

A Theoretical Argument “Africa As A Nation” Beyond Romanticisation የንድፈ ሐሳብ ከርከር አፍሪካን እንደ ሀገር የማየት አመለካከት

Africa, as both an idea and a symbol, has always occupied a place in modern knowledge structures that is ambiguous and oftentimes contradictory. In order to appreciate the central argument, one should look at Africa as a place, a people, of course, time and space. Beyond the societal normative conceptions of culture, religion, language and skin tone, there is a diversity of thought. When we see the great idea of "Africanism" mixed with "commodification," that's where the contradiction comes in.

Comparatively, the majority of Pan-Africanists and conscious citizens wish to perceive Africa as a unified economic and political entity that can be romanticised and idolised, which is a healthy perspective. Others believe that Africa should remain with the status quo into fifty-five or further partitioned nations under the banner of a “sovereign state,” which is also another perspective.

I have been criticised on numerous occasions for romanticising and idolising Africa as a nation and having such a rosy view of Africa and its people. I am cognizant that Africa consists of fifty-five distinct nations with diverse ethnic, racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds and over one thousand languages.

One may make the case that the identification of Africa and its people is where the concept of Africa is most internally consistent. Despite the many different African cultures, this is the best source for a thorough and unbiased overview. I view Africa's diversity as a unique blessing rather than a source of contention.

The geographical space and designation of Africa and Australia are classic metaphors to illustrate my case. If Australia can function as both a continent and a country, then many academics should find the African example no more strange or objectionable than the Australian one.

For argument's sake, consider whether the fifty-four states that comprise the United States of America (USA) can work together as a country. It is theoretically possible for Africa to unify as a single entity, the United People of Africa (UPA).

Similarly, China and India have population sizes comparable to Africa and are each organised into twenty-eight zones. This indicates that progress is achievable, provided political will and a proper governing system are in place.

From Global Framework Comparison to Postcolonial Africa Political Dynamics

A greater African unity has been an ideological goal for many Africans, but, as a consequence of an elusive and unpragmatic approach for a very long time, it has proven increasingly difficult to

achieve. It is obvious that African unification cannot be realised by depending solely on political endeavours or by focusing exclusively on economic dynamics; instead, a holistic strategy is required.

New momentum has emerged for expanding political and economic linkages across Africa's many nations. With a more profound recognition of the importance of regional unification and an improved grasp of the factors that led to previous failures. But I seriously wonder if there is a more transparent road map in place that allows states to cede sovereignty and set up a collective governance system.

Unification of Africa, not because it will bring us some ideal future, but rather in the first place because it will make life better for regular Africans in the present and the future. The concept of a better, more prosperous, and unified Africa has been advocated for a very long time by political leaders, academics, and pan-African activists. Despite the best intentions, persuasive speeches, rhetoric, official conferences, and formal treaties, the outcomes on the ground still need to be improved.

Africa has not yet begun to heal from its political and social fractures, and African citizens still cannot freely travel to neighbouring nations. Contradictorily, African political leaders encourage investors from the rest of the world while rebuffing and alienating Africans residing in their individual countries. Africa and Africans still have the opportunity to rethink the space they will occupy and determine their destiny despite all the negative news.

Immediate Vs. Gradual Unification Debate and Its Relevance

It is vital to investigate the postcolonial African debate on immediate vs gradual African unity in a sanctity manner to comprehend the whole failure of governance that has occurred up to this point. As someone who has spent more than a decade researching the topic, I have critically examined the central argument from two perspectives. Specifically, I was interested in learning more about the proposed governance strategies of both camps. Second, whether the proposed method has substance or the argument is founded on a conceptual void.

Prior to the establishment of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), African states were divided into three major political groups: Casablanca, Monrovia, and Brazzaville. There were a number of factors at play, but ideology and colonial language played a significant role in fostering the divide. Moreover, the governance structure model of the African Union was at its core.

The Casablanca group believed that political unity was necessary for the later integration of African economies. In contrast, the Monrovia and Brazzaville groups insisted that African unity should be taught via economic cooperation and eventual political unity. In both groups, there was no doubt that they desired to see Africa as a cohesive community defending its rightful position in the

world and creating a favourable environment for its people. The only distinction was how to reach the destination.

Both sides engaged in a vigorous debate with the purpose of shaping the future of the African people. Despite the arguments and good intentions, my research indicates that neither group had a documented, specific plan or ideology for achieving Africa's unification. If I am mistaken, I would appreciate being corrected. This does not imply that there were no emotive assertions or belief-based disputes on both sides.

However, the Casablanca group was thinking of taking radical steps toward unification, such as adopting a unity government headed by the continental head of State and a united African Military high command. On the other hand, the Monrovia faction advocated for a more measured approach, with collaboration in economics, culture, education, and politics serving as a foundation for an eventual pan-African administration.

Despite the fact that no official plan paper was presented that was supported by significant research. Regardless, when it came to the core idea, both groups were in agreement that rapid decolonization, the end of apartheid, and the acceleration of the establishment of Pan-African institutions that fulfilled the aspirations of the African people were necessary.

For the sake of argument, let us imagine that those in Casablanca who favour immediate political unions won the discussion against those who advocated for gradual African unity through economic cooperation. Beyond the traditional model of hierarchical civil administration, what are their ideas for the ideal form of government, the judicial system, the military, and the security strategy? How should the central government be organised, as well as the president and the structure of the cabinet they have? Beyond emotional assertions, no answers were provided for these questions on both sides.

The same is true for those who advocate for the gradual unification of Africa; there needed to be a concrete plan in place for how to direct the unification process through economic cooperation when they began their advocacy. However, at least they knew for sure that the aftermath of colonial authority had yet to prepare Africa to have a single centralised administration.

The slogan "Africa Reunite or Perish" is an emotive rather than intellectual claim, and hence I disagree with it. The majority of Pan African projects do not adequately address the questions of how, when, why, and who. This is the reason why most ambitious ideas to improve the lives of Africans fail to materialise and become a laughingstock. It is time to pose and raise essential questions about why Africa is falling behind and at the bottom of the world and why the people's suffering is everlasting.

Postcolonial Africa Unification Schemes and Incongruities

The incomplete pursuit of African unity had numerous elements, each of which posed concerns that the political elite had not adequately resolved. There is a considerable difference between idealistic ambitions and pragmatic action, an action that is founded on fact-based, data-driven, and a blueprint that is attainable plans of action.

Africa's unity ambition has been hampered from the start by the fact that it depends on the support of African political leaders rather than the African people themselves. Subsequently, the sovereignty of the several African nations is not in any way compromised by the existence of a unified African continent. The fact that each sovereign nation should be given the leeway to implement policies that balanced domestic concerns with those of the continent as a whole is beyond dispute.

There are well-known African unification plans, such as the Lagos Plan of Action (LPA), the Lagos Final Act (LFA), and the Abuja Treaty. Unquestionably, these texts had a substantial impact on reorienting policy to oppose economic pressure from Bretton Woods institutions; at the same time, African economic unification plans had a similar effect.

However, the Lagos Plan of Action differs from an African continent's economic integration proposal. The UN-ECA created the Lagos Plan of Action, which the OAU supported. The plan aimed to boost Africa's self-sufficiency to boost economic growth between 1980 and 2000. The approach sought to reduce its dependency on Western financial institutions by enabling Africa's natural resources.

Still, the Abuja Treaty calls for creating an African Economic Community through a gradual process of coordinating, harmonising, and integrating the activities by creating Regional Economic Communities (RECs) in Africa. However, critics of the Abuja Treaty say that it lacks a structure specifying how and when the economic integration programme will be implemented outside generic proposals. In addition, the RECs need to catch up in implementing the pact.

Final Arguments

The Chinese philosopher Lao Tzu said, "The journey of a thousand miles begins with one step". Nevertheless, the first step should be decisive in signalling the ultimate goal if it has the most precise notion and is supported by the beneficiaries; otherwise, it remains a pipe dream. What factors into the viability and use of "Africa as a nation"? This opinion contends that there are at least two morally non-compromised views on the subject of an 'immediate vs a gradual African unity.' The commentary is intended to aid in critical, reflective, and productive uses of the word "African unity."

As the new period develops; however, more and more people understand that Africa is the best laboratory for others. For Africans, the time is not ripe for experimentation; instead, there is only one way to realise the oneness of millions, if not billions, of Africans. How far can we stretch our

epistemological imagination, or what motivates us to ask novel questions about the nature and foundations of our knowledge. to tackle the endless quest for African unity?

Can Africa be both a continent and a country? The answer is unquestionably yes. In addition, it has the potential to emerge as a dominant political and military force on the planet. The resilient, self-sufficient, and peaceful Africa is not just a desirable alternative for Africans, but for all of humanity.

Seife Tadelle Kidane (PhD): is a Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Pan African Thought and Conversation (IPATC); Department of Politics and International Relations, University of Johannesburg.