1   Introduction
Heritage Management in Colonial and Contemporary Africa

Derek R. Peterson

This book is about the work that the heritage industry does in African political life.[1] Like Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, we take heritage to be a form of cultural production in the present that has recourse to the past.[2] But unlike her, we argue that the products of heritage work do not always have the museum as their destination. In colonial and post-colonial Africa, the practices of museology – detachment, decontextualisation, display – helped to constitute and organise cultural and political life. Heritage work has had a uniquely wide currency in Africa. In colonial times, administrators organised tribal communities around a supposedly traditional order of law and custom. In the 1960s and 1970s, African politicians sought to build the nation by integrating disparate ethnicities, constituting the basis for unitary national cultures. Today, there is a booming market in heritage products of Africa, and entrepreneurs avidly pursue development by making medicine, art, music, clothing, and other articles into global commodities. A great variety of brokers outside the museum have been involved in the production of heritage. Their work was essential to the construction of regimes of governmentality. Linguists plucked words out of people's mouths, published grammar books and dictionaries, and gave material form to standardised print languages. Ethnographers chose rituals and life practices out of the whole fabric of human life, documented their logic, and created a textual architecture for African religion, kinship, and ethnicity. Administrators looked for the rules that guided human interaction, assembled codes and precedents, and created the infrastructure for customary law. Through these and other documentary practices the routines of human

[1] The author gratefully acknowledges comments offered by Andrew State, Neil Kodesh, and participants in the workshop 'Colonial Ruptures and the Politics of Knowledge', held in Ann Arbor in April 2012. Archival collections are abbreviated as follows: BDA: Bundibugyo District Archives; KasDA: Kasese District Archives; KabDA: Kabarole District Archives; Churchill: Churchill College archives, Cambridge; UNA: Uganda National Archives, Entebbe.
[2] Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998), 149.

1

life were lifted out of the dynamic real world, placed outside the reach of change and innovation, and rendered anachronistic at the moment of publication. Secure within the pages of the book, encoded in legal statutes, encased in glass display cases, the anachronisms produced by the human sciences became a resource for government administration, a library for traditionalists, and a marketable source of value for cultural entrepreneurs.

All of it was a work of fiction. Africa has always been a place of open frontiers, in which people could move relatively freely across an open terrain.[3] Cultures have always been dynamic and open; pre-colonial states were polyglot and diverse. Prior to the twentieth century, African political leaders did not possess the institutional architecture with which to close their frontiers and impose a monoculture on the disparate people they governed. The notion that any people – whether a tribe, a nation, or any other kind of community – had a settled past is necessarily a fallacy. Almost everyone was an immigrant. There are no purebreds. The diversity and dynamism of Africa's population history has made the work of heritage all the more tendentious. In Africa as elsewhere, heritage work is an act of consolidation, a means of taming cultural diversity and organising diverse rituals, behaviours, and objects into a regimented routine.

The Politics of Heritage in Africa aims to push the study of heritage work outside the domain of museum studies and explore the wider arenas where ideas about tradition, patrimony, and authenticity are debated and defined. The book draws together disparate fields of study to show how the lifeways of the past were made into capital, a store of authentic knowledge on which contemporary political actors could draw. All of the essays take an historical approach to their subject matter. Scholars in the field of museum studies too often orient their research towards the present day, offering prescriptive advice to curators and policy makers about how to reorganise displays and open up heritage sites. This volume, by contrast, explores the changing regimes through which knowledge about the African past was produced, edited, displayed, and made meaningful. The book sheds light on the variety of sites in which this work of editing took place: in linguistics (Irvine and Dakubu); in music (Nii-Dortey); in architecture (Gavua, Silverman); in the building of monuments (Minkley and Mnyaka, Witz and Murray); in poetry (Buthelezi); in cemeteries and laboratories (Rassool). And it brings into view the cultural workers who were involved in the making of African heritage. Here we meet Felicia Obuobie, who conceived a memorial garden for Martin Luther King Jr in the remote Ghanaian town of Manso; Bongani Mgijima, who launched

---

[3] John Iliffe, *Africans: The History of a Continent* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); see also Paul Landau, *Popular Politics in the History of South Africa, 1400 to 1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

an unlikely museum in a disused workers' hostel in Lwandle, in the Western Cape; Sakhile Nxumalo, whose efforts to create a 'Zwide Heritage Day' challenge the coherence of the Zulu ethnic community; and Saka Acquaye, who composed folk operas that linked Ghanaians together in a Nkrumaist vision of national solidarity. Taken together, these chapters show heritage to be a mode of political organisation, a means by which the relics of the past are shored up, reconstructed, and revalued, as commodities, as tradition, as morality, or as a patrimony.

The book grows out of a series of academic exchanges joining scholars at the University of Michigan with colleagues based in the universities of Ghana and South Africa. Over the course of several years – beginning with a workshop on digital records management at Rhodes University, passing through a major conference in Accra, and culminating in a consultation at the University of the Witwatersrand in 2011 – the contributors have been engaged in a comparative conversation about their work. The geographical focus is both exclusive and productive. There are good reasons to study Ghana and South Africa alongside each other. Ghana was the first of Britain's African colonies to claim its political independence; South Africa is the African state that has most recently achieved majority governance. Ghana's first President, Kwame Nkrumah, was an enthusiastic builder of national culture; likewise, South Africa's ruling African National Congress has been remaking its history of struggle into a curriculum for national heritage. Ghana is today a leading destination for African-American tourists, and Ghanaian culture brokers have been active in marketing the historical architecture of the slave trade for the international market. South Africa's entrepreneurs have sought to make history marketable by revaluing the landscape of apartheid's abuses into sites of tourism. By placing Ghana and South Africa alongside each other, we can open up comparisons that productively illuminate the more generalised dynamics of the heritage economy.

This introductory chapter chronicles the history of heritage work in Africa. An historical approach is essential, for it was under colonial governance that both the physical infrastructure and the political rationale for many heritage projects were established. In the early twentieth century colonial states set out to order Africa, developing museum collections, conducting ethnography, and sponsoring linguistic research that uncovered the foundations of Africa's cultural life. Their work made anachronism into a source of authority, herding Africans, both intellectually and politically, into out-of-date regimes. The second section focuses on the work of heritage in independent Africa, showing how sovereign states remade the architecture of colonial governance by rebuilding the museum infrastructure. The chapter ends by reflecting on the dynamics of heritage in contemporary Africa, focusing on the career of the National Resistance Movement government in Uganda. In Uganda as elsewhere

in contemporary Africa, the past is a source of marketable value, and
an array of entrepreneurs – traditional doctors, chiefs, jewellery makers,
philanthropists – are producing heritage commodities. The incorpora-
tion of African cultural production is a welcome source of revenue, but
it also encourages monopolist practices. There has been a recrudescence
of the out-of-date and the anachronistic: new kingdoms are being cre-
ated, long-forgotten royalist ceremonies are being rehearsed, crowns are
being polished. The contemporary heritage economy has encouraged the
recreation of profoundly unequal, exclusive government arrangements,
giving kings, princes, and other relics a central place in the marketing of
history. In this way the heritage economy poses a substantial challenge
to the liberal promises of democracy.

Museum Cultures in Colonial Africa

The term 'cultural imperialism' appears to have entered analytical
nomenclature in the 1960s.[4] At a time when newly independent African
states were establishing the foundations for a sovereign political order,
'cultural imperialism' gave radical intellectuals a lexicon by which to
define language, religion, and art as fields of struggle. 'Every colonised
people – in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex
has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality –
finds itself face to face with the language of the civilising nation; that is,
with the culture of the mother country,' wrote Frantz Fanon in 1967.[5]
It was the task of the artist, the novelist, the educator and the musician
to 'decolonise the mind', to decouple contemporary life from European
influences, to reconnect African culture with the taproot authenticity
of the vernacular, the language of the people.[6] The logic of political
independence was imported into the field of cultural production, and
African artists, musicians, and writers were given a particular vocation:
the recovery of a sovereign way of life.

In fact colonial governance was creative, not only destructive, of
African cultural systems. Colonial states in Africa were ethnographic
states.[7] They valorised African languages, cultures, and institutions, gave
them a solid form, put them on the page, so as to make them the grounds
of governance. Museums were part of the infrastructure through which

---

[4] John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism* (London: Continuum, 1991), 2–3; see Ryan
Dunch, 'Beyond Cultural Imperialism: Cultural Theory, Christian Missions, and Global
Modernity', *History and Theory* 41, 3 (October 2002): 301–25.

[5] Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* (New York, NY: Grove, 1967 [1952]), 18.

[6] Argued particularly in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language
in African Literature* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Educational Publishers, 1981).

[7] See Nicholas Dirks, *Castes of Mind: Colonialism and the Making of Modern India* (Prince-
ton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), Part Three.

missionaries and other agents of colonialism ordered Africa.[8] The eth-
nological section at the Uganda Museum originated from the British
governor's 1908 order that administrative officers should send in 'curios
of all descriptions such as articles of local interest, specimens of native
weapons and manufactures, and local products, vegetable and mineral:
in fact all articles of historical, ethnological and industrial interest'.[9] For
colonial officers, museumisation was a useful way of placing conten-
tious or dangerous objects out of the public domain. On 10 July 1954,
the police searched the home of the old woman Magoba, in north-west
Uganda, and confiscated five objects that were said to have been used
for witchcraft. The objects – a string with cowrie shells, two headbands,
a piece of barkcloth – were handed on to the Uganda Museum. They
were given numbers E54.58 through E54.62 in the catalogue.[10] Dozens
of objects similarly came into the Museum's collection through the oper-
ation of the courts, since the law obliged judges to 'order the confiscation
and destruction of any article brought before [the court] . . . which the
court is satisfied was or might have been used in the commission of
[witchcraft]'.[11] Other objects came into the Uganda Museum's collec-
tions through military force. In 1963 the Museum was given a collection
of artefacts from the mountains of western Uganda – two drums, three
spears, flutes, and other articles – by a captain in the police Special Force
Unit.[12] He and his men had been fighting to put down a rebellion that
people in the mountains had mounted against the Uganda government.
Museum collections are the physical remains of practices, institutions,
movements, and ideologies that were conquered and dismembered, as
governments established their rule over Africa's peoples. Human bodies
were similarly disincorporated. In this volume Ciraj Rassool reminds us
about the gruesome work by which the collections of physical anthro-
pology museums were constituted. Most famously, the body of Sara
Baartman, the 'Hottentot Venus', was upon her demise placed in the
Museum of Natural History in Paris, where Georges Cuvier and his
students dissected it.[13] A host of other African bodies were likewise
dismembered, pickled, placed in barrels, and shipped off to museums,
where they became evidence in the enterprise of racial science (Rassool,
this volume).

[8] See Helen Tilley (ed.), *Ordering Africa: Anthropology, European Imperialism, and the
Politics of Knowledge* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2007).
[9] Quoted in Valerie Vowles, 'Uganda in the Fifties', *Newsletter (Museum Ethnographers
Group)* 12 (October 1981).
[10] Uganda Museum archives, 'Ethnography, 1948–58' catalogue: objects E54.58–E54.62.
[11] UNA CSO Box 105/18373: Uganda Protectorate, 'The Witchcraft Ordinance', 1957.
[12] Uganda Museum archives, 'Ethnography 1958–64' catalogue: objects E63.111–
E63.119.
[13] Clifton Crais and Pamela Scully, *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus: A Ghost Story
and a Biography* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

The objects that were assembled in ethnographic exhibitions were not, in their conception, destined for the museum. In Africa as elsewhere, museum collections were constituted out of a process of detachment, of dismemberment, as the remains of human and political bodies were pruned, requisitioned, and put on display.[14] In 1919 British officials in southern Uganda managed to kill Ndochibiri, a spirit medium and leader of a long-running rebellion against colonial government. They cut off his distinctive two-fingered hand, dried it, and displayed it for public examination on the District Commissioner's porch. His head was cut off and sent to the British Museum.[15] Other potentially subversive objects were similarly taken out of circulation. The drum Nyakahoza was the voice of the ruling dynasty of Kinkiizi (in southern Uganda). It was an active agent in Kinkiizi's political life: people made offerings to it during times of drought, asking the drum to bring rain on their fields.[16] In the late 1930s two sons of the king converted to Christianity, and they handed the drum to a British missionary as evidence of their sincerity. The missionary deposited it in the Uganda Museum.[17] For the missionary as for the District Commissioner, the museum worked in the service of government. In its halls dangerous objects were stripped of their upsetting powers and naturalised, transformed into subjects of scholarly study and aesthetic admiration. The Uganda Museum opened its ethnography gallery in 1954. The catalogue illuminates the logic that guided the exhibition. Entitled *Tribal Crafts of Uganda*, it categorised objects according to their material form: there were chapters on 'Basketry', on 'Gourd Vessels', and on 'Pottery'. Drums were dealt with in a chapter on 'membranophones'.[18] For the museum's curators, drums were material objects, instruments with which to make music. The political voice of the drum – its coordinating resonance, its power to summon people and punctuate their movements – was rendered inaudible.[19] In the museum, drums became objects of ethnography.

14 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, *Destination Culture*, Ch. 1.
15 Yohana Ssebalija, 'Memories of Rukiga and Other Places', in Donald Denoon (ed.), *A History of Kigezi in South-West Uganda* (Kampala: The National Trust, 1972), 195; Rhodes House archive Mss. Afr. s. 1384: J. E. T. Philipps, 'The Nabingi: A Mandwa Secret Society' (typescript, July 1919).
16 Described in Paulo Ngologoza, *Kigezi and Its People* (Kampala: Fountain, 1998 [1967]), 30.
17 H. Ahurwendeire, 'Some aspects of the history of Kinkiizi' (BA thesis, Makerere University, 1973).
18 Margaret Trowell and K. P. Wachsmann, *Tribal Crafts of Uganda* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953).
19 For drums and political coordination in eastern Africa, see Steven Feierman, 'On Socially Composed Knowledge: Reconstructing a Shambaa Royal Ritual', in Gregory H. Maddox and James L. Giblin (eds), *In Search of a Nation: Histories of Authority and Dissidence in Tanzania* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2005), 14–32.

The museum was only one among several institutions in which Africans' bodies, cultures, languages, and institutions were dismembered and reincorporated as museum pieces. Indirect rule – by which government employed African chiefs, kings, and sultans as lower-level functionaries – was an engine for the production of heritage discourse. It made the arts of antiquity central to the *realpolitik* of governance. British officials buttressed the legal authority of their African intermediaries by codifying apparently ancient traditions, and African intermediaries, in turn, lent themselves authenticity by emphasising the antique character of their institutions. The kingdom of Toro, for example, was an administrative convenience for the British government of colonial Uganda. It had been constituted in the late nineteenth century by the British conquistadores who established the colony.[20] But by the mid-twentieth century the kingdom's elites were avidly identifying themselves as legatees of an ancient civilisation. 'The word LOCAL GOVERNMENT for Toro Government should not be applied,' wrote the kingdom's prime minister. 'The History of this country is one of a Kingdom about 2,000 years old.'[21] Royalists laid on an impressive pageant when a British lawyer visited the court. 'No one stands in the presence of his sovereign,' the lawyer reported. 'There is a court Jester who welcomes visitors by leaping about with a spear, and both sunrise and sunset are heralded with the beating of drums.'[22] Toro's leaders urged that their king should be given four motorcyclists, a white-uniformed chauffeur, and a brass band, all clad in blue, to accompany him during state functions. By these means they sought to protect the 'dignity and conventional prerogatives' of Toro's throne.[23] Royalist pageantry gave Toro elites means to contrast their kingdom's order with the uncivil, disordered politics of their neighbours. 'All districts without a king should be persuaded to elect a hereditary king from among their noble families,' argued Toro politicians. 'The Kikuyu people have no hereditary king. . . . If they had kings there would have been no Mau Mau.'[24] Toro elites were not antiquarians. In archaic rituals, with brass bands and chauffeurs, they established their kingdom's preeminent place in history. By their strategic ornamentalism Toro elites made their kingdom worthy of respect in the colonial theatre.

The discourse and practice of colonial governance prized the archaic and the out-of-date as the foundation of authentic African tradition. The

---

[20] See Edward Steinhart, *Conflict and Collaboration in the Kingdoms of Western Uganda* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1977).

[21] KabDA Box 122, 'Petitions, Complaints and Enquiries' file: H. Nkojo to Governor, 20 August 1953.

[22] Churchill DGFT 5/8: Dingle Foot, editorial letter, 30 July 1956.

[23] KabDA Box 145, 'Relationship with Rulers in Agreement Countries' file: J. Babiiha to Katikiros of Toro, Bunyoro and Ankole, 19 July 1958. The District Commissioner marked this memorandum with the annotation 'Good God!'

[24] Churchill DGFT 5/8: 'Kingdom of Toro, Revised Proposals', n.d. (1956).

enterprise of inventorying, codifying, or inventing traditions was carried out in a number of registers. In linguistics, missionaries and African converts searched out archaic phrases to translate Christian concepts into vernacular languages. African languages were – like all languages – dynamic, full of irregular syntax and loan words. There was much that could not be put into words (Yankah, this volume). Competent speakers had to be creative: they used circumlocution, loan words, and other artifices to avoid bringing controversial or divisive events into discourse. Bible translators regarded loan words and other innovations as corruptions of the authentic vernacular. In their word lists and grammar books, the linguists who first documented African languages sought to uncover the taproots of Africans' intellectual culture, in order to yoke Christian ideas with the basic concepts of African cosmology (Irvine, this volume).[25] In the papers of the Scots missionary who translated the Old Testament into Kenya's Gikuyu language there are dozens of pages titled 'Modernisms' or 'Foreign Words of Comparative Recent Introduction', listing words and phrases that had been imported into the vernacular from English or Swahili.[26] Linguists sought to roll back the clock and compose vernacular texts with anachronistic vocabulary.

Like the linguists, moral reformers looked to uncover the antique foundations of contemporary cultural systems. The mid-twentieth century saw the publication of dozens of history books, written in vernacular languages, that documented the history of the Asante, the Gogo, the Zulu, and other groups. This corpus of homespun history was animated by the need to conserve customary morality against the debilitating threat of amnesia.[27] 'People who have no respect for their society's customs and practices . . . are scattered all over the earth, and people refer to them as *jodak* [vagrants],' wrote Chief Paul Mboya in his 1938 study of Luo culture.[28] One researcher claimed to have traced the history of the Luo people 'as far back as 9,000 BC or thereabout'.[29] In Luo country as elsewhere in colonial Africa, patriotic historians filled volumes with proverbs, folk stories, and legal codes. By this means they sought to protect their people against the rootlessness of ignorance. Historical preservation

---

[25] Paul Landau, ' "Religion" and Christian Conversion in African History: A New Model', *Journal of Religious History* 23, 1 (February 1999): 8–30.

[26] Edinburgh University Library 1785/7: 'Foreign Words of comparatively recent introduction now in use among the Kikuyu', n.d., and 1786/6: 'Modernisms, ndaari na ma tene', n.d.

[27] See Derek R. Peterson and Giacomo Macola, 'Homespun History and the Academic Profession', in Peterson and Macola (eds), *Recasting the Past: History Writing and Political Work in Modern Africa* (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2009).

[28] Paul Mboya, *Luo Kitgi gi Timbegi* (Kisumu: Anyange Press, 1983 [1938]). For a translation, see Jane Achieng, *Paul Mboya's* Luo Kitgi gi Timbegi (Kisumu: Atai Joint, 2001).

[29] The book in question was J. Okinda's *History mar Luo*, described in Kenya National Archives, Kakamega Regional Depot, file NE 9/9: Director of the East African Literature Bureau to Senior Education Officer, Kakamega, 20 February 1951.

helped to buttress the cause of moral reform by giving conservatives a means to contrast the corruptions of the present with the virtues of the past.[30]

The system of apartheid in South Africa was but one expression of this more general valuation of the archaic. The architect of indirect rule in Natal, Theophilus Shepstone, looked to the Zulu state established under Shaka's regime as a model for colonial governance. He surrounded himself with the artefacts and emblems of Zulu royalty – Shepstone had his own snuff-box bearer – and organised local government institutions after Shaka's example.[31] As Mbongiseni Buthelezi reminds us in this volume, the 'Zulu' – like other South African 'native' people – were actually a diverse, polyglot polity, not a coherent cultural unit.[32] But South Africa's heritage industry had no time for nuance. From the 1913 passage of the Native Land Act up through the late twentieth century, millions of Africans were removed from their homes and settled in reserves, called 'homelands', on the basis of their ethnic identity. Ten homelands were established and, eventually, given a nominal political independence. South Africa's tourist industry borrowed the language of separate development, making the archaic into a marketing strategy. The South African Tourism Board – established in 1947 – encouraged tourists to visit 'picturesque Bantu-lands where customs and tribal rites are still practised according to ancient traditions'.[33] A series of cultural villages were established, where visitors were allowed to witness distinctive tribal ceremonies and participate in a daily routine of rituals and ceremonies.

A large and variegated ensemble of entrepreneurs – linguists, moral reformers, missionaries, chiefs and elders, colonial administrators, tour guides – were involved in the invention of tradition in colonial Africa. None of them could adopt a dispassionate view of the past. All of them were preservationists, vigorously defending ways of life that they thought to be endangered by the debilitating passage of time. All of them were conservatives, working to uphold standards of order against the tides of change. All of them regarded culture as a source of moral instruction and a ground for political solidarity. Where did the museum stop and real life

[30] Derek R. Peterson, *Ethnic Patriotism and the East African Revival: A History of Dissent, ca. 1935–1972* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).

[31] Carolyn Hamilton, *Terrific Majesty: The Powers of Shaka Zulu and the Limits of Historical Invention* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); and Thomas McClendon, *White Chief, Black Lords: Shepstone and the Colonial State in Natal, South Africa, 1845–1878* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2010).

[32] See Michael Mahoney, *The Other Zulus: The Spread of Zulu Ethnicity in Colonial South Africa* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012).

[33] *The CVR Tourist Guide to South Africa, 1966–67* (Johannesburg: C. van Rensburg Publications, 1966); quoted in Leslie Witz, 'Transforming Museums on Postapartheid Tourist Routes', in Ivan Karp, Corrine A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja, and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (eds), *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007), 113.

begin? The outmoded, the dead, and the defunct were the foundation of colonial order.

But there were always other lives for the objects of ethnography to live. The drum Nyakahoza was given to missionary Leonard Sharp by its keepers in the late 1930s (above). Sharp had the drum displayed at a local church as evidence of their conversion, then took it to the Uganda Museum. Forty years later, an old man named Baryaruha described the drum's awful revenge in an interview with a Makerere undergraduate.[34] One of the men who had given the drum to the missionary was possessed by a spirit; as he died he cried aloud that Nyakahoza was killing him. Another of the drum keepers was involved in a bicycle accident, and his leg was made lame by his injuries. Baryaruha was reminding his young interviewer that the museum effect had limits, that drums had powers that could not be contained in a glass display case or chronicled in ethnomusicology.

Heritage and Nation Building

The ethnographic order of colonialism was subjected to challenge in the 1960s, during the decade of African independence. In 1964, the only African leaders who did not avowedly embrace socialism were Haile Selassie of Ethiopia, Léon Mba of Gabon, and William Tubman of Liberia.[35] Between the 1950s and the 1980s, no fewer than 35 of 53 African countries declared themselves to be socialist.[36] Their ways of being socialist varied widely: Jomo Kenyatta's regime, which espoused 'African Socialism', actually pursued a decidedly capitalist economic policy; while in Tanzania and Mozambique socialist regimes removed urban dwellers to rural villages and promoted collectivised agriculture as an antidote to capitalism. Regardless of the nature of their commitment, the rhetoric of national governance was Marxist. Fenner Brockway, the famously leftist intellectual of the Labour Party in Britain, once called Africa 'the most comprehensively revolutionary continent', since 'every politically alert African nationalist regards himself as a socialist'.[37]

Africa's authorities thought it their task to free their people from local inequalities and promote an egalitarian society. Nationalists saw tribalism as the leading impediment to unity, and they used the power of the

---

[34] Ahurwendeire, 'History of Kinkiizi'.

[35] Kenneth W. Grundy, 'Mali: The Prospects of Planned Socialism', in William H. Friedland and Carl G. Rosberg, Jr (eds), *African Socialism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1964); cited in Gregory Mann, 'One Party, Several Socialisms: Mali's US-RDA' (African Studies Association annual meeting, 2012).

[36] M. Anne Pitcher and Kelly Askew, 'African Socialisms and Postsocialisms', *Africa: Journal of the International African Institute* 76, 1 (2006): 1–2.

[37] Cited in Joshua Muravchik, *Heaven on Earth: The Rise and Fall of Socialism* (San Francisco, CA: Encounter Books, 2002), 199.