

British and French Styles of Influence in Colonial and Independent Africa:  
A Comparative Study of Kenya and Senegal

Laura Fenwick

SIS 419 002: Honors Capstone

Dr. Patrick Ukata

23 April 2009

## **Introduction**

The goal of colonialism was universal: extract economic benefits for the colonizing government. However, France and England had fundamentally different approaches to their colonial rule. While England wanted to exploit resources and create a profitable environment for its settler communities, France espoused an additional goal of transforming the African populations within its sphere of influence into French citizens. Nowhere is this effort epitomized better than in Senegal. These different approaches affected the type of colonial rule and the post-colonial relationship in an elemental way.

The two powers had many similarities in their colonial rule. They imposed direct rule, limiting rights of the African peoples. The colonial administrations established a complementary economy based on exporting raw goods and importing manufactured goods. They introduced European culture and taught their own history in schools. France, however, took the idea of a united French Empire a step further with the policy of assimilation. Reeling from the ideals of equality from the 1848 Revolution, the French Republic granted political rights and citizenship for *francisé* (Frenchified) Africans. Its rule in West Africa was characterized by an unprecedented degree of political representation for Blacks. The English government did not grant this amount of political rights until the final years of colonial rule, when international and domestic pressures for decolonization were mounting.

French West African colonies enjoyed their close economic, political, and cultural ties with the metropole. While other French colonies were fighting for independence, these states were calling for a federation with France – wanting to extend the process of assimilation in order to have the same rights as French citizens but remain united. English dependencies, on the other hand, were negotiating for a political independence. England had never attempted to assimilate

Africans within its Empire. Lacking this cultural aspect, it was easier for Britain to disengage from its former colonies; the African elite wanted them to leave as well. While former British colonies wanted to maintain trade and development aid with the U.K., England was not entrenched in the policies of its former colonies like France. In its independence negotiations, French West Africa signed Cooperation Accords, ensuring the continuation of French influence. These different approaches to colonialism affected the type of institutions put in place by the colonial powers and the affability of that relationship. In turn, this affected the process of decolonization and, as we will see, the method and degree of influence of the former colonial powers in the early years of independence.

I will present these different approaches to colonialism and neocolonialism first through a historical analysis of British and French colonial rule in Africa to understand the institutions in place at the time of independence. I will continue this analysis through the first fifteen years of independence to determine the type of neocolonial influence exerted on former colonies and the effect of this relationship on the politics and economy of the newly independent states. My methodology will be based in a comparative case study between Kenya, a former British colony, and Senegal, a former French colony. I selected these two countries for their geo-strategic, compositional, and historical similarities to make the comparison more salient. Kenya and Senegal were significant dependencies for their respective colonial parents, particularly within their region. In addition, these coastal states were important for trade. They are composed of diverse populations, representing many tribes, languages, and religions. Transition to independence was peaceful and the founding presidents were dynamic politicians whose influence is still felt. While there has been some political unrest, these countries have avoided intractable violence as seen in failed states such as Somalia and Sudan.

There are some significant differences that should also be noted. Kenya was a British settler colony and, while there was a significant French community in Senegal, there were no large European farming estates and therefore the colonial administration did not face the same challenges in land policy. I did not choose the major settler colonies (Algeria, Rhodesia, South Africa) whose decolonization was marked by a unique degree of conflict and violence. Instead, I selected colonies with a significant European presence, to guarantee that European norms and practices were institutionalized at the time of independence, and whose decolonization process was peaceful, keeping some degree of ties with the former colonial power. These overarching similarities of situation will make the comparison of their post-colonial relations more relevant and highlight the effects of England and France's different approaches more clearly.

### **Colonialism: Ideology and Legacy**

Colonial regimes of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries had many similarities because they shared the same essential goal. European powers established administrations with the aim of benefiting the metropole through economic exploitation and increasing their own international prestige. Even if they justified their presence under the label of 'civilizing mission,' the major concern of colonial powers was how to handle the 'Native Question.'

European powers had to answer the fundamental question of how a minority maintains control over a majority in a foreign land. There were two basic responses: direct and indirect rule. Direct rule was the most common type of political administration. The European power deemed indigenous structures inadequate for their purposes and therefore established their own administrations. The colonial law was enforced by the European military. Indirect rule, pioneered by Lord Lugard in Nigeria, utilized tribal authorities to carry out British orders. In

reality, the differences between direct and indirect rule were not absolute as colonies implemented aspects of both systems.

The colonial administrators instituted a rule of law to ensure their control. Only ‘civilized’ natives and Europeans enjoyed the associated rights. British founder of Rhodesia Cecil Rhodes famously summarized, “Equal rights for all civilized men.”<sup>1</sup> Cleavages within the indigenous society developed between educated, “Westernized” Africans living in urban centers and rural communities.<sup>2</sup> Civil society developed in cities, whose residents enjoyed greater rights. In contrast, rural communities were still influenced by tribal authorities and saw few benefits of colonial rule. Present day racial and tribal inequalities within African states have origins in this division within society.

The nature of African states since independence has been greatly influenced by their colonial experiences. Many aspects of the economy were carried over from the colonial era including the types of exports and the strong trade links with Europe. Racial and tribal inequities were multiplied by colonial policies and uneven development. The decolonization process in particular reflected the historical relationship between the colony and the European power and affected the nature of the relationship after independence. For example, France and Senegal shared a special relationship and, as it was seen as mutually beneficial, the transition to independence was peaceful and the two maintained close ties. On the other hand, colonies that struggled for independence against a power not willing to grant it were less likely to remain close. Mozambique and Angola underwent costly liberation battles against Portugal. The preservation of functional political ties after that amount of violence was difficult. Mahmood

---

<sup>1</sup> Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996), 17.

<sup>2</sup> Mamdani, 18.

Mamdani concisely states, “The form of rule shaped the form of revolt against it,”<sup>3</sup> which in turned shaped the post-colonial relationship. To understand the basis of British and French ties with their former colonies, it is necessary to review the type of colonial relationships that existed. I will now present the Kenyan and Senegalese experiences as case studies of British and French rule.

### The Kenyan Experience: Wazungu and Mau Maus

At its height, Great Britain was the largest colonial empire; it was said the sun never set on the British Empire. The Commonwealth of Nations, comprised primarily of former colonies, is today the largest intergovernmental organization after the United Nations. With no serious rival to imperial expansion after the overthrow of Napoleon, British influence extended wider than ever during what became known as the Imperial Century. The British legacy, felt in every region of the world, includes language, government structure, religion, infrastructure, and even sports. The ties between colonies and the U.K. did not end with independence as British rule had left its mark.

The notion of Kenya as a colonial state began with the arrival of the British military in 1895. The British goal was to extract economic benefits through the control of the East African country. The most efficient method of imperialism was to effectively establish a political dictatorship.<sup>4</sup> Opposition was silenced by violence and all political posts were appointed by the colonial administration. With the influx of British settlers during the interwar period, most notably in Kenya and Rhodesia, the colonial government’s role changed. Its purpose from then on was twofold: export goods to benefit England’s economy and ensure the prosperity of the white settler community. Odhiambo describes this time as the ‘second colonial occupation’ as

---

<sup>3</sup> Mamdani, 24.

<sup>4</sup> Wunyabari Maloba, “Decolonization: A Theoretical Perspective,” in Ogot and Ochieng’, ed., *Decolonization and Independence in Kenya: 1940-1993* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1995), 9

the colonial government had to provide land for the colons (namely, by evicting squatters) and ensure their political superiority through legislation.<sup>5</sup> The 1939 White Highlands Order in Kenya, for example, met both of those aims as it reserved the best farming land for Europeans. The British also ensured a large supply of farm workers by implementing heavy hut and poll taxes and legislation prohibiting Africans from growing cash crops.<sup>6</sup> There were few employment choices other than working on European plantations to earn money to pay the steep taxes.

Europeans dominated the economy in other sectors as well. They had opportunities for the best jobs and the highest salaries in government and industry. Britain created a capital market where none had existed before. Colons exported raw materials such as coffee, tea, and horticultural produce to the established markets in England. In addition, African colonies were a destination for European manufactured goods. These capitalist practices tied African states to Europe. Enterprises established by settlers were for the benefit of foreign investors and did little to improve the African economies as a whole.<sup>7</sup> The sole goal was to benefit the English – either on the mainland or in the Highlands.

Europeans were the elite class by default, propped up by legislation and Sterling Pound. The majority of Africans survived as subsistence farmers. The lucky ones who had access to higher education formed a petty-bourgeois class in Nairobi, working as lawyers, clerks, and teachers. Activists for independence would come from this privileged class.<sup>8</sup>

Tensions between whites and blacks became more pronounced at the end of WWII. When African veterans returned home, they brought with them aspirations and expectations for economic prosperity. However, the ex-serviceman had no access to land; squatters had been

---

<sup>5</sup> E.S. Atieno-Odhiambo, “The Formative Years: 1945-55,” in Ogot and Ochieng’, 29.

<sup>6</sup> W.R. Ochieng’ and E.S. Atieno-Odhiambo, “On Decolonization,” in Ogot and Ochieng’, xv-xvi.

<sup>7</sup> Maloba, 9.

<sup>8</sup> Ochieng’, Atieno-Odhiambo, xvi.

evicted. Many joined a broader movement of urbanization caused by lack of opportunity in the white-dominated Highlands. This growth exasperated the city's few resources and slums cropped up on the outskirts. Economic barriers, low wages, and limited opportunity for financial success fueled the dissatisfaction with colonial rule.

The first major revolt against British power was rooted in the inequalities regarding land access, a revolt against the "tyranny of property."<sup>9</sup> The White Highlands Order reserved half of all arable land for Europeans. Most of this land was in the Central Highlands, a region whose occupants were predominately from the Kikuyu tribe. Some Kikuyu banded together and were able to buy property, forming a wealthy, landed class with close ties to the colonialists. Unfortunately, the majority, plagued by unemployment and poverty, were bitter at the inequalities. The Mau Mau Rebellion began as an outcrop of the frustrations of poor, mostly young, Kikuyus.<sup>10</sup> The colonial administration declared a State of Emergency through nine bills in July 1952. As British and local groups cracked down, the Mau Mau fled to the wilderness to continue their resistance. The British military and police forces united with 100,000 members of the Home Guard, an association of Kikuyus who opposed the Mau Mau Revolt.<sup>11</sup> The army gained the upper hand after Operation Anvil in April 1954. Tens of thousands of Kikuyus in Nairobi were imprisoned, undermining financial support for the rebels. The African Rifles then systematically combed the Aberdare range and Mount Kenya region during Operation Hammer, arresting rebels along the way. The end of the rebellion came with the arrest of the last leader, Dedan Kimathi, in October 1956.

Though the armed rebellion had been dismantled, the British knew that the situation necessitated some degree of political reform. The 1954 Lyttelton Constitution included African

---

<sup>9</sup> David Anderson, qtd. in Atieno-Odhiambo, 27.

<sup>10</sup> Atieno-Odhiambo, 35.

<sup>11</sup> Atieno-Odhiambo, 41.



and Asian ministers and equal powers between European and non-European representatives.<sup>12</sup> In addition, certain posts within the colonial government were Africanized. By appeasing the majority of Kenyans by granting outlets for political expression, the colonial government increasingly marginalized the rebels from the majority of Kenyans. The major goal was to prevent more violence.

One consequence of these concessions was the expansion of the Kenyan political elite. The growing petty-bourgeois class was not satisfied with the administration's paltry reforms and campaigned for nothing less than 'Africa for Africans'. Jomo Kenyatta, head of the Kenya African Union (KAU), realized that the end of colonialism would have to be a Westminster decision.<sup>13</sup> Despite the increase of African representatives to eight, KAU sent a delegation to London. This pressure resulted in the Lennox-Boyd Constitution that included a provision for 14 African seats. This group also pressed for the end of the State of Emergency. The 1960 decree resulted in the release of thousands of detainees.

The negotiations for independence took place at three conferences at the Lancaster House in the 1960s. There were three main interests the British wanted to safeguard during these negotiations: their military bases, Kenya's economic ties to the UK, and the interests of the immigrant populations.<sup>14</sup> Overall, England wanted to ensure continued goodwill from its former colonies and strived to keep friendly terms. Settlers felt betrayed by the British government, who now promoted independence. As white rule was nearing an end, many fled. Colonel Grogan said, "Only a damn fool would not sell."<sup>15</sup> This type of mentality resulted in capital flight of £1

---

<sup>12</sup> B.A. Ogot, "The Decisive Years: 1956-63," in Ogot and Ochieng', 51.

<sup>13</sup> Atieno-Odhiambo, 34.

<sup>14</sup> Ogot, 53.

<sup>15</sup> Ochieng' and Atieno-Odhiambo, xvii.

million per month.<sup>16</sup> Regardless of their opinions, England continued to prepare the country for independence. A massive program of land redistribution was undertaken in 1962 to transfer over 1 million acres of European farmland to African smallholders. This was politically motivated, as England wanted to hand over power to a stable country. The final conference in 1963 granted Kenyan independence, ending almost 70 years of colonial rule.

The process of British disengagement from its empire began after WWII. The Labour government oversaw the decolonization of the English stronghold in India. The return to power of the Conservative Party in 1951 saw a renewed interest in maintaining the empire. By the 1960s, however, England could not resist the ‘wind of change’ any longer. Its economy still had not rebounded from WWII and there was growing international pressure for national determination as the Cold War powers were against colonialism. While there was a violent revolt against the administration, the process of independence in Kenya was political, as were the majority of Anglophone independence movements, aside from Southern Rhodesia and Cyprus. However, political independence was not the end of British influence. A significant European population remained in Kenya. The new political elite maintained many colonial institutions after independence. In addition, most of England’s former colonies opted to remain in the Commonwealth of Nations. Kenya chose to retain political ties and the English legacy survived.

#### Senegal: From Assimilation to Autonomy

The Senegalese had a very different colonial experience from Kenyans. Both colonial parents implemented a system of direct rule for extraction of economic benefits. However, France conducted a policy of cultural and political assimilation, with the goal of creating French citizens out of the Senegalese. France did not establish a settler colony in Senegal, largely because large-scale farms, like the coffee plantations of Ngong Hills, were not feasible in the

---

<sup>16</sup> Ogot, 63.

climate. Finally, the road toward an independent Senegal was a bloodless one as the Senegalese did not want to cut ties with the nation who had informed so much of their society.

French interest in West Africa began in earnest in the 17<sup>th</sup> century with the establishment of the St. Louis fort in present day Senegal. The settlement remained fairly self-contained until King Louis XVIII called for colonization of the interior, a campaign conducted primarily by Governor Louis Faidherbe. French population grew in urban centers such as St. Louis and Gorée, as did the influence of French culture. However, the proactive ‘cultivation’ of Africans into Frenchmen began as a repercussion of the 1848 French Revolution. The natural extension of the principle of equality of man was that Africans could be equal to Europeans. The policy of assimilation was rooted in the theory that education could overcome any cultural differences: once Africans shed their cultural traditions, they could stand as equals with the French. This was a uniquely French approach as the British simply accepted their cultural superiority and made no attempts to reform Africans into Englishmen.

The French assimilation policy played out in multiple arenas. Politically, the Senegalese were granted representation in the Chambre des Députés in 1848, notably over a century before any other West African state. A General Council and municipal councils modeled on the French Conseils Généraux were established. The colonial administration also created a French-style education system. In a decidedly non-assimilationist move, Governor Faidherbe also established schools for Muslims who were opposed to the mission schools.<sup>17</sup> Residents of St. Louis and Gorée were granted French citizenship, including voting rights, in 1848. This African elite became known as the *originaires*. It is important to note that this policy was not extended to

---

<sup>17</sup> Michael Crowder, *Senegal: A Study of French Assimilation Policy* (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1967), 16.

other French West African states and France would later attempt to reduce the rights they had granted to the Senegalese.<sup>18</sup>

The rights enjoyed in the urban centers were not universal in Senegal. The French administration attempted no assimilation in rural areas. Residents were deemed *sujets* and their rights to movement and association were limited.<sup>19</sup> The colonial government also relied on chiefs to oversee the forced labor of the *sujets*. The civil rights of this class expanded in the 1930s as Senegalese representatives pressured the French Assembly for reform. Thus, in 1936, 78,400 of the 1.7 million Senegalese had French citizenship, compared with 2,100 citizens in the rest of French West Africa.<sup>20</sup>

A notable characteristic of the colonial period in Senegal is that the politicians advocated for an expansion of the assimilation policy. The goal was that by making Senegalese citizens equal to French citizens, Senegal would have greater leverage in its relationship to France. However, there was no desire to disrupt the special and valued relationship with France and therefore no calls for independence. One politician who embodied the objectives of increased rights for Senegalese while upholding determinedly French values was Blaise Diagne. He promoted obligatory military service regardless of race in return for citizenship. However, there was a limit to the degree of power he wanted to achieve for his fellow countrymen. Representing Senegal at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Pan-African Conference in 1921 he declared, “We French natives wish to remain French, since France has given us every liberty.”<sup>21</sup> As the Senegalese were content with the status quo, there were no appeals for radical change.

---

<sup>18</sup> Crowder, 22.

<sup>19</sup> Crowder, 12.

<sup>20</sup> Crowder, 34.

<sup>21</sup> Crowder, 31.

Unfortunately, the relationship between France and Senegal did change radically under the Vichy Regime (1940-1945). Chief of State Philippe Pétain rescinded the status of citizen for the *originaires* living in the Quatres Communes (St. Louis, Dakar, Gorée, and Rufisque) and eliminated the deputyship. This era was also marked by a level of racism never before seen in Senegal and forced labor was expanded.<sup>22</sup>

French policy towards its African colonies in the post-WWII era was defined at the 1944 Brazzaville Conference. West African colonies were granted the same rights that Senegal had enjoyed for years. It was also decided that Africans would have citizenship in a French Federation, not in mainland France.<sup>23</sup> These changes only slightly affected Senegal. In fact, the Senegalese were disappointed that the new Constitution did not expand the assimilation policy. Michael Crowder posits that the failure of the French to extend assimilation was one of the “predominant influences behind the reaction against assimilation.”<sup>24</sup> This frustration would fuel efforts at autonomy.

Léopold Sédar Senghor was a leader in the campaign to modify Senegal’s relation to France. Frustrated because of the close ties between SFIO (Section Française de l’Internationale Ouvrière) and France, he established the Bloc Démocratique Senegalais (BDS). BDS endorsed a federal relationship with France. This promotion of political equality with France coincided with a cultural movement exalting ‘*la negritude*.’ Supporters of negritude called for a return to African values and culture and countered the claim of French cultural universalism.<sup>25</sup> This movement manifested itself in literature. Historian Cheikh Anta Diop penned a revised history of Africa, emphasizing the unifying aspects of black history. In effort to display the value and

---

<sup>22</sup> Tony Chafer, *The End of the Empire in French West Africa: France’s Successful Decolonization?* (New York: Berg, 2002), 40.

<sup>23</sup> Crowder, 44.

<sup>24</sup> Crowder, 49.

<sup>25</sup> Chafer, 2002, 16.

contributions of black society, Diop drew on Egyptian history: “[...] The Egyptian achievement was essentially a Negro one and [...] all Africans without exception can draw from it the same moral benefits that the West does in regard to the Graeco-Latin civilization.”<sup>26</sup> The society with the greatest degree of assimilation was now promoting a return to its cultural roots.

Political support for BDS was evident in the 1952 and 1956 Conseil-general elections where Senghor’s party gained a significant majority over SFIO. French policy reform only fueled the movement. The 1956 *loi cadre* was an attempt to mollify its colonies by transferring powers to an elected assembly. However, Senghor was not satisfied. The devolution of power to the territories was not accompanied by any executive powers, essentially keeping the states weak. The idea of independence was floated in political circles. The *Parti Africain de l’Indépendance*, the first African party for independence, formed in 1957.<sup>27</sup>

In 1958 Charles de Gaulle offered all French colonies the opportunity for autonomy. The choice was either to accept the 5<sup>th</sup> Republic Constitution wholesale and join the new French Community or become independent and forgo all assistance. Guinea was the only country to reject the Community and became independent in 1958. In response, De Gaulle, immediately ended all assistance. Three thousand French left the country, taking all their property and destroying that which could not be moved.<sup>28</sup> The consequences for rejecting France were high. Unsurprisingly, the majority party in Senegal passed the referendum, wanting to safeguard French assistance at the cost of continued colonialism.

Pressure was mounting for France to relinquish control of its territories. It was mired in conflict in Algeria and the struggle in Indochina had not been forgotten. However, West African

---

<sup>26</sup> Crowder, 55.

<sup>27</sup> Crowder, 70.

<sup>28</sup> Martin Meredith, *The Fate of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2005), 69.

countries and France wanted to maintain the mutual benefits of close ties. According to Senghor, “The choice of the Senegalese people is independence; they want it to take place only in friendship with France, not in dispute.”<sup>29</sup> Negotiations for independence began and the African states signed comprehensive Cooperation Accords, detailing the nature of their future relations to France. In June 1960, the Mali Federation, a union between Senegal and Soudan, became independent. Senghor’s egalitarian, European-style ideals conflicted with the politics of Modibo Keita. This ill-planned federation, between two very dissimilar states, fell apart only two months later. Senegal became an independent state in August 1960.

France, like England, had been weakened by WWII and was subject to the same global pressures for decolonization. Unlike Great Britain, France focused on restructuring its relations to West Africa rather than taking steps towards independence. France had cultivated a significant population of elites in Senegal who had decades of political experience. By allowing this group control over certain aspects of the state and granting them privileges enjoyed by French citizens, the *originaires* were content with their close ties to France. Unfortunately, French efforts at reform did not go far enough to expand the rights of Senegalese in the nature of French citizens. The political elite realized they would never be equal to French citizens as long as the relationship was a colonial one and therefore changed course and advocated for autonomy. The special relationship between Senegal and France was appreciated on both sides of the Mediterranean and, despite the formal changes that independence brought, close ties and cooperation continued after 1960.

### **Post-Independence Relations**

Independence did not represent a clean break from the colonial era. Many would argue that the new era simply replaced colonialism with neo-colonialism, where the state was still

---

<sup>29</sup> Crowder, 63.

coerced, or at least influenced, by the former colonial power. Liberation from imperialism was supposed to correct the colonial injustices suffered by the indigenous population. In reality, little changed in the nature of power. The new ruling elite recognized that the colonial power had been successful at preserving its regime and maintained many of its institutions. The colonial administration was established to maintain minority rule over a majority and was authoritarian in nature. The new regimes saw themselves as successors of this power and were convinced the autocratic nature would help them keep it. Mahmood Mamdani attributes “the inherited impediments to democratization” in independent African states to this carry-over of colonial political institutions.<sup>30</sup> In addition, the structure of the economy, created to benefit foreign powers, was left largely in tact. In Kenyatta’s words: “We are determined that the development of African businesses and industries should be carried out without damaging the existing fabric of the economy.”<sup>31</sup> African politicians wanted to retain the advantages of close ties to Europe, even if the nature of the relationship only benefited the elite.

Due to the degree of political, economic, and social connections of institutions and individuals between the states, the most important relationship of the independent state was still with its former colonial parent. I will now look at the post-independence experiences of Kenya and Senegal and determine the nature degree of English and French influence over their institutions and policies.

### Britain’s Disengagement

The pressures for decolonization, such as the financial cost of the empire and U.S. interests, motivated England to disengage from its former colonies after independence. However, British interests did not dissipate with the first autonomous African elections. There was a

---

<sup>30</sup> Mamdani, 25.

<sup>31</sup> Robert Maxon, “Social and Cultural Changes,” in Ogot and Ochieng’, 98.



significant expatriate population in former settler colonies. Trade and business ties were still important and British military interests remained. It was also vital to entrench the former colonies in the Western camp in the face of mounting Cold War tensions. The independent regime also retained many of the structures of the colonial state though, as we will see, this continuity was not enforced as in Francophone states. Britain had less control over its former territories – as expected after independence – but the economic and political benefits of maintaining close ties was obvious to both parties.

British diplomatic priorities had changed after WWII. The Commonwealth states now came second to the special relationship with the United States. As the Cold War continued, the most important policy goal was to bolster the Western camp vis-à-vis the Soviet threat. Thus, England was motivated to ensure that the newly independent states in its sphere of influence were not tempted to seek out Soviet aid. Membership within the Commonwealth of Nations was one way to keep these states oriented to the West. Burma had rejected Commonwealth membership at independence in 1948 and had since ‘slipped into dangerous neutralism.’<sup>32</sup> England used its influence to prevent the Soviets from gaining a foothold in Africa.

As long as the USSR was not in the picture, Britain no longer sought a monopoly on its sphere of influence in Africa. Thus, Kenya was able to diversify its political ties and by 1974 was one of the most active African states in terms of diplomatic relationships.<sup>33</sup> One of the sources for trade and aid was the United States, who was seeking greater influence within the continent during the Cold War. President Kennedy said in 1962, “We see Africa as probably the greatest open field of maneuver in the world wide competition between the [communist] bloc

---

<sup>32</sup> Nicholas White, “The Business and the Politics of Decolonization: The British Experience in the Twentieth Century,” *The Economic History Review* 53, no. 3 (2000), 559.

<sup>33</sup> Susan Aurelia Gitelson, “Policy Options for Small States: Kenya and Tanzania Reconsidered,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 12, no. 2 (1977), 35.

and the non-communist.”<sup>34</sup> This newfound interest in Africa did not subside. In an effort to modernize the Kenyan air force and increase regional security, U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld offered to sell Kenya twelve airplanes in 1976. In addition, Americans comprised an increasing number of technical assistants. In 1971, 10.2% of experts in Kenya were American. However, the English presence was still felt as British experts counted for 59%.<sup>35</sup> As England no longer desired to micromanage its former colonies, Kenya sought ties with other countries, including Canada, the Nordic countries, and Japan.

These geo-strategic considerations in the bipolar world trumped English business interests in its former colonies, according to Nicholas White in “The Business and Politics of Decolonization.” While there was a British business presence in the Congo, the U.K. intervened in the post-independence political crisis because of its geographical position. They feared Soviet manipulation of the situation and did not want the Congo to be an entry point for the USSR into Central Africa. Prime Minister Harold Macmillan decided in 1962 not to oppose the reunification of the Congo, against the wishes of the Katanga business lobby.<sup>36</sup> This is an example of the supremacy of Westminster foreign policy over business ties in its former colonies.

British economic interests persisted after independence, even if they were not prioritized in London. However, the future of foreign corporations was not bright at independence. Many liberation movements and later independent African governments promoted a reorganization of the economy into a socialist model. The 1965 Sessional Paper No. 10 entitled “African Socialism and Its Application to Planning in Kenya” proposed multiple types of property ownership, control of wealth, and the implementation of taxes to decrease the divide between rich and

---

<sup>34</sup> Meredith, 143.

<sup>35</sup> Gitelson, 42.

<sup>36</sup> White, 561.

poor.<sup>37</sup> These socialist goals never became policy. Kenyatta was a capitalist and guaranteed the continuation of trade with the industrial North through the protection of norms of market forces and private ownership.<sup>38</sup> The merger of KANU and KADU further relieved investors. After Kenyatta was elected Prime Minister in 1963, many important members of the Opposition Party resigned to join KANU. The end of the KADU Left ensured the continuation of capitalist policies.<sup>39</sup>

The new governments, firmly situated in capitalism, retained many economic policies of their predecessor. The most important continuity, for British interests, was the continued reliance on foreign investment. Transnational corporations continued to dominate industry and thrived under the political umbrella provided by their African investors.<sup>40</sup> Government policies strengthened the power of multinational corporations while doing little to benefit the national economy or the majority of Kenyans. The undiversified economy was vulnerable to price fluctuations on commodities. Agrarian policies still favored cash crops at the expense of food crops, leaving the country in a food crisis.<sup>41</sup> The policies of export of raw materials and reliance on foreign capital for industries created a pattern of dependence while British interests continued to thrive.

The continuity of economic ties between former British colonies and London was not enforced by any mechanism. Trade links were not guaranteed through legislation. In fact, British colonies had not been forced to give preference to English imports since 1846.<sup>42</sup> Regardless, England remained Kenya's largest individual trading partner. In 1972, the U.K. accounted for

---

<sup>37</sup> Maxon, 84.

<sup>38</sup> Maxon, 85.

<sup>39</sup> White, 552.

<sup>40</sup> Ochieng', 90.

<sup>41</sup> Maloba, 15.

<sup>42</sup> Robin Grier, "Colonial Legacies and Economic Growth," *Public Choice* 98 (1999), 320.

28.4% of imports and 89% of exports.<sup>43</sup> England continued profiting from trade with Africa, but avoided criticisms of neocolonialism as there was no enforcement of these ties.

Even though the benefits continued, England disengaged further from its economic ties with Africa. The sterling area was established during WWII in order to standardize exchange controls throughout the Commonwealth. As British interest in its former colonies waned, this preferential treatment seemed outdated. The sterling area ended in 1972 when Westminster unilaterally applied exchange controls to countries in the sterling area. Countries could respond to this policy anyway they wanted. Many copied the British example, and established their own exchange controls. Some had already done this in the 1960s.<sup>44</sup> Britain benefited from a de facto deference to its interests, but it did not enforce its economic policies.

Kenyan policy was also aimed at reducing British influence and settler control of the government and economy. The new government continued Africanization of sectors. The Trade Licensing Act of 1967 allowed only Kenyan citizens to trade in non-urban areas. However, the process of Africanization was slower in the government. Some whites retained strategic positions such as Minister of Agriculture Bruce Mackenzie.<sup>45</sup> Many of the personalities and institutions after independence were leftovers from the previous era. Politician Tom Mboya explained,

There is no point in change for its own sake [...] In most cases we have started off with those bequeathed to us by the former colonial powers. This is the system we have been used to working within. [...] It is difficult to breakaway entirely, to steer a new course, to create institutions which are African, yet which are appropriate for modern society.<sup>46</sup>

The government gave lip service to a new economic system but in reality little changed after 1963. The elites – both in the government and in business (though many fit into both categories)

---

<sup>43</sup> Gitelson, 42.

<sup>44</sup> Richard Joseph, "The Gaullist Legacy: Patterns of French Neo-Colonialism," *Review of African Political Economy*, No. 6 (1976), 7.

<sup>45</sup> Maxon, 93.

<sup>46</sup> Maxon, 93.

– supported English economic policies, as they benefited from such capitalist practices. These practices also guaranteed the continuation of economic benefits to the former colonial power.

Outside of the economy, Britain was more proactive about protecting its interests, namely in terms of its military. Continued military cooperation in the form of training and joint exercises was guaranteed in 1964 agreements.<sup>47</sup> Kenya also allowed Great Britain to maintain air force and naval facilities. In return, the Kenyan air force was stocked with British and Canadian aircraft. East African governments also called on British troops to protect their regimes against army mutinies in Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya in 1964.<sup>48</sup> This mutually beneficial military cooperation was only possible with continued good will between the governments.

One of the most salient legacies of British rule was cultural. The English language continued to dominate despite a Swahili literary movement. English was the language of instruction in Kenyan schools. Many politicians received degrees from European and American universities and therefore it was the dominant language in the legislature. Despite the preference of some to wear traditional fashions, Western dress also became mainstream within the government.<sup>49</sup> The West was associated with modernity and progress and Kenyan efforts to emulate that way of life took the form of a ‘cultural dis-Africanization.’<sup>50</sup> In addition, personal and business networks with Europeans continued, making the cultural break with England more difficult. One should note that these ties were not as ‘brotherly’ as in Francophone Africa. The British government was much more distant to the African populations as there had been no effort at cultural assimilation or political integration. The familial ties developed between African and

---

<sup>47</sup> Gitelson, 40.

<sup>48</sup> Meredith, 177.

<sup>49</sup> Maxon, 139-140.

<sup>50</sup> Maloba, 20.

French politicians did not exist in the British context. Though the cultural ties were less pronounced, there was little effort by the elite to remove this colonial legacy.

Britain attempted to disengage from its former colonies after independence. As long as they sided with the West in the Cold War struggle, England was unperturbed by states diversifying their foreign relations. The U.K. also reduced its economic sway when it effectively dismantled the sterling area in 1972. It did protect its military interests by maintaining infrastructure on the ground. Continuation of its influence in other areas was not enforced by England. Kenyatta's government decided to retain many economic policies after independence. While they did benefit foreign investment, African states were not tied to these policies as in French West Africa. Kenya did try to move in its own direction with Africanization of posts and calls for socialism. However, the elite was too tied to the benefits of capitalism and Westernism to be motivated for real change. So while Britain and Kenya attempted to disengage from each other, there were also efforts on both sides to maintain ties. While the effect of English rule was apparent in the post-colonial era, the only official source of English influence was the Commonwealth of Nations.

#### Commonwealth of Nations

England maintained political ties with its former colonies primarily through the Commonwealth of Nations. It was initially created as a forum between the metropole and her colonies. This institution was particularly valued by England during the World Wars in the coordination of economic and defense policies. In the post-WWII era, as the wave of liberation began to sweep across the British Empire, the nature of the Commonwealth evolved.

The precedence for former colonies' membership in the Commonwealth was set by India in 1947. Prime Minister Nehru acknowledged the desire to remain within the institutional

framework of the Commonwealth, but as an autonomous state. England was not averse to maintaining a degree of interdependency. Thus the Nehru Formula was created: members were no longer required to be a dominion or colony of England, though they must accept the monarchy as the ceremonial Head of the Commonwealth.<sup>51</sup> The transition within the Commonwealth from colony to autonomous state was smooth. British authorities celebrated the independence of Ghana in 1957 as the first of many African states to gain independence and retain membership in the Commonwealth.

Newly independent African states joined New Zealand and Australia's calls for an administrative council. The Commonwealth was essentially an intergovernmental organization with no supranational powers. With the creation of the Commonwealth Secretariat in 1965 the organization became more powerful, but still emphasized intergovernmental collaboration. The mandate of the organization expanded with the 1971 Singapore Declaration to promote "representative institutions and guarantees for personal freedom under the law that are our common heritage."<sup>52</sup> More democratic criteria were enumerated in the 1991 Harare Declaration. Ironically, many authoritarian leaders signed these documents promoting democratic ideals including Dr. Hastings Banda, the Life President of Malawi.<sup>53</sup>

The enforcement mechanism of the Commonwealth principles was founded as a result of the Harare Declaration. The Commonwealth Ministerial Action Group (CMAG) drafted protocols with specific time frames for responding to violations of Commonwealth principles. For example, Nigeria's membership was suspended between 1995 and 1999 for repeated violations of Harare principles and the execution of prominent activists, including Ken Saro-

---

<sup>51</sup> Edward McMahon and Scott Baker, *Piecing a Democratic Quilt? Regional Organizations and Universal Norms* (Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc., 2006), 107.

<sup>52</sup> McMahon, 110.

<sup>53</sup> McMahon, 110.

Wiwa.<sup>54</sup> Fellow African members supported the Commonwealth's use of penalties for democratic violations. Ghana, Sierra Leone, and Botswana advocated for the extension of Zimbabwe's suspension for election fraud and human rights abuses in 2003.

There are strong incentives for membership as evidenced by the majority of former colonies choosing to remain affiliated and the record of suspended states regaining full membership. The Commonwealth can exercise a degree of influence over member states. According to a Commonwealth official, "Falling adrift of the Commonwealth consensus is a surprisingly powerful carrot. There does seem to be a genuine fear of being dragged in front of other members, accused of violating collective democratic principles, and either ostracized, suspended, or even expelled."<sup>55</sup> There is only one example of when the CMAG penalties did not pressure a member to reform. In response to the 2003 extension of Zimbabwe's suspension, President Robert Mugabe simply left the Commonwealth and Zimbabwe has not returned. The other four suspensions have resulted in the state regaining membership, not to mention the more numerous lower levels of reprimands that have inspired members to reform.

As the membership became increasingly dominated by independent states, Great Britain tried to de-emphasize its role. The Commonwealth was determined to reject South Africa's 1961 application for membership in protest of apartheid, challenging the position of Margaret Thatcher's government, yet Britain did not attempt to override the majority position.<sup>56</sup> Former colonies were also comfortable using the Commonwealth as a forum to criticize British actions. At the Singapore Conference in 1971, Kenya joined other nations in strongly opposing British resumption of arms sales to South Africa.<sup>57</sup> Kenyatta also expressed dissatisfaction with British

---

<sup>54</sup> McMahon, 116.

<sup>55</sup> McMahon, 125-6.

<sup>56</sup> McMahon, 123.

<sup>57</sup> Gitelson, 40.



response to the crisis in Rhodesia in 1965. Members argued that a feasible agreement was only possible with British military presence. However, Kenya restrained its opposition and did not break ties with the U.K. Tanzania, one of the nine countries to sever diplomatic relations with England over this issue, was itself a member of the Commonwealth. Its harsh stance jeopardized a large loan from Britain.<sup>58</sup> Kenya did not take its dissatisfaction to this extreme, placing a premium on its trade with and aid from England.

The preeminence of England within the Commonwealth is undeniable as it was once in control of many of these territories. The Secretariat is headquartered in London and Queen Elizabeth II is the official Head of the Commonwealth. Its global economic power persists. However, England does not exploit the Commonwealth for its own benefit. The 53-member organization does promote democratic ideals that England values but the mechanisms that support and enforce these principles are pursued through a multilateral approach. Even when the penalties are unsuccessful, the visibility of the Commonwealth's actions can influence international opinion. While the condemnation of Zimbabwe did not stop Mugabe's violations, the suspension brought media attention to his authoritarian rule.<sup>59</sup> England had the opportunity to monopolize this organization but it instead chooses to exercise influence according to procedure and on a multilateral basis.

#### French Neocolonialism in Independent French West Africa

The independence of French Black Africa represented not the end of French control but the introduction of new methods of influence. France guaranteed its hold on its former colonies through comprehensive Cooperation Accords. It managed to decrease the financial burden of its colonies by transferring control of internal affairs to the independent governments but kept the

---

<sup>58</sup> Gitelson, 51.

<sup>59</sup> McMahon, 120.

benefits of a close relationship. By labeling its neo-colonial intentions as *coopération*, France was able to maintain influence over key sectors such as education, defense, and economy. These never published agreements tightened economic relations and preserved *la zone franc*, allowed for the continuation of financial and technical assistance, and guaranteed the presence of French troops. While the newly independent states were no longer colonies of France, political, economic, military, and social ties were stronger than ever.

After independence, the elites of both countries shared the common interest of remaining close. This desire played out with the creation of organizations to increase cooperation including the *Conseil de l'entente* (1959) and the *Union Africaine et Malgache* (1961) which became the *Organisation commune africaine et malgache* (OCAM) in 1966. Senghor promoted these efforts and, joined by President Habib Bourguiba, called for a francophone association in 1968, renamed the *Haute Conseil de la Francophonie* in 1986. Perhaps the most visible of these forums are the annual Franco-African summits initiated by French President Georges Pompidou in 1973. These highlight the special relationship between France and its former dependencies. There is no formal agenda for these meetings and the summits have the air of a 'family reunion.'<sup>60</sup> Non-francophone states have been included in the summit in recent years, as France has diversified its economic ties in Africa. However, the most valued states, primarily former colonies, are invited to *pré-carré* (closed) sessions.

One major characteristic of the post-independence relationship was the personal ties between the elites. President Senghor was the epitome of a *francisé* African and was respected in French political spheres. He maintained a close relationship with Pompidou, friends since attending La Sorbonne together in the 1920s. Personal connections like these may have led to a

---

<sup>60</sup> Peter Schraeder "New Directions in Francophone West African Foreign Policy" in Gilbert Khadiagala and Terrence Lyons, ed., *African Foreign Policies: Power and Process* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001), 44.

de facto consensus on certain foreign policy issues, but political pressure was influential as well. Charles de Gaulle openly opposed the creation of a supranational African organization. It was not a surprise that most francophone states advocated for a minimalist approach to African unification. Several francophone states, disregarding the OAU principle of respect for colonial-era boundaries, supported the Biafran struggle for independence in the 1967 Nigerian Civil War, following French lead. Even after decolonization, France and its former dependencies were aligned on foreign policy.

The degree of French influence over her former colonies is nowhere as evident as in the economy. French West African states had been united through the CFA franc since the Bretton Woods agreements. This currency was tied to the French franc through a fixed exchange rate. The countries thus belonging to *la zone franc* had to adhere to membership rules, conveniently established by France. The French Treasury had partial management of states' foreign exchange reserves. In fact, two-thirds of Senegal's currency reserves were held at the Bank of France.<sup>61</sup> In addition, French finance administrators were to be consulted on national policies. With no independent control of their economic sector, *la zone franc* essentially meant a succession of sovereignty from the new states to the former colonial power.

Allechi M'bet and Amlan Niamkey outlined the benefits and disadvantages of the Franc zone in their discussion of the future of the CFA. The system allowed for easy capital inflow for the member states and for a greater borrowing capacity as the explicit ties to France bolstered their credibility. In addition, the degree of financial control by France limited inflationary practices by African leaders. Finally, it encouraged trade among African members and paved the way for monetary union. Conversely, the Franc zone effectively permitted members to pursue a lackadaisical domestic economic policy, trusting the CFA to do all the brunt work. It also put

---

<sup>61</sup> Tony Chafer, "France and Senegal: the End of the Affair?" *SAIS Review* 23, no. 2 (2003), 159.

members at the mercy of fluctuations of the French franc.<sup>62</sup> While the CFA had its benefits, members had to cede a great degree of economic control to France.

France used its considerable influence over economic policy to guarantee French saturation of African trade. Reciprocal duty-free arrangements were created and, while allowing African access to the French market, also allowed French access to the African market. Thus expensive French goods flooded local markets.<sup>63</sup> The Cooperation Accords also guaranteed exclusive access to key resources. France received the majority of minerals necessary for its high-technology industries from African states, including 100% of uranium.<sup>64</sup>

African states were rewarded for their trade agreements with France with subsidies for agricultural products. The most significant Senegalese export was the groundnut, making the economy extremely vulnerable to any price fluctuations of this crop. However, France guaranteed a level of stability in the economy (and as a result in the government) after independence by offering a large subsidy. In 1962, France bought 800,000 of the 900,000 tons of groundnuts over the market price.<sup>65</sup> France was entrenched for better or for worse in African economies.

The level of French control over African economies was not matched in former British colonies. After independence, England was in no way responsible for the currency of its former dependencies. When it devalued the pound sterling in 1967, only three African countries decided to follow England's lead. Countries in the CFA did not have the same choice as they were inextricably tied to the French franc. They were not even consulted about the 1969 French franc

---

<sup>62</sup> Allechi M'bet and Amlan Madeleine Niamkey, "European Economic Integration and the France Zone: The Future of the CFA France after 1996," *African Economic Research Consortium*, Research Paper 19, July 1993, 11-12.

<sup>63</sup> Joseph, 9.

<sup>64</sup> Guy Martin, "Continuity and Change in Franco-African Relations," *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 33, no. 1 (1995), 9.

<sup>65</sup> Crowder, 117.

devaluation, despite the ripple effects on *la zone franc*.<sup>66</sup> Historically, the European states had different economic traditions. The French economy was never as strong as England's and the government favored protectionist policies. Those policies were passed down to Black Africa and, as trade with African states accounted for such a large percentage of overall French trade, it is not a surprise that France would establish agreements securing control of its economic interests.

Though Senegal was not a settler colony, at the time of independence 30,000 Frenchmen were living in Dakar.<sup>67</sup> This large presence did not dissipate in the next decade. In 1969, 13,000 *coopérants*, or technical assistants, were stationed in Black Africa.<sup>68</sup> French citizens also made up a large percentage of the teachers and professors within the education system. French policy was also aimed at protecting the interests of these communities.

In addition to the French civilian population, there was also a significant military presence. Through the 1970s, 10–15,000 armed forces were stationed in Black Africa.<sup>69</sup> France had supported the creation of domestic armies at the time of independence. These essentially were extensions of the French army. One of the goals was to preserve friendly regimes protect economic interests. France would take any measure to protect these regimes, even restore Léon M'ba's regime after a coup d'état in Gabon in 1964. French troops stationed in Dakar and Brazzaville arrived in Libreville and restored M'ba less than 24 hours after the bloodless coup. In a less extreme example, France intervened in Congo-Brazzaville and Gabon after the result of a

---

<sup>66</sup> Joseph, 7.

<sup>67</sup> Crowder, 81.

<sup>68</sup> Joseph, 10.

<sup>69</sup> Joseph, 11.

football match led to fighting between the supporters.<sup>70</sup> France also helped suppress the Bamileke rebellion in Cameroon.

In another dramatic example, France organized the overthrow of Jean-Bedel Bokassa in the Central African Republic. He was once strongly supported by the French government who helped him throw a lavish coronation in 1977; the estimated cost of the celebration was \$22 million.<sup>71</sup> His rule became an embarrassment for the French regime in the late 1970s as rumors mounted about torture of student demonstrators and sentences to death by lion or crocodile. On 20 September 1979, with Bukassa on an official visit to Libya, French troops stationed in Gabon and Chad took control of Bangui in Operation Barracuda. The French army reinstated David Dacko, the cousin who Bukassa had overthrown in 1965. When similar criticisms were raised against Idi Amin's regime in Uganda, England did not undertake a comparable overt operation to overthrow him. French actions demonstrate that France would go to any extreme to protect its sphere of influence, even if its role is obvious.

African regimes enjoyed the security provided by the French military in addition to the economic benefits. In Senegal, 10% of the national income upon independence came from the presence of French troops.<sup>72</sup> One of the largest French military presences was in Senegal. The size was determined by the degree of French economic interests in the country, the number of French residents, and the type of political links.<sup>73</sup>

French influence in the affairs of West African states was hard to disguise in the post-colonial years. From the military personnel and the *coopérants* to the CFA franc and the political and personal ties of the elite, France was still involved in many aspects of the newly independent

---

<sup>70</sup> Meredith, 177.

<sup>71</sup> Meredith, 228.

<sup>72</sup> Crowder, 117.

<sup>73</sup> Martin, 14.

countries. The Cooperation Accords guaranteed that independence was more of a continuation of colonial policy than a new era for West Africa. England had no intentions of maintaining the type of formal influence France pursued in its own sphere of influence. France attempted to extract the same economic benefits after independence and it became even more important to have friendly regimes in power. In certain cases, France would support non-democratic regimes and come to their aid when internal security and stability was threatened. France's relationship to its former colonies in the years following independence were structured and comprehensive, in stark contrast to the laissez-faire attitude of the British government, who preferred a hands-off, indirect approach.

### Pan-Africanism

One clear example of the different approaches to their former colonies can be seen in European reactions to calls for African integration. Ghanaian Kwame Nkrumah was the father of Pan-Africanism and the most vocal proponent of an African federal union. The first step to achieving the union he envisioned was the independence of African states from colonial control. His famous adage 'Seek ye first the political kingdom' encapsulates this stage. Senghor's negritude mirrored these political goals by promoting independence from the cultural oppression of colonialism. Negritude literature attempted to prove the fundamental unity of Africans, which was only divided by the arrival of Europeans.<sup>74</sup> This cultural dimension also contributed to calls for independence.

As the founding President of the first sub-Saharan African country to gain independence, Nkrumah was extremely respected throughout the continent. However, the consensus on his Pan-Africanism ended with the goal of liberation from colonial powers. Opinion was divided into three camps. The first was led by Nkrumah and supported a federal union similar to the United

---

<sup>74</sup> Crowder, 56.

States. Michael Crowder notes that in Anglophone Africa, liberation movements were focused on political independence from England.<sup>75</sup> This type of union would more decisively sever political ties with England. However, Algeria, Morocco, and Guinea in particular joined this Casablanca group, in favor of any safeguards from potential French interference.

The other extreme position was held by the Brazzaville group, led by Houphouët-Boigny. The majority of Francophone states were against any type of political integration. While the idea of negritude had taken a strong hold in French West Africa, the political aspects of Pan-Africanism were less salient. Politically and culturally, French West Africans saw themselves as French. The Senegalese sought a federal relationship with metropolitan France, not its African neighbors. It was no surprise that France was not keen on any union that would disrupt its own network in West and Central Africa. This group sought to maintain the status quo.

The moderate countries comprised the Monrovia bloc. These countries, led by Nigeria, advocated increased cooperation but were opposed to political union. The Organization of African Union (OAU) was founded on 25 May 1963, largely in line with Monrovia interests. The OAU found that consensus among these diverse states was difficult to achieve and was further undermined by lack of resources and inadequate infrastructure. The ineffective body was reorganized in 2002 into the African Union but is still largely impotent in handling African affairs and crises.

Some states saw African unity as an opportunity to replace neocolonialism and European influence with an African system of governance. However, not all states were unhappy with the degree of European involvement after independence. In addition, the former colonial parents still had interests in Africa and did not want integration to jeopardize their influence. While the British did not support African integration, their opposition was not nearly as vocal as that of

---

<sup>75</sup> Crowder, 56.



France. French interests were more extensive and, as France still had the political weight to influence policy, Francophone states agreed that African integration was not favorable. There were obvious benefits to maintaining economic ties to France, as shown above, which would have been damaged by African union, but it is safe to say that both national interests and French opinion influenced Francophone states' position on Pan-Africanism. Anglophone states were more evenly divided on the question of unification.

### Aid and European Integration

European integration and the establishment of the European Economic Community in 1957 affected member states' relations with countries in sub-Saharan Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific (ACP) and provided another source of influence and aid for those regions. Part four of the Treaty of Rome created European Development Funds (EDFs) to give technical and financial aid to African colonies of member states. France also campaigned for Articles 131 and 136, which allowed for the association of non-European states with special relations to EEC members. European aid to former colonies was formalized in the Yaoundé I Convention in 1963. This agreement between the EEC and 18 Associated African and Malgache Countries (EAMA) gave trade advantages and aid to former colonies.<sup>76</sup> Yaoundé II (1969-1975) pledged the majority of the third EDF to Francophone Africa to build infrastructure.

British accession in 1973 led to a reworking of European aid to include Anglophone Africa. The UK wanted to extend the benefits and preferences Francophone Africa had been enjoying to Commonwealth states. The wider reaching Lomé I agreement in 1975 included aid to 46 ACP states, including Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, Zambia and other Anglophone African states.

---

<sup>76</sup> The original beneficiaries were Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Tchad, Congo (Brazzaville), Congo (Kinshasa), Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Somalia, and Togo.

Lomé I continued to prioritize infrastructure and the fourth EDF had a budget of €4 billion.<sup>77</sup>

Lomé I also introduced the STABEX system to offset losses due to price drops or crop failures for exports such as cocoa, coffee, groundnuts, and tea.

Despite the opening of markets to all EEC members and the increasing multilateralism of aid, the dominance of former colonizers remained. France was so entrenched in the West African market that there was little room for new entrants. In Kenya, England was still the most important bilateral donor; only the World Bank allocated more money between 1970 and 1974.<sup>78</sup> France and England benefited from this integration because they could share the burdens associated with their neocolonial economic ties. For example, the Community agreed to buy a fixed amount of sugar from ACP states at a guaranteed price aligned with the EEC's domestic sugar price.<sup>79</sup> ACP states thus enjoyed preferences from an association of states and not just their former colonizer. This multiplied the benefits and made the developing states less reliant on one source of aid.

The integration also changed the nature of aid. France began to channel increasing amounts of aid through Lomé and international financial institutions such as the IMF and World Bank, thus deferring to the dominant neo-liberal development ideology.<sup>80</sup> Essentially, structural adjustment programs became the norm in both Anglophone and Francophone states. It was one step towards disengaging from the traditional bilateral ties to French West Africa. For England, the Community served a similar function as the Commonwealth: it was a source for multilateral influence and aid to Africa that was largely aligned with English goals.

---

<sup>77</sup> "The Lomé Convention." *Development and Relations with African, Caribbean, and Pacific States. European Commission.*

<sup>78</sup> Gitelson, 42.

<sup>79</sup> "The Lomé Convention."

<sup>80</sup> Martin, 11.

## **Conclusion**

As we have seen, France and England had very different post-colonial ties with Africa. France emphasized a cultural facet to their colonial rule. Due to this identity aspect, neither the French nor Senegalese political elite promoted a fundamental break with colonial practices after independence. England did not pursue assimilation in its colonies and, when the political transfer of power was complete, England disengaged. The new leaders were motivated to maintain colonial-style ties without explicit British control. Unlike French involvement post-independence, which included extremes such as reversing coups, England preferred a hands-off approach. It channeled its influence through the Commonwealth of Nations and did not overturn its opinions even when they were contrary to English interests. The question now becomes how did these two distinct approaches affect nation building in the early years of independence.

The political elite of both countries had the challenge of leading an African nation that had been ruled by Europeans for almost a century. The Senegalese had an advantage in that French policy had not been as divisive between tribes. Rather, France had encouraged Senegal to create a national identity even during colonial rule. Senegal's first President was representative of the lack of importance placed on race. Senghor was a Serer and a Catholic – both minorities – and married a French woman. National identity became an amalgam of French and negritude norms and thought in the elite, though the French aspect was less prominent in rural areas where citizens had fewer interactions with French influence. With less emphasis on tribe and ethnicity, nation building was an easier process.

Where the French saw Africans, the English saw Kikuyu, Luo, or Kalejin.<sup>81</sup> England had emphasized tribe in its divide and rule policy. The distinct tribal differences were largely based in different economic opportunities and the degree of British development in certain regions of

---

<sup>81</sup> Crowder, 98.

Kenya. The land policy disproportionately harmed one tribe. In a country where racial differences are distinct, the election of a Kikuyu politician was significant.

Issues of race, and associated economic class, have been present in African countries since independence and, in certain extremes, tribalism has weakened state power. Tribes in Kenya had different economic opportunities, reinforcing differences between ethnicities. In Senegal, society was stratified by social standing. The solution to both types of division was to utilize patronage systems to preserve the regime. Regimes leveraged state resources for political support. This practice continues today and accounts for some of the corruption evident in modern African states.

Neocolonial influences also affected the ability of the African leadership to establish African policies and institutions. Francophone Africa was limited in its ability to conduct foreign policy. The dominance of France left little space for other states to influence or even interact with former French colonies on a significant level. On the other hand, England encouraged its former colonies to diversify ties. It did not aggressively defend its *pré carré* as France did. While Kenya's main source of financial aid was England in the 1970s, it received significant amounts from West Germany and Sweden as well as considerable amounts from Canada, Japan, and the United States. Its former colonies were free to disagree with English foreign policy as evidenced by disputes in the Commonwealth (though disagreements were rarely so harsh as to jeopardize economic ties). However, former British colonies were able to seek resources from non-Western sources. The biggest bilateral contributors to Tanzania between 1970 and 1974 were China and Yugoslavia.<sup>82</sup> England was no longer interested in maintaining a monopoly on foreign policy of Commonwealth states. Thus Anglophone Africa was more capable of pursuing independent foreign relations.

---

<sup>82</sup> Gitelson, 48.

Kenyan politicians also had the opportunity to build Kenyan institutions and a Kenyan economy because of the disengagement of England. The leadership, however, opted for maintaining the status quo of colonial style governance and policies. Senegalese leaders had much less autonomy and no legitimate ability to create Senegalese institutions in the fifteen years after independence. Thus neocolonial influence hindered nation building in terms of creating a national identity in Anglophone Africa and state building in establishing African institutions in Francophone Africa.

France and England had different approaches to colonial rule and their neocolonial influence after independence. France was more entrenched in its colonies with the application of assimilation policy and the formalization of political and economic ties after independence. This degree of involvement limited Francophone African autonomy over foreign and economic policy and extended the dependence on France after independence. England was less concerned with the cultural aspect of its rule than with creating an advantageous economic environment. Anglophone colonial administrations gave in to the wind of change and the U.K. successfully disengaged from its former colonies. The new African governments had the option of creating new institutions but chose to continue colonial policies. This led to a high reliance on foreign investment and the continuation of England as the major trading partner. The result was the creation of an independent sub-Saharan Africa in the 1970s that was largely dependent on Western aid and trade. However, the Francophone and Anglophone states took different paths to get to that point due to the type of relations they maintained with their former colonial powers.

# Works Cited

- Boone, Catherine. "State Power and Economic Crisis in Senegal." *Comparative Politics* 22, no. 3 (1990): 341-357.
- Chafer, Tony. "France and Senegal: the End of the Affair?" *SAIS Review* 23, no. 2 (2003): 155-167.
- Chafer, Tony. *The End of Empire in French West Africa: France's Successful Decolonization?* New York: Berg, 2002.
- Clapham, Christopher. *Africa and the International System: The Politics of State Survival*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Crowder, Michael. *Senegal: A Study of French Assimilation Policy*. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd, 1967.
- Gitelson, Susan Aurelia. "Policy Options for Small States: Kenya and Tanzania Reconsidered." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 12, no. 2 (1977): 29-57.
- Grier, Robin M. "Colonial Legacies and Economic Growth." *Public Choice* 98 (1999): 317-335.
- Joseph, Richard. "The Gaullist Legacy: Patterns of French Neo-Colonialism." *Review of African Political Economy*, No. 6 (1976): 4-13.
- Khadiagala, Gilbert and Terrence Lyons, ed. *African Foreign Policies: Power and Process*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2001.
- Mamdani, Mahmood. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Martin, Guy. "Continuity and Change in Franco-African Relations." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 33, no. 1 (1995): 1-20.

M'Bet, Allechi and Amlan Madeleine Niamkey. "European Economic Integration and the Franc Zone: The Future of the CFA Franc After 1996." *African Economic Research Consortium*, Research Paper 19, July 1993.

McMahon, Edward R. and Scott H. Baker. *Piecing a Democratic Quilt? Regional Organizations and Universal Norms*. Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press, Inc., 2006.

Meredith, Martin. *The Fate of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2005.

Ogot, B.A. and W.R. Ochieng'. *Decolonization and Independence in Kenya: 1940-1993*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1995.

"The Lomé Convention." *Development and Relations with African, Caribbean, and Pacific States. European Commission*. (Accessed 20 April 2009).  
[http://ec.europa.eu/development/geographical/cotonou/lomegen/lomeitoiv\\_en.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/development/geographical/cotonou/lomegen/lomeitoiv_en.cfm)

White, Nicholas J. "The Business and the Politics of Decolonization: The British Experience in the Twentieth Century." *The Economic History Review* 53, no. 3 (2000): 544-564.