

**FOUNDATIONS OF AFRICAN PERCEPTIONS
ON SECURITY AND VIOLENCE.
OVERLAPPING THE NEED FOR PEACE WITH
THE NARRATIVES OF STRUGGLE,
A SAFE WAY OR AN AFRICAN WAY?**

Diana Sfetlana Stoica*

DOI: 10.24193/subbeuropaea.2023.2.05

Published Online: 2023-12-30

Published Print: 2023-12-30

Abstract

Would western defined security be an African security and would this reproduce, or develop, from indigenous African ontologies, so that African understanding of security and violence could actually bestow to the global peacekeeping actions?

Considering this research question, focused on the understanding of security and violence in an African postcolonial and maybe de-colonial taxonomy, the present paper invites to reflect on the evolution of the concepts of security and violence in African scholarships, their connections with the sustainable African social development narratives that seem to monopolize the space of debates in African Studies. Moreover, the intentions are to explore the disruptions between the need for peace and the narratives of struggle in the context of a critical resistance to the global connecting and disconnecting biases that define the conceptual "security" and "violence".

This content analysis and critical look on the becoming of the term of violence, at the base of a typical evolution of the term security, in African literature or African focused debates, might contribute to defining that security and violence are floating terms, their understanding in an African taxonomy should be Africanized, being highlighted that

* Diana Sfetlana Stoica, PhD, is an associate lecturer at the West University of Timisoara. Diana Sfetlana does research in Qualitative and Multi-method research in African Studies, Development Narratives, Decolonization, Mobility, Global South Narratives, Identity in Politics, Postcolonialism, Power Relations and Image in Tourism and Aviation, Race, Cosmopolitanism, and Power Narratives.

Email: diana.stoica80@e-uvt.ro

security includes violence as inner boosting element, that allows for the two to be in a strange relationship, recalling for attentive consideration and critics on the application of Western inspired peacekeeping actions that do not take into account specific conditions such as territory and culture.

Keywords: *violence, security, (de) coloniality, resistance, signifier*

INTRODUCTION

The questions and objectives of research that have given light to this paper track around the hermeneutics of security and violence in an African repository, linked to development, decolonization and power relations at the international level, in an African perspective. The key idea expressed by Serequeberhan, in commenting Kant, that «it has to be maintained that it is the “weak” and not the “powerful” that can possibly serve as a “fulcrum” for “a federation of free states.” In the manner of the six-inch-tall Lilliputians, these states have to be able to overpower the Gulliver nations that dominate the international scene and threaten collective security.»(Serequeberhan, 2015, p. 68), is a starting point for this analysis.

It is the expression of disruptions on imagining security, lastly defining violence, in a manner that trascedes Western thinking and it is affirmed by new debates and narratives of African Philosophy recognition, African Self-reognition, sustainable African development, as well as new social change, opposed but linked to resistance, and, when all il told, the violence. More than analyzing an eventual evolution of the concepts of security and violence in African scholarships, this analysis proposes to use the perceptions of a two staged exploration on the central concepts (the possible perception in African narratives read in a frame of European perception on it).

Through qualitative research the central objective would be to explore the disruptions between the need for peace or collective security and the narratives of struggle in the context of a critical resistance to the global connecting and disconnecting biases that define the conceptual “security” and “violence”. In this context, wondering on the possible existence of differences in the way concepts are understood, interiorized and applied, is a pertinent act of the social sciences and philosophy. Since global power balance is put into question when talking about perceptions on security and violence, the perspective proposed herein is an alternative to the analysis of discourses carried in the sphere of knowledge production in Sub-Saharan Africa, in the context of de-coloniality.

Therefore, the question boosting the present reflection is “Would western defined security be an African security and would this reproduce, or develop, from indigenous ontologies, so that African understanding of security and violence could actually bestow to the global peacekeeping actions?”

This is rather a challenge to follow narratives of African development by own means, focusing on colonial power relations and decolonization, which, in line with Cabralism would include armed, economic and political resistance (Cabral, 2016, p. 43), with the expected result to unpack, deconstruct and compare the meanings of “security” and “violence”, in order to bring a small contribution to the agenda of those who are able to create ideas and put in act peacekeeping actions that would be able to capitalize creatively these concepts, their interdependency and the results of their interactions in the perception of nationals who might not consider positive some peacekeeping actions exercised from outside their nation, region or more, their epistemic sphere.

As a phenomenon ranging on a terrain of “myths of independence and illusions of freedom” (Ndlovu Gatsheni, 2013, p. 4), decolonization is used to mark the delimitations between coloniality to which concepts herein will be linked, and (de) coloniality as the expected turn of the decolonial, presuming the aim of ex-colonies, or generally states from the Global South and the Third World to achieve the real liberation from the global colonialism and consequently the global coloniality, as matrixes of colonial power. In the context of decolonization, which, according to Abdelkhabir Khatibi did not bring the decolonization of thought (Spurr, 1993, p. 200), which was sustained by many African thinkers, including Wa Thiong’O (1981), the meanings of “violence” and “security” are analyzed on a scale of various meanings related to the contestation of the colonial power, ranging from the resistance to Western Thinking or Global North epistemology, from a distinguished, distinguishable or less Global South epistemology, up to the narratives of African becoming as a new social change. “Security” would be seen as global narrative, interiorized, and “violence” a weapon to prevent the dissolution of such narrative or, on the contrary to contribute to its deconstruction.

In order to simplify the theoretical frame of the reflection, decoloniality will be considered the matrix on which comparison of “security” and “violence” would be unpacked, taking into account all features of the decoloniality that express, include, or imprint the evolution to which and ever of the meanings given to the two concepts in African narratives from published books, papers and even discourses susceptible of a large circulation in the social

media. Practically, the analysis contains a qualitative exploration of ideas expressed by philosophers, historians and analysts of African contexts.

According to definitions and observations of Everisto Benyera on the distinctions between coloniality and decoloniality, this analysis will link the central notions to coloniality as “continued presence of a sophisticated power matrix” on one side and decoloniality, which argues that the colonial state became indigenised in order to survive (Benyera, 2020, p. 30), on the other side. However, decoloniality in the present analysis will be intended as a potential or ideal contestation of the essence colonial power relations themselves, presuming the process of indigenization would have caused the overcoming of fears, insecurities, resentments that colonial rule induced on colonized people. When used (de) coloniality in the text, the necessity to distinguish, at a later moment, whether coloniality or decoloniality has to be the subject to value for the respective aspect, is reflected.

VIOLENCE AND SECURITY AS SIGNIFIERS TO (DE)COLONIALITY

Various and often redundant scholarships have concentrated on violence, the meanings, types and relations of it with the knowledge production, and ultimately the (de)coloniality. But, it was less expressed how security evolves in the narrative of (de)coloniality, in correlation with violence.

Moreover, violence was often looked as action, event or process, while the third meaning, that of process, was considered in regards to colonial order, violence being one pillar of colonialism (Mbembe, 2001, p.13). Due to this ramified look from “security” and “violence” to colonialism and finally decoloniality, passing through perceptions and discourses that form the categories of knowledge production, the present analysis has to be necessarily poststructuralist, in the sense that it was given by Michel Foucault when referring to the avoidance of cultural category totalities (2002, (17)). Departing from “violence”, its meanings are taken away from predefined structures and also from its proximal type – the process – in order to construct for it an event-process historical frame, in relation to which “security” is its result, as much as its cause. However, the semiotic look would be a first step of this analysis.

Regarded separately, security and violence could be signifiers to (de) coloniality.

In Umberto Eco's interpretation of the ways Hippocrates considered the term of sign, that would stand between the signified and the signifier, precisely as being less neutral than the symbol as token or "identification mark" (Eco, 1986, p.27), the content analyzed herein is defined by the presence of a "chain of signifiers", "that ultimately dissolve into the discourse as an activity", consisting of continuous producing of signifiers through interpretative processes (Eco, 1986, p. 24). For this reason, and considering Eco's intention to develop a discourse on signifiers departing from Jacques Lacan, it is fundamental to link this activity of dissolution of signifiers in the discourse, to the necessary consideration of the relationship between discourse and history as interpreted by Lacan in Platon's Symposium, in 1991, not as situated-ness but as "how history itself arises from a certain way that discourse enters into reality" (Scalambrino, 2015, p. 78).

This brief overview on the semiotics linked to the idea that "security" and "violence" could be seen as signifiers to (de) coloniality is relevant in order to consider, for the first stage of the analysis, why these two concepts are linked to (de) coloniality, in a network of signifiers, but also to show that discourse of violence and discourse of security at the moment they enter into the reality, are necessarily historical, on one hand. On the other hand, talking about coloniality and the idea of dissolution in discourse as activity, and the idea of process capitalized by Umberto Eco, introduces the preference to consider violence as an event-process and not only an event or a process, on the contrary to security, which is no event and no process, linked to violence in the frame of coloniality and decoloniality in ways that will be detailed in the followings.

VIOLENCE AND SECURITY, COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS ON THEIR FEATURES OF COLONIALITY

The choice was to explore the links of "violence" and "security" with coloniality (proximal type for the decoloniality), and not colonialism, colonial order, or any form of mediation postcoloniality, or Western style of the periphery (Appiah, 1991, p. 348), as the meanings given, perceptions and opinions expressed in African repository in reference to them are regarded under the three categories of coloniality such as the coloniality of power, of knowledge and of being (Ndlovu Gatsheni, 2013, p. 7). Coloniality is shaped by Global South's thinkers like Quijano, Grosfoguel or Maldonado Torres, as underpinning the relations of power still existent in the Western perception

on the capitalist world, trying to construct a de-colonial thinking, according to Ndlovu Gatsheni (2013), or delimitating a space of understanding of “global power imbalances between the Africans and Europeans” (Ndlovu Gathseni, 2013, p. 12).

Notwithstanding this intentional delimitation of space that is highlighted in African repository and that will obviously guide this analysis, the coloniality is also expressed by its *modus operandi* through institutionalization of all spheres of life (Benyera, 2020, p. 29), being a product of the colonialism, seen to have imposed Western modernity with violence, having limited the possibilities of the “Other” to create and manage its own perspective on the reality (Nyere, 2020, p. 124).

In consideration of these meanings of coloniality, approaching all fields and being included in all Global South narratives, Benyera’s institutionalization caused by coloniality itself, might reveal the nature of the relationship of perpetual re-signification between violence, security and coloniality (with its specific difference of de-coloniality), in a correlation between new emerging security ideologies and mechanisms for the calculation of the protection, that turned to be the currency of citizenship (Mbembe, 2017, p. 22). A currency that was not available for everybody, at every time or in the same way, under colonial rule, due to net divisions between citizen and subject in Africa, already commented in 1946 by Mahmood Mamdani (1996, p. 48).

The “not-for-all” security or protection is still linked, in the perception tributary to coloniality, to the categorizations as race, human / non-human narratives, that causes the reaction, as positive violence against coloniality, seen that reaction itself regards a “cleansing and epistemological revolution” ongoing and continuous, with meanings as interpreted by Edward Said, developing on the words of Franz Fanon (Ahluwalia, 2001, p. 48), revolution which could not exist in case coloniality would be denied. Paradoxically violence as reaction appears as positive although it is linked to coloniality whose existence it can’t deny, meanwhile security, was, from the beginning, a privilege, as marked by Mamdani in the example of individually paid state security staff for the protection of the properties and indirectly food and livelihoods (Mamdani, 1996, p. 206).

Many references to violence in a colonial context and explicitly in an African repository were highly rating violence as intertwined with the necessity of resistance, inspired by George Sorel’s “smashing of the authority” (Mbembe, 2019, p. 22) or Franz Fanon’s decolonization as political event (Mbembe, 2019,

p. 6), as well as by Amilcar Cabral's considerations on violence as representing the politics of imperialism (Lovejoy & Falola, 2003, p. 37). Violence, seen per extension to its political value, could, therefore, seem feature of coloniality and decoloniality as well, or represent the past, present and future of any order, as it is always in act.

On the contrary, references to security are subtle and implied, a critical stance of the demander in reference to aims of peace, safety, harmony and development expected or defended, in a Western, Euro-American world or perspective (Slater, 2004, p. 39, 66).

In the narrative of resistance, violence might be that signifier that produces another signifier, namely security, for the signified coloniality, if applying the semiotic lens proposed. But, security is a narrative whose abuse in the rhetoric would boost violence, in terms of Western „invasiveness, penetration and intervention" (Slater, 2004, p. 26), and other political strategies called by Nkrumah as strategies to cement the West's position of influence on independent African states (Langan, 2018, p. 17); or, like commented by Achille Mbembe in reference to the limitation of movement and identity of individuals for security reasons (Mbembe, 2017, p. 24) or the regime of confinement (Mbembe, 2017, p. 177) for a security aim, which finally produces violence. In the meantime, narratives of security returned to have an autochthonous face meaning violence, in the case of regime security overlapped on human security, in the postcolonial state (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p. 86).

On the other hand, in the African dialectics, the act of resistance is, in the first instance, an opposition, causing narratives of opposition, through critics or through disregard of old power-knowledge relations, being reflected as decolonization, in the form of postcolonial critique or the fortification of a critical community (Langenbacher & Shain, 2010). In terms of violence expressed by this critical resistance, security is searched for, but also deconstructed, since acquiring consciousness on being on the same side or on different sides of the same barricade, would mean the dissolution of the security as a non valid narrative or irreconcilable narrative. Translated into the realities of the postcolonial state, it is the case reminded by Achille Mbembe when talking about a sort of „tonton macoutization" in some African states in a postcolonial context, when the pre-existent lack of discipline leads to bridges between soldiery and the world of crime, or the law and order operations are mixed with violent administrative coercion (Mbembe, 2001, p. 83), deepening the sense of lack of security of populations.

In the African literature, there are numerous citations of authors like Franz Fanon, Amílcar Cabral, Aimé Césaire who represent the resistance in both action type (for example, the war of Algeria) and epistemic liberation, but who pleaded for the “return to the source” (Cabral, 1978), „restitution” – the term used by Franz Fanon to express the invention of the own liberation (Mbembe, 2017, p. 169) and the actual reinvention or regain of the self-hood (Ahluwalia, 2001, p. 40), as social change and, as Achille Mbembe called it, progress of the manity (Mbembe, 2017,p.182). Therefore, violence appears as having been regarded also with condescendency, while interrogations on the ethical face of it were flourishing.

As for security, being ethical because of being a narrative expressing an aim of the humanity, customary right and informal settlement (Theodory, 2018, p. 170), a good, intended as feature of the life (Mbembe, 2001, p. 46) and a need highlighted by the paradigm of Western states whose security need not to be threaten (Langan, 2018, p. 167), or the need to protect oneself against the Other / the refugees (Onoma, 2013, p. 40), or an interest (Mude, 2020, p. 87), interrogations linked to ethics could hardly be started without taking into account the position of the speaker. Perceptions on the security that was imposed by military domination, like in the case of the Fulani people in Nigeria, were illustrating that security is not ethical on both sides, it is not an entirely humanity respectful aim, not even a right, good or need for those who do not see in that security other than an imposition/

For this motivation, security is contextual, and eventual (or evenimental), although, on the contrary to violence, security as narrative and extraterritorial (Slater, 2004, p.17) would tend to blend power relations of coloniality and refer to a global interest to security and moreover, to the negation of power relations in the intend to maintain an equilibrium called peace. Mark Langan notes the security-driven approaches to Africa, by western states that considered moral to assist developing countries manage their security threats (Langan, 2018, p. 152).

It is important to reveal that development, seen as the transformation that took inevitably place after the materialization of violence, a conflict, a resistance, was used strategically, along with security, in the discourse of African political classes, especially in Francophone African states, in order to justify French patronage networks (Langan, 2018, p. 160). Recalling on the indigenization pertaining to decoloniality, and ideas on inevitable transformations at Marx, Engels and Hegel, also (Peet, 2006, pp. 166-171), as

well as in the various analysis that explored the main capacity of the states to sustain violence, as resistance and opposition, or as the management of the conflict (Woodhouse, 2006, pp. 78-79), the notion of „security“ tends to lose previous features and be modelled in the context of authoritarian regimes.

From a different perspective, according to western narratives that practically gave the definition to the term development, development includes security, and since a developed society was wrongly defined as secure in the same western perspective, that tried to colonize other spaces of knowledge production, security appears as a western constructed term, almost equivalent to a transformation after violence as in the case of development.

Hence, while violence is creative, in the ways also Franz Fanon saw it (Mbembe, 2019), security is destructive of the creative process, locking it on the need to produce a certain result, from a certain perspective. There is no previous consciousness on the actual result of the resistance act of violence, or the types of security referred to, or the entity of the beneficiaries, prior to creating a transformation through violence, and that is why security is seen more as an event, or an event-result (it is known to be a result, but not a necessary one). Kwame Nkrumah saw in security an event, highlighting the African regional self-reliance (Acharya, 2018), which is actually connected to the process of decolonization, and expresses the African dreams of decoloniality. Being in the same „chain of signifiers“, security is based on violence and inseparable from it. Security insinuates itself on all fields of life, like violence, whose spirit creates a sort of culture (Mbembe, 2001, p. 175).

As a matter of fact, professor Boaventura de Sousa Santos sees in the insistence of Franz Fanon to highlight the necessity of the violence in the decolonization process meant to assure security among other goods in the ethical sense of the term, the proof of disruption between two worlds of sociality: the metropolitan one and the one of coloniality (De Sousa Santos, 2018, p. 25), so the necessary conflict between them in reference to the types of security they considered and obtained. Seen that subjects of power in general, colonial subjects in particular, are the same in the two worlds, of metropole and *coloniality*, the meanings of violence and security were mitigated to the point that the question was whether one can imagine a universal good such as security being contextual or situated. Meanwhile, for violence, the situation would look different, as it would not be located in a symptomatic positionality, but in the genealogy and trajectory (Sithole, 2015, p. 224) including, for this reason, in the intentions and ways security could be perceived and projected.

Fanon's already recorded "cleansing and epistemological revolution" (Ahluwalia, 2001, p.48), could perennially deepen the disruptions of such different worlds as the metropolitan one and that one of the *coloniality*. On these disruptions Achille Mbembe brings up Fanon again, who problematizes the crisis of the dominant, considering absurd and intolerable for either the dominated becoming like the dominant, or not being already like the latter (Mbembe, 2019, pp. 137-138). And in this argument could lay the confirmation of a globosity of the term security itself, because even if imposed on one side or on the other side, it would have the same meanings for both sides of a colonial relation, causing similar narratives of coloniality.

If violence should be considered an event-process, standing on perceptions from African repository, security, by its double folded role of cause and result could be seen as the triggering element for the desire of truth and law, admitting that security is signified by the perception on the questioning of the truth and by the need of being protected by a law, in reaction to the commandment of colonialism (Mbembe, 2001, p. 26).

Hence, the meanings of violence are extended in this direction, in relation to security, just considering that in the mind of the colonizers, or the strongest ones, who should be victorious in spite of those most knowledgeable, the use of violence with Africans would fulfill the gaps created by the absence of truth and the lack of law (Mbembe, 2017, p. 70).

In relation to the perception on the questioning of the truth, as signifier for security, it is relevant the relation between security, as seen in African narratives, pawnship and Ubuntu ("I am because you are"). To explain this, African narratives of voluntary offering oneself as pawn for the debt of a relative was brought forward, called the pannyaring (Ekechi, 2013, in Lovejoy and Falola). In this case, the truth of the pawn, or his justification for his offering himself is an act of protection of his relative, which is, by being a donor act, an act of power that jeopardizes the security, or peace, or right to question his own truth of the relative, leaving him with less certainties for the future.

Albeit, in the sense that the term security was used by African leaders, security was linked to the unity and the principle of Ubuntu, due to which, in the same logic, the relative's questioning of the truth is based on the justification that because the other is, he could be, because of the other's sacrifice it was possible for him to feel secure, the abandonment on the Other being a feature of the security and of the politics of liberation (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018, p. 216), equivalent with peace in pan-african decolonial

narratives. Pannying is thus justified for the aim to secure the person as debtor, to secure the creditor, nonetheless to secure relations between them, for a peaceful climate. Accepting the inherent violence of the power one exercises on the pawns and *pannyards*, although the relation of power would be valued differently by any of them in regards to the intentionality of being dominated, would reveal that security might however be linked to de-coloniality, as long as indigenized power relations are central to these narratives.

At the other pole, every manifestation of power creates the opportunity for the contestation of power (Bongmba, 2006, p. 182), which functions also in the case of the violence used by security officers in the name of the necessity to defend security, causing instead a harassment of people by political authorities in African states (Bongmba, 2006, p. 29; Makinda&Okumu, 2007, p. 12), bringing forth the deconstruction of the security with the expansion of a narrative of deep-rooted violence. Thereupon, the escalation of violence determined narratives of demilitarization of the culture (Mbembe, 2021, p. 25) to flourish and put into question security as having to be searched and not created, whilst it would be as much structural as the violence in relation to coloniality. Violence was considered, for many decades, structural, because it shaped the social self in time, being already built in the structure and more importantly, it does not need an actual subject-action-object relation to be identified (Galtung, 1969, p. 171), or endemic (Ndlovu Gatsheni, 2013, p. 9).

Looking on security as structural too would mean developing on Mamdani's theory on displacing the victim narrative with that one of the survivor's narrative, concentrating on the issue (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018, p. 155) as reflection of an inner security reason of any of the subjects: the perpetrator or the victim.

VIOLENCE-SECURITY AND THE DECOLONIAL TURN

The resurgence or insurgence of decolonization/decoloniality in the twenty-first century is directly ranged against the violence of modernity, colonialism, imperialism, and neo-colonialism (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018, p. 43). At the point of a decolonial turn reflected in narratives of last years, therefore, security is put in danger by the main act of resisting the power that aims to establish it and consequently search for it, from the point of view of defending own perceptions and methods to manage it. Or, as it was noted by Achille Mbembe (2016), the state of security feeds from the state of insecurity, whose

lasting is extended as it contributes to the consciousness of the necessity of the first one and merely offers an argument for its long-lasting.

While violence is systemic, structural, institutional, symbolic, and physical (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013), security is looked at under its rhetorical force, for the senses it has in the African Self-Recognition narratives especially in revolutionary poetics (Egudu, 1978). In the meantime, as recorded before, it is considered an event (the outcome of a long process of violence), integrative (many times related to ideology), a rhetoric of the colonialism who appealed to secrets and the security of its rule that was described as the nocturnal face of the democracy (Mbembe, 2019), but also considering speeches of African unity and development carried even by contested leaders, or, finally, a perpetually absent good (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p. 9).

Taking into account such directions, in the context of decolonization processes, defined after the non-alignment movement, the narrative of security that should have been a narrative of non-violence, became one of counter-violence, security being continuously produced within conflict situations. As it was suggested by Achille Mbembe the actions of a new power, that intends to maintain a maximum vulnerability of the masses for a better control of resources, are not only for an economic aim (2021, p. 186), but mostly to ponder the “price of life” in capitalism, within the question of the African personhood based on the “vital force” (Masolo, 2004, p.55), which includes, among others, the ideals of security.

Both concepts, violence and security, were politically used. At least at a discursive level, the liberation processes, named as actual war in Algeria, but only as conflicts in other African states, ended up as a conflict “among ourselves”, following Cesaire’s opinion on the situation of Patrice Lumumba’s Congo (Mbembe, 2017, p. 157) and the independence paradigm. Hence, security was not linked exclusively to coloniality, but to the questioning of competition, in a decolonial context. The independence paradigm regarded the reproduction of colonial violence and was seen in regards to Zimbabwe’s ZANU party philosophy of embracing violence as a legitimate political tool (Mpofi & Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015, p. 128), also.

The culture of violence in politics (Lovejoy & Falola, 2003, p. 116) was promoted from the colonial period and transferred as a nationalist paradigm of war (Ndlovu-Gatheni, 2015, p. 6) in many African states, case in which, many times, the decolonization process became “bastardized and ideologized” (Ndlovu-Gatheni, 2015, p. 7), leaving no room to changes from inside the aims

of liberation (an actual social change), but to the replication and maybe reinterpretations of old forms of power relations in the society (an ideology of resistance).

All these are showing that security and violence might have the same root, while security has its violent dimension or an inner violence, first of all epistemological.

During the decolonization process, this inner epistemological violence should be deconstructed by the aim of this process, and epistemic colonization (Ipadeola, 2017, p. 148) is expected to be reversed. On the consequence, security follows this logic of deconstruction, having the tendency, on the contrary to the ideals and directions of decolonization, to maintain a systematic and of *long durée* violence of the Western narratives on African narratives, or on the Third World (Pieterse, 2010, p. 99), including in regards to the meanings of security.

Achille Mbembe rightly observes that in the most simple equation on violence, the principal parameter is the powerful or the dominant and all myths of violence are related to him, especially those that incriminate the weak or the dominated as instigator for the violence of the dominator (Mbembe, 2019, p. 138). In fact, Tsenay Serequeberhan talks about the necessary confrontation and appropriation of the colonizer's violence from the colonized (2013, p. 71). Or, from a detailed example on the colonialism in Nigeria given by Toyin Falola (2009, p. 52), there is a reading on the possibility of a voluntary surrendering, through negotiations, due to which violence can be avoided. But, looking at Mbembe's assertion that violence is physical, moral and also rethorical (Mbembe & Sarr, 2017, p. 35) it seems that surrendering to these forms of violence is caused by the seduction exercised by the fable of colonization over some colonized, who became conscious complices to it (Mbembe, 2021, p. 73). The main foundations of surrendering consisted of long periods of conflicts leaving communities in an estate of starvation and vulnerability to (neo)colonial salvation, on one side, but, according to Toyin Falola surrendering was also the effect of modern types of manifestation of power, resembling slavery, by the „corrupt political leadership that promotes cultures of dependency and poverty“ (Falola, 2013, p. 50).

At this point, the intention of the dominant (neo-colonizer) to maintain security, seen to be dependency, at least, could be confounded to that one of the neo-colonized to have security assured (like right to come out of the poverty), although talking about two different understandings of the security, being this the first argument to reflect upon on the considerations made at the beginning,

that African meanings on security might be different than those given by a western thinking or in the language of the colonizers.

For the language of decolonization, violence was risking to become a good of common interest and focus, being base to the creation and evolvement of a civil society (Mbembe, 2001, p. 36). However, the actions of African intellectuals combatting colonialism, through resistance actions and discourses had little effect on the achievement of a well-being in these societies, at a socio-political and (in this way) even at an epistemological level (Falola, 2003, p. 38). Taking into account, as global meaning, the well-being as security, the observation that violence through resistance and discourse, in African contexts, could not have led to the achievement of security speaks for itself and shows that violence could be considered, in an African repository, not sufficient for the fulfillment of security.

For Franz Fanon, resistance and consequently decolonization were both violent, and since he explored the manners the colonized became violent into the colony (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p. 143), he opened the path on considering that decolonization was mostly prepared and sustained by a steady construction of violence in a colonial context based on the psychological violence recorded by Ngugi Wa Thing'o (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2015, p. 6). In the context of this phenomenon, the main definition of security, acknowledged in colonizer's terms, could have been questioned, due to epistemological violence, that includes elements to sustain the logical apparatus of commandments (Mbembe, 2001, p. 111) and consequently a view popularized in Fanon's writings on security as a signifier for the quality of a human to be a master, or in control of the Self or of the Other (Kiros, 2004, p. 221).

But the violence of the decolonization phenomenon had to be built necessarily on the aim to change senses and directions of defining security, as feature of the human status, decolonization being akin to the "reclaiming of a humanity" (Serequeberhan, 2013, p. 74), re-elaborated by Achille Mbembe in the humanization of the "thing" as reversed process to the "*thing-ification*", the creation of a new man, a new language and a new humanity (Mbembe, 2017, p. 168).

Because security is seen as a need in western culture, deemed the Maslow's pyramid of needs, and knowing that the colonial postcolonial state, is "formed out of a residual apparatus of violence and coercion" (Serequeberhan, 2015, p. 29), therefore also based on epistemic violence and hermeneutic coercion, the meanings of security could be searched in the ways

understanding and approach to violence are changing. Namely, from violence over the dominated in order to be conquered, to violence of setting maps (Garuba, 2002), hence creating a space of security, ending with the violence to cure (civilize or develop), like, cartoonish, the “cure of Africans from their supposed laziness” (Mbembe, 2001, p. 113).

Chasing the same line of transformation recorded for the violence, security should be first reflected upon from the point of view of an action of conquest, or, as result of action of violence that has already ended, namely an imposed status of peace, as a consequence to humanitarian interventionism after 1990, highlighting a moral obligation of the international community in relation to a state whose security, even at a social internal level is considered to be threatened (Lau, 2020, p. 108). Thereupon, security is signified by borders and assured by the membership, as broad term for nation ship, which recalls the deconstruction of it, pursuant to the critical resistance to the establishment of nations for the colonized, without the will of the colonized, and the issue of nations created by the will or guidance of colonial mapping, through divisions of ethnical groups that were themselves considered as created (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2018, p. 149). And in the end, security is well-being, or development from a western perspective, therefore, in African perception, a tool for the forced integration into the design of a global world where harmonization is nurtured for the objective to keep alive western categorization views and images. Although in the colonies there would have existed some minimal preoccupation of the colonizers for the welfare of the colonized, especially in the british ones, this welfare needed to be identified likewise and this identification was itself imposed, subject to the violence of power relations (Esteva, 1992, p. 10).

Taking into account these perspectives, the encounter of violence and security on the terrain of morality is central to the argument, for the defining of a possible context of overlapping the need for peace on the narratives of struggle and the considerations on the meanings of security in an African perspective, as being different or subsumed to an African epistemology, with all necessary results from this, in regards to peacekeeping narratives at a global level.

In its quality of result, need, good or aim, security must be moral, while violence, seen as event-process, would be difficult to value as moral or not, because it has stages, subjects, circumstances and endings that allow many undertones. The demand on the morality of violence was entrenched with the

critical resistance to the cultural domination „which dehumanized Africans and destroyed many of their institutions“, a European encounter that needed to be understood, nevertheless was put under the scrutiny of a „Fanon school“ (Falola, 2003, p. 37). In fact, the morality of the violence could be translated in the duty to violence argued by Fanon, whose perspective on violence was that it was a political as much as a clinical concept and in regards to the latter, a practice of the transformation of symbols (Mbembe, 2017, p. 162).

The clinical vision on violence is defended also from the perspective of the political discourse in the Global South, referring to the reason of the West or the dominant reason on the stage of the international relations, like in the intervention of President Sukarno about “Inject[ing] the voice of reason into world affairs” in relation to which Tsenay Serequeberhan fittingly averts a „global political reason, beyond might, violence, and brute force“ (2015, p. 72). Admitting this global political reason would be peace, and security, in Global South possible understanding, the layouts of violence and security are overlapped, due to a common feature of representing cures and being instruments for the epistemological freedom (injecting reason, intended as real global reason, not Western reason), case in which peace keeping means giving space to the narratives of a struggle that leads to the deconstruction of Western, and ultimately, any type of imperialism.

Violence, characterized as „systemic, structural, institutional, symbolic and physical“ (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2020, p. 23), was seen as undesirable for some and, in the meantime, desirable for its endings (Falola, 2014, p. 60) or sustained by the war of justice (Ojo, 2011, p. 343), for others. Considering achieving security an ending of the manifestation of violence, it becomes linked to coloniality but remains the support for a decoloniality based on Fanon’s „radical negation“ (de Sousa Santos, 2018, p. 75) of the previous order, which actually confirms its pre-existence without which the new order searched by decolonization, as new thinking and doing for the rehumanizing of the world (Gatsheni, 2020, p. 27), wouldn’t have been possible.

CONCLUSIONS

As explored in this perspective, violence and security are important elements for the consideration of coloniality / (de) coloniality, and their evolution in tandem with peace, in a holistically considered African context. The terms of violence and security are floating terms in African narratives and security is dependent on violence so that, security should be looked in within

violence that portrays all fields of realities, as it was defined in African repositories of knowledge. Violence is systemic and structural having many features to be looked at as an event-process, meanwhile security is eventual and generic, being considered not for granted but a result of the necessary struggle of liberation from colonial archetypes, more than just colonial relations, in a consideration of (de)coloniality defined as the burden of new methods to return to epistemologies that were validated prior to the manifestation of coloniality. Since violence is creative in African narratives and for the achievement of security violence would be central, security becomes created, too, but the creation of security is not casual and not independent from the ways violence is created. Therefore, security has to be searched not only from the point of view of an aim to achieve, but under the form of a method to contain the violence of own manifestations. In this sense, policies that regard administration of various aspects of life in African contexts should ponder that the understandings of security and violence should be Africanized, in order for any policy or act to be really symbolically adapted to African ontologies. Peacekeeping actions of Western inspiration should be less interventionist, should look into the specificity of the territory, be only supportive and not coercive, should function on request and not on supposed moral obligation, but, the most important, they should first understand the cultural needs in relation to security, as well as the ontological positions towards violence (to avoid cultural clash and inefficiency of security seeking, regarded as security creating in African narratives).

BIBLIOGRAPHY (alphabetical order):

Book:

Acharya, A. (2018). *The end of American world order*. John Wiley & Sons.

Ahluwalia, P. (2001). *Politics and post-colonial theory: African inflections*. Routledge.

Benyera, E. (Ed.). (2020). *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa: Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths*. Springer.

Bongmba, E. (2006). *The dialectics of transformation in Africa*. Springer.

Cabral, A. (2016). *Resistance and decolonization*. Rowman & Littlefield.

deSousa Santos, B. (2018). *The end of the cognitive empire: The coming of age of epistemologies of the South*. Duke University Press.

Eco, U. (1986). *Semiotics and the Philosophy of Language* (Vol. 398). Indiana University Press.

- Egudu, R. N. (1978). *Modern African poetry and the African predicament*. Springer.
- Falola, T., & Essien, K. (Eds.). (2014). *Pan-Africanism, and the politics of African citizenship and identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Falola, T. (2003). *The power of African Cultures*. Rochester.
- Falola, T. (2013). *The African Diaspora: Slavery, Modernity, and Globalization* (Vol. 1092, No. 5228). University Rochester Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *The archeology of knowledge*. NY.
- Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. *Journal of peace research*, 6(3), 167-191.
- Langan, M. (2018). *Neo-colonialism and the Poverty of development in Africa*. Springer.
- Langenbacher, E., & Shain, Y. (Eds.). (2010). *Power and the past: collective memory and international relations*. Georgetown University Press.
- Lovejoy, P. E., & Falola, T. (Eds.). (2003). *Pawnship, slavery, and colonialism in Africa*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press.
- Makinda, S. M., & Okumu, F. W. (2007). *The African Union: challenges of globalization, security, and governance*. Routledge.
- Mamdani, M. (2018). Citizen and subject. In *Citizen and Subject*. Princeton University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2001). *On the postcolony* (Vol. 41). Univ of California Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2016). *Nanorazzismo: il corpo notturno della democrazia*. Gius. Laterza & Figli Spa.
- Mbembe, A. (2017). *Critique of black reason*. Duke University Press.
- Mbembe, J. A., & Sarr, F. (Eds.). (2017). *Ecrire l'Afrique-monde*. Philippe Rey.
- Mbembe, A. (2019). Three Necropolitics. In *Necropolitics* (pp. 66-92). Duke University Press.
- Mbembe, A. (2021). *Out of the dark night: Essays on decolonization*. Columbia University Press.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Coloniality of power in postcolonial Africa*. African Books Collective.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2018). *Epistemic freedom in Africa: Deprovincialization and decolonization*. Routledge.
- Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2020). *Decolonization, development and knowledge in Africa: Turning over a new leaf*. Routledge.
- Onoma, A. K. (2013). *Anti-refugee violence and African politics*. Cambridge University Press.

- Scalambrino, F. (2016). Jacques Lacan," Transference: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book VIII." *Philosophy in Review*, 36(5), 211-214.
- Serequeberhan, T. (2013). *The hermeneutics of African philosophy: Horizon and discourse*. Routledge.
- Serequeberhan, T. (2015). *Existence and heritage: hermeneutic explorations in African and continental Philosophy*. SUNY Press.
- Slater, D. (2004). *Geopolitics and the post-colonial: rethinking north-south relations* Blackwell.
- Spurr, D. (1993). *The rhetoric of empire: Colonial discourse in journalism, travel writing, and imperial administration*. Duke University Press.
- Wa Thiong'o, N. (1992). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. East African Publishers

Chapter in a collective book:

- Esteva, G (1992) Development in (Ed) Esteva, G., & Sachs, W. (1992). Development. *The development dictionary: A guide to knowledge as power. Population and Development Review*, 18, 1, pp. 6-25.
- Kiros, T (2004) Frantz Fanon (1925–1961) in Wiredu, K. (Ed.). (2004). *A companion to African philosophy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Lau, R. K. S. (2020) Getting Beyond the Somalia Syndrome? Revisiting the United States' Intervention in Liberia 15 Years Later in Benyera, E. (Ed.). (2020). *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa: Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths*. Springer, pp. 103-122.
- Masolo, D.A. (2004) African Philosophers in the Greco-Roman Era in Wiredu, K. (Ed.). (2004). *A companion to African philosophy*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 50-65
- Mpofu, B., & Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2015). Robert Mugabe: The Will to Power and Crisis of the Paradigm of War. In *Mugabeism?* (pp. 121-133). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Mude, T (2020) Theorising the Direct Effect Doctrine of International Law in Human Rights Enforcement in Benyera, E. (Ed.). (2020). *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa: Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths*. Springer, pp 77-102
- Nyere, C (2020) NATO's 2011 Invasion of Libya: Colonialism Repackaged? in Benyera, E. (Ed.). (2020). *Reimagining Justice, Human Rights and Leadership in Africa: Challenging Discourse and Searching for Alternative Paths*. Springer. pp 123-158

- Ojo, J.B.B.(2011) The Impact of Globalization on International Security in House-Soremekun, B., & Falola, T. (Eds.). (2011). *Globalization and sustainable development in Africa* (Vol. 51). University Rochester Press. pp. 327-353
- Sithole, T. (2015). A Fanonian reading of Robert Gabriel Mugabe as colonial subject. In Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (Ed.). (2015). *Mugabeism?: History, politics, and power in Zimbabwe*. Springer. (pp. 217-236). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.
- Theodory, T. F. (2018) Revisiting Traditional African Land Ownership Practices Using Indigenous Knowledge Lenses: The Case of the Haya in Tanzania in Nhemachena, A., & Warikandwa, V. (Eds.). (2018). *Social and legal theory in the age of decoloniality:(re-) envisioning Pan-African jurisprudence in the 21st century*. African Books Collective. pp., 165-186

Article in a scientific publication:

- Garuba, H. (2002). Mapping the land/body/subject: Colonial and postcolonial geographies in African narrative. *Alternation*, 9(1), 87-116.