

Differentiating Cold War Era African Nationalism from Contemporary Populist Nationalism

Mr. Read

CHY4UP

5 October, 2020

The period following the Second World War was marked by momentous political change all around the world. With Western Europe devastated by a bloody conflict, the balance of power in the international sphere began to shift, leaving the world's two emerging superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, to compete for influence, and ending Europe's centuries long dominance on the global scale. This new political era was perhaps most apparent to the people of Europe's colonies, specifically those in Sub-Saharan Africa. As many as 1 million African men and women served in some capacity during the Second World War, and a great many of them did so at the behest, if not outright compulsion, of foreign authoritarian regimes, mainly Britain, France and Belgium (Parsons). The role Africa played in this conflict complicated the Allies narrative of the war as a fight against tyranny, aggression, and racial intolerance, as the Africans who contributed to halting the Nazi's imperialist ambitions returned home to colonial rulers who acted in similar ways. This, along with the fact that Europe had been seriously weakened economically by the war, allowed African leaders to realize their aspirations for independence, and gave way to the end of colonial rule in Africa and Asia. However, the borders of new African states largely followed the continent's colonial subdivisions, as had been decided by European powers at the Berlin Conference of 1884 (Heath). As such, many of the states had illogical borders which did not follow natural geographic divisions, like rivers or mountain ranges, and had populations made up of different ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups. Because of this, the early leaders of post-colonial Africa needed a way to unite the otherwise divided people of their states-to-be, in order to leverage imperial powers towards independence. They achieved this through the political program of nationalism. As stated in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; "The term "nationalism" is generally used to describe two phenomena: 1. the attitude that the members of a nation have when they care about their national identity, and 2. the actions that the members of a nation take when seeking to achieve (or sustain) self-determination." (Miscevic). African nationalism certainly meets this definition, but contemporary western readers may be more familiar with the term in connection to growing populist movements in Europe and North America. Political scientist André Munro defines

populism as; “[a] political program or movement that champions, or claims to champion, the common person, usually by favourable contrast with a real or perceived elite or establishment.” (“Populism”). While populism technically has no economic orientation, it is most commonly associated with right-wing ideology, as well as nationalist sentiments. Some contemporary nationalist politicians include: Nigel Farage, leader of the UK’s Brexit Party; Marine Le Pen, leader of France’s Rassemblement National (formerly le Front National); and sitting U.S. president, Donald Trump. These leader’s advocate similar policies in their respective countries. They are staunchly anti-immigration; are distrustful of institutions, specifically those involving cooperation with other nations, such as the European Union or United Nations; and believe in the need to defend the cultural heritage of their nations. Now, the question to be answered in this essay is as follows; what are the differences between the African nationalism of the Cold War Era, and the nationalism being advocated now by populist politicians? These differences will be highlighted in three specific areas, determining whether each movement unites or divides people, by understanding the nature of the leaders of each movement, and by examining how each movement addresses participation in international organizations.

The first feature to be examined in each type of nationalism, is whether it unites or divides people. As explained in the introduction, the borders of the modern African states were drawn by Europeans, many of whom lacked knowledge of the geography or demography of the continent. Because of this, there are very few African states with ethnically homogenous populations. Some notable exceptions to this are Rwanda, Burundi, and Eswatini (formerly Swaziland), all of which were established nations before the arrival of Europeans, and had their borders largely preserved during the colonial period (Curtin). But nations like Kenya, for example, are home to over 70 different ethnic groups, none of which constitute a majority (“Kenya--Ethnic Groups”). The largest ethnic group, the Kikuyu, make up only about 20% of the nation’s population (“Kenya--Ethnic Groups”). The case is similar in Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa, and most other large African

states. All are home to a huge variety of ethnic groups, none of which make up a majority. This fact is important in making African Nationalism distinct from other kinds of nationalism. It's important to note the difference between a nation and a state. For the purposes of this essay, a state is simply a territory considered to be an organized political community, and this essay will use the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy's definition of a nation; "a nation is a cultural group, possibly but not necessarily united by a common descent, endowed with civic ties (Seymour 2000)... So defined, the nation is a somewhat mixed category, both ethno-cultural and civic, but still closer to the purely ethno-cultural than to the purely civic extreme." (Mesceviv). Using these definitions, African Nationalism can now be understood as follows; African Nationalists aimed to establish a nation, so that they could establish a state. That is to say, in order to achieve independence, they needed to establish a common national identity around which the different people groups within their borders could gather. A great example of this is the work done by Kwame Nkrumah, Ghanaian leader, first as Prime Minister of the Gold Coast in 1952 and later as President after Ghana declared its independence from Britain in 1957 ("Kwame Nkrumah"). After becoming Prime Minister, Nkrumah's main goal was to establish a sense of national unity and singular identity. His experience and education allowed him to do this quite successfully, as he'd worked as an academic and political organizer in the United States, England, and Canada ("Kwame Nkrumah"). Nkrumah believed that there were certain basic tenets of nationhood, which nations used to express their independence, sovereignty, and uniqueness (Fuller). Nkrumah constructed a national narrative for Ghana, which centered around the country having a rich and glorious past, as well as Founding Fathers, and national heroes (Fuller). He also created unique currency, postage stamps, a flag, and other iconography (Fuller). Nkrumah used these symbols and narratives as a way of uniting the ethnically heterogeneous population of Ghana, and to develop a single national identity. This national unity was useful in demonstrating to the British Government that Ghana had viability as an independent state, and also served to increase Nkrumah's political influence, as his party, the Convention People's Party, would go on to secure 70% of national assembly seats in 1956 ("Ghana"). This

allowed Nkrumah to obtain recognition for the new country of Ghana as an independent self-governing member of the Commonwealth, and as a member of the United Nations in 1957. The history of Nkrumah's development of the Ghanaian national identity is relevant to this discussion, because it's a perfect example of how the leader's of early post-colonial Africa constructed ideas of nationhood, as a means of uniting their populations to achieve independence. Similarly, anti-colonial leaders in Kenya also created a national identity in order to win their independence. Jomo Kenyatta, first Prime Minister and subsequent President of Kenya after it gained its independence ("Jomo Kenyatta"), coined the term 'Harambee' to describe the philosophy of Kenyan's coming together to achieve independence and to spur development (Sande). Harambee is a Swahili word which means 'pulling or working together', and it soon became a slogan for the first national government (Sande). Kenyatta's philosophy of Harambee was important not only in advocating for independence, but also in ensuring the success and peace of a post-colonial country. One of the three tenets of Harambee as described by Kenyatta was; "Constitutionalism: According to him [Kenyatta] it was upon all Kenyans to work towards ensuring that the country operates through the stipulated rules so as to avoid the country from being dragged into an anarchic empire." (Sande). Clearly, Jomo Kenyatta's philosophy of Harambee was a way to bring together different groups of people within Kenya, in order to advocate for their shared interests of independence and national development. European critics often pointed out that the borders of African nations were illogical in ethnic terms, and that as such they were non viable as nations. But, as put by historian Philip D. Curtin; "The Africans merely answered: 'We have to start somewhere.' And they went on with their plans for building state-nations." (Curtin). Kwame Nkrumah and Jomo Kenyatta are two examples of leaders who did just this. Unfortunately, this preference for unity over division is somewhat unique to the nationalism of Cold-War Era Africa, and is not at all characteristic of the nationalism of today.

Contemporary nationalism when compared to it's Cold-War Era African counterpart, is much more divisive. As a result of the rapid societal and technological change that's taken place in the last few decades, the average person knows much more about other parts of the

world than they did even 20 years ago. One might think that this would lead to greater cultural tolerance and understanding, but as any observer of current events can confirm, this has not been the case. Terrorist attacks in western countries are on the rise, and a growing number of them are being carried out by so-called 'white nationalists' against ethnic and religious minorities. In New Zealand, for example, in March 2019 a gunman attacked two mosques in the city of Christchurch, killing 51 people (Graham-McLay). Before the attack, the shooter published a 74-page manifesto, in which he detailed his belief that non-white immigration and mixed race relationships resulting in multi-racial children, constituted an existential, genocidal threat to white people around the world (Coaston). Another example is the shooting at the Pittsburgh Tree of Life Synagogue, in October of 2018, where 11 Jewish worshippers were killed (Robertson). The perpetrator in this case was also a self proclaimed 'white nationalists', as was clear from a social media post he made just a few hours before attacking the synagogue, in which he referred to refugees as 'invaders that like to kill our people' (Robertson). While it's true that violent white nationalism is not part of the political mainstream in any country, it's difficult to ignore the role that certain nationalist politicians are playing in encouraging racial and religious divisions. After all, both the Christchurch and Pittsburgh attackers cited mainstream politicians as inspirations for their attacks. For the former it was nationalist French politician Marine Le Pen (Coaston), and for the latter it was sitting U.S. president Donald Trump (Robertson). It is not fair to say that either Trump or Le Pen are entirely responsible for these attacks, however there is a clear line to be drawn between the way they speak about immigrants and religious minorities, and growing divisions between these groups and the white, christian majorities of their countries. The way that Donald Trump has spoken about immigrants, specifically those from Latin-America, is certainly controversial. Throughout his time on the political scene, Trump has described migrants from Central and South America, many of whom are asylum seekers fleeing violence in their home countries, as criminals, gang members, and rapists (Rivas). At one of his campaign rallies in Florida in May 2019, Trump spoke about border patrol agents working to prevent Central American migrants from crossing the border. When he asked the crowd

‘How do you stop these people?’ a man attending the rally shouted, ‘Shoot them.’ to which Trump responded ‘That’s only in the [Florida] panhandle, can you get away with that statement.’ (Rivas). Trump received heavy criticism in August 2019 for the way he’s spoken about Latin immigrants, after a white gunman attacked a Walmart in El Paso, Texas, with the explicit goal of killing hispanics. To reiterate, Trump cannot be held entirely responsible for this attack, however it’s a clear example of the widespread division he creates with his words, especially in a country which, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, is 18.5% hispanic. Another example of a nationalist leader who creates division in their country, is France’s Marine Le Pen, leader of le Rassemblement National. Le Pen’s attitude towards minorities, specifically religious minorities, is a much discussed topic in French media, because of her father, Jean-Marie Le Pen’s reputation as an anti-semitic and holocaust denier (Sayer). However, Marine Le Pen herself is most well known for her polarizing views on Islam and French society. Throughout her political life, Le Pen has repeatedly stated her belief that the growth of Islam in France puts the country in ‘mortal danger.’ (Chrisafis). Some of her policy proposals include the banning of headscarves in public-places, and a prohibition on ritual animal slaughter, which would affect Islamic halal slaughter, as well as Jewish kosher practices (Chrisafis). Perhaps most notably, Le Pen was tried, and subsequently cleared, for inciting religious hatred in 2015, after comparing Muslims praying in the streets to the Nazi occupation. These attitudes are being touted in a country which, according to the Pew Research Centre, has the largest Muslim population in all of Western Europe, at 8.8% of the population (Pew Research Centre). Le Pen’s increasing political prominence has correlated with increasing anti-Muslim attacks across the country. In 2019 alone, the number of attacks increased by 54%, with events like the shooting of an imam at a mosque in the city of Brest in June 2019, or the accosting of workers building a mosque in the town of Bergerac, with a pig’s head and animal blood, just two-weeks after the Christchurch attack. Clearly, the words and policies of contemporary nationalist politicians, namely Donald Trump and Marine Le Pen, creates great division between different groups within their countries.

The next point to examine when discussing the differences between African Nationalism and contemporary populist nationalism, is the nature of the leaders of each movement. When discussing African politics of any kind, it's important to understand the nature of the people who make up the continent's political class. According to The World Bank, only 65.58% of adults in Sub-Saharan Africa are literate, and in some places, like Chad, that number is as small as 22% (The World Bank). As such, the number of people able to actively participate in politics is much lower than it is in other places around the world. The number of politically engaged citizens during the Cold-War Era, was even smaller than it is now. This relatively small political class meant that the African Nationalist movement was heavily elitist. The Oxford English Dictionary defines elitism as; "The belief that a society or system should be led by an elite." This idea is evident in two facets of the movements; the education and experience of the leaders, and the difference between the leaders' motivations and those of the general population. The leaders of African independence movements were usually very well educated. For most, that education began in missionary schools, set up by groups like the Jesuits and the Church of Scotland, which were free to attend, so long as students converted to Christianity (Blixen). For example, Kwame Nkrumah attended a Roman Catholic missionary school for nine years, and he began his career as a teacher at one as well ("Kwame Nkrumah"). Jomo Kenyatta also started living and working at a Church of Scotland missionary school when he was just ten years old ("Jomo Kenyatta"). Many would then go on to earn degrees from universities in the West, namely in the U.S. and UK. Julius Nyerere, a famous Tanzanian leader, earned an M.A. in history and economics at the University of Edinburgh in 1952, becoming the first Tanzanian to do so ("Julius Nyerere"). David Jawara, a leader from The Gambia, studied veterinary medicine at the University of Glasgow, and qualified as a veterinary surgeon there ("David Jawara"). After completing their studies, many African leaders went on to work for the colonial government in administrative positions. Kenyatta for example, served as a clerk in the Public Works Department of the City of Nairobi, and worked as an interpreter in the High Court ("Jomo Kenyatta"). Jawra became principal veterinary officer of The Gambia in 1957 ("David Jawara"). These men were

considered elites within the African political sphere, not because of their wealth or the power of their families, but because they had a level of education and experience which was very uncommon in Africa at the time (Curtin). These skills made them obvious choices to become leaders of nationalist movements in their respective countries. However, their unique status within the African population meant that their motivations for advocating independence were quite different from those of the common people. The main dissatisfaction with colonial rule among the wider African people, stemmed from the economic exploitation they had suffered, and continued to suffer, at the hands of Europeans. For example, the system by which Africans were forced to work for white settlers in exchange for being allowed to live on their land, which essentially amounted to serfdom (Blixen). However, the people most affected by this sort of exploitation usually did not have the resources or the education to effectively oppose it, and there was no political incentive for the African political elites to do anything about it either (Curtin). In fact, most African Nationalist leaders were faring quite well under the colonial administration. They had received an education, and were employed directly because of colonial rule. The true driving force of anti-colonialism among the African political elite had very little to do with economics, but was instead Western racism and cultural chauvinism. The prejudice towards black people that was rampant during the Cold-War Period, and would eventually lead to the civil rights movements of the 1960s in the United States, rubbed hardest against those Africans most in touch with the West (Curtin). Because the African political elites worked alongside white Europeans, during their studies and in the colonial government, the prejudice towards them based on the colour of their skin was especially apparent. In addition to this, because of their exposure to Western political ideas, the African political elites in large part left behind their loyalties to any specific ethnic or traditional group, because they viewed them as incompatible with the modern world (Curtin). They also understood that the prejudice they experienced from Europeans wasn't because of their belonging to any specific ethnic group, but simply because of their identity as black Africans (Curtin). This unique perspective exclusive to the African political elite had a profound effect on the decolonization period, as it's the reason the independence

movements chose to preserve the political structures left by colonial rulers, instead of building entirely new states around each ethnic or cultural group. As historian Philip Curtin said; “The shape and content of these [new African] states were almost beside the point. What counted was African control.” (Curtin). This clearly shows the degree to which the African Nationalist movement was dictated by a relatively small group of political elites, who had motivations which were different from that of the general African population. The elitism of African Nationalist movements is sharply contrasted by the populism characteristic of contemporary nationalist movements.

Western nationalist movements and their leaders have gained political traction in recent years, through employing the political strategy of populism. Populist politicians seek to establish a narrative that the concerns of the common people are being ignored by established elite groups. Who exactly these elites are may change depending on what’s most politically advantageous to the populist. Sometimes it’s bureaucrats and civil servants in powerful institutions, like the European Union, who are commonly vilified by European populists. Other times, the elites are academics and experts, who have been criticized very heavily by populists during the Coronavirus Pandemic. Regardless of who the supposed elites are, the image of the populist leader is always crafted in the same way. Populist leaders always emphasize their status as anti-establishment political outsiders, and claim to be delivering the unambiguous will of the people. Donald Trump is an example of a leader who exhibits these traits very explicitly. Trump is the first president in U.S. history to have had no public service or military experience before taking office (Crockett). Many would see this as evidence that he’s not qualified to take on the responsibilities of the presidency, however Trump chooses to use his inexperience to his political advantage. His status as an outsider is something he’s continued to tout throughout his time as president, and now in the lead up to the 2020 election, it’s become a core part of his campaign. Presidents running for re-election typically focus on the things they’ve achieved during their time in office, but Trump’s approach has centered around criticizing the supposed ‘Deep State’ of working against him and his supporters (Page). He has decried the Food and Drug Administration, the Centre for Disease

Control, and other government organizations, accusing them of undermining him, despite those organizations being led by officials he himself appointed (Page). In August 2020, while speaking to factory workers in Ohio, Trump promised to ‘drain the Washington swamp once and for all.’ (Parker). He has stuck with this anti-establishment portrayal of himself, despite having served an entire presidential term. This shows just how integral Trump’s status as a political outsider is to his political strategy. Another example of a populist politician who emphasizes their status as an anti-establishment political outsider, is the UK’s Nigel Farage. Leader of the Brexit Party and founding member of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), Farage is a prominent figure in British politics. He’s best known for his ‘man in the pub’ persona, and is incredibly critical of mainstream politicians for being mechanical and overly on-message (Parkinson). He prefers instead to bluntly state his opinions, without much recourse to political correctness (Parkinson). His straightforward disposition is central to his public image. Farage has also been vocal about his displeasure with the Conservative Party throughout his political career, and when asked by a journalist if UKIP was declaring war against the Conservatives, he’s quoted as saying: ‘It’s a war between UKIP and the entire political establishment.’ (Parkinson). Evidently, the framing of leaders as anti-establishment political outsiders, is an important aspect of contemporary populist nationalist movements. Another key aspect of the populist political strategy used by contemporary nationalist leaders, is the assertion that they are delivering the simple, unambiguous will of the people. Marine Le Pen is a great example of a leader who does this. Le Pen’s slogan for her 2017 presidential campaign was, ‘au nom du peuple’ or ‘in the name of the people’, a sentiment which she’s worked very hard to make a key aspect of her public image (Geva). The politics of Le Pen are very emotional. She seeks to activate feelings of love and loyalty towards herself and those deemed to be within ‘the people’, and feelings of repugnance and disgust towards political elites and enemies of ‘the people’ (Geva). Dorit Geva, a sociology professor at the Central European University, described le Rassemblement National in the following way; “I continue to be struck by the emotionally vivid universe created by the party. There is not only a Manichean universe of good and bad, of the people and its enemies, but an

emotionally intense cosmos of love and hate.” (Geva). These strong emotions are reflected in Le Pen’s policy, which while minimal in content, is maximal in emotional impact (Geva). Her policies regarding Islam are a great example of this. By subjugating Islam in France, she’s taking action against the ‘out group’, and easing the fears of the ‘in group’. She’s claiming to be delivering the simple will of the French people, when in reality she’s only delivering for a specific, mostly white, mostly Christian, part of the French population. Clearly, these two aspects of the populist nationalist political strategy are at the very core of the contemporary nationalist movement.

The final point to investigate when determining the differences between Cold-War Era African Nationalism and contemporary populist nationalism, is the way each movement approaches the international community. The decolonization of Africa and Asia coincided with the establishment of a number of new international organizations. The United Nations, founded in 1945 (“History of the UN”), or the Commonwealth, founded in 1931 (“Our History”) are examples of institutions created during this period, which even today are still valuable in maintaining peace and furthering cooperation between nations. Newly independent African states were particularly interested in becoming active members of these international organizations, because it helped to legitimize their status as independent nations in the eyes of the international community. The Gambia, for example, is a country that made a particular point of being part of international institutions, despite its small size and little political influence. After it achieved its independence from Britain in 1965, the first President of The Gambia, Dawda Jawara, made an effort to take advantage of the legitimization conferred by his nation’s participation in international organizations. He immediately bid to join the United Nation, perhaps the most definitive step a state can take towards legitimization on the world stage, and made The Gambia a member of the Commonwealth, allowing her to maintain close diplomatic and economic ties with Britain, while still asserting her own sovereignty (Nyang). The Gambia also became a member of a number of more regional organizations: like the Organization for African Unity, which would

eventually become the African Union; and the Organization of Senegalese River States (OERS), a more regional organization from which she was originally excluded (Nyang). The Gambia's membership in the OERS is especially notable, because of the country's contentious relationship with its neighbor, Senegal. Senegal is a much larger country, which completely encircles the Gambia, and despite being two separate states, they have very similar ethnic populations. As such, many regional scholars proposed unifying the two countries into a single confederacy (Nyang). Gambian nationalists were strongly opposed to this, citing concerns around cultural differences between The Gambia's close relationship to England and Senegal's close relationship to France (Nyang). Many nationalists were also concerned by the significant role religion played in Senegalese politics (Nyang). By seeking membership in a regional organization such as the OERS, The Gambia impressed upon Senegal and the other West African states, that she was keen about her independence, and that if any organization of shared interests was to develop in the region, all states should be allowed to participate (Nyang). The example of The Gambia shows how post-colonial African states used international organizations to assert their independence. Another example of the key role international organizations played in African Nationalist movements, is the work of Julius Nyerere. Nyerere was a Tanzanian leader, who served as the country's first Prime Minister and subsequent President, after independence in 1961 ("Julius Nyerere"). After studying abroad in Britain, he returned home and became heavily involved in the movement for independence. Nyerere served as leader of the Tanganyika African National Union, a political organization seeking to hasten the process of emancipation ("Julius Nyerere"). In 1955 and 1956, Nyerere travelled to New York, to petition the United Nations Trusteeship Council to provide a target date for his country's independence ("Julius Nyerere"). While his petition was ultimately unsuccessful, it established him as the preeminent nationalist spokesperson for Tanzania ("Julius Nyerere"). Despite his heavy involvement in the Tanzanian movement for independence, Nyerere's greatest accomplishment is usually considered to be the establishment of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The OAU was a joint project between Nyerere and Ghanaian President Kwame

Nkrumah, which sought to increase cooperation between the governments of the post-colonial African states (Sahoun). It also aimed to further the emancipation of states who had to achieve independence, through lobbying imperial powers and financially supporting independence movements (Sahoun). The OAU was instrumental in achieving independence for states such as Zimbabwe, and the organization was committed to ending white minority rule, in states like Apartheid South Africa (Sahoun). The OAS was a unique institution, in the sense that it was the first continental organization to be established in the post-colonial world; neither Asia nor Latin America had anything comparable (Sahoun). For Nyerere, the OAS was an expression of his belief that if the people of Africa could work together, they would be able to exert influence in a world where, historically, they had had very little (Sahoun). The achievements of Julius Nyerere and the example of The Gambia show how important the involvement of post-colonial African states in international organizations was to nationalist movements. However, this interest in cooperating with other countries through international institutions is not shared by all proponents of nationalism.

Contemporary nationalists are much less enthusiastic about their country's participation in international organizations. The aversion nationalist politicians have towards international institutions is usually based on the idea that they undermine a nation's sovereignty. This is often combined with a populist narrative, where the problems of a nation are being caused by globalist elites within international institutions, and the only way for the needs of the ordinary people to be truly met, is to concentrate power into the national government, and to strip international organizations of their abilities to influence domestic affairs. A clear example of this has been the foreign policy of the current United States President, Donald Trump. A famous campaign slogan of Trump's during his 2016 presidential campaign was "America First". This attitude is certainly reflected in the foreign policy he's pursued since being elected, which has diverged significantly from that of other presidents in the last few decades ("Trump's Foreign Policy Moments"). Some notable events which show the president's specific aversion to international organizations were his withdrawal from the Trans-Pacific-Partnership, a twelve country Asia focused trade-agreement which had been

championed by the U.S. under the Obama administration; and his choice to have the United States leave its seat on the United Nations Human Rights council (“Trump’s Foreign Policy Moments”). Another recent and troubling move made by the Trump administration, was the placement of sanctions on Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court, Fatou Bensouda, after she pledged to investigate alleged war crimes committed in Afghanistan, including those by American personnel (Pilling). This move was widely condemned by leaders all around the world (Pilling). Trump’s attitude towards international organizations was most blatantly stated in his 2019 speech to the United Nations General Assembly. “The free world must embrace its national foundations. It must not attempt to erase them, or replace them... If you want freedom, take pride in your country. If you want democracy, hold on to your sovereignty. And if you want peace, love your nation... The future does not belong to globalists, the future belongs to patriots.” (Trump). Based on his foreign policy as well as his 2019 speech to the UN, it’s certainly fair to say that the brand of nationalism represented by Donald Trump is distrustful of international institutions, and aims to subvert them.

Another example of contemporary nationalist politician’s disdain for international institutions, is the ‘Euroscepticism’ of nationalist leaders like Nigel Farage. Euro Skepticism is a political program which advocates the disengagement of European nations from the European Union, and Farage is perhaps the most notable proponent of this idea. Nigel Farage got his start in politics after he left the conservative party in 1992, in response to the signing of the Maastricht Treaty. He went on to become a founding member of UKIP, a right-wing populist party which was created with the explicit goal of facilitating Britain’s departure from the EU. It was because of pressure from the growingly popular UKIP, that then Prime Minister David Cameron decided to hold the famous Brexit Referendum of 2016, in which a slim majority of of British electorate voted to leave the EU (Parkinson). Throughout the long drawn Brexit process, Farage continued to vocally advocate for as much disengagement from the EU as possible. He became leader of the Brexit Party, which was established in 2019 to field mostly former UKIP candidates in what was to be Britain's last election for Members of European Parliament (Parkinson). Farage’s attitudes towards the European Union, were made

most clear in his final speech to the European Parliament on January 29 2020, two days before the UK officially left the EU on January 31 2020;

“I want Brexit to start a debate across the rest of Europe. What do we want from Europe? If we want trade, friendship, cooperation, reciprocity, we don’t need a European Commission, we don’t need a European court, we don’t need these institutions and all of this power... We love Europe, we just hate the European Union... Indeed, there is a historic battle going on now across the West, in Europe, in America and elsewhere. It is, globalism against populism. And you may loath populism, but I’ll tell you a funny thing, it’s becoming very popular.” (Farage).

The examples of Farage and Trump prove how integral distrust of international institutions is to the contemporary populist nationalist movement.

These two political movements, African Nationalism and contemporary populist nationalism, may have similar names, but the differences between them are clear and significant. Those differences were clearly demonstrated, by determining whether each movement united or divided people, by examining the nature of the leaders of each movement, and by understanding how each movement viewed international organizations. African Nationalist leaders sought to unite their ethnically and culturally divided populations, through establishing a shared national identity, which could be used to leverage colonial powers towards independence. Contemporary nationalists on the other hand, sow division within their countries, through their words and policies that target specific minority groups, and create conflict, sometimes violence, between those groups and the white christian majority in their countries. Next, African Nationalists embraced the elitism inherent to their movement. They took pride in their advanced educations, and understood that their motivations for seeking independence were very different from those of the general African population. Contrastingly, contemporary nationalists emphasize their status as political outsiders, and claim that their policies are the manifestation of the simple, unambiguous will of the people. And finally, African Nationalists were eager to participate in international

organizations, because of the legitimacy they conveyed on their newly independent states. By coming together through regional institutions, like the Organization for African Unity, they were better able to advocate their common interests. Conflictingly, contemporary nationalists are opposed to international institutions, because they feel they threaten their national sovereignty. In conclusion, while the movements of African Nationalism and of contemporary populist nationalism may be akin in name, the differences between them are so pronounced, that it's necessary to approach them as two completely different movements of political thought.

Works Cited

- “5 facts about the Muslim population in Europe.” *Pew Research Centre*. Pew Research Centre, 29 Nov 2017. Web. 4 Oct 2020.
<<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/11/29/5-facts-about-the-muslim-population-in-europe/>>
- “Anti-Muslim attacks in France soar 54% in 2019.” *Daily Sabbah* 28 Jan 2020. Web.
- Blixen, Karen. *Out of Africa*. London: Penguin Books., 1937. Print.
- Coaston, Jane. “The New Zealand shooter’s manifesto shows how white nationalist rhetoric spreads.” *Vox* 18 Mar 2019. Web.
- Crockett, Zachary. “Donald Trump is the only US president ever with no political or military experience.” *Vox* 23 Jan 2017. Web.
- Curtin, Philip D. “Nationalism in Africa, 1945-1965.” *The Review of Politics*, vol. 28, no. 2, 1966, pp. 143–153. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/1405684. Accessed 10 Sept. 2020
- “David Jawara.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 04 Oct 2020.
<<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Dawda-Kairaba-Jawara>>
- Farage, Nigel. “Nigel Farage's dramatic final speech at the European Parliament ahead of the Brexit vote.” *Youtube*. 29 Jan 2020. London Broadcast Radio. 3 Oct 2020.
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LlGmfPHBiDw&t=16s>>
- Fuller, Harcourt. “Father of the Nation: Ghanaian Nationalism, Internationalism and the Political Iconography of Kwame Nkrumah, 1957 - 2010.” *African Studies*

Quarterly. Ed. Todd H. Leady. 19 vols. Gainesville: University of Florida. 2015. Web.

Geva, Dorit. "Marine Le Pen's goosebump politics." *Open Democracy* 16 Dec 2019. Web.

"Ghana." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 21 Sep. 2020.

<<https://www.britannica.com/place/Ghana/Contact-with-Europe-and-its-effects#ref76829>>

Graham-McLay, Charlotte. "Christchurch shooting: mosque gunman sentenced to life without parole." *The Guardian* 27 Aug 2020. Web.

Heath, Elizabeth. "Berlin Conference of 1884–1885." *Encyclopedia of Africa*. : Oxford

University Press, , 2010. Oxford Reference. Date Accessed 4 Oct. 2020

<<https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780195337709.001.0001/acref-9780195337709-e-0467>>.

"History of the UN." *United Nations Seventieth Anniversary*. United Nations, n.d. Web. 26

Sep 2020. <<https://www.un.org/un70/en/content/history/index.html>>

"Jomo Kenyatta." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 24 Sep 2020.

<<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jomo-Kenyatta/Return-to-Kenya>>

"Julius Nyerere." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 27 Sep 2020.

<<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Julius-Nyerere>>

"Kenya--Ethnic Groups." *East Africa Living Encyclopedia*. African Studies Center University of Pennsylvania, n.d. Web. 21 Sep 2020.

“Kwame Nkrumah.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 21 Sep 2020.

<<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Kwame-Nkrumah#ref5304>>

Miscevic, Nenad, "Nationalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2020

Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.). <<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/nationalism/>>.

Nyang, Sulayman S. “Ten Years of Gambia's Independence : A Political Analysis.”

Présence Africaine, no. 104, 1977, pp. 28–45. *JSTOR*,

www.jstor.org/stable/24349456. Accessed 13 Sept. 2020.

“Our History.” *The Commonwealth*. The Commonwealth of Nations, n.d. Web. 26 Sep 2020.

<<https://thecommonwealth.org/about-us/history>>

Page, Susan. “Even as president, Donald Trump takes a familiar stance: The political outsider.”

USA Today 27 Aug 2020. Web.

Parker, Ashley. “The permanent outsider.” *The Washington Post* 21 Aug 2020. Web.

Parkinson, Justin. “Profile: UKIP leader Nigel Farage.” *BBC* 2 Apr 2014. Web.

Parsons, Timothy. “Africa’s Role in WW2 Remembered.” *fifteen eightyfour Academic*

Perspectives from Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge University Press, 25 August 2015. Web. 13 September 2020.

Pilling, David. “Fatou Bensouda: ‘It’s about the law. It’s not about power’” *Financial Times* 29

Sep 2020. Web.

“Populism.” *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 2020. 15 September 2020.

<<https://www.britannica.com/topic/populism>>

Rivas, Anthony. "Trump's language about Mexican immigrants under scrutiny in wake of El Paso shooting." *ABC News* 4 Aug 2019. Web.

Robertson, Campbell. "11 Killed in Synagogue Massacre; Suspect Charged With 29 Counts." *The New York Times* 27 Oct 2018. Web.

Sahnoun, Mohamed. "Nyerere, the Organization of African Unity and liberation." *Pambazuka News*. 13 Oct 2009. Web. 27 Sep 2020.<<https://www.pambazuka.org/pan-africanism/nyerere-organization-african-unity-and-liberation>>

Sayer, Zach. "Court upholds fine against Jean-Marie Le Pen for Holocaust remark." *Politico* 27 Mar 2018. Web.

The World Bank. *Literacy rates, adult total - Sub-Saharan Africa*. Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics. 2018. Web.

Trump, Donald. "President Trump addresses U.N. General Assembly - FULL SPEECH." *Youtube*. CSPAN, 24 Sep 2019.<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Dq0GPD2-p_E>

"Trump's Foreign Policy Moments." *Council on Foreign Relations*. Council on Foreign Relations, 2020. Web. 28 Sep 2020.
<<https://www.cfr.org/timeline/trumps-foreign-policy-moments>>

United States Census Bureau. *QuickFacts*. Washington: United States Census Bureau. 2019. Web.

