentally and incubated in a box of pre-determined negative ideas about himself. This is why a European cannot fathom the real extent of the colonial damage on the psychological mind of the African. To the European, the violent process of the Mau Mau was a mere, “sinister tribal cult affecting a largely primitive and superstitious people, confused and bewildered by their contact with the civilised world and prey to the malevolent designs of ambitious politics.”(Meredith, 2011, p: 80).

On the other hand, “Kenyatta as the nationalist leader was blamed for the violence, portraying him as a criminal mastermind who employed witchcraft and coercion in his drive for power and profit and proceeded to rig his trial to justify their claims, “(Meredith, 2011, p: 79). Kenyatta continued to be the prime suspect in the Mau Mau uprising though in an attempt of seemingly wanting to be trusted by the Europeans, he tried many times to rid himself of the stigma of ever being attached to such an organisation, as Fanon would later say “he loudly proclaims that he has nothing to do with these Mau-Mau, these terrorists, these throat-slitters.”(Fanon, 1963, p: 62). The colonialists believed intensely that Kenyatta was involved in the rebellion as they “traced the signs of African unrest back to the time of his return to Kenya in 1946 after a period of fifteen years abroad.”(Meredith, 2011, p: 80). This was a unanimous agreement amongst all the White people in Kenya and in 1953, Kenyatta was eventually incarcerated and spent seven years in prison. However, the incarceration of Kenyatta in 1953 saw an increase in the membership of the Mau Mau during his trial and rendered his reputation clean as he kept out of trouble. Upon his release in 1960, Kenyatta emerged as a hero and was treated and welcomed by his people as a very important figure within the Kenyan society.

The Mau Mau rebellion was more than just a physical rebellion against the estimated 63 years of colonial oppression in Kenya; this was a psychological battle of Africans who were desperate to free themselves from mental oppression and the tension that built up in them for so long and which instilled an inferiority complex within them to make them believe they were sub-human. Frantz Fanon emphasises the effect of colonialism when he justifies that violence against colonial occupation is in fact a good thing “because the spirit of discouragement that has been deeply rooted in people's minds by colonial domination is still very near the surface.” (Fanon, 1963, p: 194). This eventually led to the frustration-aggression discussed earlier, however, this time aimed at the colonial masters in order that the metacolonised may be cleansed of his inferiority and self-hatred. Fanon goes on to make a link between the spirit of discouragement and violence in his statement “the African knows all this, and laughs to himself every time he spots an allusion to the animal world in the other's words. For he knows that he is not an animal; and it is precisely at the moment he realizes his humanity that he begins to sharpen the weapons with which he will secure its victory.”(Fanon, 1963, p: 43). Fanon states that upon realising that the African is not the subhuman or baby that required guidance as the colonial system had labelled him, he begins to find his true identity within himself and realises he need to fight for his humanity.

The refusal of political representation for the Africans made it impossible for their concerns or grievances to be noted and properly conveyed to their former oppressors. This created a frustration-aggressive state for the African, who constantly had to suppress his feelings and emotions when told repeatedly they cannot be trusted with self-governance or in running a country as they will destroy

themselves due to their inborn criminality and barbarism. The Mau Mau rebellion could not be recognised as apolitical activity either because of the refusal black people had to be involved in politics or have political representation as mentioned earlier. In the words of one Colonial Officer while based in Kenya he even said, describing the Mau Mau initiation ceremony as “based on lethal mixture of pseudo-religion and the evil forms of black magic.”(Meredith, 2011, p: 80). However, we see that these types of activities have always formed part of the African culture in empowering them or re-connecting them to where they feel they belong. Before Europeans arrived, such activities were never considered as black magic or evil but instead as culture but today, due to colonial mental influence through religion, even Africans believe these practices are evil and should not even be discussed.

This is not the first time we see Africans opting to the usage of magic and voodoo when involving a revolt. The former slaves in Haiti exhibited the same behaviour before fighting against the White enslavers on the colony by visiting an African priest on the night of their mission to start the process of ending slavery. Therefore, this process, by the African, seems like a mental freeing process for him before embarking in a liberation struggle. He has a need to get in touch with his roots, which unfortunately during colonialism, one of the missions of the regime was to destroy. To this date as Bulhan says, “the promoters of metacolonialism also affirm that one finds the good and moral life by embracing Europeans as demigods and assimilating their culture while eroding the religious heritage of non-Europeans” (Bulhan, 2015, p:247). This means, because Africans were able to fight the first fight which meant the freedom of their bodies from colonial oppression through the utilisation of their own cultural incarnations and supernatural empowerments, this means the next step of conquering the mental oppression by post-colonial leaders, would have been the discarding of Western thinking and ideologies and staying with the same methods as used by those who engaged in the armed struggle.

According to Political Psychology “cognitive capabilities limit and affect the nature of political decision-making and the process of decision making affects cognitive capabilities.” (Deutsch, 1983, p: 222). When one’s cognition is limited to not think beyond the given and prescribed limitation, it will create a certain behavioural reaction that indicates the presence of a cognitive suppression which often leads to the taking of decisions that affect one’s next step. The African, though being called a barbarian and a savage, had to “consider it as a triumph of barbarism; but of its own volition it achieves, slowly but surely, the emancipation of the rebel, for bit by bit it destroys in him and around him the colonial gloom.” (Fanon, 1963, p: 21).

For the European, coming to Africa was not only about civilising the African, it was also about emptying him of all that was pre-colonially inside of him. The White Man’s Burden is the name of a poem written in 1886, by the British imperial poet, who used it to convince Europeans that anyone who is outside the Western culture needed to be civilised and brought on par with their cultures and languages. Many White people believed in this poem and what it represented for them. This belief created a strong psychological effect in the mind of the European making him believe that indeed what he was doing was the right thing, mandated to him. Mamdani says, “In colonial discourse, the problem of stabilizing the alien was politely referred to as the ‘African question’. It was a dilemma that confronted every colonial power and a riddle that pre-occupied the best of its minds.” (Mamdani, 1996, p: 3). The European carried this mission out through colonialism to get the African to be subjected to him, but through the process of decolonisation, a realisation that the African is his own civiliser had to take over psychologically in order to restore the dignity and mental strength of the African.

The decolonisation process was meant to restore the Africa's dignity because "in the colonial era, the African, person had been politically disenfranchised, economically exploited, socially segregated and culturally alienated." (Oyugi, et al, 2003, p: 17).

By the end of his book, *Wretched of the earth*, Fanon was beginning to move into a new humanism of getting politically educated after the process of physical liberation in order to get mentally liberated, we require political education. This political education should have been the next phase for the new post-colonial leaders who would then take over as the leaders of their own country. Without this new humanism that would set the mind free, Fanon, would argue according to Meredith, that "Africa had achieved only a false decolonisation, leaving the real power to foreigners and their agents among the ruling elites." (Meredith, 2011, p:147). This we see in the next chapter of post-independent Kenya.

Conclusion

The process of decolonisation has shown that, it was more of a psychological process than any other. Decolonisation however, did not and should have ended at the physical freedom; it was something that needed to be taken further to the liberation of the mind in what seems to be Fanon's new humanism of acquiring political education as a means of this mental liberation. The usage of psychology to indicate that during colonialism Africans showed to be the same people as Europeans when they demanded their freedom also revealed the lies that were taught by colonial psychologists and psychiatrists that the African is inferior and needs to be ruled over.

It is also worth noting that the criminality that was once spoken of is not a concrete truth but the "truth" that was constructed to keep the African at an inferior space. Political psychology has also shown us that, the suppression of cognitive abilities places a limit on the decision making abilities of the individuals. The African lived for a long time under this mental oppression which landed him in two spaces, portraying violent behaviour towards fellow men and eventually when he realised his humanity, he channelled it to this anger to the colonial system which placed him in that situation.

When this anger was expressed by the African, it was deemed a mental condition diagnosed only to suit their theories that would further support the exploitation of the African people. European powers have always shown to only want to respect their mother land more than their colonies and rights exercised in Europe were always different as compared to rights exercised by the same power over their colonies. The ignorance of the impact of psychology on the mind of the African is the very same as the ignorance of the psychological methods that were used to brainwash the African right at the beginning of colonialism. Decolonisation was a process of liberation of the body; however, this above discussed decolonisation did not liberate the mind as we will see in the next chapter: Post Independence. It is important to note that even with the giving up of political power, the British could not just let go of their tea and tobacco's largest producer. The coloniser ensured that he left behind a door open for him to keep coming back for more. The ideas shared at the 5th Pan African Congress in 1945 were ideas about how to liberate the countries. Attended by many influential leaders who became leaders of their countries, we are able to note that the Africans meant serious business about their independence.

According to Fanon, decolonisation cannot take place in the absence of violence. Fanon stated that colonialism in itself was violence against the mind and therefore violence needed to be applied in its removal. This also explains why the Mau Mau did not believe in the KAU as having the full capacity to fully reach the mandate of the people, which was to attain freedom. Round table

discussions such as that of the 5th Pan African Congress were completely out of the question for Fanon. For Fanon, violence liberates both the mind and the body. The blood the former oppressed sees spilled is what cleanses him from former chains and releases him into his next level of freedom.

Fanon detested the behaviour of the nationalist leaders who were educated abroad and now came back to their mother lands only to want to negotiate and call it decolonisation. Regardless, just like Fanon also mentioned, every generation has a purpose and mandate for which it must fulfil. In my opinion, the post-independence leaders' generational mandate was to liberate their people physically. The next generation will have to deal with the mental liberation, or perhaps, it could have been achieved all in one go.

Chapter 5: Post-Independence Kenya

Introduction

The following chapter gives a narrative picture of the occurrence of post-independence leadership in Kenya. This chapter is very important as it the chapter where I make clear comparisons of the colonial state and post-colonial and the effects of colonialism on the mind of post-colonial leaders. This comparison is important to answer the question why former liberators became the new oppressors? Post-independence Kenya highlights the very early stages of African leadership in all its characteristics. How the settler was replaced by new oppressors and psychologically, how this could have occurred. Was it a psychological matter or was it purely an economically driven action?

Post-Independence

Those from the outside world, who have an idea of colonialism in Africa, have this idea that it ended when African leaders took over the reigns over their countries, but this is no wonder “discussions on colonialism turned stale in Africa during the last several decades after most African countries attained independence,”(Bulhan, 2015, p: 240). This was as the result of the assumption that colonialism only affected the physical space in Africa and once it physically left Africa, then everything was now good and ready to run by the African leader. This assumption failed to put into consideration the deeper effects of colonialism and how colonialism operated in Africa to ensure that it still left room to keep coming back to oppress and exploit the African people and their resources.

When Jomo Kenyatta became the prime minister of Kenya in 1963 and appointed president in 1964, it became clear to the people of Kenya that change had finally arrived on their land and they felt empowered to take over their own country and make the most out of it. Kenyatta served as the nation of Kenya’s first post-independent leader right up until his death in 1978 as the leader. Under Kenyatta, the Kenyan economy recorded favourably largely because, though contrary to the socialist ideologies that most African leaders preferred in, Kenyatta “adhered to capitalist policies, encouraging both indigenous private enterprise and foreign investments.”(Meredith, 2011, p:265). This made him a favourite man by the Western powers, who still wanted access into Kenya’s resources. Kenyatta still maintained constant contact with his former colonisers mainly for economic reasons which also saw the rise of the African middle class and land being reallocated back to the people as White farmers were eventually bought out of their farms and the previously owned White occupied highlands were now being occupied by Africans. His success in placing the African back at the top in his own land is something worth making known because “it cannot be maintained that he totally failed Kenya. To do so would be both unscientific and unjust.” (Mohiddin, 1998, p: 2).

On the other hand however, Kenyatta also centralised power in and around him by turning the country into a one party state by de facto which saw him banning all opposition parties. Kenyatta justified his actions like Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana as he believed that multi-party politics caused tribalism and this was one of the ways to get rid of it. He made sure that every political decision was going in the direction of reinforcing his power further. Most of the activities that occurred during this period in Africa were an indication of a clear lust for power and influence. For someone whose cabinet was made up mainly by his fellow tribesmen, this justification for a one-party state would seem somewhat hypocritical, yet the appointment of a non-Kikuyu tribesmen Daniel arap Moi as his

deputy also sent through a strong message that he was doing something about the level of tribalism in his country. This imitation of a one-party state of the colonial administration however, still indicated that the African could not detach himself from what he saw and learnt from the colonial rulers. Therefore, Kenyatta like most “first generation of African leaders was the product of colonial governance.”(Mohiddin, 1998, p:3). The disdain he felt towards opposition parties made him appear as a tyrant amongst his own people and symbolised a sign of authoritarianism. Through his one party system, he used his power to eliminate any opposition either through incarceration or even death. He imitated the colonialist very well because this is how they dealt with the Mau Mau and other oppositions that wanted to challenge its authority.

Corruption

In post-independence Africa, leaders did not waste an opportunity to accumulate wealth for themselves, “Indeed, political activity was seen by ambitious Africans as the most direct way of securing wealth and social standing.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 170). The offices that were once occupied by colonialists when they left the colonies were now occupied by the new freedom bearers. “Though ministers in parliament and at public meetings still issued promises about social equality and referred sympathetically to the needs of the common man, the gap between the rich elite living in plush villas and the masses surviving in slums became even more noticeable.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 171). Political connection and activity were viewed as one’s entrance into wealth. In post-independent Kenya, a famous slogan called It is now our turn to eat became famous amongst the Kenyan people especially politicians who were now making this newly attained freedom all about acquiring personal wealth for themselves and their families. The previous positions that were occupied by the colonists became the goal for the new leaders to attain.

It is also not easy to understand the activities and happenings that occurred in post-independence Africa without referring to psychology and the psychological impact of colonialism because the role of psychology and “its role in oppression generally and European colonialism particularly has been one of the hidden and not often recognised dangers of a discipline that claims to specialise in the science of the mind and behaviour.”(Bulhan, 2015, p: 240).

Under Kenyatta, corruption was also not a thing hidden away, though “Kenyatta himself was never a target of such criticism, but members of his own family- ‘the royal family’ as they were known aroused strong resentment.”(Meredith, 2011, p: 267). The corruption that was carried out by the colonial government during its stay in Kenya was that which excluded the masses out of everything while continuing to enrich themselves and their families. This repetition is an indication of what the metacolonised believed and assimilated within himself as the right way of handling public administration and systems. During colonialism, even the systems were programmed to function in a way that benefitted and protected the coloniser, this state capture was also repeated by both post-independent leaders, Kenyatta and Daniel arap Moi.

Corruption under Daniel arap Moi was amongst the many negative factors that defined his regime. According to Meredith, during Moi’s regime, even “the judiciary became notorious for corruption. An investigation carried out in the post-Moi era found that almost half of Kenya’s judges and more than one-third of magistrates were corrupt.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 385). The judiciary was captured and no one was honest in their work, people bought their way out of trouble and those close to Moi were protected from any prosecution. The feeling of entitlement towards what was once owned by colonial masters resembled the same entitlement colonial powers wanted Africans to believe they had over their land, resources and labour.

Even in the midst of his corruption and maladministration, Moi still believed that he was a great leader and wanted Kenyans to still see him as “a true nationalist in his own right, and as a close confidant of Kenyatta. He travelled constantly throughout the country addressing many prearranged or ad hoc public gatherings. He popularized *nyayo* within the context of what he called love, peace and unity” (Adar and Munyae, 2001, p:2). The “*nyayo*” is a Swahili term that means “footsteps.” Moi would go and make this a very popular term as he claimed in his oath and throughout his term as president that he would be walking in the footsteps of Kenyatta. While the colonial government was oppressing the people, they also made sure they psychologically kept on reassuring the people that they were the best people to govern them and that without them they would not have been civilised or developed. The White Man’s burden, religion and education psychologically conditioned the colonialist that he was the right person to rule over the African and what he was doing was within the best interest of the people. This rhetoric was repeated by Moi, but this time, using Kenyatta as a standard and justification of his actions.

The Big Man Syndrome

It would seem as though the amount of coups that have taken place one after another during this period in Africa, the leaders that succeed each other, fashionably keep repeating the same actions of their predecessors such as the once mentioned by Meredith as “corruption, mismanagement, tribalism, nepotism, and other assorted malpractices”. (Meredith, 2005, p: 219). One question that keeps popping up is the why the Big Man Syndrome even had to exist especially after successful revolutions for independence? So much hope was invested in this new life of independence, yet, it seemed to all go up in smoke with the rise of this economically bankrupting syndrome.

“Africans either are not able to see this pattern because of the subjective uniqueness across their singular experiences, or they do see the pattern and are simply unable to break from the cycle.” (Watson, 2010, p: 1). The matter of this issue stemming from a singular experience is what I already implied in my previous discussions that, it may seem from a psychological point of view that the reason behind the inability for African leaders in particular to break away from this cycle is because they do not know any other better form of governance except the one they had learnt under the colonial leadership which was that of looting and exploitation. When the former liberators start acting like their former oppressors, we ask, were it due to the absence of a different kind of political experience or rulership or are African leaders innately corrupt? No. instead we see that the ineffectiveness of administering and implanting democracy in Africa by the leaders has made governance in Africa to be torn into two trends: “the longstanding organization of African politics and states around autocratic personal rulers; highly centralized and overpowering presidencies and emotional glue from ethnic bonds. The other is the surge since 1990 of democratic impulses, principles, and institutions.” (Diamond, 2008, p: 138).

These trends indicated that, Africans want democracy and that they when they took over their countries, they wanted to implement it onto their people, however, something kept on holding them back and creating frustration for the leaders in the process who would normally end up acting as tyrants. When Africans were promised freedom, democracy and proper functioning institutions to protect and cater for the people, no one could comprehend that in a little more than a decade, new colonialist would be back in offices to further the mandate of the former colonialists but this time in a different skin colour. The promises given to Africans by their former liberators who they supported to the very end “euphoria swept through the African continent before and soon after African territories hoisted flags, sang national anthems, and celebrated the rise of African leaders to

power.”(Bulhan, 2015, p: 240). However, this did not last for long because although colonialism was finally destroyed in Africa, the culture, religions and education in Africa still ensured that the European legacy was left to dominate and thrive. This ensured the rise of the Big Man syndrome, politicians who finally had power to control and manoeuvre things into their favour finally stepped in and began to centralise power, while disregarding any other person who felt otherwise.

The Big Man rule can be defined as “a form of autocratic rule that is highly personalized and restrained little by modern institutions, which has the effect of making the ‘supremacy of politics’ in Africa extremely risky with high stakes for those who engage in the process and a great degree of uncertainty for the public in general.” (Watson, 2010 p: 1). The Big Man rule is basically characterised by self-rule, power, prestige, self-governance without accountability. It is the highest level of dictatorship that swept through the sub-Saharan region in a form of brutal centralised governance.

Writing about the big man syndrome, quoted by Meredith Fanon said “ministers grow rich, their wives doll themselves up, the members of parliament feather their nests and there is no soul down to the simple policeman or customs officials that does not join in the great procession of corruption.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 173). The Big Man rule is not a unique African problem as many dictators found across the world including for example South America and even (as it can be legitimately argued) that all British Prime Ministers under colonialism were all Big Men in relation to their colonies.

“A critical legacy of colonialism not sufficiently analysed is the way formerly colonised people acquire knowledge, understand their history, comprehend their world, and define themselves.”(Bulhan, 2015, p: 241). After colonialism, Africans did not go back to who they were. Instead, democracy and capitalism in the form of modernisation and civilisation were adopted by post-colonial leaders and forced in by their former oppressors pre-maturely. The African was not going to succeed in a system that he had never lived under and therefore, in the absence of an alternative African governance such as true democracy and the respect for human rights, African leaders (after adopting the idea of a state), ended up adopting the same ways of the former oppressor hopeful that it will produce different results as it did for the white colonialists.

The issues still affecting post-colonial Africa such as tribalism, lack of social identity and inferiority complex could not have made democracy possible under the leadership of people who still needed to be freed mentally. This type of mental oppression would somehow find its way out in the open and the big man syndrome was one of the ways of revealing itself as “a notion associated with the concept of neo-patrimonialism, which had permeated social-political life rendering it anti-democratic in many ways (Shawa 2012: 45).

The Big Man rule had a framework of law institutions and democracy, but was largely characterised by a state captured by a network of elite powers. Administration and the application of the rule of law was a highly subjective matter. Although colonialism had left Africa, Heyden argues once again that “few patrimonial rulers survived colonization, but despite the disappearance of patrimonial systems of rule in Africa, the norms associated with such systems survived among the leaders of the new nation-states” (Heyden, 2006, p: 96). During colonialism in Africa, the colonial rulers had a system that kept both political and economic powers centralised around them only. The law also applied differently to them as compared to others.

The Big Man rule is a psychological legacy left behind by colonialism as it shows the very nature of colonials, “those who do not have power want it, and those who have power want to keep it.” (Watson, 2010, p: 2). The absolute and totalitarian power that colonialists possessed, the new leaders embarked on as well once they attained power. Colonialists who had the power, did not want to give it away, therefore, when the nationalist leaders came into power, they simply repeated the same method. During colonialism, due to the totalitarian nature of ruler ship the colonial system imposed in the form of refusal to grant representation to the African, every decision was taken by the colonialists for the colonised, Leaders who once had the whole nation trusting them with their lives had now resorted to stealing and terrorising the very same people. Nkrumah the Ghanaian leader who chaired the 5th Pan African Congress in Manchester in 1945 to discuss the freedom of his people “banned opposition parties on grounds of national security; government opponents were routinely imprisoned and like Hastings Kamuzu Banda and many other African leaders, relied on fear as an instrument of control, (Meredith, 2011, p: 176). This type of leadership raises the questions of whether they were doing this due the absence of an alternative African ruler-ship that they were exposed to? In Kenyatta’s case, “when he was born, Kenya had almost no Europeans. They came in his childhood and youth, created a settler colonial state during his young and mature adulthood, and were driven out when was becoming old.” (Celarent, 2010, p: 723).

Usually the leader would operate only on a trust basis; his trust would be given to only family members, tribesmen and even close friends. These were the people that they pull and place in highly influential positions in their governments. They rewarded loyalists which often meant “sometimes the taming of loyalists conflicts with the appeasement of the public.” (Watson, 2010, p: 2). However, this did not bother the ruler because he still had the power to do as he so pleased. The whole wave of the Big Man Syndrome in Kenya like anywhere else in Africa, it was about having absolute power of the whole country’s political and judicial systems.

For Daniel Arap Moi, after being appointed president in 1978, Moi went on to change the country’s political system to becoming a one-party state by right. Although the country had become an actual one-party state already since 1963 when Kenyatta took over, Moi then resorted to making it a legally recognised one-party state to further centralise power around himself and the ruling party. Meredith describes Moi Arap Daniel’s rule of Kenya by saying “in Kenya the risks of speaking out publicly against Moi’s regime were well known. Arrest, detention and other forms of harassment — for journalists, academics, trade unionists and even members of parliament — were the most likely outcome” (Meredith, 2005, p: 400). The manipulation of the media during the Big Man era by Moi, ensured that only news they wanted reported were reported and if anything other than what they deem appropriate was reported, journalists would pay the price During Moi’s regime “A Nairobi business magazine which published reports in 1989 if political corruption in the coffee and tea industries was swiftly banned.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 385). It was a time when leaders could do as they pleased and passed laws that protected them and their power.

Tribalism

Before colonialism came to Africa and African countries became what they are today, tribalism has always been there. People spoke their own languages and had their own ways of living. However, with colonialism, things worsened as borders were created and what was once separate kingdoms and chiefdoms now became one thing, forcing people to live with each other under colonial rule. “In 1884 and 1894 Britain declared protectorate over Uganda and Kenya and Kenya’s boundaries were demarcated without the consultation of the Kenyan’s people.” (Ndege, 2009, p: 3). Colonialist crated countries in a way that it would be much easier to rule without any disruptions

and to keep absolute control. Colonialists maintained the separate clans, tribes and cultures that previously had nothing in common in one country for their benefit and forced them to adopt a larger identity which is Kenyan. These new demarcation meant that people had to learn to live with each other and to accept one another as one entity under colonial rule. Europeans depended mostly military conquest especially to win over land. "The French were most active in pursuing this policy of military conquest. Of course Britain's military imperialism was equally spectacular and bloody, the African response, was also resolute and often prolonged." (Uzoigwe, 1985, p: 36).

Post-colonial Kenya, we see that the system of tribalism could not be entirely eradicated as it was deeply entrenched in the minds of the people during the estimated 68 years of British occupation of the land. Leaders who came after the colonialists failed to reverse this system because they witnessed it working out for the colonists during their occupation and thought it would work out for them too. After independence, due to the nature of the tribes that were brought together involuntarily, those who believed that they were from royal families and their families held prestige positions in pre-colonial era, wanted to reclaim their land and royalties. This created deep problems because the Kikuyu, who are the largest ethnic group in Kenya followed by the Luo have already claimed their seat, even politically.

Tribalism was supported and encouraged a lot by colonialists in order to promote the divide and conquer rule in their colonies. During colonial occupation in Kenya, Black people couldn't get politically involved and were prevented from getting proper political representation. As a result, "the confined political activity to the district level in order to contain the development of nation-wide political affiliations and parties. They feared that such parties might raise political consciousness amongst the Africans to a level where the whole country would unite against the colonial system." (Oyugi, et al, 2003, p: 197).

Post independent African leader proceeded and perfected this system of keeping tribes apart for the sake of retaining power and centralising it amongst themselves. Furthermore, instead of building a more united Kenya, they too prevented this by sparking tribal hatred. Moi was a staunch oppose of multi-party politics and in "an attempt to suppress a movement that called for multi-party politics, Moi's regime began an ethnic cleansing campaign to rid the Rift Valley province of any tribe that supported the movement (Meredith, 2005, p: 402).

In 1938, Jomo Kenyatta published a book called "Facing Mount Kenya." The book was a careful and nostalgic study of his tribe the Kikuyu tribe. In the book he wrote about his tribe before colonial occupation and how life was better off then. Kenyatta was a staunch culturist, a man who loved and missed his tribe and wanted its superiority restored. When he was the general secretary of the Kikuyu Central Association (GCA), Kenyatta got a chance to travel to London where he went to speak about the land issue of Kenya and how it was stolen from his Kikuyu tribesmen by the British. However, even with that, Kenyatta's "passion was first and foremost Kikuyu, not African. It is his tribe and its practices that Kenyatta discusses and defends here, not African customs in general." (Celarent, 2010, p: 724). Kenyatta advocated for the freedom and return of land back to his people the Kikuyu and not all the Africans living in what was known as Kenya.

During his presidency Moi "a tribalist at heart, handed out key posts to Kalenjin members using state power to undermine the patronage networks of the old Kikuyu elite established during Kenyatta's regime to cripple business interests of his opponents." (Meredith, 2011, p: 384). The same way Kenyatta surrounded and centralised political power around the Kikuyus and the colonial masters surrounded and centralised political power around themselves, when Arap Moi took power,

as demonstrated by his predecessors and in the absence of a different ruling system, he wasted no time in following suite. Ethnic politics became what define Kenyan politics. Kenyatta also maintained tribalism in his politics especially in his old age where he “ruled not so much by exercising direct control over the government as by holding court with an inner-circle of loyal ministers and officials, predominantly Kikuyu from his home district of Kiambu.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 265).

During colonialism, “colonial governments relied heavily on African chiefs and other functionaries to collaborate with officials and exercise control on their behalf.” (Meredith, 2011, p: 6). Post-colonial Africa saw the same practice being repeated by independent leaders who collaborated with local chiefs to ensure control and to keep an eye on any opposition. The local chiefs were used to keep a watchful eye on their communities and to ensure that the people do not rebel but most importantly do not unite in case they mobilise. During colonialism, the only thing Africans seemed to be confident about in their struggle against the regime was that they wanted it to end and they wanted their independence. Post-colonial visions were not strategized nor did they have a plan put in place to unite the people of Kenya because themselves, they were divided and tribalistic.

What occurred then beyond European occupation and continued to define Kenyan politics was the “erosion of social bonding, indigenous beliefs, identities and indigenous knowledge” (Bulhan, 2010, p: 243). Africans had to be misplaced psychologically regarding who, whom and where they truly belonged. This misplacement meant that it was going to be easy to maintain rule over Africans and the divisions caused by this misplacement also meant the post-colonial leaders would carry it with them into the new Kenya and even for generations to come. This type of ethnic politics that proceeded through into Kenya’s independence eventually created mistrust even amongst the Africans themselves. The immense amount of mistrust created by the colonial government is what made Africans in Kenya to prefer their own as compared to uplifting everyone else. This system was applied by colonialists who did not trust Africans and therefore kept power away from them. The colonial regime “discouraged nation-wide political parties because of their desire to divide the Africans so that they can be easily manipulated and ruled by the unpopular colonial government.” (Oyugi, et al, 2003, p: 146). The mental categories formed unconsciously in their psychology from their previous experiences prompted them to repeat the same system.

Arap Moi’s presidency was also characterised also by “ethnic representation, resource accumulation and distribution, and a system of unbounded politics that ensured that party loyalty is transient.” (Steeves, 2006). He became obsessed with those who seemed more against him than with him he centralised power around him and dealt harshly with the media, anyone who was not reporting in a way that pleased him or seemed to challenge his leadership. Eventually with this obsession of power and securing it, “the issues of corruption, “tribalism” and human rights per se became distant concerns.” (Adar and Munyae, 2001, p: 1). It is important to show how Moi walked the shoes of his predecessor Kenyatta as Kenyatta walked in the shoes of his predecessor the colonial system. This is the point of this essay as using political psychology to argue that our mental categories are shaped by our past experiences which in turn influence political behaviours. Moi could not have escaped the psychological impact Kenyatta’s government had on him and neither could Kenyatta, the colonial government.

The handling of Human Rights

According to Raveloson, “Human rights are much more than a mere component of democracy” (Raveloson, 2008, p: 4). A healthy democratic state is in full operation, when human rights are respected and adhered to. When the people in a country govern and decide on laws and

regulations that should govern them, when these rights are adhered to. But when leaders are the only who decide alone on what needs to be done and they do not adhere to the needs of the people, it becomes impossible for the rights of the people to be protected. Post independent leaders effected this well at “meetings, conferences and rallies were taken merely as occasions for the leaders to tell the people what they, the leaders wanted them to know and do and not as opportunities for the leaders to listen to the people.”(Mohiddin, 1998, p: 4).

The violation of fundamental human rights in Kenya during Moi’s regime has its roots in both the colonial and Kenyatta era. Moi used this abuse to exert further control on the people as the colonial masters had done. “Daniel Arap Moi ruled Kenya using a strategic mixture of ethnic favouritism, state repression and marginalisation of opposition forces, utilising violence, detention and torture. State predation featured, with looting of finances, land grabbing and property seizure.” (Steeves, 2006). To succeed in his terrorising regime, Moi ensure that he aligned himself with the military. As a result of this, he was able to use the military at any time for his own advantages. During Moi’s reign, military rule became an extension arm used for his authoritarianism tactics and to eliminate oppositions while enforcing further ‘discipline’ and fear on those who challenged the regime and to terrorise any opposition that may be identified or suspected.

Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis has been to highlight the left behind by colonial rulers in post-independent Africa went beyond economic and political disarray, but that indeed and to a large extent included the psychological impact which set the tone to how the economic and political handlings in post-independent Africa unfolded.

The role of political psychology played in this thesis and its contribution within the African politics sphere was a very important phenomenon as it carried theories that attempted to explain how the mind of an individual is shaped by past experiences. Bulhan's explanation of the Meta-colonised is the same as what Fanon spoke about in the last chapter of the *Wretched of the Earth* book: Colonial Wars and disorders. The fact that the Meta-colonised remained under the influence of the Meta-colonisers since post-independence clearly shows that the legacy of colonialism on the mind of Africans simply cannot be a matter to ignore. The important role played by both psychologists and psychiatrists during colonialism was a clear indication that these two disciplines were used as powerful tools to occupy the Meta-colonised as both Bulhan and Fanon had stated in their books.

The reversal of this impact is one that is still going to take time, mostly until the two disciplines themselves (psychology and psychiatry) as well as education enters the process of decolonization. Bulhan stated that, "a broad consideration of colonialism suggests that this system of domination entails contest of reality in three worlds: the world of things (raw materials), the world of people (cheap labour) and the world of meaning (occupation and oppression of the mind and ontology)." (Bulhan, 2015, p: 252). Therefore, from what Bulhan stated, we are also made aware that colonialism was indeed not only about the occupation of natural resources and cheap labour, but also a system of ensuring submission and cooperation for a long time even after it had long departed the continent through the occupation of the mind. The post-independent leaders showed this through the way they continued to be subjected to the meta-colonizers long after they left.

The British continuing to have access into Kenya's natural resources was an indication that the Meta-colonised (African leaders) were still under the psychological grip of the Meta-colonisers. The psychological damage that occurred on the mind of the post-independent leader was one caused by the actual absence of any other system besides the dictator and totalitarian system. The absence of such a system was showed in lack of strong leadership for the civil society, but also in taking the lead in protecting the country's natural resources from former colonials masters .

Kenya's economy experienced significant growth when taken over by Kenyatta who remained closely in touch with the West and the growth experience, during this period, was primarily a function of the global economy in the 1960s. However, even with this growth in Kenya, the wide gap between the rich and the poor was still clearly evident.

The tyranny rule seen under the Big Man rule (neo-patrimonialism) was a significant indication of the colonial legacy left on the minds of the African leader. The theories of neo-patrimonialism argue that favouring one's own tribe/group is an entirely rational exercise, rather than a distortion. However, I believe it is a distortion because it colonial rule also started as a rational exercise aiming to cater for its own but later on became a distortion because of the superiority complex. Most

leaders were not born when colonialism began in their countries, contrary to Kenyatta whom there were no settlers at all when he was born in his country Kenya but colonialism became the main system that they all became accustomed to. The way the imperial leaders treated the people, laid the foundation for the post-colonial leader.

Decolonisation as mentioned in the essay is a concept that should have gone beyond the physical revolution. Fanon spoke about how the physical violence frees the African from the oppressors' hand, but mental slavery requires another type of revolution. Education alone cannot free one's mind unless that education is in itself decolonised. The fathers of liberation were educated in the West and yet still they failed to unify their countries and promote a national culture or even implement the democracies they saw and enjoyed while studying overseas. By decolonisation of the people of Africa, the African leaders were meant to liberate themselves and people from mental colonialism and Eurocentric concepts such as culture, language and lifestyle. Decolonisation meant a realisation of one's true humanity, but with independence, this dream faded as it saw many Africans going right back into the hands of new colonisers.

It thus became evident that it proved absolutely impossible for post-independent leaders to follow a system of democracy when they themselves had never been exposed or even lived in one as their own before. I would not suggest that African leaders hate democracy or that they are an enemy to democracy. In the thesis, we have seen that whenever a new leader takes over, they speak democratic values and seem to show an interest in wanting a better life for their people. However, with issues of tribalism having left unattended to and largely neglected, the same leaders would just end up going back to what they know to retain power.

The constant change of bills and passing of policies to extend their presidential stay while manipulating the election results show that democracy has never really been a part of the African leader's style of rulership. Most electoral systems were at the discretion of the president, and therefore, they could do whatever they wanted. With Kenyatta there were no elections because they had made KANU the de facto only party to govern and oppositions were not entertained. Elections under Moi however, were not as a result of believing in democratic values but as a response to the threat made by Western countries to withdraw aid that Kenya so much needed.

Colonial administrators utilized African traditional structures for "indirect rule," but deformed them by promoting the power of the chief or the traditional leader at the expense of pre-colonial checks and balances mechanisms. Post-independence African presidents have just perfected these systems. For many of these presidents and their allies, there is no monetary gain outside of politics and this is why they needed to stay on board till death.

The rule of law on post-independence Africa as was supposed to characterise the newly democratic states was evidently subjective. The type of law of freedom and human rights enjoyed by Europeans in Europe and by those who were in Africa were also not the same. Post-independent leaders, especially those of Moi's government enjoyed full centralised power that exempted them from prosecution and the rule of law just like with colonial masters. Post-colonial leaders choosing to find solutions for the people without the people concerned. The paternalistic approach from the top down was used after colonialists when the aid era came to Africa. Post-independent Africa should have meant that the previously marginalised and oppressed were now given a voice to speak their mind, to be free in their thinking and self-determination. Certainly the challenge of decolonisation was the assistance of the African people in finding their true identity after years of oppression. Political psychology has also analysed that many people have a difficult time

differentiating the difference between personality and beliefs. With colonialism, the two concepts were merged together as one. The introduction of Christianity by missionaries made people believe that even their personalities had to merge with the belief. Therefore, one had only to act like a Christian, think and speak like a Christian. This created a great deal of submission and obedience from the subjects which prevented them from challenging the system. As mentioned before, the education provided to the locals also did not do much in liberating the true African mind. The education itself was colonised and created further divisions amongst the locals. Africans had accepted Christianity and western education as part of who they were and made them identify more with Eurocentric ways which were deemed more Christian, superior and holy. By so doing, self-identity and conceptualisation remained a mystery to the African and remained hidden under the umbrella definition of what and who the European said the African was.

Political psychology has shown that the way we think and act or make our decisions is largely influenced by previous experiences. With that in mind, it is always important to remember that the leaders of post-colonial Africa lived at a time where they witnessed the systems of colonial rule and instead of eradicating them; they simply perfected them, like a good student who became better than their teacher. The African mind still requires liberation from the impact of colonialism as Fanon once suggested. This is the only way the continent's leaders will start making decisions and passing bills that not only benefit themselves but also those they are supposed to serve. The former liberators became oppressors due to the absence of mental liberation and identity in one's true self. This thesis does not exempt the post-independent leader from any responsibility of his actions while blaming colonialism for everything, I am however, bringing to the fore that the colonial legacy had an impact on the African's mind which later affected his economy, identity and development of his state. I strongly believe that, as soon as the African mind is fully liberated, then true freedom and democracy can reign on the continent. Certainly colonialism had a big mental impact on post-colonial leaders, but strong leadership of liberators to liberators can still be attained in the future.

Bibliography

1. Abdulai, Abdul-Gafaru. "Political Context Study–Ghana." *Leeds and Accra: Human Rights, Power and Civic Action Research Project* (2009).
2. Acemoglu, Daron, and James A. Robinson. *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business, 2013.
3. Adar, Korwa G., and Isaac M. Munyae. "Human Rights Abuse in Kenya Under Daniel Arap Moi, 1978." *African Studies Quarterly* 5.1 (2001).
4. Ahmed, M. "Africa leadership the succeeding generation challenges and opportunities." (1998).
5. Bartlett, Frederic C. "Remembering: An experimental and social study." *Cambridge: Cambridge University* (1932).
6. Becker, Paula, and Jean-Aimé A. Raveloson. "What is Democracy?" Luanda: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung (2008): 5.
7. Bennett, George. "The development of political organizations in Kenya." *Political Studies* 5.2 (1957): 113-130.
8. Brewer, William F., and Glenn V. Nakamura. "The nature and functions of schemas." *Center for the Study of Reading Technical Report; no. 325* (1984).
9. Bulhan, Hussein A. "Stages of colonialism in Africa: From occupation of land to occupation of being." *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 3.1 (2015): 239-256.
10. Celarent, Barbara. *Varieties of Social Imagination*. University of Chicago Press, 2017.
11. Connah, Graham. *African civilizations: An archaeological perspective*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
12. Deutsch, Morton, and Catarina Kinnvall. "What is political psychology?" *Political psychology* 42 (2002).
13. Diamond, Larry. "The rule of law versus the big man." *Journal of Democracy* 19.2 (2008): 138-149.
14. Djellal, Faridah, and Faïz Gallouj. "The laws of imitation and invention: Gabriel Tarde and the evolutionary economics of innovation." (2014).
15. Falola, Toyin, and Tyler Fleming. "African Civilizations: From the Pre-colonial to the Modern Day." *World Civilisation and History of Human Development* 1 (2009): 123-140.
16. Fanon, Frantz, and Jean-Paul Sartre. *The wretched of the earth*. Vol. 36. New York: Grove Press, 1963.
17. Gurr, Ted Robert, and Will H. Moore. "Ethnopolitical rebellion: A cross-sectional analysis of the 1980s with risk assessments for the 1990s." *American Journal of Political Science* (1997): 1079-1103.
18. History of Kenya: President Daniel Toroitich Arap Moi
<https://softkenya.com/kenya/history-of-president-daniel-toroitich-Arap-moi/>
19. Horvath, Ronald J. "A definition of colonialism." *Current anthropology* 13.1 (1972): 45-57.
20. Hook, Derek. "Frantz Fanon, Steve Biko, 'psychopolitics', and critical psychology." (2004): 84-114.
21. Houghton, David Patrick. *Political psychology: situations, individuals, and cases*. Routledge, 2014.
22. Hyden, Goran. "Between state and community: Challenges to redesigning governance in Africa." *a Working Conference on 'Designing Constitutional Arrangements for Democratic Governance in Africa: Challenges and Possibilities', cosponsored by the Workshop in Political*

Theory and Policy Analysis, African Studies Program, and Office of International Programs, Indiana University, Bloomington, USA. 2006.

23. Johnson, Vincent. "The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of Citizens of 1789, the Reign of Terror, and the Revolutionary Tribunal of Paris." (2016).
24. Kasumba, 2011: Pre-Colonial African Societies
<http://4.global-learning-portal-6.appspot.com/library/bundle/resource/>
25. Kenyatta, Jomo. *Facing Mount Kenya: the traditional life of the Gikuyu*. Vol. 219. East African Educational Publishers, 2015.
26. Mamdani, Mahmood. "Citizen and Subject: contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism." *PERSPECTIVES ON POLITICAL SCIENCE* 26 (1997): 120-120.
27. Mayanja, Evelyn. "Strengthening ethical political leadership for sustainable peace and social justice in Africa: Uganda as a case study." *African Journal on Conflict Resolution* 13.2 (2013): 113-146.
28. Meredith, Martin. *The State of Africa: A history of the continent since independence*. Simon and Schuster, 2011.
29. Meyer, Kathryn. *Kenya: Decolonization, Democracy and the Struggle for Uhuru*. Diss. 2015.
30. Ndege, Peter O. "Colonialism and its Legacies in Kenya." *Moi University (July-August, 2009)* (2009): 3.
31. Nissimi, Hilda. "Mau Mau and the Decolonisation of Kenya." *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies* 8.3 (2006): 2.
32. Nethercote, John, Tracey Arklay, and John Wanna, eds. *Australian Political Lives: Chronicling political careers and administrative histories*. ANU E Press, 2006. (Uzoigwe, 1985,).
33. Barker, Kenneth L., Donald Burdick, and Donald W. Burdick. *The NIV study bible, new international version*. Zondervan Bible Publishers, 1993.
34. Oyugi, W. Ouma, Peter Wanyande, and Crispin Odhiambo-Mbai, eds. *The Politics of Transition in Kenya: from KANU to NARC*. Heinrich Böll Foundation, 2003.
35. Philcox, Richard. *The wretched of the earth: Frantz Fanon; translated from the French by Richard Philcox; introductions by Jean-Paul Sartre and Homi K. Bhabha*. Grove Press, 2004.
36. Philpott, Daniel. *Revolutions in sovereignty: how ideas shaped modern international relations*. Princeton University Press, 2001.
37. Rashid, Nazifa. *British colonialism in East-Africa during nineteenth century*. University of Chittagong. Bangladesh. 2014.
38. Rai, David. *Statehood and the law of self-determination*. Vol. 43. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2002.
39. Robinson, James A. "States and Power in Africa by Jeffrey I. Herbst: A review essay." *Journal of Economic Literature* 40.2 (2002): 510-519.
40. Shawa, Lester Brian. "The big-man syndrome as a security threat in Malawi: A critical theory perspective." (2012).
41. Sowards, Kelly. *Makers of world history: Jomo Kenyatta "The burning spear"*. 2nd edition, volume 2. St Martin's. New York. (1995).
42. Steeves, Jeffrey. "Presidential succession in Kenya: The transition from Moi to Kibaki." *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics* 44.2 (2006): 211-233.
43. Watson, Corey. "Breaking the Cycle of Big Man Rule in Africa." *Anthós* 2.1 (2010): 5.
44. Wrong, Michaela. "It's Our Turn to Eat (London, Fourth Estate)." (2009).
45. Wyrick, Deborah Baker. *Fanon for beginners*. Red Wheel/Weiser, 1998.