COLONIALISM, ARMED STRUGGLE AND INDEPENDENCE IN ANGOLA AND KENYA

Abubakar Ahmadu
Department of Sociology, Federal University Wukari
ahmaduabubakar85@gmail.com-07034260425

Usman Danladi Saleh
Department of Sociology, Federal University Wukari
usmandsaleh@gmail.com-08036378368

KEYWORDS:

Africa; armed struggle; colonialism; guerilla warfare, independence; violence

ABSTRACT

Colonialism is a system that left indelible footprints in economic, social and political space of Africa. This study assessed colonialism and armed struggle in the quest for independence in Angola and Kenya. By so doing, the study mapped out specified objectives thus: to explore the rationale behind colonialism and to interrogate the factors eliciting the use of armed struggle in the quest for independence. The study further assessed scenarios where armed struggle manifested their ugly heads in the quest for independence. Secondary data were employed to address the research objectives. The study offered insights into the theoretical underpinnings surrounding colonialism and armed struggle. Findings suggested that, colonialism was never negotiated with the Africans. Rather, it was set out for ulterior motives which predominantly dwelled on satisfying the economic interest of the colonial masters. Technological revolution further consolidated the economic interest of the Europeans since the cravings to get raw materials and markets for industrial product reached its tipping point. Dissatisfaction with the existing state of affairs at the time which included all sorts of discrimination of the locals in ownership of land, employment and economic and social injustices played immense role in the use of armed struggle by the locals to get out of the wood.

Mau-Mau secret organization in Kenya is one of the sensitive movements pointing to the employment of violence in the march for independence. The movement for the liberation of Angola and the "Barkongo" guerilla warfare demonstrated classic cases of armed struggle against the Portuguese. "Barkongo" guerilla warfare left a historic record of the largest European casualties on Africa soil. It is recommended that: discriminatory policies should be put in the back burner to give room for economic, political and social justices when managing people's wealth and nation and there should be concerted effort in strengthening the spirit of African brotherhood against any external aggression or invasion of African economy, politics and resources.

Introduction

Colonialism has a long-standing history in Africa which will be difficult to eclipse in the course of time. The system is said to have deposited lots of impact in social, economic, cultural and political landscape in the continent. Understanding the dynamics of colonialism requires insights into the pattern of colonialism, and how it flares across Asia and Africa. These continents are strategic as far as colonialism is concerned. Famous in Asia was the colonial administration in India. The Nationalist struggle for independence in India and elsewhere in Asia started before World War II (Clymer, 1995). This is commendable because it ushered a pathway which stood the test of time in the decolonization processes in the region.

The Indian struggle for independence championed by Mohatma Ghandi toed the non violence approach. This does not mean that the Indians were not subjected to some sorts of abuse or discrimination like their counterparts in Burma. Nationalist movement in the 1920s in India was becoming increasingly militant and such movement was ripped long ago when the Indian National Congress the most important of modern nationalist organizations was founded in 1885 which coincided with a period when the Europeans were partitioning Africa at the Berlin conference (Clymer, 1995). Also, colonial military structure was discriminatory against the Burmese. Mandy (2013) argued that colonialism manifested its discriminatory inclination in the military structures of Burma wherein Burmese nationalists were marginalized within their own country because of their exclusion from the colonial army. Given the outright displeasure against colonialism, workable approaches might have been used to end the system. In Asia precisely, the World War II brought changes in imperial power structure coupled with a complex process of decolonization which destabilized existing categories of power and privileges thereby dismantled formal empires which ushered the way for the attainment of independence (Maitri, 2013). One of the aftermaths of World War II was the far-reaching implications in exposing the

weakened structure of the colonialists' countries and the stripling of demigod status the natives placed on the Europeans. All these contributed in no small measure in building the germane to overthrow colonialism. Windows of independence in Asia opened with Indian marking her formal decolonization from British on 15th August, 1947.

Africa remains a continent with intriguing colonial experiences. The erstwhile trans-Atlantic slave trade which preceded colonialism left much to be explored in the annals of dehumanization of the black race. This is because while finding resonance from the horrors of slavery, colonialism came with another phase of outright conquers. The pre-colonial trade in slaves and Gold created the fertile ground for the Europeans to impose political domination of Africa (Rodney, 1972). This owes largely to the gap created during the period which gave European ample access to the coast of

Africa. Pre 19th Century adventures never granted Europeans the needed balance of force to penetrate Africa. The Europeans had their ways probably due to the porosity of the African coast when European ships could dominate the scene. When you mix this with lack of formidable union or force to chart the course of Africans you would understand why the window for intrusion of the Europeans through the African coast they already navigated became apparently opened. The last straw that broke the back of the camel was the technological changes which in the long run created the need to penetrate Africa as well as created the power to conquer Africa (Rodney, 1972). The scramble for Africa began in 1870s to lay a foundation for the new phase of conquers (Barkindo, Omolewa & Babalola, 1994). Economic interest may have shaped tremendously the posture of the new endeavour. As earlier stated the enabling environment for the scramble was already created during slave trade. The resolutions reached at the Berlin conference defined at the time what was to become colonialism along with the partitioning of the colonial territories to their various colonial masters. Stelios and Elias (2016) held that the scramble for Africa which was birthed during the Berlin conference of 1884-1885 marked the portioning of Africa by Europeans into spheres of influence, protectorates and colonies. The Berlin conference reached the finish line given that borders were designed even when Europeans had barely fully settled in Africa, and they had paltry knowledge of the conditions of the locals. Andrew (1990) affirmed that most of African countries had been partitioned among seven European powers by 1900. From the onset, the fertile ground for the use of armed struggle was created given the spate of discrimination the natives were subjected to. When this reached a maximal point, a number of colonized territories began to solicit independence at a point when they felt they had garnered the germane to control their affairs. Violent and non violent approaches were used at different times and locations. Non violent approaches like conferences and movements by indigenous Africans within and outside the continent came to limelight

with the establishment of the first Nationalist movement called National Congress of British West Africa in 1920 (Eluwa, 1971).

However, studies were conducted on colonialism and independence in Angola and Kenya respectively. For instance, Wasserman (1973) had it that, the dismantling of colonial empire was facilitated by the rise of nationalists' activities. This did not put into much consideration, theoretical underpinnings which illustrate the rationale behind colonialism and how armed struggle unfolded. Instances where the Kenyans resorted to the Mau-Mau movement were not considered. Even findings by Frank (1974), which conceived the Mau-Mau revolt as an outcome of a prolonged agrarian struggle between the Kikuyu squatters and the European settlers leaves a gap that needed to be filled. The social, economical and political factors that led to the creation of the clandestine Mau-Mau movement are grossly left out. This is in addition to the estimates of casualties in the aftermaths of the feud between Kenyan nationalists and the colonial authorities. Also, Guimaraes, (2001) revealed that the formation of Movemento de libertacao de Angola MPLA or the Movement for the Liberation of Angola and Uniao Das Pupulacoes De Angola were politically motivated and they shaped Angolan nationalism which was primarily meant to end Portuguese rule. Adequate interrogation of factors that led to the use of violence by Angolans was not treated in the findings. What led to the use of armed struggle and why did the locals and the Europeans fall victims in the Mau-Mau revolt and Barkongo guerilla warfare are sensitive incidences to look into? What led to the victimisation of both the locals and the colonialists following the use of armed struggle left theoretical and conceptual gap needing review?

Thus, colonialism and armed struggle in the march for Africa's independence elicit investigation in the field of Criminology given that the processes were not launched piecemeal without casualties. This is because Criminology acknowledges the relevance of history in keeping tabs with those events bothering on colonialism and armed struggle but emphasizes the interrogation of social cum economic and political factors birthing armed struggle and the scenarios where they registered their presence in the march to independence. The study assesses theories and interrogates the historical findings that accounted for colonialism and factors that elicited the use of armed struggle and scenarios and/or cases where armed struggle were demonstrated in Angola and Kenya respectively.

Theoretical Underpinning

Political economy is the study of production and trade and their relations with law, custom and government; and with the distribution of national income and wealth. The earliest works of political economy are usually attributed to the British scholars Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo. The classical period in the development of political economy theory started with the publication of Adam

Smith's (1776) wealth of Nations. Anecdotal submission may hold that the classical era of political economy began with the emergence of the thoughts of the French Physiocrats such as Francois Quesnay (1694-1774) and Anne Robert Jacques Turgot (1727-1781) in the midst of 18th century civilization spanning to the year of Karl Marx's death in 1883 even though Karl Marx was indeed regarded as an important political thinker. From an academic standpoint political economy is predicated on the Marxian economics i.e. the tenets of historical and dialectical materialism.

Contemporary political economy tolerates interdisciplinary studies drawing from Economics, Sociology and Political science in explanation of how political institutions, the political environment and the economic system influenced each other. Political economy recognizes the role of government and/or class and power relationships in resource allocation which often result to political or exploitative class dichotomy. It involves the study of struggle or the processes by which some actors benefit from particular systems or processes at the exclusion of others. This could translate that, political economy views individuals and group relationships as being surrounded with conflicts over who gets power and authority over ownership or possession of resources at the expense of the other parties.

The tenet of this theory would portray colonialism as being at cross road with the yearnings of Africans. The tussle to wrestle power and establish territories in order to have absolute control of the mode of production and governance preoccupied the bottom line of the feud between the colonial masters and the natives in Africa. This theory though relevant in dissecting how the colonial masters benefited by imposing their authority to reap from the resources of Africans but fails to address the question of frustration suffered by Africans which was the bone of contention in the use of armed struggle. Frustration-aggression theory may offer insightful explanation into the phenomenon of frustration which birthed the use of armed struggle in the quest for independence in Africa.

Frustration–aggression theory was conceived in 1939 by John Dollard, Neal Miller, Leonard Doob, O.H Mowrer, and Robert Sears. The theory holds that aggression is the aftermaths of blocking, or frustrating, a person's efforts to attain a goal. In the latter formulation, the theory stated that while frustration prompts a behavior that may or may not be aggressive, any aggressive behavior is the result of frustration, making frustration not sufficient, but a necessary condition for aggression. This theory is also used to explain riots and revolutions, which both are believed to be caused by poorer and more deprived sections of society who may express their accumulated frustration and anger through violence.

This theory provides clear explanation to the rationale behind armed struggle in the march for independence in Africa. As argued by the theorists, the aggressive tendency of the natives is borne out of the sheer frustration they encountered in the course of achieving

their goal. The confiscation of the natives land, discrimination in employment, unfriendly tax regime, force labour and racial discrimination summed to frustrate Africans from achieving their goals on their soil. Their goal responses suffered interference or frustration by the colonial government. The result of this frustration manifests in the form of protests and guerilla warfare launched by the Africans against the repressive instrument of the colonial authorities that locked up their opportunities and privileges. Merton's social structure and anomies holds that the key to frustration is imbedded in the institutional deficit created by the colonial authorities.

Robert K. Merton's social structure and anomie (1938) reveals the interplay of institutional deficits which exposed the locals to revolt against colonial rule. The colonial authorities at the time prescribed legitimate goals and legitimate means of achieving them. Merton argues that, the colonial social structure was deficit hence produced strain. Strain made the locals improvised innovative means (armed struggle) to achieve a goal (independence) since the colonial society could not create an equal playing ground for the locals to access the legitimate means to achieve their legitimate goal. A repertoire of injustices like the confiscation of the natives' land, racial discrimination, discrimination in employment, unfriendly tax regime made up the list of strain-inducing factors. Since Africans must eat and live freely, the use of armed struggle in order to gain independence was the last resort. This theory does not put into consideration the causes of victimization of both the locals and the natives.

Routine Activity theory gives a clear cut explanation as to why many Africans and Europeans were killed in the armed struggle. The theory is the brain child of Marcus Felson and Lawrence, Cohen (1947-1973). They offer good illustration as to why people, object and institution etc fall victims of attack. Victimisation is the interplay of three factors: motivated offenders, suitable targets, and absence of guardian. Motivated offenders are individuals capable and willing to commit crime and/or attack. Suitable targets are persons or objects that are seen by the offender as vulnerable and attractive. Absence of guardian is the absence of protection and/or security. The vulnerability of the natives in areas of logistics, intelligence and weaponry and when you mix this with the fragile protection and security available for the locals you would understand why they were gruesomely killed in numbers by the Europeans. The mass killings of the locals and the Europeans in the Mau-Mau movement and guerilla warfare were the interplay of poor guardian amid vulnerability which made them a suitable target. The aftermaths of the peasant revolt in Kenya claimed 7,800 natives and 500 government forces as well as a record 2000 Europeans ever killed on African soil following the guerilla warfare in Angola (Barkindo et al., 1994). The topography of the African made local war tactics and guerilla warfare successful against the

Europeans. Abubakar (2018) found that the topography of a terrain creates safe havens for terrorist to launch attack and hide. This was the case with the Mau-Mau movement whose logistics, intelligence and recruitment were conceived at mountainous surroundings (Barkindo et al., 1994).

The Berlin conference of 1884-1885 was a turning point in the formal partitioning of Africa into colonial empires by Europeans. It represented an official agenda that offered leeway for colonial administration in Africa. Rodney (1972) revealed that, the Berlin Conference which took place 440 years later after the Portuguese sailed West Africa successfully decided who should steal which part of Africa by European. Another revelation by Stig, Wolfgand and Ronald (1988) suggested that the priorities of the negotiators of the Berlin conference dwelled on economic interests, missionary aspirations and national rivalries. These are pointers to the fact that colonialism was meant at the initial attempt to advance the course of the Europeans.

Economic interest preoccupied every other interest in the scramble for Africa. Earlier European Anthropological study suggested a cynical move to gauge the depth of Africa's resources. Joao (2020) held that Anthropology was instrumental to colonialism and that the greed for mineral resources such as diamonds, copper, and gold was the driving factor behind the introduction of ethnographic collation and field work by the Portuguese in her colonies. The excavation of these precious economic resources was damned exploitative to the colonies. Barkindo et al (1994) held that the main motive for colonization was for economic exploitation by the colonial powers. It may not be far off the mark to say that, industrial revolution opened a new paragraph in the search for raw materials and good markets for European finished goods. In Asia Cane sugar production may have been at the front burner in the Atlantic Islands, the Caribbean and Brazil from 16th to the 18th Century.

The relevance of sugar as the most important commodity traded at the international market and its relationship with colonialism offered an important context in probing the nature of colonial societies in Asia (Ulbe, Juan, Giuisticordero & Roger, 2007). In Africa precisely, Frankema, Williamson, Jeffrey and Pieter (2018) revealed that the scramble for West Africa held sway when European major export markets were in decline. This new development was further consolidated with the coming into limelight of colonialism. The discovery of fertile land and natural resources in tropical and sub tropical Africa renewed the interest of the Europeans in the production of large quantities of crop to feed their industries. Rodney (1972) expressed that European monopoly firms had an eye on new profitable ventures either outside or inside their country and this informed why they fought to gain control over raw materials, markets and means of communication at all cost.

This is corroborated by Barkindo et al (1994) wherein they opined that this

development made European firms at home to pressurize colonial authorities to intensify the production of primary crops wherein cotton manufacturers in Britain formed themselves into what was called the British Cotton-Growing Association, in 1902 in order to promote the cultivation of cotton in the British colonies of Africa. It is noteworthy to reaffirm that the Portuguese at the time was a poor European country; as such Angola and other Portuguese colonies were seen as an appendage of Portugal for economic reasons. Brian (2017) revealed that Portugal profited from the extraction of Angola's resources like Ivory, timber, diamonds and oil but reinvested very little into the development and conservation of the country's considerable wealth. This informs the use of brutal instrument since the Portugal's economic survival was tied extensively to her colonies. This is a testament to the economic motive surrounding colonialism in Africa.

However, despites the overriding economic interest that shaped Europeans' invasion of Africa, the education and infrastructural policies even though punctuated with shortcomings was humane. The introduction of western education may have bridged the gap of economic exploitation since it laid a solid foundation for the fight against ignorance and illiteracy in Africa. It remains to be seen whether the dividends of Europeans' educational and infrastructural development could be enough to compensate for the economic exploitation of colonial Africa.

Factors that elicited the use of armed struggle in the quest for independence in Angola and Kenya

From a criminological standpoint, certain forces played out to elicit the use of violence in the march to wrestle power from the colonial masters. The colonial society was ab initio structured to favour the Europeans at the expense of the locals. This informs why it was outrightly rejected in many instances. Barkindo et al (1994) held that all forms of colonial rule were not acceptable to the Africans. Worthy of being mentioned in the march to this rejection was built on the fact that Africans lost her destiny within the time frame to their colonisers. Adding to the bitter experience was the extent of exploitation and brutality they were predisposed to. This among numerous factors leveraged the manifestation of armed struggle in the march to independence.

More so, all African countries where armed struggle raised its ugly heads had factors that shaped it. European obnoxious policies cannot be divorced from its propensity to trigger violence. This is because violence protest ensued by degrees with the imposition of obnoxious policies. For instance, Mohamed (2017) revealed that aside the unrestraint mass violence against canarians, European conquerors demonstrated confiscation of land and near total deportation of island populations. These had their ways in African with stiff resistance in some quarters given the economic importance of land. A vast majority of Africans from time immemorial predominated primary occupation for mostly

subsistence production. For instance, long before the Portuguese invasion, the Bantu speaking tribe in Angola like the Kikuyu and Masai in Kenya had established a viable farming economy (Meijer and Birmingham, 2004).

This is a pointer to the relevance of primary occupation to the Africans. Stripping them of their land was devastating because it disrupted the communal chain of subsistence production thereby worsening poverty. Confiscation of land hard hit on the Masai and Kikuyu people of Kenya. Barkindo et al. (1994) indicted the British policies which gave the nod for the confiscation of thousands of hectares of land from the Masai and Kikuyu and indiscriminately offered to the European settler community as drivers of the use of violence by Kenyan Nationalists. The Kikuyu who took farming as fulfilled profession could not swallow the pains of losing their farm land amidst total relegation to work for the Europeans. Corroborating this argument, Malcom (1953) revealed that the main contributing factor on the African side to the violence in Kenya relies extensively on poverty because the Kikuyu were the hardest hit on the issue of land. The famous Mau-Mau movement was conceived to question these obnoxious policies of the Europeans in Kenya. Corroborating the intricacies of confiscation of land, Moses (2013) held that the commodisation of land and labour by colonial regimes left lots of dire consequences on Africans during colonialism even though Africans initiated strategies which ameliorated their predicaments in matters of land and labour. Since man must eat to survive, the Africans in the face of barefaced exploitation and discrimination went out of the box to find means of survival.

However, other related findings conceived unfriendly tax regime, discrimination in employment opportunities, and gross racial discrimination among other factors which shaped the posture of armed struggle. Racial discrimination was a determinant factor for residential settlement and recruitment into the colonial workforce. Andrew (2012) held that the British colony of Southern Rhodesia practiced racial segregation in many spheres including education, access to health care and political participation. Segregating the locals especially in access to health care services could be quiet devastating. Within the door step of the colonial society were well equipped health sector but with limited access to the locals. Aside this, the differences in accommodation between Europeans and Africans coupled with the very low pay received by African employees in relation to their European counterpart were too unfriendly to pacify the Africans (Barkindo et al, 1994). Good wages would have breached the gap created by limited access to education, political participation and health services in the colonial society.

More so, the rallying factor that informed the use of armed struggle in Angola was premised on sheer mal-treatment imposed on Africans by the Portuguese government. This became evident because Angola was seen as one of the treasure bases of the Portuguese. Being a poor and backward

European country then, Portugal never wanted to grant independence to her African colonies (Barkindo et al, 1994). One of striking reasons to the Angolan revolt was the Portuguese discriminatory assimilation policies which at its later stage, created a tiny class of 'assimilados' who had some privileges devoid of political right while majority of the Africans belong to the 'indignants' who had neither political right nor civil rights (Barkindo et al, 1994). These classes may not have been established on the basis of race but selective discrimination of vast majority of Angolans. This might have informed the claims made by many Portuguese officials and their apologists that the Portuguese created harmonious multi-racial societies in their colonies which were indifferent to racism (Walter, 1973).

This did not solve the many problems Angolans had with the Portuguese government. This is because the Angolans were perturbed by the gravity of injustices raising their ugly heads in sequence particularly the limited opportunities granted the natives in economic and political space. While political liberation was championed by the various movements earlier identified in this piece, trade unions were poised to facilitate economic liberation. Achieving these liberations was not forthcoming at the earlier stage due to the Portuguese obnoxious policies of repression. Perry (1962) corroborated this finding wherein he revealed that the Portuguese instrument of repression forbade trade union and political activities in her colonies. By this, the move to have a stake in economic and political affairs which was tipped to set the ball rolling for independence was sabotaged. Just like the Masai and kikuyu people of Kenya, the Angolans resorted to armed struggle against the Portuguese.

Exploring cases of armed struggle in the quest for independence in Angola and Kenya

It is interesting to note that, not all African countries employed the use of armed struggle and/or violence in the march for independence. All ways to Africans' liberation were facilitated by the rise of nationalist movement. Wasserman (1973) posited that nationalist activities leveraged the dismantling of colonial empire. This was the last straw that broke the back of the camel. As earlier pointed, the locals initially employed the non violence approach not until it was not effective.

A litany of injustices leaning on European obnoxious policies, confiscation of the natives' land, racial discrimination and the likes may have informed the use of armed struggle to suppress colonial rule and probably got Africans out of the wood. Guerilla warfare and the Mau-Mau movement were phenomenal in the use of armed struggle in Angola and Kenya respectively. Violence approach in Kenya was unprecedented especially when viewed from the activities of a clandestine militia organisation called "Mau-Mau". Wunyabari (1994) argued that Mau-Mau was a highly complex movement which traces unique peasant revolt against British colonialism. This started secretly in 1950 among the

Kenyan Africans though the actual leaders and sponsors of the group were anonymous. What was unique and intriguing in the movement was simply that recruits were drawn from the locals and were made to swear oath of allegiance by sustaining the secrecy of the movement and declaring absolute submission to the modus operandi of the group. Louis (2004) argued that the movement did not only work secretly but evidences suggest that at the initial stage of the movement, membership was voluntary but in succeeding years, pressure were mounted on members of the Kikuyu tribe to join the movement.

The movement gained ascendancy as a potent force against British colonialism and it was set out primarily to gain independence for Kenya. Besides the yearning for independence, the locals may not have been satisfied to condone gross dehumanization championed by the colonial masters. In another related finding, Frank (1974) affirmed that the Mau-Mau revolt was an outcome of a prolonged agrarian struggle between the Kikuyu squatters and the European settlers. This could mean that the displacement and confiscation of land relegated agricultural production. Access to employable venture could have mitigated the economic fallouts of land confiscation. Unfortunately, this could not hold water hence the bidding for vital confrontational strategy through armed violence. The formation processes were that, the leaders of the movement established war camps in mountains wherein unemployed youths and those whose land were confiscated got recruited amid overwhelming supports from neighbouring villages in the form of food and logistics (Barkindo, et al. 1994). Corroborating this finding, Daniel (2007) affirmed that Mau-Mau movement was assisted by collaborators known as loyalists drawn from same communities as insurgents. The precarious conditions of the locals woo collaborators and sympathizers across the divides in Kenya. Free food and means of survival had their ways to the camp by the locals as part of their contribution to restore their dignity and freedom.

However, another finding suggest that prior to the establishment of Mau-Mau secret organization, the Kikuyu Central Association was charting the cause of liberation. This association took the front seat in their condemnation of colonialism. It became necessary for the colonial authority to proscribe the association. There were indices pointing to the fact that, Mau-Mau organization was an offshoot of the proscribed Kikuyu Central Association which was solely made to evict the white man from Kenya (Malcom, 1953). Against all odds, the movement was rooted by the downtrodden peasants to revolt against inhumane policies on Kenyans. The consequences of the peasant revolt left a lot of scars in Kenya because it accounted for large number of deaths and indiscriminate destruction of lives and properties. Government forces killed 7,800 people and lost about 500 of its own men coupled with about fifty million pounds spent by the

British administration to suppress Mau-Mau movement (Barkindo et al, 1994).

The social and economic lost was mindboggling. This is in addition to the October, 1952, scuffle which led to the killing of Chief Waruhiu in his car (Malcom, 1953). This ugly development made colonial authorities launched a mass arrest of 98 African political leaders and news papers editors of African extraction including senior chief of Nderi of Nyeri District who was hacked and slashed into pieces in broad daylight (Malcom, 1953). Given the level of disproportionate atrocities caused by Mau-Mau Movement, the British Government did all it could to eclipse the philosophical scaffolding upon which the movement was built. Marshall (1998) held that the British government held that the revolt was an atavistic eruption of African savagery rather than a legitimate response to real grievances. Even though the actual sponsors of the movement were not known, Jomo Kenyatta was the leading forerunner of the Kenya independence. It is noteworthy that, the Mau-Mau agenda ushered a new narrative with far reaching implication as seen in the number of changes made by the British government to accommodate the Africans in civil service and politics. It also leveraged the Lancaster House conference in London in January and February 1960 which opened the paragraph for the elections held between 20th and 27th February culminating into the independence of Kenya (Bennet, 1961). Having done all the home work, on 12 December, 1963, Kenya gained her independence with Jomo Kenyatta as the then President.

The Angola's case was not mild in every honest assessment. Cain (2013) suggested that armed struggle for the liberation of Angola from Portuguese rule surfaced in 1961 with the demand for land rights preoccupying the independence movement. The appetite to improve the living conditions of Angolans birthed a number of advances like Movemento de libertacao de Angola MPLA or the Movement for the Liberation of Angola and Uniao Das Pupulacoes De Angola in 1955 and 1958 respectively (Barkindo et al, 1994). These movements were politically motivated and they shaped Angolan nationalism which was primarily meant to end Portuguese rule (Guimaraes, 2001). These movements which were earlier established to toe the path of non-violence resorted to armed struggle because the movement failed to reach its goals through its non violence ideals.

Walter (1973) corroborated this stance wherein he pointed out that in 1961, two Angolan liberation movements MPLA and Frente National de Libertapzo De Angolan (FNLA) began armed struggle aimed at freeing Angolans from Portuguese colonial domination. As earlier indicated, the Portuguese derived a lot of economic benefits in Angola, therefore granting land right to the locals was gotten through confrontation. That was why attempts to suppress the liberation struggle accounted for the huge military expenses in the annual budget when Portuguese began to conquer Luanda hinterland (Douglas, 1969). The

huge military budget could not achieve its manifest purpose rather the spates of violence continued with series of intimidation from the colonial authorities. In responding to the threat of liberation, Africans who voiced against the obnoxious policies and regulations were arrested and deported to prison camps.

The June, 1960 peaceful demonstration organized by Icola and Bengo villages over the arrest and deportation of Agostinho Neto, the eminent Angolan poet and intellectual was punctuated with massacre and utter destruction of villages (Perry, 1962). More so, series of attempts launched by the locals via guerilla warfare against the colonial authorities in Angola was testament to the use of violence against colonial power. Kenneth (1974), guerilla successes exposed the depth of weaknesses in the colonial system and it offered a convincing proof that Africans possessed immense power for change. Angolans saw hope in the guerilla warfare and petitions against discriminatory policies of the Portuguese government by some of the assimilados began to echo. Also, the atrocities of the Portuguese dictatorial regime reached a tipping point thereby leveraged the enlistment of women into the armed struggle. Selina (2017) revealed that the nationalist movement used the philosophy of the patriotic motherhood to woo women into the 1961-1975 armed struggles against Portuguese colonialism. Nevertherless, the prelude to the use of violence in Angola was the Bakongo revolt by African workers on the cotton estate in the centre of the country over the cultivation of cotton and delayed payments for their crops (Barkindo et al, 1994). This was facilitated by the enlistment of Bakongo guides into the bush guerilla warfare with large pool of recruits from Kwanhama tribe of Southern Angola (Douglas, 1969).

Sequel to this unfortunate incidence, the Bakongo nationalists launched guerilla war which resulted in the killing of 2,000 white settlers. This was unprecedented because it was historic record of the largest number of European civilians killed in a single feud in African countries championing the nationalist struggle. This led to massive arrests with the Portuguese launching indiscriminate airstrikes and land raids on villages killing about 50,000 nationalists (Barkindo, et al 1994). The Portuguese could not afford the collateral damage which took a record number of its soldiers emanating from the guerilla war amid deleterious economic consequences. A preponderate number of the Portuguese were not happy hence the collapse of the dictatorial government of Dr. Catano in Portugal on April 25, 1974 hence General Spinola became the President of Portugal and immediately set the pace for the independence of Portuguese territories in Africa (Barkindo et al, 1994). Angola got her independence on 11 November, 1975 when Dr. Agostino Neto of the MPLA became her first President.

Conclusion

Colonialism in Africa was officially birthed at the Berlin conference of 1884-1885. This

marked the partitioning of Africa for Europeans' occupation. Right from inception, colonial rule was imposed on African with an ulterior motive which was predominantly economic oriented. Aside the evangelical interest, conditions were ripped to feed the ever-bourgeoning industries in Europe and this accounted significantly to the exploration of resources in the underdeveloped territory called Africa.The approaches used by the colonial masters were such that, the natives were discriminated upon in diverse areas ranging from civil service administration, settlement pattern and gross confiscation of land belonging to the peasant farmers. All these offered the enabling background for armed struggle in order to wrestle power from the colonial masters. However, while some historical findings reveal the rationale behind colonialism and armed struggle, others look beyond by interrogating the far reaching implication of the armed struggle especially the Bakongo guerilla warfare and the Mau-Mau movement, which shaped the independence of Angola and Kenya, respectively. The theoretical underpinnings consolidated the historical findings by dissecting why the natives employed armed struggle and why both the natives and the Europeans were victims of mass killings. The use of violence represents a disproportionate incidence of deviant behaviour, which underscores the field of criminology and security studies. This informs the relevance of the need for historical criminology, which would focus on assessing historical records for the purpose of interrogating the nature of crime, violence and other deviant behavior not only during colonialism but in the entire phase of human existence.

Discriminatory policies should be put in the back burner to give room for economic, political and social justices when managing people's wealth and nation.

i. There should be concerted effort in strengthening the spirit of African brotherhood against any external aggression or invasion of African economy, politics and resources.
ii. There should be call for compensation of African countries suffered from the ravails of colonialism.
iii. Africans should have a formidable union to suppress any form of intrusion into their political, social and economic space.
iv. Violence amongst human should be reduced to the barest minimum by entrenching the principle of social justice.
v. There is a need to intensify the relevance of history in criminology and security studies or carve out a new branch of Historical Criminology in the corpus of academic disciplines.

References

Abubakar, A. (2018). The roles of routine activity theory on crime prevention in the era of

terrorism in Nigeria. *Fulafia journal of Social Sciences, 1 (2), 87-97*

Andrew, N. (2012). Sport and racial discrimination in colonial Zimbabwe: a re-analysis. *The international journal of history of sport, 29 (6) 850-867*

Andrew, D.R (1990). *The colonial moment in Africa: Essays on the movement of minds and materials, 1900-1940.* Cambridge University press, United Kingdom

Barkindo, B., Omolewa, M., & Babalola, G. (1994). *Africa and the wider world.* Lagos, Nigeria, Learn Africa Plc

Brian, V.W. (2017). An environmental history of Angola. *South Africa journal of science, 113 (7-8), 1-2*

Bennett, G. (1961). Kenya's frustrated election. *The World today, 17 (6), 254-261*

Cain, A. (2013). Angolan resources and conflict. In J. Unruh & R.C. Williams (Eds.). *Land and post conflict peace building.* Routeledge

Clymer, K.J. (1995). *Quest for freedom: the United States and India's independence.* NewYork, Columbia University Press

Daniel, B. (2007). The enemy within: loyalists and the war against Mua-Mau in Kenya. *The journal of African history, 48 (2), 291-315*

Douglas, L.W. (1969). The Portuguese army in Angola. *Journal of modern African studies, 7 (3), 425-439*

Eluwa, G.I.C. (1971). The National Congress of British West Africa: a pioneer Nationalist Movement. *Tarkikh, 3 (4), 12-21*

Frankema, W., Williamson, F., Jeffrey, W., & Pieter, W. (2018). An economic rationale for the West Africa Scramble: the commercial transition and the commodity price boom of 1835-1885. *The journal of economic history, 78 (1), 231-267*

Frank, F. (1974). The social composition of the Mau-Mau movement in the white highlands. *Journal of peasant studies, 1 (4), 486-505*

Giumaraes, F.A. (2001). Angolan anti-colonialism. In origins of the Angolan civil war. Palgrave Macmillan, London. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1007/9780230592632

Joao, F. (2020). Diamond desire-probing the epistemological entanglements of Geology and Ethnography at Diamang (Angola). *South African historical journal, 72 (3), 431-460*

Kenneth, G. (1974). Settler colonialism in Rhodesia. *African affairs, 73 (290), 10-36*
Louis, L. (2004). *Mau-Mau and the Kikuyu.* London, Routledge

Maitrii, A.T. (2013). *Nationalism and post-colonial identity in Southeast Asia.* Routledge
handbook of Southesat Asian. Retrieved from: https://www.routledgehandbooks.com

Malcom, D. (1953). Mau-Mau activities and the unrest in Kenya. *The Antoich Review, 13 (2),*
221-233
Mandy, S. (2013). Ethnic armies and ethnic conflict in Burma. Reconsidering the history of
colonial militarization in Kachin region of Burma during the second world war. *South East*
Asia research; 12 (2), 601-611

Marshall, S.C. (1998). *Mau-Mau Memoirs: history, memory, and politics.* Lynne Rienner
publishers, Colorado, United States

Meijer, G., & Birmingham, D. (2004). Angola from past to present. Accord: from military peace
to social justice. *The Angolan peace process, 10-15*

Mohamed, A. (2017). Europe's first settler colonial incursion into Africa: the genocide of
aboriginal canary islanders. *Africa Historical review, 49 (1), 1-26*

Moses, O. (2013). African colonial economies: land, labour, and livelihoods. *History compass,*
11 (2), 91-103

Perry, A. (1962). Portugal and the end of ultra colonialism. New Left review, (17), 85-114

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa.* London: Bogle-L'Ouverture
Publications.
Selina, M. (2017). Motherhood as activism in the Angolan people's war, 1961-1975. Meridians,
15 (2), 358-381

Stelios, M., & Elias, P. (2016). The long effects of the scramble for Africa. *American Economic*
review, 106 (7), 1802-1848

Stig, F., Wolfgang, J.M., & Ronald, R. (1988). *Bismark, Europe, and Africa: the Berlin Africa*
conference 1884-1885. Oxford University press, USA.

Solveig, M.R (1999). Independence, dependence, interdependence: some reflections on the
subject and personal autonomy. *Disability and Society; 14 (3), 353-367*

Ulbe, B., Juan, A., Giuisticordero., & Roger, G. (2007). *Sugarlandia revisited: Sugar and*

colonialism in Asia and the Americas, 1800-1940. Newyork-Oxford, Berghahn Books

Walter, R.M. (1973). *Racism and revolution: a case of Angola* (Master's Thesis).
Simon Fraser University research repository, Burnaby, Canada

Wasserman, G. (1973). The independence bargain: Kenya Europeans and the land issue 1960-
1962. *Journal of commonwealth and comparative politics, 11 (2), 99-120*

Wunyabari, O.M. (1994). *Mau-Mau and Kenya: an analysis of a peasant revolt.* East African
Publishers. Retrieved from: pdfs.semanticscholar.com