

## **The Concept of the Indirect Rule in West African Countries: A Critical Study**

**Dr Ibrahim YEKINI, ENS**

(Université d'Abomey Calavi, Bénin)

[Adebiaye20@gmail.com](mailto:Adebiaye20@gmail.com)

**Dr Barnabé B. OLADJEHOU, FLLAC**

(Université d'Abomey Calavi, Bénin)

[barnafr@gmail.com](mailto:barnafr@gmail.com)

**Dr Hergie Alexis SEGUEDEME, FLLAC**

(Université d'Abomey Calavi, Bénin)

**Résumé :** La présente étude vise à examiner le concept un empire indirect dans les pays de l'Afrique de l'Ouest. Le colonialisme concerne l'établissement et l'entretien de la domination étrangère sur un groupe de peuple dans le but de se faire assez de profits par le pouvoir colonisateur. Les colonisateurs ont instauré l'empire indirect pour contrôler les autorités locales dans la colonie et spécialement l'autorité traditionnelle. Le pouvoir colonial a adopté une politique économique et des pratiques qui ne font que détruire que construire les pays Africains sur le plan économique, politique et culturel. En fait, les effets du colonialisme ont détruit la tradition et la culture africaines. Les pouvoirs Européens ne se souciaient pas des intérêts de l'Afrique, mais leurs propres intérêts. Les effets négatifs du colonialisme devenaient évidents après l'indépendance de plusieurs pays Africains.

**Mots clés:** domination indirect, colonialisme, pouvoir traditionnel, culture.

**Abstract:** The present study aims to examine the concept of the indirect rule in West Africa countries. Colonialism involves the establishment and maintenance of foreign rule over a set of people for the purpose of getting maximum economic benefit by the colonizing power. Colonizers established indirect rule to control local chiefs in a colony and especially the traditional executive authority. The colonial power adopted economic policies and practices that destroy, rather than help, African countries economically, politically, and culturally. The effects of colonialism, in fact, destroyed Africa's traditional lifestyles and culture. The European powers did not have Africa's interests in mind, but their own interests. The negative effects of colonialism became evident after the independence of many African countries.

**Key words:** Indirect rule, Colonialism, traditional power, culture.

## **Introduction**

Over the past decades, a social science literature has dwelled on the subject of colonization and economic performances of former colonies around the world. Indirect Rule is a colonial ideology which aimed at using local chief in a colony to achieve the objective of the colonist. It is also a situation where chiefs governed small political units, and in particular where their traditional executive authority was questionable, the political officer found himself interfering in native authority affairs more frequently than ideally he should. This was true in many parts of West Africa and in parts of Yoruba land, where the borderline between ' advisory and supervisory in the activities of the political officer was not always clear. Though indirect rule reposed primarily on a chief as executive, its aim was not to preserve the institution of chieftaincy as such, but to encourage local self-government through indigenous political institutions, whether these were headed by a single executive authority, or by a council of elders. In Northern Nigeria for example, a policy of minimal interference with the chiefs and their traditional forms of government was pursued.

Economists became interested in colonial legacies in their search for the reasons why some countries have grown relatively slower than others. In fact, former British colonies have grown faster, although much controversy still surrounds the likely mechanisms of transmission of any such colonial legacy. The colonial economy in most of Africa countries was structured to improve the economies of the colonizing or metropolitan powers. But the problem here is how the colonial economy could benefit the colonizers. The ending of colonial rule in most Africa countries has not resulted in a complete control of their economic or political affairs. They are sovereign states only in name. In reality, many of them remain under the economic and political control of their former rulers. As we can see from the history of many African countries, the achievement of political or flag independence does not automatically lead to economic independence (Yunusa, 2009:131). Economic exploitation presupposes and requires a consistent production of surpluses and profits that can be appropriated without harming the production capacity on which the regime of exploitation itself depends.

It is important to note that agriculture formed the mainstay of Africans in the pre-colonial past. In this enterprise, food production featured prominently for most of Nigeria,

hence, like most traditional African societies, there was self-sufficiency in food supply. As Boateng (1978:78) rightly observed:

owing to the greatly superior economic and technological advantages which the developed nations enjoy, they are still in a position to determine or even to dictate to a large extent, the economic fortunes of the developing nations which depend on them for the very things, such as Capital goods, technical know-how and entrepreneurial skills, which they need in order to modernize and upgrade their fragile economies.

However, given the fact that one major reason why Britain colonized Nigeria was to ensure a cheap and steady supply of raw materials to British industries, the colonial administration completely discouraged the cultivation of food crops while encouraging cash crops production (Usono 1977). At the point of independence, some nations or countries came out of colonialism with clear estrangement while some have all the symptoms of total break from the imperialist world whereas they were still deeply sunk in the shackles of imperialism. Nations, which at the point of obtaining their freedom from the colonial masters merely took flag independence without all necessary economic independence turned out to be mere neo-colonies and consequently represent the neo-colonial states of the world. Unfortunately, so many of such countries reside in the African continent.

This article focuses on the effects of colonialism in Africa, and some of the differences between British concepts of indirect rule and that of France.

## **1- Colonialism and Development: Conceptual Issues**

The two major concepts that this study deals with are colonialism in West Africa countries and the conceptual issue of development.

### **1.1. Colonialism in West African Countries**

Colonialism involves the establishment and maintenance of foreign rule over a set of people for the purpose of getting maximum economic benefit by the colonizing power. Put in another way; colonialism is the extension of political control by one powerful nation over a weaker nation. The people and their land make up a colony. The foreign power sends people to live in the colony to govern it and to use the colony as a source of wealth (Word Book

Encyclopedia 1992). These foreign immigrants dominated the countries where they settled not only politically, but also socially and economically. In order to sustain their domination, they seized the lands of people, settled there and imposed various forms of taxes. In the view of *Akorede (2010:158)*, colonialism can be seen as one country's domination of another country or people. This is often achieved through aggressive military acts. Colonialism means the control or domination of the political, social, economic and cultural aspects of one group of people or nation by another. It is of a great importance to identify the point that colonialism implies "formal political control" involving territorial annexation and loss of sovereignty. The concept of colonial exploitation has been a field of vigorous debate. It has become a retrospective designation for a range of practices that colonial powers across Africa, especially the West Africa engaged in. However, such practices were part of the missions that were authorized by political doctrines and rationalize exploitation.

This exploitation backward the economic policies of colonial states and sidestep the discursive formations and ideologies of rule that authorized some of these policies. Colonialism had its roots in the greed which European countries exhibited towards Africa's untapped natural resources (Mapuva and Chari, 2010). Colonial expansionism is economic in aim, monopolistic in orientation, political in justification and military in method. The relationship between the colonizing country and the colonized is asymmetrical. It is that of dependency that favors the occupying nation to the detriment of the occupied territory. Colonization becomes the process of acquisition and maintenance of territory.

## **1.2. The Conceptual Issue of Development**

The term development is not an easy task to define, because the term is a relative one. This has led us to so many arguments that development as a concept is amorphous and rather difficult to articulate. This is because it has been used to mean different things to different people. In fact, development involves a departure from the past to the new situation, which is reflected in the economic, social, educational and political aspect of a nation (Awoyemi, 1970). Moreover, Rodney (2005) perceived development as an increasing capacity to regulate both internal and external relationship. Development can also be seen as a means of freely exercising one's economic, social, political and religious rights. Development involves not only economic growth but also conditions in which the people of a country have adequate security of job and income inequality among the people is considerably reduced (Todaro,

1979; Seer, 1995). However, what is important is that development is seen as a product of human efforts. This is because human beings manipulate the resources available and ensure they serve the goal of achieving the standard and integrity of people. Essentially, to understand the state of development in Nigeria, one must be able to understand the value attached to development in the country and indeed its politics. This is particularly necessary when it is realized that after five decades of pursuing development agenda since independence, only a few countries could let people hope.

## **2. African Economy and Colonialism**

The way Africa has been portrayed during colonization has provoked an endless debate and rich literature on the subject. Then, Souare (2007) delves into the intricacies of reflections given for Africa's underdevelopment. He notes that Africa of the 21st century is not only the poorest and the most miserable region on the planet. It is also the only region in the world that is getting poorer, especially with evident and indisputable marginalization on the face of globalization. Fifty years after, most of African countries regained independence. Today Africa is being considered as the poorest continent in the world, contributing less than three percent (3%) to international trade. The benefit or otherwise of colonialism has been a recurring decimal. Some argued that it was beneficial to African economy while some African scholars like Walter Rodney (2005) believed that colonization disservice the Third World Countries. Some scholars such as Fadeiye saw colonialism as beneficial to African nations argue: that colonization introduced formal education, modern health facilities, modern markets, modern transportation and communication etc. Such writers also claims that colonialism brought peace which attracted European capital to Africa and that African peasant farmers were assisted by European capital and scientific knowledge which helped to boost agriculture and economic development. (Fadeiye, 2005:143).

However, there is no gain saying that colonialism contributed greatly to facilitate under-development in Africa. For instance, Jack Woddis (1970) argued that: European colonizers stole Africa's land, labour and national resources by all subtle or treacherous means. The British penetration of African economies as argued by Ake (2008:38) created some fundamental affinities between African economy and that of the colonizing power. They controlled the development of economy in the interest of the metropolis which went along with the expansion of colonial trade, meant structural link and structural interdependence.

African countries suffered terribly under the colonial economy, as the economic policies in the colonies were geared toward the benefit and interest of the colonizing powers. Economic activities in colonies were subordinated to the interest of the colonizing nations that exercised no attempt at developing the economy of African countries like their own. The terms of trade under colonial rule were unequal and largely grossly unfavorable to Africa.

About the same issue, Ake shows clearly how Africa was successfully thrown into the orbit of Europeans, world capitalist system. According to him, the first step was the monetization of the African economy. It is true that an incipient degree of monetization had taken place in Africa evident in the use of such currencies as gold dinars, or gold dust, cloth money, copper rods, iron, and cowrie shells, but their cumbersome forms and character from their utility as means of exchange. As the trade grew between the colony and the metropolis, the complementary and interdependence along the line of manufactured and primary production were reinforced. First, the money income accruing to the colony from colonial trade went largely to the consumption of imported manufactured goods from the metropolis. Also, the European demand for African primary products, and the brutally self – interested way in which it was satisfied, led to a form of development which made the African economies heavily dependent on the metropolitan economies. Third, colonial trade tended to destroy the traditional crafts and craftsmanship in Africa. This is because it flooded the market with substitutes which were cheaply provided but considered exotic, more desirable or more functional by the African population than the traditional substitutes. Lastly, the colonizing power in Africa ensured the specialization of the colony in primary production by adopting a system of quotas and tariffs which heavily favored unprocessed primary commodities from the colonies. Most African countries including Nigeria achieved paper independence without economic independence. After achieving political independence, countries that suffer from colonialism still have their economy tied to the apron-string of their former colonial masters. Post–independence Nigeria, for example, suffered from neo-colonialism as her economy was and is still being dominated by Britain, her former colonial master. The multinational corporations still have preponderant influence on the Nigerian economy; thereby dictating the economic pace at which Nigerian will develop. The effect of this as observed by Chikendu (2004) are still being felt today through the syndrome of dependency. Economic dependency is the most telling punitive legacy which colonization bequeathed to all countries in Africa.

### 3. Effects of Colonialism on Africa

The colonial powers adopted economic policies and practices that would destroy, rather than help, Africa economically, politically, and culturally in the future. The effects of colonialism, in fact, destroyed Africa's traditional lifestyles and culture. The European powers did not have Africa's interests in mind. They were only concerned with their own interests. The negative effects of colonialism became evident after the independence of many African countries.

The economic policies adopted by the European powers were several.

1. The colonial governments took much of the land away from the Africans for personal or commercial use, such as mining and large commercial farms. The Europeans took the best land and called it their own. It was Belgium and Britain in central, East, and South Africa who were primarily responsible for this practice-the Belgians in Congo and the British in Kenya and South Africa. Because Central, East and South Africa had pleasant climates and fertile soil for agriculture, the British and Belgians started to settle and immigrate into these area
2. Since the European powers needed manpower to manage their farms and mining companies, they used Africans as cheap labor. The Africans either having lost their lands or not able to live off lands, began to move to the towns, farms, or mines in search of work. The working conditions were horrible, often involving corporal punishment, and the wages were low, partially given in the form of cash and partially as food rations.
3. The colonial governments also needed money to pay for running these overseas governments and for services for the settler communities. Their mother countries in Europe gave the colonial governments little financial help, and so they needed to increase their capital by taxing the local Africans. This became a problem after world War II, when Europe was devastated and broken. Taxing the Africans went hand in hand with the use of African labor. Since taxes had to be paid in European currency, the Africans were indirectly forced to work for the Europeans in order to obtain the cash for paying the taxes. The result was that more Africans were forced to work for the Europeans.

4. Because of the loss of manpower after the two world wars, the European colonial powers started a new policy of forced labor, starting in the 1920s. Africans were recruited to work and sent to towns, farms and mines. The results were many; villages lacked the manpower for food production, which led to famine; male homosexuality and female prostitution increased among the African communities in the towns; and there was alienation from traditional village life, which led to the declining power of the village chiefs. In addition, immigrant's laborers from Asia were employed by the Europeans, who were responsible for the local economy. This created tension between the Africans and the foreign immigrants.
5. The Europeans also changed the economic structure of African society. They introduced commercial or cash crops to meet the industrial demands in their home countries. Cocoa, coffee, tea, and cotton were produced on a large scale, and minerals were mined extensively. This resulted in neglecting the production of food for basic living. In turn, this neglect led to famine among many Africans. In short, the Europeans changed the economy from one where foods were produced to an economy based on the production of a few cash crops.

However, many will admit that there were many negative results for the Africans, such as the following: resources depletion; labour exploitation; unfair taxation; lack of industrialization; dependence on cash crop economy; no trade allowed; the fragmentation of traditional African society, culture and values; retarded political development and ethnic rivalries within countries, since the boundaries were the ones set by Europeans. In the other hands, without colonialism, Africa would still today be behind the rest of the world in many areas. Some histories claim that there were some positive results which are.

- Western medicine was introduced, which aided in the growth of the African population.
- Formal education was introduced, which helped broaden the African outlook
- Africa's infrastructure was based on the European one with regard to the road system, railway, and water, electricity, and communication systems.
- The introduction of Christianity promoted literacy and health care through the work of missionaries. It created a basis for all Africans to come together and assist one another.



- The boundaries, as established by the different colonial powers, made state formation easier in the process of independence.

#### **4. British Administration in West Africa countries.**

In Nigeria, the Gold Coast in West Africa, Kenya, and Uganda, Britain organized its colonies at the central, provincial, and regional or district levels. There was usually a governor or governor-general in the colonial capital who governed along with an appointed executive council and a legislative council of appointed and selected local and foreign members. The governor was responsible to the colonial office and the colonial secretary in London, from whom laws, policies, and programs were received. He made some local laws and policies, however The British colonies were often subdivided into provinces headed by provincial commissioners or residents, and then into districts headed by district officers or district commissioners. Laws and policies on taxation, public works, forced labor, mining, agricultural production, and other matters were made in London or in the colonial capital and then passed down to the lower administrative levels for enforcement. At the provincial and district levels the British established the system of local administration popularly known as indirect rule. This system operated in alliance with preexisting political leaderships and institutions. The theory and practice of indirect rule is commonly associated with Lord Lugard, who was first the British high commissioner for northern Nigeria and later governor-general of Nigeria. In the Hausa /Fulani emirates of northern Nigeria he found that they had an established and functional administrative system. Lugard simply and wisely adapted it to his ends. It was cheap and convenient. Despite attempts to portray the use of indirect rule as an expression of British administrative genius, it was nothing of the sort. It was a pragmatic and parsimonious choice based partly on using existing functional institutions. The choice was also partly based on Britain's unwillingness to provide the resources required to administer its vast empire. Instead, it developed the perverse view that the colonized should pay for their colonial domination. Hence, the choice of the indirect rule. The system had three major institutions: the "native authority" made up of the local ruler, the colonial official, and the administrative staff; the "native treasury," which collected revenues to pay for the local administrative staff and services; and the "native courts," which, which purportedly administered "native law and custom," the supposedly traditional legal system of the colonized that was used by the courts to adjudicate cases In general, indirect rule worked

fairly well in areas that had long-established centralized state systems such as chiefdoms, city-states, kingdoms, and empires, with their functional administrative and judicial systems of government. But even here the fact that the ultimate authority was the British officials meant that the African leaders had been visualized and exercised "authority" at the mercy of European colonial officials. Thus the political and social umbilical cords that tied them to their people in the old system had been broken. Some astute African leaders maneuvered and ruled as best they could, while others used the new colonial setting to become tyrants and oppressors, as they were responsible to British officials ultimately. In the decentralized societies, the system of indirect rule worked less well, as they did not have single rulers.

Lugard, one of the English authorities had insisted on a reform of the indigenous taxation system and of the administration of native justice when he was the Governor of Northern Nigeria and believed that, while the colonial government should repose on the chiefs, their administration should be progressively modernized (Aghalino, S. 2000). And, though his successors left them largely to themselves, Sir Donald Cameron, Governor of Nigeria from 1931 to 1935, who had introduced indirect rule to Tanganyika and held similar beliefs to those of Lugard, was shocked by the situation in Northern Nigeria, where he felt the emirates were fast developing into Indian-style native states. Indeed, in the earliest inter-war period many emirs and chiefs ruled as 'sole native authorities', a position which gave them for practical purposes more power than they had in pre-colonial days, where they were either subject to control by a council or liable to deposition if they became too unpopular. Secondly, they were permitted to administer traditional justice, which, in the case of certain emirs, included trying cases of murder for which the death sentence, subject to confirmation by the Governor, could be passed. They administered political units that corresponded to those they would have administered before the arrival of the colonial power. They were elected to office by traditional methods of selection, and only in the case of the election of a patently unsuitable candidate to office, would the colonial power refuse recognition. There was thus a minimal undermining of the traditional sources of authority. The main change for the Fulani Emirs of Northern Nigeria, for instance, was that they now owed allegiance to the British Government rather than to the Sultan of Sokoto, and collected taxes on its behalf, though they retained, in most cases, 70 per cent of the amount collected for the administration of their native authority. This system of indirect rule was, with modifications, practiced wherever possible in Britain's colonies in West Africa and in most of her other African territories. There

were notable exceptions, especially in Eastern Nigeria, where the absence of identifiable executive authority in most communities made indirect rule as practiced in Northern Nigeria almost impossible to apply. The goal of ruling through traditional political units on whom local self-government could be devolved was maintained, and after much trial and error, a system of democratically elected councils was formulated as most closely corresponding to the traditional methods of delegating authority. If, taking into account such variations, we use indirect rule in Northern Nigeria as a model we shall see just how greatly the French system of administration in Black Africa differed from that of the British. The British system depended on the advisory relationship between the political officer and the native authority, usually a chief, heading a local government unit that corresponded to a pre-colonial political unit. The French system placed the chief in an entirely subordinate role to the political officer. Brown, G(2009) shed light on the role of the French political officer towards the end of his article, where he hints at the nature of his status as a paternal King. But it is important to stress that the chief in relation to the French political officer was a mere agent of the central colonial government with clearly defined duties and powers. He did not head a local government unit, nor did the area which he administered on behalf of the government necessarily correspond to a pre-colonial political unit. In the interests of conformity the French divided the country up administratively into cantons which frequently cut across pre-colonial political boundaries. Chiefs did not remain chiefs of their old political units but of the new cantons, though sometimes the two coincided. In certain cases the French deliberately broke up the old political units, as in the case of the Futa Jallon where their policy was ' the progressive suppression of the chiefs and the parceling out of their authority. What is important here is that, chiefs were not necessarily those who would have been selected according to customary procedures; more often than not they were those who had shown loyalty to the French or had obtained some education. While the British were scrupulous in their respect for traditional methods of selection of chiefs, the French, conceiving of them as agents of the administration, were more concerned with their potential efficiency than their legitimacy. We need not wonder then that as a young French administrator, after serving in Senegal and Dahomey, M. Robert Delavignette should have been astonished, on his way to duty in Niger, to find that the British political officer in Kano actually called on the Emir when he had business with him and paid him the compliment of learning Hausa so that he could speak to him direct. It is clear then that the French explicitly changed the very nature of the powers of the chief and that 'his functions were reduced to that of a mouth piece for orders

emanating from outside. Hence, it was not surprising that when, in 1957, just before the independence of Guinea, Sékou Touré decided to do with chiefs. The operation was effected with remarkably little protest from either the indigenous population or from the French administration that had made use of them. In African countries, British had imposed chiefs, as in Eastern Nigeria and parts of Uganda, their prestige had in fact gone up, but this has certainly not been true in the former French territories. In formulating these general models it is once again essential to recognize exceptions to the general rule. But in general the French system of administration deliberately sapped the traditional powers of the chiefs in the interest of uniformity of administrative system, not only within individual territories but throughout the two great federations of West and Equatorial Africa. Delavignette also notes this in *Freedom and Authority in French West Africa*. Why this great difference in approach by the two powers to the question of native administration, given that both for reasons of economy had to administer their vast African possessions with the aid of chiefs? The difference has much to do with national character and political traditions. While few would disagree that the British were inspired by the concept of separate development for their African territories, there is still much debate as to how far the French were inspired by the concept of assimilation even after its formal abandonment as official policy in favour of a polity 'association. Only by an examination of the extent of the survival of assimilations goals in French colonial policy we can understand the reasons for the difference in the two approaches to native administration. This survival showed itself at two levels: as a dominant feature of the politic association and in the personal ethos of the French political officer. But the politic association that succeeded the colonial power would respect the manners, customs, and religion of the natives and follow a policy of mutual assistance rather than exploitation. Rather it was one in which, while recognition was given to the impracticability of applying a full-scale policy of assimilation to African societies, a number of assimilationist characteristics were retained. First, the goal of creating French citizens out of Africans was not abandoned; it was just made more distant and much more difficult of achievement. Second, there was a high degree of administrative centralization on the mother country, which was not compatible with a true politic association. We have already seen that the French made little concession to indigenous political units in dividing up their African territories for administrative purposes. Third, the French civilizing mission was not abandoned, and though education might be sparse, it was modeled on the French system. Children spoke French from the day they entered school. No concession was made to teaching in the vernacular as in the

British territories. Fourth, individual territories were not considered as having special characters, so that the same administrative organization was imposed on them all. Political officers would be posted from one territory to the other some-times every other year, which gave them little time to learn the local language or ethnography. On the other hand, the British political officer remained in the same territory for a long period of time, and in the case of Nigeria, in the same region; and promotion depended in part on the ability of the political officers to learn indigenous languages. Thus, under the French system the one constant for the political officer could only be French culture, while for the British officer every encouragement was given to him to understand the local culture.

As a corollary, the French gave some encouragement to the formation of native elite, which was absorbed into the territorial and federal administrative services, albeit not on a very large scale. The British, on the other hand, in the twenties and thirties actively discouraged the formation of a class of Europeanized Africans, particularly at the level of the central colonial administration; rather they should be encouraged to work with the native administration. For example, Nigeria was, in the words of Sir Hugh Clifford (Ahazuem and Falola), Governor from 1919 to 1925, a collection of self-contained and mutually independent Native States' which the educated Nigerian had no more business co-coordinating than the British administration. Thus Nigerians were by and largely excluded from the senior service of government, while a number of French colonials reached high posts in the administration. This attitude towards the educated native arouses the bitter envy of his counterpart in neighboring British colonies. Jean Daniel in Meyer in *Desert Doctor* (London, 1960, and P.60) writes his experiences in French Soudan in the Army Colonial Medical Service before the Second World War: 'My colleague was a full-blooded Senegalese. He had studied medicine in France, attending the Bordeaux Naval School, and had the rank of lieutenant.' Fifth, the African colonies were considered economic extensions of the metropolitan country. The colonies should provide assistance to France in the form of raw materials for her industry, and, in addition to this, troops in time of war, in return for which the African would benefit from French civilization. Colonial policy in the inter-war period was to be a doctrine of colonization starting from a conception of power or profit for the metropolis, but instinctively impregnated with altruism. Finally it was at the level of the political officer himself that the tendency to assimilation so often manifested itself. Whatever official colonial policy may have been concerning, the status of chiefs and the necessity to respect indigenous institutions,

it is clear that the majority of French political officers believed sincerely in the French civilizing mission and that it was their role to bring 'enlightenment' to the Africans. They certainly did not believe that indigenous culture or institutions had anything of value to offer except as a stop-gap. L. Gray Cowan writing (1958) states that: The young of subdivision in bush is still a proponent of assimilation through the very fact of his education as a Frenchman although it is no longer a part of official policy. The administrator from republican France, particularly in the inter-war period, had little time for the notion of chiefs holding power other than that derived from the administration itself. This provides a marked contrast with the average British administrator, who believed sincerely that for Africans their own traditional methods of government were the most suitable, provided they were shorn of certain features that did not correspond to his sense of justice. Coming from a country which still maintained a monarchy that had done little to democratize itself on the lines of the Scandinavian monarchies, he had a basic respect for the institution of kingship and the panoply of ritual that surrounded it. The British officer respected his chief as separate but equal, though certainly not somebody with whom he could establish personal social relations. It was the educated African before whom he felt uneasy. In Nigeria for example, even as late as 1954, one could hear such epithets used by Northern political officers about Southern politicians. The African's place was in the Emir's court, not at Lincoln's Inn or Oxford. The French political officer, on the other hand, was able to establish relationships with the educated African.

### **Conclusion**

Colonialism has destroyed the atmosphere of beauty, perfection, and identity of pre-colonial African societies. The British colonial economic policies in Africa have implications for Africa's development on one hand, and abuses African's resources on the other hand. Our intention in this article is to draw attention on the aspects of under-development in Africa in general and in West Africa countries in particular, while taking careful note of the historical antecedent of colonialism. I have tried to present an overview of Africa's development from the contact with colonialism up to independence. I point out that the colonial economic policies affect Africa's development. For instance, the colonial economic policies helped to under develop West African countries. The colonial economic policy supported the importation of end-product because the British wanted an outlet for her own manufactured product in order to stave off declining domestic consumption, and falling rate of profit at home. The colonial economic policies did not lay a solid Africa formation industrial take-off

at independence, what some African countries needed was a deliberate policy designed to transform the colonial economic structure from external dependence towards an economy that is internally oriented. In other words, there have been significant measures to effectively challenge and alter the raw material export versus end-products import policy of the British colonialist, indicating that colonial economic policies are enjoying continuity, indeed, have been intensified in post-independence. The British did not meaningfully develop any sector, instead exploited countries. So far, Africa's reliance on the Western model of development is still dependent on external inputs, its cooperation with the highly industrial nations to achieve faster economic growth and development has been externally induced.

So, in the face of colonial derogation, the prime duty of African leaders is to restore Africa dignity and to show that African people did not hear about the culture for the first time from Europeans and their societies were not mindless, but frequently had a philosophy of great depth and value that they lost during the colonial period. Africans must look for ways and means for the restoration of humanity to African society through the recreation of pre-colonial social, political, and religious instructions.

### **References**

1. Aderibigbe, S (2006), *Basic Approach to Government*, Lagos: Joja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd.
2. Agagu, A.A (2004), "The Nigerian State and Development: A Theoretical and Empirical Exploitation" in Agagu, A.A and Ola, R.F (eds), *Development Agenda of the Nigerian State*, Ibadan; Fiag Nigeria Publishers.
3. Aghahowa, J.O and Ukpebor E.E.M (1999), "The British Colonial Economic Policies and Nigeria Underdevelopment", *The Nigerian Journal of Politics and Public Policy*, Vol 3, NO 1&2.
4. Aghalino, S. (1993), "*Isoko under Colonial Rule, 1896-1949*", Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University Ilorin.
5. Aghalino, S.O (2000), "British Colonial Policies and the Oil Palm Industry in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria, 1900-1960", *African Study Monographs*, Vol. 21, No 1, January

6. Ahazuem J.O and Falola, T (1987), "Production for the Metropolis: Agriculture and Forest Products", in Falola, T (ed.), *Britain and Nigeria. Exploitation or Development?* London: Zed Books.
7. Ake, C (2008), *A Political Economy of Africa*, Lagos: Longman Nigeria Plc.
8. Akorede, E.I (2010), "Colonial Experience in Africa: How it Affects the Formation of a United States of Africa", *International Journal of Issues on African Development*, Vol.2, N0
9. Akpan, N.E (2003), "Colonial Administration in Nigeria" in Osuntokun, A et al (eds) *Issues in Nigeria Government and Politics*, Ibadan: Rex Charles Publications.
10. Babawale, T (2007), *Nigeria in the Crisis of Governance and Development: A Retrospective and Prospective Analyses of Selected Issues and Events, Vol.2*, Lagos: Political and Administrative Resource Center (PARC).
11. Boateng, E.A (1978), *A Political Geography of Africa* <http://books.google.com>.
12. Brown, G (2009), Crisis, Colonial Failure, and Subaltern Suffering, *speech to joint session of U.S. Congress, March 4*,
13. Chikendu, P.N (2004), *Imperialism and Nationalism*, Enugu: Academic Publishing Company.
14. Chilivambo, A (1978), "On Rural Development: A Note on Malawis Programme of Development for Exploitation", *African Development*, Vol III, No 2.
15. Fadeyiye, J.O (2005), *A Social Studies Textbook for Colleges and Universities, Vol 2*, Ibadan: Akin- Johnson Press and Publishers.
16. Falola, T (2007), *History of Nigeria 3: Nigeria in the Twentieth Century*, Lagos: Longman.
17. Helleiner G.K (1981), "Peasant Agriculture, Government and Economic Growth in Nigeria" in Okwudiba, N (ed), *Path to Nigerian Development*. Dakar: Codesria