

Crisis of Citizenship and Nationhood in Africa: Reflections on Hegemony and the State

Mojibayo Fadakinte¹, Ph.D & Babatunde Amolegbe¹, MPA, M.Sc

Abstract

One major challenge which post-colonial Africa faces, today, is crisis of citizenship and nationhood, which this paper attempts to explain by arguing that Africa is made up of countries where none is a nation that is made up of one people. Therefore, in post-colonial Africa, the remarkable and fundamental differences in character, attitudes, habits, feelings and ways of life of the different peoples that make up a country, create a situation where the differences make the peoples to be antagonistic and bitterly hostile to each other, especially in their struggle for power and control of resources. This paper therefore interrogates the idea of hegemony and the state, how their nature and character accentuate the crisis of citizenship and nationhood and how the dynamics of colonialism and colonial rule continue to “terrorize” post-colonial Africa, because hegemony and the state that ought to unite the peoples and build a nation are bedeviled with internal crisis. In conclusion, the paper suggests that the constitution of each African country should make provision for each nation to have the opportunity for self determination.

Keywords: Citizenship, Nationhood, Hegemony, State, Post-Colonial Africa.

Introduction

Crisis of citizenship and nationhood is now an issue that partly accounts for the crisis of development in Africa – from the east to the west, central Africa and the horn of Africa, the crisis is noticeable and profound. The pervasive nature of the crisis has led to wars, tumults, genocide, perpetual conflicts and mutual distrust. Over the years, crisis of citizenship and nationhood has dominated intellectual discourse even though most of the discussions and narratives do not identify lack of hegemony and incipient states as the root causes of the crisis. Thus, hegemony and a cohesive state, which ought to galvanize the citizens into a nation, are patently absent, creating a crisis that has persisted since each African country attained flag independence. Thus, so critical and fundamental to this crisis, in most African states, is the absence of hegemonic order that ought to catalyze and jumpstart the process of state formation that will create an acceptable level of homogeneity by institutionalizing and maintaining a social order that will eventually engender some high level of consciousness and a common identity.

It is worth stressing that the structural deficiency in state formation processes, in most of African societies has had far reaching implications for achieving nationhood, particularly in multi-ethnic and pluralized ex-colonies such as Nigeria, D R. Congo, Rwanda, Sudan and Central African Republic. And since citizenship is belongingness, as pointed out by (Adebanwi, 2010), which should never be in doubt, but which is why citizenship and identity continue to deepen state fragility in most part of Africa, precisely because, in most part of Africa, citizenship and identity are in doubt, in disputes and in crisis. Again, the numerous conflicts generated by multi-ethnic nations are intensifying rather than abating, thus promoting the agitation for a definition of citizenship in post-colonial Africa. It is, therefore, the concern of this paper to argue that the solution to the problem of citizenship in Africa must begin with an elucidation of the dynamics of nationhood in order to understand hegemony and its relationship to state formation processes.

¹ Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Lagos, Nigeria

Thus, most crises in Africa are traceable to the problem of identity and citizenship within the contraptions or the so called territories in Africa, thus generating inter-ethnic and sometimes, cross border or trans-border hostilities which have remarkably set Africa back in terms of acceptable standards and level of development.

Citizenship and Nationhood: Some Conceptual Notes.

Citizenship is derived from the historical relationship between an individual and his community. Today, however, citizenship is the relationship between an individual and a state, defined by the law of that state, with corresponding duties and rights. According to the Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics, citizenship is the status of being a citizen usually determined by law. (Macmillan, Oxford Concise Dictionary of Politics 2009). Citizenship is the status of an individual as a full and responsible member of a political community. A citizen is a person who owes allegiance to a state and in turn receives protection from the state. He must fulfill his duties and obligations toward the state as the state grants him civil, political and social rights. Therefore, citizenship implies two- way relationship between individual and the state (Gauga, 2003).

Bendix, (1977), has traced the development of citizenship and identified how the lower class assumed full citizenship focusing on its historical evolution through the experience of Western Europe. (Marshall, 1950), one of the foremost and classical theorists on citizenship examined the concept from two perspectives. Firstly, the individual as a member of a political community has certain rights and privileges vis-à-vis non-members. Secondly, the individual has certain rights, duties and obligations which he has to perform in the interest of the political community. Flowing from the libertarian philosophy, with particular preference to England, Marshall shows that the politically underprivileged classes acquired their rights piecemeal - civil rights, political rights and social rights. Marshall's work provides both the theoretical and functional foundations for the concept of citizenship, even though he did not address the crisis of citizenship and nationhood which is a reflection of crisis of hegemony and that of the state.

Thus, his analysis does not contain the impact of nationhood on citizenship and how a hegemonic order in ex-colonial societies can help to facilitate the resolution of crisis of citizenship. (Ekeh, 1975) emerged with an African perspective on the phenomenon that is, the impact of ideologies of legitimation on citizenship and compared the development of citizenship in colonial and post-colonial Africa, with his idea of two publics. Again, to (Ekeh, 1975), the colonial experience led to a noticeable but remarkable shift in African politics, a development that upsets the traditional conceptions of citizenship and listed the following far-reaching unintended consequences of colonial ideologies on citizenship, that is, the encouragement of Africans to identify citizenship with rights and not with duties and taking the conception of civil duties, without any regard. In other words, Africans are pre-occupied with demands for rights and not civil duties whereas; the reverse is the case to Marshall and Bendix. (Nwabueze, 2010) went on to define citizenship as a concept linked to the history of a nation. As far he is concerned, citizenship implies nationality from which it follows, which means that a state which is not yet a nation has no citizens, properly so called. Again, (Marshall, 1964), explained citizenship as a conferment of social bond through which the state lays claim to and defines its sovereignty, activity, legitimacy and identity. And in the global context, according to (Adejumobi, 2001) a modern state is a collectivity of citizens and therefore, citizenship is a form of social pact constructed by the dual elements of reciprocity and exchange between the individual (citizens) and the state.

This development engenders obligations from the individual in terms of loyalty and commitment, thus presuming civic equality, equality before the law, access to opportunities in state institutions and structures, justice in the affairs between the states on the one hand and among individuals on the other hand in the political community. In summary, citizenship is meaningful only within the context of nationhood, (Anthropology/History) or nation-state, (Modern/Legal Status), but more appropriately in the context of nationhood. And that is because a nation connotes a collection of persons united as one people so as to form a cohesive social body. (Nwabueze, 2010).The word nation had been amenable to multi-numerous definitions in the past and it is perhaps the most influential member of a family of words which all refer to a collection of human beings. Other words which are synonymous with nation are race, tribe, people, state, clan, class and society. They have all been used to describe something similar though each has at all times had additional connotations and associations which limit this availability. (Minogue, 1967). A nation in the ethnological sense, is commonly defined as a group of people who form a distinct community by inhabiting a definite territory and recognized themselves as possessing a relatively homogeneous set of cultural traits. These include a common or related blood, a common language, a common religion, a common historical tradition and common customs and habits. Another basic ingredient is the desire to continue their fellowship and distinctiveness in the future.

A nation in this sense may be pervaded by a sense of nationalism – a spiritual sentiment or feelings of a special unity which marks off those who share, in it from the rest of mankind (Anifowoshe and Enemu, 1999). For Kedourie, (1966) the principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation because the nation means a group of people, belonging together by similarity of birth, larger than a family but , smaller than a clan or a people . Also, a nation has a body of persons inhabiting a definite territory and united together by the fact of living together on a common land. They may come from a number of races but by living together, they develop certain things in common. The first is a common capital of thoughts and feelings acquired and transmitted in the course of a common history; a common capital or tradition which includes a common language, a common religion and a cultures expressed in different forms in art and architecture, in literature, in social habits. Indeed, a nation is a people descended from a common stock. It means a people brought together by ties of blood relationship (Mahajan, 1988).

Alesina, and Spolaore (2003) argue that a nation is a group of people who share language, custom and sense of homogeneity and humorously added that a nation is a group of people united by a common error about their ancestry and a common dislike of their neighbors. Consequently, a recognition of oneness as an identity by a people brings about nationality in such a people. And that is because; nationality is essentially spiritual in character, which implies a special unity that marks off those who share in it from the rest of mankind. That unity is the outcome of a common history, of victories won and traditions created by a corporate effort (Laski, 1967). They recognize their likenesses and emphasize their differences from other men. Their social heritage becomes distinctively their own, as a man lends his own peculiar character to his house. They came to have an art, a literature, recognizably distinct from that of other nations (Laski, 1967). Thus, a people develop the spirit of nationalism whenever they have the awareness that make them desire to be free from domination. In other words, nationalism is a spiritual concept which originates in the people, for having the same geographic unity which is historically constituted as a stable community of people, formed into a political body.

Thus, (Mahajan, 1988) says, Nationalism, sentimentally, is a political concept, directly related to struggle for power which respects the individuality of states, recognizes variations in law to government and segregates group from group on the basis of common core of ideals and beliefs. In addition, nationalism combines love of country and suspiciousness of foreigners. Thus, love of country comes from shared values and suspiciousness of foreigners from the belief that foreigners do not share such values in the same strength. The first shared value is the love of familiar places in the neighborhood, the land, the homes, the valleys and mountains, all the surroundings that one loves because they have seen part of oneself from infancy. (Mahajan,1988)

Hegemony and the State

Scholars agreed that no coherent theory of hegemony has been established until Gramsci's intervention through his Prison Notebooks. However, allusions to hegemony have at various times been made by Karl Marx and Engels (Mohammed, 1999) in relation to the role of the proletariat in the struggle for social development. The concept of hegemony derives from the Greek word hegeisthai, meaning "to lead" and today it refers to the exercise of leadership by one group or a class in the society. Hegemony is in two broad categories – domination and leadership, with the first encompassing the use of state apparatus, while the second is made up of moral and intellectual leaderships, with both exercised by the dominant class.

According to Gramsci, a ruling class forms and maintains its hegemony in civil society by creating culture and political consensus through unions, political parties, schools, media, the church and other voluntary organizations. Thus, the hegemonic process is the way the dominant class maintains a dominant culture through the use of social institutions to formalize power. It is thus a simultaneous consent given by the people to the general direction imposed on the social life by the dominant group. (Goodwin, 1983, Lukacs, 1991). Indeed, hegemonic process is an order, a certain way of life, which permeates and percolates the entire society. In this context, all state institutions, political, social, economic and cultural life of the society are subsumed and operated within these pervasive values. Joseph, (2000), describes the Gramscian concept of hegemony, as the socio-political power that flows from the "spontaneous consent" of the populace through intellectual and moral leadership and also, as authority as employed by the subalterns of the State.

According to him, what we can do for the moment is to fix two major super structural levels, the one that can be called "civil society" that is, the assemble of organisms commonly called private and that of "political society" or the "state". These two levels explain how hegemony functions through the dominant group that exercises power throughout society and the direct exercise of domination, by the state and juridical government. (Gramsci, 1976). In other words, hegemony can be exercised either by a group in society, based on consent, or it is exercised by the state, with the use of command. Flowing from here, it is agreed that hegemony according to (Joseph, 2000) has the role of securing unity and cohesion of the social system. It is therefore, instructive to note that hegemony is fundamental to the unity of all human societies.

Giltin, (1980) agrees that hegemony is ruling class domination and the subordination of other classes and groups through an elaborate and penetration of ideology into their common sense and everyday practice. Thus, hegemony is about the way the dominant class is able to articulate its interests, values, world views and present the articulated interests as the general interests of society. This is why (Joseph, 2000) says that to understand why a group should be or is hegemonic, we must go beyond how it exerts dominance and interrogate the context of economic, political and cultural conditions that assist the group in furthering the hegemonic tendencies. According to (Agbaje, 1992), Hegemony is a social system of intra – cleavage and cleavage relations in which power is secured and contested not only through direct and undisguised coercion but also via the agency of a broad popular consensus. Thus, hegemony is a form of consciousness that secures the unity and cohesion of the social system and also ensures the reproduction of basic structural processes and relations. Put differently, hegemony as a social value explains the existence of the dominance of one social group over others such that the ruling group known as the 'hegemon' acquires some degree of consent from the subordinates groups and classes, as opposed to dominance purely by force.

The Concept of State

No doubt, attempting an acceptable definition of the state is herculean because the state has been seen and defined in various ways, reflecting different ideological perspectives. (Chinoy, cited in Oyedirin, 2003), says that the state refers to those institutions that establish who shall possess the monopoly of the legitimate use of force within a given territory and how the power which rests upon that monopoly shall be organized and used. (Laski, 1967) defines the state as a territorial society divided into government and subjects claiming within its area, a supremacy over all institutions and to (MacIver, cited in Onyeziri, 2000) state is the organization of which government is the administrative organ with code of laws, governmental institutions and citizenry. This implies that the state is a special form of association which has the right to compel obedience from other organizations within its borders. (Vincents, 1987) describes the state as a continuous public power above both the ruler and the ruled whose acts have legal authority and are distinct from the intentions of agents or groups. Whereas, (Giddens, 1993) defines the state as a political organization whose rule is territorially ordered and which is able to mobilize the means of violence to sustain that rule. And according to (Gaub, 2003), the capitalist system throws up a chosen few that are well organized and thus becomes the "will of the society through hegemony" and then seeks to justify their power and authority.

However, for this work, we shall adopt the force theory of state which does not assume that the state is the natural expression of an evolving society or as a community chosen by God, according to the Divine Rights theorists or even as an organized community based on contract. To (Burns, cited in Fadakinte, 2013) the modern state emerged when the will of the ruling class is imposed on the majority. To (Goodwin, 1982), the state emerged when capitalism created the capitalist class, a particular class that plays the leading role in establishing and consolidating a given economic system since it owns and controls the means of production. Put differently, the state emerged when society was split into social classes in the process of capitalist formation.

As a result of this development, (Goodwin, 1982) contends that the state becomes identified with the ruling class which produces hegemonic ideology in terms of exercising dominant ideas in the society. Beyond this, Marxists contend that the state is a veritable instrument of the dominant group who uses force, an avalanche of class conflicts which is built and sustained on force. (Goodwin, 1982, Giddens, 1993, Lukacs, 1991). And Max Weber also supports the force theory of state by propounding that force is a means that is specific to state. To him, it is a community that claims monopoly of the legitimate use of force within a given territory. (Gerth and Mills, 1972) In our analysis of the force theory of the state, we noted that the modern state evolved when the will of the ruling class was imposed on the majority, an outcome of class struggle that threw up the propertied class who need to protect their interests through the institutions of the state.

As noted by (Jalee, 1977), the state as an institution represents the interests of the economically dominant capitalist class and thus, manipulates state apparatuses as instruments to advance its own cause which becomes the dominant class hegemonic ideology that are reproduced and maintained through consent. According to Gramsci, political power is thus derived from intellectual and moral leadership which is used to control the thoughts and actions of the entire society. Thus, the dominant class equates the state and has the capacity to create hegemonic order that will facilitate domination.

The African State and Hegemony.

Much of Africa as presently constituted, owes its formation and perhaps evolution to the Berlin Conference of 1884 where Africa was shared among competing imperial powers which was the beginning of administrative boundaries as political boundaries and also marked the beginning of the effective implementation of capitalism in terms of mode of production that forever impacted on African economy and society. Thus, the European imperial powers brought colonialism to Africa and colonialism then disorganized African pre-colonial societies, imposed capitalism when there were no capitalist institutions or capitalist social classes to grow capitalism. Indeed, colonialism brought capitalism to Africa when the pre-colonial societies were basically feudal. Consequently, capitalist state formation became inverted, and till date, those with no economic power are with political power which makes politics, the struggle for power, to be severe, violent and bloody because any faction with political power uses the state to amass wealth. (Fadakinte, 2013). Thus, soon after independence factional struggle for power, among the dominant class, became severe and violent, precisely because no particular class had hegemony, with the needed apparatuses of state, to be in charge of the society and be in a position to provide leadership, organize the different nations within the same country (nation-state) and socialize them to have a common identity and evolve meaningful policies for development.

What all this means is that colonialism and subsequently colonial rule, made it difficult to have a well defined class structure in Africa. Consequently, the emergent dominant class was amorphous, made up of all manner of individuals with no class consciousness and with no class solidarity. Thus, the emergent dominant class did not possess hegemonic values and was without hegemonic culture which made it difficult for them to create hegemonic process for the society. Therefore, the apparent lack of hegemony in post-colonial Africa, occasioned by the problem of disorganized and in-cohesive dominant class, that could not evolve a ruling class, resulted in the development of an incipient post-colonial state. And today, the post-colonial state is fraught with complex crises, so much so that more than five decades into their flag independence African states are yet to find their bearing.

Ake, (1981), Berman, (1982), agreed that the most crucial and striking characteristic of the colonial state was the contradictory character of the structures and processes which reflected the contradictory social forces of colonial society. According to (Ake, 1981), colonial state operated as a bureaucratic apparatus of control, jumped start economic management for the colonizers and becoming a sub type of the capitalist state. This, evidently, facilitated two critical functions. Firstly, it guaranteed the conditions for extraction of raw materials and accumulation of capital by the metropolitan bourgeoisie. Secondly, it provided a form of stable political order and control over the indigenous population. (Onimode, 1983). It is thus clear, according to (Ekekwe, 1986), that the colonial state represented the capitalist class in metropolitan Europe for the maintenance of their dominance in the colonial society and consequently, used the colonial state for capitalist formation in Africa.

This is precisely why, to discuss the modern African state, it is logically convenient to start with the colonial state, the colonial state that is characterized by market imperfections, monopolistic tendencies and virtual dependence on the metropole for technical and monetary requirements. For the post-colonial state, (Alavi, 1972) contends that the post colonial state was brought about by colonial experience and alignments of classes at the superstructure of political and administrative institutions. Also, (Ake, 1981) observes that the post-colonial state is primarily a law and order state which is underpinned by obsessive reliance on instruments of coercion to sustain state power and authoritarian tendencies of the rulers. Again, (Ake, 1981) opines that a distinguishing feature of the post colonial Africa socio-economic formation is the limited autonomy of the state which rebuts the assertion of the emergence of the state since autonomy is the very essence of the state.

In the words of (Osaghe, 1998), the Weberian ethos of legal-rational cum bureaucracy of impersonality, impartiality and rationality have not been entrenched in the system thus making it easier for the state to be captured by ambitious rulers. Beyond this, (Clapham, 1985) sees the post colonial Africa as bunch of neo-patrimonial entities. Though the state is formally based on the Weberian typology of legal principles, it functions as a vehicle for pushing out patronage and personal aggrandizement of the power holders, because a faction is in charge, with enough control over the resources to determine who gets what, when and how. (Midgal, 1988) has however, argued that the post colonial states are confronted with the dilemma of setting goals and effecting change and whatever goals they set become unattainable because the core colonial values still resonate, dominate and continue to be the bane of post colonial societies.

Thus far, it can be argued that the post colonial state in Africa lack hegemony in view of the fact that no one class is able to dominate and take control of the society, due to the rancorous and violent factional struggle for power by the dominant class. And that is because, as noted by (Ihonvbere, 1989) the inability of the state to be neutral reflects the nature and development of the productive forces and also reflects the rudimentary development of commodity production which threw up an amorphous class formation and fierce struggle for hegemony by the various factions. Thus, in view of the absence of a cohesive dominant class and the existence of incipient ruling elites that lack viable and strong economic base, the emergent post-colonial state became involved in capital accumulation which provided veritable ground for competing factions of the dominant class for economic ascendancy. This in turn, fuel violence as winning political power becomes a Zero sum game. Nwabueze's, (2010) work on colonialism in Africa is also apt here. According to him, the privatization of the state through one- man- rule affects the ideological, intellectual and political life of the state and it creates atrophy and also the inability of the state to maintain its crucial existence that is, maximal utilization of resources for its people, in terms of the provision of adequate security for life and property, safeguarding the territorial integrity and effective execution of policies.

However, the state in advanced capitalist societies is represented and reproduced by the dominant class with the needed political power and the ideology that transcends narrow class or sectional interests. (Alavi, (1972, Saul, 1981). But in African post- colonial societies, what preoccupied the dominant class, immediately after independence, was political power rather than the establishment of an economic base so as to be able to create a hegemonic process for the society. Thus, the dominant class, in post-colonial Africa, did not possess the needed hegemony for state formation and therefore, could not evolve a ruling class to construct a hegemonic process. Mafeje, (1999) argues that, for a state to have a firm root, it must develop organically out of the society and must construct hegemony and legitimacy for itself in the society.

However, the post colonial state has, since independence, been unable to do exactly that and that is because the state is constructed principally on its colonial origins which reflect the colonizers philosophy, structure and organization. (Olowu, 1994). As argued by (Ake, 1985), the states in Africa have become a set of partial instruments, serving the interests of the ruler and his clique or in the words of Fanon, "Bourgeoisie of the civil service" using state's instruments as a means of self enrichment (Fanon, 1963). Consequently, the post-colonial state does not have the capacity to mediate conflicts within and between political communities. What it does is to punish perceived vulnerable groups, suffocate civil society and ultimately, choke the political space. All this development exacerbates the tendency towards monumental conflicts within the polity rather than the cultivation of national identity and culture. Thus, there is hardly any rule of law, no plausible system of justice, no transparency and all the coercive institutions of the state are above the law, with the civil society below it, and ordinary people are out of sight, far beyond the protection of the state, while the judiciary is dissociated from justice and the bureaucracy is oppressive and arbitrary. (Ake, 1985).

The African State and Crisis of Citizenship and Nationhood.

Identity crises in Africa stem from pluralism and multiculturalism and that is because there is no cohesive state to mediate unhealthy competition between ethnic groups thereby putting citizenship in a serious crisis. And most of African countries like Nigeria, Uganda, DR. Congo, Congo Brazaville, Rwanda, Burundi, Mali, Cote'd Ivoire, Libya, Kenya, Ethiopia Burkina-Faso, etc are multicultural and plural in structures and institutions which creates multiple and competing identities that attenuates the citizens loyalties and allegiance to the state. In other words, since most of the African states consist of a number of nationalities with no hegemonic leadership, the problem generates sectarian identities in form of tribal, ethnic or religious exclusive identities. Thus, primordial groups take precedence over the state as primary object of identity and allegiance, which seek to contest political space within the state.

The consequence of this situation is the apparent lack of hegemonic process that ought to transform the post-colonial state into a nation-state, the failure of which throws up the crisis of citizenship as each nationality maintains its identity. (Ekeh, 1978) reinforced this development by pointing out that in Africa, the concept of citizenship had dual derivative – Primordial (common ancestral, ethnic affinities) and Civic Citizenship (Egalitarianism). It is the primordial, as noted by (Osaghae, 1990) that often serves as the functional basis of defining citizenship especially in the distribution of public goods and constitutional issues. In DR. Congo as in Cote D' Ivoire, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Nigeria etc it is the same issue of “natives versus settlers” where, settlers are regarded as non-citizens while the natives, who are the “real” citizens are to be entitled to all that the state can provide including political power.

Beyond that, (Nwabueze, 2010) asserts that none of the so called states are nations or one people because, apart from the extent of territory and differences in language between the ethnic groups within each state, is the remarkable and fundamental differences in character, attitude, habits, feelings, way of life and social conditions between them, that make them to be antagonistic, mutually antipathetic, utterly incompatible and even bitterly hostile to each other. And this is evident in the way pluralism is creating violent conflicts between the population of the same country, such as, Nigeria, Sudan, Kenya, Rwanda, Burundi, Congo, Central African Republic, Mali, Cote d' Ivoire etc. According to (Oтите, 2010), with different groups within each country in Africa, of varying degrees of loyalty either to the village, town or society, ethno –occupational, ethno –religious differences as well as ethno – economics conflicts become rife. For example, some Tutsi communities in Eastern Zaire (Congo) of over 600,000 who relocated over more than a century ago from Rwanda, according to (Herbst, 2010), have not been able to become Congolese and have engaged the original Congolese inhabitants in armed conflicts to this day and have thus, become sympathetic to Rwandese government.

Again, to (Wilmot, 1979), almost all African leaders failed to develop a consistent and enduring platform for nationalism because most of the political institutions that were put in place were fragile and lacked the needed sophistication that will assist in the realization and attainment of nationhood. Although, nationalism is critical to the development of nationhood, African leaders did very little to promote the values of nationhood because they were mostly tribal chiefs in their political calculations and strategies. Also, the leaders were bereft of hegemonic capacity which ought to fashion out the social order that will permeate the society and later create dominant values for state formation, engender and galvanize the citizenry to nationhood. Diamond, (1988) also argued that there had been more conflicts generated by the artificial nature of the country, the absence of any colonial effort to lay the required foundation and inculcate some semblance of nationhood in Africa and this became unattainable after independence which continue to worked against national unity and identity. As a matter of fact, the challenge of integrating African states around a common ground of nationhood remains formidable. Ayode's, (1988) seminal work on States without Citizens perhaps captures the dilemma of citizenship situation in Africa.

According to him, of the three component elements of the State – people, government and territory, the first two are largely denuded of all meaning as functional entities. As a result, they are divorced and alienated from the state as the people exist not as citizens with a claim against the state to be matched by reciprocal duties to it but as individuals struggling for survival. Konneh, (1996) examined the citizenship issue in Liberia with particular emphasis on the Mandingo people. His analysis was confronted with the issue of “who is a real citizen of Liberia”. His penetrating analysis revealed the alienation and seclusion of various indigenous ethnic groups while the settlers from the U.S, the Caribbean and other African states were eligible for citizenship until recently. Konneh attributes this development to the constant conflict between legal stipulations and perceptions especially after the civil wars. Konneh's discussion shows some level of inter connectedness between citizenship and nationhood. The fragility of the African state explains why the state cannot resolve and mediate between the feuding citizens in any African country. Again, the crisis of nationhood, to (Agbaje, 1997), is responsible for apathy, mass alienation, violence and mistrust which encourage and deepen hostile cleavages and sharpen the overall contours of ethnic, tribal, religious, and ideological divides in Africa. For example, in Rwanda, the genocidal dimension of human decapitation in 1989 which reached an apogee in 1994 where Muslims Tutsi were wiped out by the Hutus, according to (Mamdani, 1998), was the resultant effects of crisis of citizenship fuelled by lack of sufficient platform for the formation of hegemonic process, which is a demonstration of the absence of nationhood, thereby pushing citizenship into deep crises.

In Africa, cross border conflicts and instability, arising from the artificial demarcation of borders by the colonizers is also tearing the people apart. A good case is that of Banyarwanda group with over 14 million people and who speaks Kinyariwanda language that constitutes East Africa's single largest group and who are scattered within Burundi, Uganda, Congo and Rwanda. This group, according to (Mamdani, 2002) has fashioned out destructive tendencies across the Great Lake Countries particularly, Congo and Uganda. This crisis stems from the fragmented, confused and factionalized citizens that are spread over the Great Lake Countries, with loss of citizenship in the process. In addition, colonialism created the conglomeration of large number of different nations that were forcibly put together. For example, in Nigeria, there are the Hausa/Fulani, Yoruba and Igbo and many other minority groups; in Rwanda, the Tutsi, Hutu and Twa; in Uganda, the Baganda, Banyoro, Lugbara, Kakwa, Acholi and Langi; in Zimbabwe, there are the Matabele, Shona and Baretse; in Kenya, there are the Kikuyu, Luos, Masai and in Ethiopia, the Aniharas, Tigreans, Oromos and in spite of these diversities, there is no coherent and developed state which emerged in post colonial Africa, to establish a national identity for the integration of the populations. Thus, the state in Africa is a mere collection of several nationalities, with no single unifying culture or indigenous language as the basis of one, united, corporate identity for the realization of a common goal and the attainment of nationhood.

Again, according to (Nzongola-Ntalaja, 2004), Kenneth Kaunda, a former leader of over three decades was excluded from presidential elections because his parents migrated from Malawi. (Onah, 2011) situates Alassane Ouattara's predicament on the belief that he migrated from Burkina Faso despite the fact that he was once the head of Government under Houphet- Boigny the legendary leader of that country. And this is because in Africa, the concept of nationhood is absent unlike in the mould of European –nation - building process. Thus, (Dowden, 2004) noted that the future of the state in Africa will depend on the resolution of identity. In other words, until the sub- ethnic and ethnic nationalities of African countries are able to forge a common idea of what it means to be a Nigerian, Angolan, and Ugandan or Malian, nationhood will continue to be a mirage, a situation, where, for instance, the Muslim northerners in Cote d'Ivoire are unequal to their Christian southerners or Congo, where the Banyarwanda in the East are refused citizenship, will continue to fuel and intensify bitter conflicts and struggles. Thus, the relationship between the state and citizenship in Africa and the synergy or a symbiotic relationship that is expected between the two is virtually absent and hence, loyalties are primordial and ethnic based rather than to the state.

Therefore, post colonial Africa, being with weak capitalist formation, without a class to create hegemony that will weld the various belligerent nationalities, will continue to witness unabated crisis of citizenship in the form of bitter conflicts and even wars. Today, what dominates post colonial Africa is a plethora of cleavages of inter and intra ethnic struggles amongst the various nationalities which have thrown 'grenades' on the path of national integration. This is quite clear in Sudan, Kenya, South Sudan, Nigeria, Congo, Uganda, Rwanda, Central African Republic, Burundi, Cot d'Ivoire, Mali. DR. Congo, Ethiopia.

Conclusion

Thus far, it can be argued that the relevance of hegemony is not only central to political process but also critical to state formation. So, in Africa, the absence of hegemony, occasioned by amorphous class formation has brought about an in- cohesive dominant class which resulted in having a ruling elite without viable and strong economic base and which also accounts for the violent competition and struggle for power by the factions of the dominant class. And that is because, in Africa, colonialism created a plethora of territories of many and different nationalities thereby making it difficult for any country (nation-state) to have a truly national identity. As a result, the post-colonial state is subordinated to primordial and ethnic identity, resulting in ethnic and tribal violence and even wars, across post colonial Africa. The cohesive social system and interconnectedness that are crucial to facilitating nation - building in terms of culture, historical ties and identities are clearly absent in most of post-colonial Africa.

Although, citizenship constitute a major criterion for nationhood, but there is no country as a nation where the people live as one homogeneous entity with one identity, post colonial Africa therefore, merely exists as a plethora of territories and only theoretically as nation – states. Consequently, the amalgam of nationalities makes crisis of citizenship inevitable in Africa and with the inability of a cohesive dominant class to emerge with the needed hegemony, to create a ruling class and establish a state that will be able to subordinate all periphery nations into a nation-state, post-colonial Africa continues to wallow in instability and chaos. And because there can be no citizenship without a nation and since colonialism created a colonial state that forcefully glued many and different nationalities in the colonial territories called countries (nation-state), post-colonial Africa has since not known peace as a result of the belligerent nationalities, some of them as strange bed fellows.

Unfortunately, this condition of Africa has direct impact on the development of the continent, particularly with regards to political culture, liberal democracy, and political institutions with negative consequences on stability, economic development and industrialization. Thus, apart from hegemony, the presence of homogeneity in the culture, values, feelings, language and attitudes among a given people of a nation are the ingredients for citizenship, citizenship as a feeling of oneness, needed to work and bring about development.

What then is the way forward?

The time has come for Africa to start to review the artificial boundaries which is the most problematic colonial legacies that were created in Africa and which now has serious and damaging consequences on African people's culture (life), politics, and economy. This can only be objectively and rationally done if the different nationalities have the constitutional rights for self- redefinition. Consequently, the constitution of each African country should make provisions for secession (self determination) in order to create the opportunity for each nation to redefine itself.

References

- Adebanwi, W. (2010): "Contesting Exclusion: The Dilemmas of Citizenship in Nigeria". *The African Anthropologist*, Vol 12, No 1. 67-75
- Adejumobi, J. (2001): "Citizenship Rights and Problems of Internal Conflicts and Civil Wars in Africa": *African Journal of Political Science* Vol. 6 no 2; 78-102
- Agbaje, A. (1992). *The Nigerian Press, Hegemony and the Social Construction of Legitimacy*, Lewiston, N.Y. Edwin Mellen Press.
- Agbaje, A. (1997): "Mobilizing for a New Political Culture", in Diamond, L. Kirk- Green and Oyediran, O. (eds): *Transition Without End: Nigerian Politics and Civil Society under Babangida – Ibadan*, Vantage Publishers,
- Ake, C. (1996): *Is Africa Democratizing? A publication of Centre for Advanced Social Sciences (CASS) Lagos: Malthouse Press Limited.*
- Ake, C. (1981). *A Political Economy of Africa*. London, Longman Group Limited.
- Alavi, H. (1972). *The State in Post-Colonial Societies: Pakistan and Bangladesh in New Left Review*. 74-91
- Alesina, A. and Spolaore, A. (2003) *The Size of Nations*. London. The MIT Press Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Anifowoshe, R and Enemu, F. (1999) *Elements of Politics*, Lagos, Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Awolowo, O. (1947). *Path to Nigerian Freedom*. London: Faber and Faber. .
- Ayoade, J. 1988): "States without Citizens: An Emerging African Phenomenon" in Donald Rotchild and Naomi Chazon (eds), *The Precarious Balance: State and Society in African*. NY. West view.
- Bendix, Reinhard (1977). *Nation-building and Citizenship*. Studies of our Changing Social Order; Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Berman, B. (1982) "Structures and Process in the Bureaucratic States of Colonial Africa". Paper delivered at International Conference on the Comparative, Historical and Critical Analysis of Bureaucracy in Switzerland.
- Chandhoke, N (1994) "Of States and Civil Societies" in Neera Chandhoke (ed), *Understanding the Post Colonial World, Theory and Method*; New Delhi, Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Clapham, C (1985) *Third World Politics: An Introduction*: Wisconsin. The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Diamond, Larry (1988). *Class, Ethnicity and Democracy in Nigeria*. Macmillan Press, Nigeria 1980
- Dowden, R. (2004). 'The State of the African State – The Past, Present and Future of the Nation State in Africa', *New Economy*.
- Dukor, M. (2003): "Ethnic Nationalism and a Theory of Nation Building", in Dukor, Maduabuchi (ed) *Philosophy and Politics – Discourse on Value, Politics and Power in Africa*. Lagos. Malthouse Press Ltd.
- Egwu, S. G (2003): "Ethnicity and Citizenship Rights in the Nigerian Federal State", in Gana, T. A & Egwu, Samuel G. (eds) – *Federalism in Africa: The Imperative of Democratic Development- A Publication of the African Centre for Democratic Governance: Africa World Press, Inc. (2003)*
- Ekeh, P . (1978): "Colonialism and the Development of Citizenship in Africa": in Otite,O (ed) *Themes in African Social and Political Thought*. Enugu, Fourth Dimension Publishers

- Ekeh, P. P (1975) "Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement'. *Comparative Study in Society and History* 17(1) 34-61
- Ekeh, P. P. (1996): "Political Minorities and Historically Dominant Minorities in Nigerian History and Politics', in O. Oyediran (Ed), *Government and Development in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Agbo Areo Publishers.
- Ekekwe, E. (1986): *Class and State in Nigeria*. London, Longman.
- Fadakinte, M. M. (2013). "The State: A Conceptual Jungle?" *Journal of Alternative Perspectives in the Social Sciences* Vol5 No3, 551-579.
- Fadakinte, M.M (2013): "The Nature and Character of the Nigeria State: Explaining Election Crisis in a Peripheral State"- *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, Vol. 12 No 11 275-287
- Fadakinte, M. M. (2014). "The Political Economy of Capitalist State Formation in Nigeria: An Analysis of the Fragility of an Emergent State" *International Journal of Modern Social Sciences*, 2014, 3(2). 98-201
- Fanon, F. (1963) *Wretched of the Earth*: New York. Grove Press,
- Gana, A. T. (2003): "The Nigerian State as Obstacle to Federalism: Towards a New Constitutional Compact" in Gana, A. T. and Egwu, S. G. (eds) –, *Federalism in Africa; Framing the National Question*. NJ African World Press, Inc. Vol. II
- Gana, T. A (2003). "Federalism and the National Question in Nigeria: A Theoretical Exploration", in Gana, A. T & Egwu Sam (eds). *Federalism in Africa; Framing the National Question*. N.J, Africa World Press, Inc. Vol. II
- Gauba, O. (2003) *An Introduction to Political Theory–India*, Macmillan Ltd. (4th edition)
- Giddens, A. (1993). *Sociology*; Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goodwin, B. (1982). *Using Political Ideas*, Chichester, John Wiley and Sons.
- Gramsci, A. (1976). *Prison Notebooks*, New York. Oxford University Press,
- Grodzin, M. (1966). *The Loyal and the Disloyal: Social Boundaries of Patriotism and Treason* .Cleveland, Cleveland Press.
- Hall, A. J. (1994). *The State: Critical Concepts*, London: Routledge.
- Herbst, J (2000). *States and Power in Africa: Comparative Lessons in Authority and Control*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Herbst, J. (1999): "The Role of Citizenship, Laws in Multiethnic Societies: Evidence from Africa"; in Richard, Joseph (ed), *State, Conflict and Democracy in Africa*, NY. Lynne Rienner.
- Ihonbvere, J. (1989). *The Political Economy of Crisis and Underdevelopment in Africa: Selected works of Claude Ake*, Lagos. Jad Publishers.
- Ihonbvere, J. (2003): 'The Nigerian State as Obstacle to Federalism: Towards a New Constitutional Compact' in Gana.A T and Egwu, S. (eds):. *Federalism in Africa; Framing the National Question*. N.J, Africa World Press, Inc. Vol. II
- Jalee, P. (1977). *How Capitalism Works*. Monthly Review Press, Published by Librairie Francois Maspero.
- Johari, J. C. (2009). *Contemporary Political Theory – New Delhi*, IBH Publishing Company. PVT Ltd.
- Joharis, J. C. (2012) *Principle of Modern Political Science*. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers Ltd.
- John S. (1974): "The State in Post Colonial Societies: Tanzania" – *News from the Left Lecture Series*, Toronto, Canada.
- Joseph, Jonathan (2000): "A Realist Theory of Hegemony" – *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 30: 2; 45-60
- Kedourie, E. (1966) *Nationalism*, London, Hutchinson & Co. Publishers.
- Kohn, Hans (1939): "The Nature of Nationalism": *American Political Science Review*, No 6, vol. 33, 19-39; in Oyediran, O. (2003): *Introduction to Political Science* Ibadan. University Press.
- Konneh, A. (1998). "Citizenship at the Margins: Status, Ambiguity and the Mandingo of Liberia" – *African Studies Review*. Vol. 39 No 2. 87-103
- Krasner, S. (1997). "Approaches to the State: Alternative Conceptions and Historical Dynamics" *Comparative Politics*. 17; 3; 18-34
- Laski, J.H. (1967) *A Grammar of Politics*. London, George Allen and Unwin.
- Lukacs, G. (1991). *The Process of Demoralization*, Oxford. Claredon Press,
- Mafeje, A. (1999): 'State and Civil Society in Independent Africa' in Henrich Boll (ed) *Networking with a View to Promoting Peace in the Horn of Africa*, Adis Ababa,
- Mahajan, V.D. (1988) *Political Theory*. New Delhi, India. S. Chand & Co.
- Mamdani (1996), *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton, N. J.): Princeton University Press.

- Mamdani M. (2003). "An Essay on Citizenship and the State Crises in Africa", in Gana A. T and Egwu Sam (eds).). Federalism in Africa; Framing the National Question. N.J, Africa World Press, Inc. Vol. II
- Mamdani, M. (2002): 'African States, Citizenship and War: A Case Study". International Affairs. Vol. 78, No 3 12-28
- Mamdani, M. (1998). "When Does a Settler become a Native" in Mamdani, M. (Ed) Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Marshall, T. H. (1950). Citizenship and Social Class. Cambridge University Press.
- Midgal, J (1988): Strong Societies and Weak States: State – Society Relations and State Capabilities in the Third World.
- Minogue, K. R. (1967) Nationalism, London, B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Mohammed, J. B. (1999). Hegemony and the Nigerian Press under Babangida Administration: An Unpublished PhD Thesis submitted to Department of Political Science of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Nwabueze, B.(2010) Colonialism in Africa; Ancient and Modern, Ibadan Gold Press Ltd.Vol. 2.,
- Nzongola – Ntalaja, (2004). "Citizenship, Political Violence and Democratization in Africa". Global Governance, Vol. 10, No 4, 15-31
- Okene, N.V. C (2011): 'The Indigene- Citizen Complex and National Development in Nigeria'. in Ekekwe, E. Ndu, C. Ukwo, U. & Ogali, M. (Eds) Identity Politics in Nigeria .P/H University of Port Harcourt Press
- Olukoshi, A. O & Agbu, S. (1996): "The Deepening Crisis of Nigerian Federalism and the Future of the Nation-State" in Olukosi (Ed) Challenges to the Nation-State in Africa. Uppsala, Nordiska Africainstitutet, ,
- Onah, E. I (2011): "Citizenship Question in Cote Di'voire and its Implications for African States'. Nigerian Journal of International Affairs. Vol 37, No 1. 23-45
- Onimode, Bade, (1983). Imperialism and Underdevelopment in Nigeria.London, Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Onyeziri F. (2005). The Citizen and the State: Ibadan University Press.
- Osaghae, (1998): Crippled Giant: Nigeria since Independence. Indiana, University Press, North America.
- Osaghae, E. (2005). "The State of Africa's Second Liberation". The International Journal of Post Colonial Studies, Vol. 7, (1) 18-34
- Osaghae, E. E. (2010)." Revising the Concepts of State Fragility and State Building in Africa" – in Akinboye, O. Solomon and Fadakinte, M. M.(Eds) 50 Years of Nationhood? State, Society and Politics in Nigeria (1960-2010). – Lagos, Concept Publications, Nigeria.
- Otite, O. (2010): "Nigerian Society at Fifty": in Akinboye, Solomon. O. and Fadakinte M. M (eds) 50 Years of Nationhood? State, Society and Politics in Nigeria; (1960-2010) Lagos, Concept Publications Limited
- Oyediran, O (2003). Introduction to Political Science, Ibadan. University Press.
- Sabine & Thorson, (1973). A History of Political Theory. - New Delhi, Publishing Co. PVT, Ltd. 4th Edition
- Saul, J.S. (1981). "African Peasantries" in Cohen, D (Ed). Political Economy of Africa, London, Lonhman
- Smith, B. C. (2009). Understanding Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change and Development. New York, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tilly, C. (1996): "Citizenship, Identity and Social History." International Review of Social History. 3(2) 67-86
- Vincent, A. (1987). Theories of the State, Oxford, Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Wilmot, P. F. (1979): In Search of Nationhood: The Theory and Practice of Nationalism in Africa. Ibadan. Latern Books.