

POLITICS OF SOCIAL PRODUCTIONS AND THE IMPLICATIONS FOR GOVERNANCE AND SECURITY IN AFRICA

By

Dr. Ogban Ogban-Iyam

Director, Organisation for the Popularisation and Popular Control and Use of
Knowledge, Skills and Physical Resources

1. Introduction

This paper and discourse takes for granted that many people who are knowledgeable in African Affairs know and accept that there is considerable failure of governance and security in Africa given the scale of poverty, insurgency, terrorism, kidnappings, conflicts, and environmental degradation. There are also constant contests of election integrity and resurgence of military rule in some parts of the continent. Africa the home of the first Homo sapiens and the origin of civilization, for centuries now, has become an importer of science, technology and many types of manufactured industrial goods and services at high cost from Europe and other continents on the one hand, and on the other hand, an exporter of cheap raw materials and human resources. Political party rule and the associated adversarial electoral contests continue to divide, corrupt and distract the leaders and the people from facing the important challenges of growing the capacity to sustain modern life. The divisions and distractions further weaken and dispose the leaders and the led to the manipulation of those who want Africa to continue to be exploited. Africa is not a key player in global politics.

It is also taken for granted that the continent has immense human and natural resources. Many decades after direct colonial rule, the general outlook is bleak. Many scholars may disagree over what accounts for this state of affairs. I wish to address what I regard as persistent and recurring issues often seen and treated as separate and or isolated issues as really the failure of Governance and Security (for emphasis) although security is really within governance. Are these and many more unacceptable features of Africa, separate and isolated features or manifestations of the same phenomenon with different phases and faces? Is there any epistemological

and methodological perspective from which we can understand this confounding state of Africa in the world and a way out of the situation? What are the implications of politics of social productions in Governance and Security in Africa?

1.1. Overview

- I. Mass poverty, insecurity of life and property, unemployment, and Africa being an importer of expensive scientific and technological goods and services and exporter of cheap raw material resources and a low level player in global politics can be seen from the angle of failure of governance and security which are also manifestations of the dominant politics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange which has many phases and faces.
- II. The dominant politics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange, is adversarial political party rule through elected representatives (“political party rule”, for short) over capitalist social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange. Capitalist social production is antagonistic to any other form of social production and tries to subvert and suppress it. The same applies to the capitalist multi political party rule in relation to other forms of rule.
- III. Under European and European inhabited lands, science, technology, machine and industrial manufacturing blossomed and became a consolidated dominant force in entrenching capitalist social production. These science and technology and industrial manufacturing factors also contributed to phenomenal improvement in productive capacity in virtually all aspects of life. More consumer goods and services became increasingly available and affordable. The quality of life improved in different aspects of life. Political party rule and capitalist social production was imposed by Europeans on other continents and peoples of the world. Non-European people have either been compelled or tried on their own to emulate political party rule and capitalist social production to different degrees of success.
- IV. In most of Africa, political party rule and capitalist social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange have been very disastrous. Credible attempts to establish firm basis for capitalism or

alternatives were and are still subverted or could not withstand the machinations of former colonial powers as shown in the litany of ills of the continent.

- V. The continental body, formerly known as the OAU and currently the AU, are also infected with the various countries' weaknesses. The same applies to the sub-regional bodies yet they are expected to help mobilize and have a common front which should be stronger than that of each country acting alone.
- VI. The theoretical perspective for understanding the state of affairs in Africa is the centrality of the dynamics of politics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange, interpersonal life. Social production of politics is the mode of binding rule making, rule application and rule adjudication with which all human groups tend to meet the challenges of human existence such as production of food, shelter, safety of life and property, etc, the legitimate focus of governance. Its quality determines what people and their governors can do or not do at any point in time. This theoretical perspective indicates clearly the direct link between the quality of politics of social production and the quality of security and the quality of the all embracing issue of governance.
- VII. The capitalist social production and its associated adversarial political party rule is now the dominant form of social production and form of rule in the world. This form of rule and production have created great advancement in production capacity in Europe, north America and parts of Asia through the deployment of science, technology and industrial manufacturing .These forms of rule and production have greatly improved the quality of life including the broad issues of governance and security of life and property. Other parts of the world have been trying to attain the same quality of life. Those who succeed in this endeavour tend to have improved security and governance. Those who do not and have been integrated into the capitalist world like Africans, tend to be riddled with security and governance challenges.
- VIII. The ways and means of studying the situation and possible ways out consist of observation of documentary evidence, over the centuries, forms of rule and the phases and faces of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution sharing and exchange in various parts of the

world generally and Africa in particular. Interviews of participants in various aspects of politics of social production, reproduction, etc, capture important dimensions of the unwritten events.

Finding so far

- IX. African countries have so far not been able to establish firm adversarial party rule and capitalist social production with firm base in science, technology, industrial manufacturing for two main reasons. First are: the machinations of their former colonial masters to continue to exploit their former colonies. Second, it is the adversarial nature of political party politics that keep the leaders divided, corrupted and distracted from the main tasks of forming a sustained strong common front to solve the enormous difficulties of engaging in rapid scientific, technological and industrial manufacturing to meet the expectations of independence from colonial rule. For only Africans can liberate themselves, not their colonial masters.
- X. The implications for over all governance and specifically, for security in Africa are dire. Africans through colonial rule have been forced into capitalist social production and its possibilities for good life but have directly and indirectly been obstructed from developing productive capacity relevant for attaining that good life, including the needs of governance and security in the continent. The growing gaps between the legitimate survival needs of the people and the social production capacity of African countries manifests in poor governance. The people have increasingly resorted to unacceptable self-help of all sorts which further undermine governance and security

Conclusion and Recommendations

- XI. Due to the absence of committed, sustained and united leadership as well as modern scientific, technological and industrial manufacturing in most countries of Africa, the continent is unable to provide most of its needs, meet the challenges of modern life thus unable to become producers of scientific and technological and industrial manufactured goods and

services. The continent is, therefore, unable become a major player in global politics.

- XII. There is, therefore, the need for determined, sustained and concerted effort of the people and their governments to do the needful.
- XIII. The way out is the abandonment or at the very least, suspension of political party rule and, at each country level, select by lot and or rotation people from all parts of each country to rule (democracy) each country and do the same at the sub-regional and continental level. This is the way out of divisive, corruptive and distractive politics of social production which often degenerates into military rule and dictatorships when some soldiers think that the politicians are there just for only themselves.
- XIV. The other measure is to embark on rapid scientific, technological and industrial manufacturing in each country, sub-regional and regional levels, that meet the challenges of modern life. Now, we proceed to details and how we arrive at the foregoing observations, conclusions and recommendations

1.2. Details

This discourse is based on an ongoing study. In this first cut at the problems the effort will concentrate at giving a comprehensive broad picture, not a detail examination of each aspect of what has been subsumed under governance and security. The emphasis is on: what has produced the current Africans and Africa, what we Africans and Africa are, what we can be, what we want to be, and on the logic of how things are related and tied to the dynamics of social production of politics and politics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange. This should help us, at least, refresh our minds on where Africa is coming from, the journey so far, and possibly sketch where Africa must go. This approach is indicated by the broad questions already raised. The discourse is organized as follows: 1. Introduction including the overview, 2 Clarification of Terms; 3 the Questions and the Answers that We Already Know, 4. Theoretical Perspective and Methodological Imperatives, 5. Implications for Governance and Security, and 6. Conclusion and Recommendations.

2. Clarification of Terms

2.1. “Politics” is to be understood in the widest sense as all that have to do with binding or authoritative decision making, decision implementation and decision adjudication within a group in a definite space concerning social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing, and exchange (ogban-Iyam, O, 2005). It is politics that makes social or interpersonal or group work meaningfully, less chaotic, effective and efficient. As people get into interpersonal or group activities they are bound to do things according to their own understanding, if there are no guides, rules and regulations about what is to be done, how, when and where, etc. It is politics that provides the authoritative or binding answers.(Easton, David 1990) We state that there is virtually no sustained group production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange without politics and no politics without sustained group production, reproduction, consumption, sharing and exchange. This situation holds if politics is to be understood as all that have to do with binding or authoritative decision making, its application, and its adjudication in respect of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange, among a group of people within a definite territory, between definite territories and among definite territories.

Like other aspects of human social production, conflict, co-operation, disagreement and agreement, and virtually all aspects of human behaviour emerge in the course of authoritatively deciding, implementing and adjudicating social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange. Politics emerged out of social production and survives and thrives on social production.

In this sense, politics predates a state, exists in a state and exists when a state does not exist. This conception of politics is not centered on state (Nnoli, Okwudiba, 1978) but on all authoritative or binding group power in all groups of people who engage in consistent social production and reproduction, sharing, exchange, distribution, and consumption, in a more or less definite territory. Even in the twenty-first century, politics still takes place in remote villages and hamlets where the modern state power has not penetrated. As long as consistent and sustained two or more people production needs to take place then social production of politics has to take place and the reaction to the binding rules and regulations of social production begins. This reaction to the binding rules we call politics of social production. We shall come back to politics later as we discuss how politics expands globally with social production.

Every form of political order or form of rule and its attendant structures must be socially produced and sustained if they must persist for some time.

2.2. “Production” mean effort, exertion in creating, recreating, abolishing and modifying tangibles like food and intangibles like rules. “Social production” means two or more person joint effort or exertion in creating, recreating, modifying and abolishing tangibles and intangibles. It also includes consumption, distribution, sharing and exchanging such tangibles and intangibles. What is produced often depends on the quality and quantity of labour (knowledge and skills of the human beings and the number involved), the tools (bare hands, sticks, stones, simple crude gadgets, advance sophisticated equipments, artificial intelligence, etc), the objects of labour (group hunt for wild rabbits, building a group thatched roofed hut, refining crude oil, building a car, building a spaceship, removing a brain tumor, etc) and social relationship (simple communal/ communitarian exchange of labour, tools and products of labour; slave and master; caste system relation among the various castes; feudal lord and serf; capitalist employer and employee; socialist state employer and employee; collective self employers and mutually shared benefits according to needs, etc).[Marx and Engels, 1977]

Those who own and control labour power, tools of labour, objects of labour and social relations of production, often decide or determine what to produce, what is produced, distributed, shared, exchanged and consumed by who, when and where.

Early in the life of virtually every sane person, irrespective of sex, language, religion, ethnic group, skin colour, etc, a person becomes aware of his/her place in the social production system. Each realizes what things, goods and services he/she desires that she/he can get and/or what she/he is allowed to do and or prohibited from doing. Our values: likes and dislikes, virtues and vices are produced and/or developed within the production system as we struggle to cope with life demands. It is in the course of social production that fraudulent and/or virtuous behaviour are propagated, promoted or discouraged. If we perceive the system or any aspect of the production to be favourable to us, we tend to like it or that aspect and we tend to want it to continue and vice versa. Friendship, enmity, alliance, etc, are made in the course of social production. These processes may take place between a man and woman, father and son, etc. It can be within and outside of and between families, sexes, villages, countries, religions, professions, classes and skin colour and race,

etc.(Ogban-Iyam, O, 2005, 2024, 2025). If we want to deal with vices and virtues of any group, we must know how they are produced, nurtured and sustained.

There have been various types of social productions in the world since recorded history. Some of these have disappeared or are disappearing while others have been subordinated greatly by another social production system. Some of the values that the old or subordinated social productions generated still survive and have their effects in various countries. This is in spite of the social production that has become dominant globally.

2.3. “Security” is a state of being safe or protected (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary). Political Security is a condition where the State is safe and protected from external aggression and internal insurrection, violent conflicts and secession. In popular parlance it is a state where the territorial integrity and sovereignty is maintained. From the discussion in the section on production and social production, it should be clear that country’s political security is a function of the state of social production. In many countries national security or political security is often equated to the security of the head of state and his family not the security of all within the territorial limit of the country. The emphasis becomes military and police and weapons. While there is no absolute political security, the major problem arises when it is pursued in a very narrow sense of, at best, only those who authoritatively decide the social production, distribution, exchange and consumption in a country (the rulers). Nobody feels secure when his food, the air he breathes, the water he drinks, his clothing, house, movement, communication, etc, are not safe. Everybody who values his life is concerned with survival and security and will resort to self help, the way he/she deems fit within the social production system which could be regarded as a state of insecurity and or political instability by others. Therefore, the more inclusive political security is, the better for the human beings in the polity.

2.4. “Governance” here is understood to mean official or lawful control over the affairs of a political unit or entity by the people who run it or the administration of such units. (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary). Control of a political unit or entity by people who run it or the administration of such a unit is often all encompassing. If a unit in question is a country, it means dealing with all important matters in such a country. This is why issues of security can be appropriately discussed under governance. This lawful or official control is often thought of in

good or bad, failure or success terms, etc. In our context, the political unit or entity is Africa and its component subordinate political units called countries /sovereign states. Within each country are component political units that are called by different names, depending on the colonial experience.

2.5. “Development” here will simply mean “the act or process of growing or causing something to become larger or more advance; and the state of being created or made more advanced.(Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary). At individual and state levels, development has many dimensions. They can be broadly grouped into developing the human being and developing physical things, processes and the environment. Every development is part of a social production, distribution, exchange, sharing and consumption. Developments of human and material aspects also depend on the quality of social production, distribution, exchange and consumption. Knowledge of science and technology and their applications are at the base and driving force of modern development. A social production with low level of knowledge and application of science and technology, integrated into social production system often produces a weak economy of poverty and primitive politics.

That something is new does not mean that it is always good or always bad. It depends. Since human beings must produce their needs for survival and security, development must be first guided by this fact. This is important so that the people concerned decide for themselves and are guided by whether or not the development needed also advances the survival and security needs of all. When this is not done we should expect that those whose survival and security are not produced, act to survive and be protected or inflict their own fate on others. Another fact to note is that development (creating something new, growing, expanding or making more advanced) has no end. Even the so-called developed countries are still developing and are likely to keep developing. Both at individual and group levels, leaving some people behind so we can develop faster or in a manner that threatens the survival of those left behind may be counterproductive. Those left behind in the development race and/or whose survival and security are threatened by such development become agents of instability, insecurity, terror, revolts and revolutions.

3. The Questions and the Answers that We Already Know

3.1. The Questions

The first question: whether mass poverty, unemployment, insecurity of life and property, insurgency, contested elections integrity, poor governance, and other unacceptable state of affairs in Africa are isolated issues or symptoms of the same phenomenon? The tentative answer is that: mass poverty, unemployment, insecurity of life and property, insurgency, contested elections integrity, poor governance, and many other unacceptable state of affairs in Africa, are symptoms of the same phenomenon with different phases and faces. The phenomenon is capitalist social production from pre Trans Atlantic slave trade, through the Trans Atlantic Slave Trade, Colonization of Africa, to post colonial phases and faces to date. Phase and face are used for the same phenomenon to indicate time span and for different appearances for the same thing, respectively. For instance, the phases and faces of sustained contact of Africa with Europeans were trade by barter, then trade on human beings, then conquest and rule over Africans, then resumption of trade, this time, in European currencies, on European terms. The same exploitative production and exchange relations happened over different years and with different appearances.

The second question: Is there any epistemological and methodological perspective from which we can understand this confounding state of Africa in the world and a way out of the situation? The answer is that the Centrality of the Dynamics of Politics of Social Production, Reproduction, Consumption, Distribution, sharing and Exchange provides the epistemological perspective and methodological imperative for understanding, studying and remedying the African condition.

2.2. Answers that We Already Know

The plethora of literature on why Africa is backwards or less scientifically, technologically advanced like other continents and how Africa can overcome such backwardness ranges from Marxist [Marx and Engels, 1977, Ake, Claude, 1981, Claude, Ake, 1982; Goulborne, Harry, 1976; Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1976; Ekekwe, Eme, 1986]; , Dependency [Galtung, Johan, 1971], to liberal structural, functional/cultural perspectives [Almond, Gabriel and Coleman, James, 1960; Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sydney, 1963; and Anifowose, Remi (1982)]. However, the considered view in this discourse and presentation is that some of these answers are incomplete, some others are correct and their recommended solutions difficult to implement and or inappropriate. We can only deal in summary terms with this plethora of explanations, analyses, and recommendations. They can be broadly

grouped as: the psychology and personality factors of Africans, cultural factors, racial deficiencies, failure in the performance of functions, structural /functional deficiencies of politics and the economies, and leadership failure. They also include lack of free markets and counter-productive state policies and control, exploitative nature of capitalist development including unequal exchange and dependent relationship between the global south and global north. Marxists locate it correctly on capitalist exploitation and recommend a revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalist social production and the establishment of socialist social production. The dependency school sees the situation in terms of unequal relations of exchange between centre (Europe and USA) and periphery (Africa and South America and some of the former colonies) which makes the former colonies dependent on the former colonial masters and recommend delinking the periphery from the centre. Structuralism blames the situation on lack of structures for development and recommends the building of the relevant structures. Functionalism blames the situation in the failure in the roles that need to be played to get the functions of development. The culture school blames the situation on the prevalence of inappropriate culture such as subject and parochial cultures and the need to develop civic culture.

None of these diagnoses is completely baseless yet all of them need further interrogation. While not doubting the accuracy of the diagnosis and the cure in Marxist perspective, it is to be noted that where such revolutions took place in different countries such as Mozambique, Guinea-Bissau and Zimbabwe, etc, the situation has not changed significantly as the capitalists have persisted under one reason or the other to subvert or mount some sanctions on such countries. Late Samora Machel of Mozambique was brutally killed in a plane crash. Furthermore, from the benefit of hindsight, these countries need not wait for a revolutionary change in one swoop to begin to reverse the situation. Advancement in science, technology and industrial development does not happen overnight and yet it can be started so that it can begin to hack away at the basis of the power relationship differential. Similarly, the dependency view of delinking from the centres of capitalism has been difficult to apply in one country as the capitalists try different methods to destabilize such countries. Structuralism, functionalism and culture school demands from countries of Africa presume that these countries have never had contact with capitalism which promoted certain patterns of social production

whose consequences are being manifested. Furthermore, it is often assumed that the people are free to do what they want or that different non European cultures have not become scientifically, technologically and industrially advanced. Even when the former colonies were supposed to be assimilated into the colonizers culture, the capitalists colonizers still kept scientific, technological industrial manufacturing outside their colonies so their colonies remain subservient and to be exploited.

In all these views, the aspects of the scientific, technology and industrial basis of all forms of modern social production which increasingly offset the power differential of the capitalist former colonizers and the former colonized is not directly addressed.

Furthermore, Political Party politics of social production of the colonizers which is a significant divisive and destabilizing factor in the former colonies' attempts to establish a scientific and technological base for advance social production in most African countries is not addressed by structuralism, functionalism and culture perspectives.

Most of the literature takes for granted the positive role of political parties as agents of political socialization, interest articulation, interest aggregation, political mobilization and even as a factor that is indispensable for modern politics. Multiple political parties are even seen as indicators of democratic politics. [5] Political parties are rarely seen as obstacles to direct people's rule which is what democracy really is. Democracy is not representative rule, which is what the rule by elected political parties' members is. (Ogban-Iyam, O, 2005)

Multiple political parties are rarely seen for what they are, as negative colonial legacies alien to Africa. Violence and bloodletting have been witnessed during and after electioneering campaigns and after elections over the years across Africa: in Kenya, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe, to mention just a few. Election results are rarely accepted as free and fair. These acts are often interpreted as ethnic violence and are not seen as inherent features of adversarial party politics in Africa.

As for interest articulation and aggregation, it is not clear what interests of the people have been articulated and aggregated over the years with the increasing level of poverty, unemployment and unrest in the continent. Similarly, the socialization effects of political parties appear to be negative namely making the followers see

members of other parties as enemies who deserve to be maimed and or killed. In any case, most adults often already know what they want. Politicians and their political parties try to tell the voters what they think they would like to hear. Does any adult in most countries of Africa need to be told that he or she needs security of life and property, good and affordable food, good houses, good roads, good transportation and communication facilities, good schools for his/her children, affordable medical care, and all the other things that politicians tell voters? These are things people have grown up in the twenty-first century to desire. In any case, political parties do not use their own funds to do what they promise the people. It is still public resources that are used if available and if the politicians do not misuse them for themselves and forget about the voters. What is governance all about if, at the minimum, there is no security of life and property of citizens?

4. Theoretical Perspective and Methodological Imperatives

4.1. The Centrality of the Dynamics of Social Production, Reproduction, Consumption, Exchange, Distribution and Sharing in Interpersonal life

There are many theoretical perspectives from which scholars and non-scholars explain reality and various aspects of reality. This is particularly so in interpersonal or social (economic, political, psychological, religious and sociological) life. However, after Thomas Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolution* and the debates that ensued among eminent philosophers of Science like Karl Popper, Imre Lakatos, Paul Feyerabend, Thomas Kuhn and others, one can no longer say exactly the correct criteria of judging a scientific theory (Smith, M.J. 1998). It is also no longer certain that scientific explanation is superior to other kinds of ways of explaining our reality because we do not know exactly what reality is. Proofs, verifications, falsifications, and what works, particularly in the social sciences, are now assailable. This is why methodological plurality is now more tolerable. The guide chosen here is that: 1. all scientific knowledge is tentative, 2. most human beings depend on their senses in spite of their imperfections and 3. Let our senses directly and indirectly aided by dependable instruments guide a good theory or explanation, interpretation and prediction and/or a combination as well as methodology of study.

The question that may be a good guide is, what can we see, touch, smell and hear directly or through some instruments? We should not mind if our senses and senses aided by instruments, become better in future. We can always say, given the best available at the time, this is what it was, what is and what it is likely to be. Even if there are continuities and discontinuities, when we know what was, we may find out why it no longer exists, if it continues to exist, we may find out why it may not continue to exist and so on.

In a world of change, particularly in social (two or more persons' relations) world, some things change rapidly while others change fairly slowly. If we must depend essentially on our senses and reflection from what our senses tell us, we may have to be guided by those basics that our senses tell us are fundamental universal behavioural processes or elements. These behavioural processes must not change too rapidly but change so slowly that we can always identify them and take our bearings from them. If bearings are not stable or steady they are not useful because they do not provide correct measures. These basic processes should constitute social sciences atoms, cells and elements or basic units. These basic elements in life and social sciences could be: breathing, eating, growing, sensitivity, moving, reproducing, excreting, and the work people must do in order to carry out these living processes. These basic processes make social life possible. We can then build up on these basic or first order processes and then follow up other processes that human beings undertake to continuously perform and sustain these life processes and functions. Since human beings do nothing more than work to keep alive and be safe, understanding how they go about these tasks enable us to understand human beings.

A number of times, what human beings work on or produce may turn out to be the opposite of what they always want namely to protect and enhance their life processes. This work in order to be alive and safe is what may be called production (as done by one person alone) or social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange (SPRCDSE) (as done by two or more persons).

The choice of theoretical perspective here, for lack of a better term, is "the centrality of the dynamics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing, and exchange in interpersonal life". In short: The Centrality of the dynamics of SPRCDSE in interpersonal life. Here we use it in explaining virtually all aspects of social life. In this paper it is used to explain the incapacity of African

countries to produce the needs of modern life that gives rise to insecurity of life and property, quality of governance and other unacceptable features of African countries and continent.

The centrality of the dynamics of social production, reproduction, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange, in interpersonal life is simple, straight forward, fairly grounded on what we perceive with our senses, intersubjective, applicable to virtually all human beings on earth, at micro and macro levels of analysis. This perspective is free of many technical and special terms of social scientists yet it is very scientific. It is not based on a dialectical process that has a predetermined end. All depend on configuration of forces. Most human achievements are reversible depending on the forces at play. Many of the other theoretical perspectives such as systems theories, structural/functional theories, institutional theories, organizational theories and dialectical materialism perspectives, that I am familiar with, do not have this simplicity, concreteness and applicability to all periods of human existence on earth so far. Furthermore, every human behaviour and action as individual or as a group, organization, institution, country, can be and is evaluated from the point of view of production of survival, security and protection of basic life processes because every human entity that wants to live, craves for survival and security of life.

This theoretical perspective begins with Fredrick Engels profound statement that human beings have two major tasks namely production of the means of livelihood and the production of the specie (Marx, Karl and Engels, Fredrick 1977). Marx and Engels, particularly as stated in the Communist Manifesto (1977) recognized the importance of production and social production in the history of mankind, recognized the exploitative nature in different phases and epochs in human history, the exploitative nature of labour relations and the alienation of the workers, the producers, from what they produced in all modes of production after the primitive communalism mode. They also stated that the class struggle that ensued in the exploitative modes of production of slavery and feudalism ended in the overthrow of the class of the exploiters: the slave masters, and the feudal lords. They predicted the overthrow of the capitalist mode of production of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat. A transition stage of socialism that ends the exploitation of the workers by the employers will end in communism. At this stage science and technology would have advanced greatly and generated such abundance and surplus.

Exploitation of workers would have long ended. Management of people would have become management of things. From each according to his work under socialism, it becomes to each according to his needs. Exploitation of labour and alienation of the producer from his product would have ended with the end of hired labour and employer owner. They had also made allowance for a possible peaceful transition of capitalism to socialism. The main tenet was since dialectical materialism was scientific, every stage would come to pass according the law of dialectics.

If Marxist thought is taken as human thought that is subject to appreciation and appraisal which is what is being done here, then there is some correspondence of some aspects of Marxist thought with current intersubjective sense knowledge and reflection.

1. Marx and Engels were correct when they observed that there has always been a struggle between man and his environment and man and his fellow man, but incorrect when they asserted that the history of hitherto existing society (even when we qualify it with written history) is the history of class struggle. Class struggle has been a fairly recent one, especially from large slave holding group life but more in feudal societies as compared to thousands of years of history of human societies. The more fundamental truth is that it is the history of human struggle with the environment and fellow human being over what to produce, what to reproduce, what to consume, what to distribute, what to share and what to exchange. Such a struggle has manifested and has often been masked or appeared in different visible forms namely in family quarrels, fights and feuds, clans feuds and wars, tribal and ethnic struggles and wars, dynastic and feudal feuds and wars, imperial struggles and wars, racial struggles and elite and class struggles in some societies and in religious wars. It is important to note this fact so that the concept of class should not be stretched too far. If we see the struggle properly we will appreciate why each of these struggles has not ended in favour of all supporters. For the bulk of humanity, human survival and security has not changed significantly in their favour. Their survival and security needs must be produced at the same time as those of their leaders or they continue to wait. In addition, the history of societies is rarely one thing. It has also been the history of famine, plagues, epidemics and other forms of pestilence, etc.

2. Slaves, serfs and proletariat did not on their own overthrow their oppressors in spite of their serious periodic revolts. Those who were against slavery led the demise of slave owners. The Serfs never overthrew the feudal lords. The bourgeoisies overtook the landed gentry and replaced them as the dominant force. Manufacturing became more lucrative than agricultural produce. The communists mobilized the proletariat and peasants to destroy the bourgeoisies in the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic. The really exploited have rarely really succeeded their exploiters without some of the exploiters' class joining and leading them. It is often their advocates and defenders who have the knowledge and skill to deal with the exploiters: the Lenins, Maos, Che Guveras, Castros of this world. However, the oppressed struggles weaken the exploiters. The deficiencies in knowledge and skills of the oppressed, has so far made it impossible for the oppressed to successfully take over and run the production outfit of their exploiters. A Clerk, mechanic, mason and a person with little education does not become a medical doctor, engineer, or develop managerial skills overnight after the overthrow of his master. This fact is not handled adequately by dialectics. Popularization of knowledge and skills to the workers is indispensable if workers have to run their business outfit on their own. You cannot control what you do not understand. This is why even when wealth and resources have been redistributed which reduces the level of exploitation; the generation of more surplus to go round takes time. Overlooking the differential in knowledge and skills of human beings in the social production masks what each human being must have in order to survive and be secure in the production system. Unplanned takeover of a work place by those who lack the knowledge and skills is counterproductive. Human beings have limited lifespan and need not and often do not wait for revolution to take place to solve their daily problem of survival and security.

3. Emphasis on class analysis fails to properly understand pre and non industrial societies. The problems of survival and security are universal and always present. The same cannot be said of class struggle. The people need not have industrial European standard of living before they survive and feel secure. People have to begin where they are. Development has no end and it is not unilinear. People have been developing before recorded history. Where the bulk of the people live in their ethnic and tribal homeland, class analysis does not throw much light. Yet the struggle for survival and security goes on all the time. Even if all are now being compelled to follow European standards which are currently out of the reach of a majority of

African people, there is the need to do the correct analysis so that people can properly take off from where they currently are. Where there are no sharp class divisions it may well be that the system is fairer than the more technologically developed production formations in Europe. This is not glorifying such a status. It will be more productive to have people choose their options and/ or to learn to walk before being asked to sprint.

If we can focus our attention on whose survival and security are protected and whose are not and how that has been done, we can make better sense of our reality. Since the universal purpose of willing partners in social production is to serve the needs of the participants, it will be easier to change production in favour of those who are losers. Such changes could be incremental or fundamental, revolutionary or evolutionary but it must be necessarily based on intersubjective sense evidence and reflection and not mainly on conjecture or exhortation.

4.2. The basic tenets of this perspective are:

1. That human beings breathe, eat, excrete, grow, move, are sensitive to stimuli, reproduce otherwise they die. Impairment to each of these or all of these threatens human beings sense of security. In order to carry out these processes and remain alive human beings must produce food and other things to stay alive.
2. Human exertion, labour, effort, energy, produces all human actions, virtues, vices, needs, goods and services, tangibles and intangibles, except those produced by nature.
3. That human production generally saps energy and must be replenished otherwise the person dies; and for this reason, nobody wants to labour in vain.
4. That the driving or motive force for human beings to produce is their desire to sustain their life;
5. That if they cannot produce, especially food and security for themselves, other people must produce for them otherwise they die;
6. That individual production, in the sense of one person doing everything all alone is very limited.
7. That it is the limited capacity of the labour of individual that often compels her/him to join hands with others to produce;
8. That the more effective, efficient, meaningful and sustained production is social production which necessitates politics;
9. That the level of knowledge, skill, tools and organization of social production of a group and the incentives determine the output.
10. That those who own and or control the social production process **determine what is produced, reproduced, consumed, distributed, shared and exchanged;**
11. That all producers often strive to be

involved in the control of what is produced, distributed, exchanged shared and consumed so that their needs are accommodated. 12. That popular control of social production is the best guarantor of survival and security of all and that virtually all human social relations are production relationships. 13. That all human beings are born into one form or the other of social production relationship; 14. That those who are satisfied with their place in the social production regime want it to continue in their favour by using all means at their disposal while those who are dissatisfied with it want to change it in their favour by using all means at their disposal. 15. That the means often used in supporting the status quo or opposing the status quo range from peaceful to non peaceful ones, from non violent to violent ones, and from obedience to disobedience. They also include support, opposition, subservience, confrontation, loyalty, rebellion, deceit, truth, propaganda, arguments, debates, threat and revolt, etc. The ultimate is leading, participating in revolution or opposing and suppressing a revolution, making and fighting a war for and /or against the regime. 16. That human beings produce and develop their virtues and vices, likes, dislikes, friends, enemies, fears and loves, cruelty, compassion, responsibility, irresponsibility ,etc. in the course of social production. 17. That human beings produce other human beings, families, clans, tribes, nations, in the course of social production in order to ensure their own security. 19. That dos and don'ts, rules and regulations, laws, doctrines, constitutions, political parties, institutions, social stability, instability, autocracy, democracy, etc, emerge from social production and must be treated as such and as nothing mysterious and extra terrestrial. 20, That it is individual-in-group problem for survival and security in social production, consumption, distribution, sharing and exchange, that propel and manifest in individual, inter-personal, marital, family, clan, tribe, ethnic, race, class, and international conflicts, struggles, fights and wars. The same is true of political, economic, religious, legal, organization, institution, and other conflicts, struggles and wars. 21. That individual-in-group problem for survival and security in social production, distribution, consumption, sharing and exchange, is the fundamental problem of mankind; not class, race, religion, etc, and will outlive all these second or third order problems. 22. If human beings understand how they produce, sustain human actions, virtues, vices, goods and services, they can understand and manage their world better. 23. Human beings produce social problems and social solutions.

This theoretical perspective seeks to know the dynamics of production of the target of study. If one knows the motive force that produces an event then the likely way of minimizing or enhancing the production becomes clearer. If for instance, the production of a certain process or event threatens any person or group of persons' survival and security or perceived sense of survival and security, we should expect opposing reaction from the person or group of persons threatened. One can apply this perspective to all spheres of social study at micro and macro levels. The human agency and the fundamental real reason for engaging in social production is kept constantly in view. It does not matter whether it is the study of an individual, families, clans, tribes, and nations. The same applies to the study of institutions, organizations, classes, events, processes and combination of these phenomena.(An individual can always mobilize resources to do considerable good or evil in these locations.) Whatever a person wants to study, the first set of questions is: who and/or what produces what/who is under study? What process produces the thing or issue? When we understand the origin and dynamics, we begin to figure out the sustenance and elimination. There are always beginnings of many, if not most human problems and solutions. This is how a study can deal with, for example, the politics of Social production of security, poverty, unemployment, terrorism, environmental degradation, syndrome of governance and related issues.

5. Implications for Governance and Security

Here we try to apply the theoretical perspective to help us to perceive how the dynamics of social production has generated the kinds of Africans and Africa we now have as well as the implications for governance and security.

5.1. Africa in the Dominant Global Social Production

By the time the people of Africa came under colonial rule of European countries the social production was communal social production, in most areas. The “we spirit” not the “I spirit” prevailed. Labour was not a commodity to be bought and sold. If there was a physical task a person could not perform alone he appealed to others to help him out. This assistance was not to be paid for. If the task took a lot of time and energy, the person who sought assistance provided food and refreshment. In many cases, other friends and relations helped in providing the food and entertainment. All that one needed to do was to inform friends and relations that many people would

come to help one on a particular date. In addition, people formed labour groups and worked in one another's farms and other projects like building of houses.

Work tools were simple and crude such as wooden bows and arrows, digging sticks, grinding stones, spears and shields, few metal tools, animal labour, etc. Communication was by words of mouth directly or by a village crier, talking drum, etc. Education from childhood to old age was by participation in work, play and watching of others especially older people doing things or the older people calling the attention of the younger ones to what was being done. A person was trained to perform many tasks, at different times, in a life time even though some were more accomplished and so recognized in some of these tasks than others. By late teenage years, most people were very conversant with their social production, distribution, sharing, and exchange and consumption system. People were many things at different times: farmer, fisher, builder, hunter, singer, dancer, trapper, tapper, storey teller, an authoritative decision maker, an enforcer of binding rule, and an adjudicator on binding rules.

Most products were for home consumption and excess for exchange and by trade by barter. They were often made of plants, animals, fish and the soil. They were also very perishable and often became manure that enriched the soil. Virtually nothing in use degraded the environment. There was often very little excess of products after consumption.

Land, the source of major needs, was owned /controlled by kindred families, villages and sections of villages. Individual land ownership was very rare, often happened when a person had lost his kindred. There was, in fact, very little private property. There were no landless persons because they belonged to various groups that held land in common use. Land was not for sale. Virtually all adults had access to land; the main source of livelihood, and stealing as means of livelihood within each community was rare. In addition, families' ties were strong and provided for the less able kith and kin. Families' ties were both mechanisms of defence and offence. There were no standing armies. The young people and able-bodied persons rose to the defence against any threat to the group.

The people lived in thousands of villages' polities. Each village had its own binding rules and regulations and structures of governance. Elders, age grades or

cohorts carried out multiple roles in governance. There were no elections, voting and as people grew to certain age, they grew into certain roles which they also outgrew at certain age and left for successors. Matters of common interest were discussed and decided upon in a non-partisan manner, often by consensus. There were no political parties even when people held different views on matters of common interest.

In contrast, European colonialists came with capitalism Social Production.

In this system two or more people jointly produce for the profit of one person or a person and his family. Labour was and remains a commodity to be bought and sold. Land was also for sale. There was no limit to what private property one person could own. There was no limit of the number of people one person could hire or pay to work for him. “I spirit” prevailed.

The tools of labour were mostly made from metals. Many of the products and their wastes were also made of metals and chemical which did not perish or decay easily. These items often pollute the earth and the atmosphere. The range of products was immense: mirrors, knives, cutlery, iron and steel pots, buckets, chairs, tables, matches, stoves, nails, corrugated iron roofing sheets, cement, planks, sewing machines, bicycles, motor cycles, cars, trucks, motorized boats, ships, airplanes, guns of all types, clothing, leather shoes, medicines, food and drinks, magnifying glasses, telescopes, etc.

The European colonialists from each country came from a land with a leader, with virtually the same binding rules and regulations over many villages and towns and the same political structures of governance. The king or queen was assisted by his/her nobles and the legislature was made up of elected members of different political parties and non elected members. The Prime Minister, the head of government, had many ministers in charge of various social production dimensions: defence, agriculture, trade, industries, health, education, foreign affairs, justice, home affairs, etc. These ministries continued to show that politics is the child and handmaiden of social production. There was and still remains a permanent Public service organization that serves under every political party that rules each European country. Every city and town had its local governance structure linked to the central government. All these political structures of governance arose from many centuries

of the need of their successive modes of social production not just to imitate some other country as many African countries do.

With the forceful colonization of Africa and to extract the resources of Africa that the colonialists came for, they (the colonialists) adopted and adapted some of their home governance political structures for use in the part of Africa they colonized. The villages which before colonial rule lived as polities or confederation of polities were stripped of their independence. There were no colonial formal governance structures that linked each village to district or local government as in the home countries. The villages more or less carried on with a great deal of their pre-colonial political structures of governance. This made many of the village political structures of governance to outlast the colonial time except that they could no longer take binding decisions on many aspects of social production in respect of security of life and property. Colonial rule took over..

In Southern Nigeria, for instance, the nearest colonial political structure to the villages was the appointed village chiefs, councilors and native courts and court clerks which served a number of pre-colonial villages called clans. Chiefs were native court judges who were also head tax collectors. Most of the political structures of governance imposed by the colonialists have continued till date in Africa.

Most of these political arrangements of control or governance were employed to produce and reproduce not only the raw materials but also the types of Africans that the colonialists needed. While extracting minerals and plant based raw materials they produced and reproduced Africans who began to think and act like the British, French, Spaniard, Portuguese, etc : eat, speak and dress like the colonizers and despise African ways of life and believe that the Europeans were superior human beings who must be obeyed and imitated. Even those who opposed European colonial rule wanted Africans to rule themselves so that they could live like European colonial officers.

However, while trying to be like the Europeans the bulk of Africans who have acquired European type of education who were born and/or grew up in villages and rural towns are still carrying forward some of their kinship ties and norms of their parents' communal social production. They continue taking care of parents, uncles, aunts, siblings and other kith and kin that must have also helped them in one way or

the other with school fees, community scholarship, as house helps, nannies, guardians, etc. Most Africans carry this baggage wherever they go and in whatever they do. This baggage has serious effects on the post-colonial performance of Africans in the political structures they inherited from the colonialists.

While Africa became an outpost of European capitalist social production the main production of metal and chemical based goods and services were reserved for production in European countries. The implication is that even from colonial times the western educated Africans never had enough places in the modern sector labour market. These jobs in the capitalist economy were generally called Whiteman's jobs in contrast to one's parents' and communal jobs. A person's performance was not judged with the same standard of diligence when working in a white man's job (public service) as when working for parents or his community. Cutting corners was accepted while working for the white man. This standard of behaviour continued into post-colonial period and was to adversely affect the quality of governance.

The colonialists purposefully did not establish meaningful industries and manufacturing in Africa to absorb the increasing numbers who sought these jobs. Such industries would have competed and undermined European based industries. The minerals and other raw materials were taken to and processed in Europe.

Agriculture was not modernized and mechanized even in the area of cash crops. Cheap manual labour was readily available. The staple food crops and animal production remained primitive and as carried out more or less in pre-colonial times.

Particularly, relevant for our discussion, it is to be noted that more than 50 years after the end of colonial rule, most Africans still use in their farming, bare hands and simple iron and steel tools such as cutlasses, machetes, shovels, hoes and head pans, often obtained from outside the African continent. Those who use mechanical, electrical and electronic tools for work are few and depend on imports from Europe, Asia and North America. It is, therefore, no surprise that Africa is at a primitive/low level of capitalist social production in spite of the fact that the leaders profess to be capitalists or that Africa has a capitalist social production. With the colonization of Africa and the imposition of European values, Africans have come to like and consume European made goods and services. A majority of them now long for but cannot afford these manufactured industrial goods and related services being

produced in Europe and other continents after many years of colonial rule and many decades after colonial rule. The range of these items has already been indicated. Many more of these items like mobile telephones, computers, electric generators, refrigerators, air conditioners, close circuit televisions and cameras, drones, etc, are being added to the list of necessary imports.

People living under such social production who cannot make metals, chemicals and the metals and chemicals for manufacturing machines can only depend on importation of such, chemicals, metals and machines if they need them. And in a world where most of the earth surface and the people living in it have been forcefully connected to see, use and depend on the chemicals, metallic goods and services provided by machines and industrial production, the implications are dire for people who cannot produce these chemicals, metals and machines. In such places, the fundamental human struggle with the environment in order to be alive and safe is fierce. Too many people chasing after very many good things that Africa has not been producing. There are few large industrial jobs in the continent that enable people in such jobs buy these good things of life. All means fair and foul, unknown in pre-colonial Africa, are therefore, deployed to get these few jobs.

People use various intangible and tangible tools such as lies, deceit, juju rituals, nepotism, tribalism, ethnic chauvinism, sexism, kidnapping, murder, violent protests and communal warfare to get these jobs. Stealing, embezzlement, forgery, over-invoicing, blackmail, brute force, overthrow of governments, etc, are deployed to enable people, irrespective of their religion, ethnic groups, status, to obtain the means to live in modern houses with piped constant running water, steady electricity, own cars, send their children to good schools, etc. Virtually everyone is in the struggle to get these goods and services that they have been made to depend upon since colonial time and yet they are not made in their various countries and are very expensive.

The quests for these things are definitely not ethnic demands. It does not matter who makes them. Even if Africans were of one ethnic group, under the same conditions as have been stated here, the battle would have still been fierce. Ethnicity would not have been the explanation for the fierce contests. It is a fierce fight for good things of life which often take different colorations.

What is not often well known by many Africans and who have high hopes on what African current leaders can do is that those who own and/or control the means of production determine what is produced, consumed, shared, exchanged and distributed. Most importantly, it is not often appreciated that most of these owners and controllers of the means of production live outside their country and that they are not African leaders.

Where are the owners of metal, electrical, chemical, automobile, medical, household equipments, utensils, and clothing industries, etc? Of course, they are mostly outside Africa.

This is the politics of social production context of the people that conduct election campaigns, administer elections, and vote at elections. It is also the home of people that create and use political structures of governance. We run elections with computers and internet communication and do not make computers nor run any world wide net web nor deploy those who fully understand their use. Most of the electorates are peasant farmers, fishermen and fisherwomen, petty traders barely aching a living and mostly illiterate. They also include poorly paid public servants, and the worst paid: the private sector workers such as construction workers, cleaners, stewards, sales assistants, etc. We expect them not to offer bribes to voters and voters to resist and ignore bribes of paltry sums of money or cups of rice, bottles of cooking oil and sachets of table salt, etc, and not to sell their votes.

Political parties are either decreed into existence or the same conditions are given for forming political parties and keeping them in existence. For fear of having too many political parties, these conditions are so stringent that political parties cannot be formed through collection of membership fees but by those who are wealthy. And who are these wealthy people who form the political parties? These are people who have no real root in social production of tangible manufactured goods and services. They are neither industrialists nor manufacturers of modern goods and services nor the children of these manufacturers (who, of course, are in Europe and in other foreign countries). They are former military officers and politicians and their associates who misapplied public funds for themselves and associates or had actually misappropriated public funds. Political parties then become owned by those who footed the cost of forming and maintaining them. This manner of formation of these political parties makes them even more anti democracy than those of Europe Tools

for work, what is worked upon, the incentives and disincentives also have their implication for security and governance, etc.

It is unfortunate that many well meaning Africans still hope that the behaviour of these political parties and their leaders and the way they go about conducting electioneering campaigns can ever be significantly better when the social production that molds their behaviour is not getting significantly better.

In respect of political structure of governance, we expect all the office holders to defend the constitutions of their countries and perform their duties diligently. We expect the president and his appointed staff assistants in each country who had invested their personal and borrowed funds for the election campaigns to lead the way. From the economic background that we characterized earlier, these are people of either modest income with struggling dependent parents, relations or of poor financial standing or even former governors of states, who had misappropriated their states' resources. The same goes with the elected members of the national and state houses of assembly, the state governors and their appointed assistants, the judges of the Supreme Courts and other subordinate courts and their staff, the public bureaucrats and public bureaucracies from the national to the local governments, the armed forces and the police. With no social security benefits for poor African dependent relations of public office holders, it is hard to see how these political office holders can meet our expectations. The verdict has long been well known. Corruption is continued in the new positions acquired. At best, what prevails most time is sharing of the so-called national cake not the baking of a bigger national cake. (The cake baking is done by foreign oil companies not even African companies.)

All these corrupt people acquired their values in the social production system. It pays to be corrupt particularly if one is not caught. Even if a person is caught and the person is prepared to spend some of the money on the interrogators, investigators and judges, he generally gets away with his corrupt way. After all, very few people especially politicians who have stolen public wealth have gone to jail or had their property confiscated or both.

Good education and hard work does not guarantee decent standard of living. Among the richest people are many crooks and those with debatable educational qualifications and they are well-known and straddling the continent like colossuses.

African leaders are merely caretakers and the agents of foreign companies and their governments, the main producers of Africa's needs. Those African leaders who insist that Africans must become the real producers, and in the continent, using the continent's resources, stand to be removed peacefully or violently by their foreign masters and replaced by other numerous willing Africans. This is why aspiring African political leaders go to Europe and North America to assure their masters, the leaders of global capitalism that their interests will be protected. This situation is unlikely to change with the rule of political parties. Let us now turn to the context of social production of politics and the politics of social production at domestic and on global levels. This will show the link of the politics of social production with governance in Africa with that of global politics of social production. It will also show why a significant change for the better cannot come easily; and why a state of emergency for rapidly building of a science, technology and industrial manufacturing base of social production in African countries must be declared immediately.

5.2. The Context of Social production of Politics and the Politics of Social Production

In every social production system there is social production of politics and politics of social production. Politics is the product and handmaiden of social production. Politics like all other creation of human beings is produced.

Social production of Politics on one hand simply means bringing into existence and/or abolishing or modifying binding or authoritative rule making, rule application and rule adjudication of what already exist, what has been produced, what to produce, consume, share, distribute and exchange, within a group and within a territory. It is the making of binding decisions, their application and their adjudication. Politics of social production on the other hand simply means inter group and/or intra group power struggle and exertion to become makers of binding decisions or to influence binding or authoritative decisions making, their application and adjudication concerning what has been produced and/or exist, what to produce, consume, share, distribute and exchange between the groups and/or within the group in question in a definite territory. It is not the making of the binding decision itself. It is exertion or struggle to influence or change binding decision, its application and its adjudication. It involves negotiations, campaigns, protests, propaganda, civil

disobedience, murder, threats, and blackmail. It also includes subversive activities, forceful overthrow of government and the use of virtually all means to protect and defend, influence, modify, change or abolish existing binding rules. Both the social producers of politics and the non social producers of politics engage in these activities of politics of social production. Each side of the politics of social production tries to have things in its own way.

The producers of politics are often the owners and controllers of the means of production or their agents. The owners and controllers of the means of production and their agents generally determine the kind of politics produced. If the producers of politics in any country are merely agents (as they are in most African countries) they must do the bidding of their principals or get changed or removed. This aspect is particularly relevant to former colonies in Africa where the producers of politics in Africa are mainly agents of the producers who are outside the continent and unaccountable to Africans. This is why African rulers who are not the real producers are often not free agents. They are often not free to do what their own countrymen and countrywomen need or want. These people may be the official or formal leaders but they do not often have what it takes to rule effectively. They cannot assert their sovereignty without dire consequences which they never want to face.

The producers of politics do not sit idly by after producing politics. They also engage in politics of social production to ensure that the status quo remains. And if the status quo must change it must change in their favour. The French are particularly notorious for staging coups d tat in their former colonies to ensure that their agents in their former colonies remain faithful.

These producers of politics additionally use legitimately, and at other times illegitimately, state agencies such as state educational institutions, the armed forces, police and state intelligence services to canvass and propagate their views. In all these, those who are satisfied with existing political order want to defend or change it in their favour while those who are dissatisfied with the same, use virtually the same mechanisms in their favour.

Just like the general pattern of social production where the owners and controllers of knowledge, skills, tools and objects of social production determine what is produced, consumed, exchanged, shared, and distributed when, how and to who; the

same people and their agents determine the production of politics (i.e. the authoritative decision making, their implementation and adjudication of social production). They also dominate the politics of social production (reaction to the social production of politics.) All social production flows from the same leverage. This fact is very important in understanding social production, distribution, sharing, exchange and consumption through human history and on global stage till date.

The same happens at the international or global arena: the social production of international/global politics on the one hand and on the other hand, the international/global politics of international/global social production.

The League of Nations was formed essentially by Europeans. The League of Nations in turn produced a number of guidelines for international social production before the Second World War. After the Second World War, the United Nations Organizations and its agencies, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, were created. All of these were formed at the instance of the leaders of the capitalist world to guide the global social production system. These political structures of international/global social production served the interests of the major producers of the global economy which happened to be European countries. Unlike domestic politics, global/international politics has no direct enforcer of the binding guidelines. It is through voluntary submission, collective enforcement of some sanctions or refusal of social production interactions with certain violators, that international/global politics yield the expected results. As would be expected, it is the countries that have the highest levels of social production of tangibles that dominate the global social production system and call the shots. These are the global players of politics. They often get away with a number of bad behaviours through the use of vetoes. These global political structures more or less support social capitalist social production globally.

5.3. The Dominance of Capitalist Social Production Globally

The dominant social production system in the world today is capitalism. The political order produced to sustain it is elective plutocracy. It is this order that is being pushed on a global scale and is being forced upon Africa through various means. All other different social production systems are reacting to it. It needs to be reiterated that in this social production system there is no limit of wealth a person

can acquire. Profit is the main motive of those who organize and control social production. Labour is a commodity that is bought and sold.

Capitalist social production has expanded from a few people in small groups in small territories fairly isolated entities, to many people in large groups over villages, towns, countries, continents and across continents or globally initially through brute force and murder and now through various manipulations and intrigues of Europeans and their emigrants particularly the British, French, Portuguese, Spaniards and the United States of America.

As Europeans expanded their social production, reproduction, consumption, sharing and exchange they created their politics that sustained their social production. Political Science literature is replete with accounts of European conquest, imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, issues of dependency, liberation, interdependence, etc).

There are unwritten rules made by leading capitalists' countries that no African country is free to leave capitalism for any other alternative. No country in Africa must be economically independent. Even if they remain capitalists they must not develop fast enough to compete in the use of the same resources the European capitalists need in their countries. African countries state of poverty and the lure for industrial goods and services which they do not produce must be constantly used to keep even their most educated and determined leaders in their place. Those who dare must be given tough time. Those who are stubborn enough to want to try alternative must be dealt with ruthlessly.

Train and give them a public service similar to that of their former colonizers which is not very relevant to their needs. Such a public sector: civil service, armed forces, police and public schools and universities, etc, keeps them away from their people and closer to the ways of their former colonizers. In this way they have a life style which they cannot sustain with their legitimate income. They will be easily amenable to corrupt practices which outsiders, particularly their colonial masters, cannot be easily and directly blamed. It is then easy to blame the victim.

When the open and above ground methods fail, these rules are enforced through the leading capitalists' intelligence agencies be it in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba of Congo, the overthrow of the elected Iranian Prime Minister and the

installation of the regime of the Shah of Iran, Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, the disastrous invasion of Cuba to suppress Fidel Castro's rebellion, the invasion of Iraq to overthrow Sadaam Hussein, the overthrow of Muammar Khadafi of Libya, etc. These accounts abound in open literature.

There are so far, no alternative sources of resources which the capitalists need to those of the continent of Africa. These aspects of the challenges faced by African leaders are not often known by many Africans and even by many of their leaders themselves, before they assume office. They just think an appeal to the Europeans who produce the needed industrial goods and services to help produce the same things in African countries will do.

Social production has moved from the use of bare hands, sticks and stones to mechanical, electrical, electronic tools to artificial intelligence, etc. and attendant knowledge and skills. In spite of the political independence of countries, those that have not been able to develop these tools, knowledge and skills are at the mercy of those who have, since all countries are now connected in this world wide competitive social production.

Capitalist social production system has, over the centuries, also generated so much wealth and consumer goods in North America, Europe and other areas settled and ruled by Europeans. People all over the world crave for these goods and services. However, the same system has not generated the same wealth but so much conflicts, wars, hunger and misery in the former colonial territories, particularly Africa (Rodney, walter; and Wallerstein, Immanuel, 1976)..

In capitalist Europe and European settled and ruled countries there are well established social security measures that take care of the unemployed. There are virtually none of these measures in capitalist African countries. The absence of social security safety net often adversely affects the politics of these countries.

Most people are educated and indoctrinated to accept the capitalist social production system and its periodic elective plutocratic political order as the best that mankind has ever produced and is likely to produce. However, those in African countries who want to follow the capitalist path have one major obstacle to overcome. It is the fact that capitalists do not go about teaching people or helping people to produce the same things they produce, even if those people confess their

love for capitalism, unless it helps them make profit and/or make those being helped more dependent on the helpers. In fact, they prefer that aspiring capitalists do not even have the capacity to pay for what they want but remain in a position that enables the helpers to make more profit from the helped. This is why nothing short of extraordinary emergency measures or a major warlike total mobilization of all citizens across political parties' lines, are needed for the former European colonies in Africa to break through this strangle hold and obstacles.

It is difficult to find any big country, without a significant European population, that was a former colony of the capitalists that has made it to a social production stage to be called or known as a major capitalist country. India that is rising fast has had a mixed economy with a very strong public or state sector and with strong collaboration with the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic when the Soviet Union was a superpower. India also had continuous determined and informed leadership of Pandit Nehru, Indira Ghandi and the then dominant Congress Party for many decades. That leadership embarked on massive science and technological development and encouraged massive manufacturing of industrial goods and machine production.

It is hard to see how a country with constant change of leadership by different political parties like those in Africa, often preoccupied with winning elections every four years or so, can make a breakthrough even within capitalist development. This is more so when even the mixed economy social production that requires strong state involvement in production has been dismantled all over capitalist European former African colonies. An alternative to the capitalist path has even greater obstacles.

The obstruction stance of the leaders of capitalism must be taken seriously by whoever thinks about a workable political order in Africa. The case of late Salvador Allende of Chile who even went through the popularly touted ballot box system is instructive. He won a free and fair election on a platform of taking Chile to socialism. He was brutally overthrown by General Pinochet and his supporters in the United States of America. This may have accounted for why the military regime of General Babangida, a former military leader of large African country, Nigeria, rejected Nigerians preference for socialism. General Babangida had sent a team of Nigerian Political Scientists and other experts to go round Nigeria to find out the preferred political system of most Nigerians. The choice was overwhelming: Socialism.

The capitalists tend to like and promote corrupt African leaders who amass and misappropriate the wealth of their people to themselves. Think of African leaders like late Mobutu Seseseko of Zaire, late Jean-Bedel Bokassa of Central African Republic and Nigeria former Presidents, Governors and political officers.

The former Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) was the first to successfully revolt against capitalist social production. It established a socialist social production which entailed state ownership and control of the means of production, consumption, sharing distribution and exchange. When USSR lasted it developed to be a superpower raising the standard of living of the people from a low to a high standard. With its collapse many members of the defunct USSR have reverted to capitalism or mixed economy social production.

The continent of Asia has the highest number of countries that have so far successfully revolted against capitalist social production. The Republic of China is the biggest survivor revolution against capitalist social production. China has engaged in social production that has raised the standard of living phenomenally. China is now the second biggest economy in the world. It is only second to the United States of America, the leader of the capitalist world. There is no love lost between the United States of America and China.

Cuba is another surviving country with socialist social production under the shadow of United States threats and sanctions. Cuban health facilities and health personnel have assisted many African and Latin American countries. Cuba was actively involved in ending white minority regimes in Southern Africa.

Venezuela is not only trying to survive as a socialist production system but it is also trying to build a democratic order from bottom up. Its leaders see the capitalist's reward system in social production, of each according the worth of his work, still surviving in socialist countries, as state capitalism or political party leaders' capitalism. The other aspect of the Venezuelan model is the attempt to eliminate the narrow specialization that does not allow for the full development of each person's full capacity (Lebowitz, Michael, 2016).

The Tanzanian and Guinea alternatives non capitalist social productions collapsed. One of the weaknesses of these models was the failure to overcome the primitive social production system and establish an industrial, machine, advance

scientific and technological based social production. They could not address quickly and adequately the urgent need to produce metals and metal based goods and services which the people had long been made to depend on and use. The leaderships depended more on exhortation and moral discipline than on rapid development of modern productive forces. A combination of both particularly with more of the latter may have made them successful.

The very successful Libyan alternative to capitalist social production as long as Muammar Khadafy lasted in power in Libya was violently suppressed by NATO powers led by the United States of America and France. This model put the bulk of Libya's resources into raising the quality of life of the people in a manner no other social production system in any other country has ever done. Water, housing, education, health, agriculture and other aspects of social production were tremendously improved. Although education sector was tremendously improved it was still according to the current specialization, not the all round type being envisaged in Venezuela. It is hard to tell how far the reduction in the gap in education, skills and control of wealth among the people would have started a real self rule, democracy, by the people of a country in modern time. However, for many years now Libya is in shambles showing how tremendous achievements in governance and security can be, and have been destroyed and reversed.

The point that must be noted for our discussion here is that there is one dominant social production system and corresponding plutocracy that relates to all countries in the world. There are no easy alternatives for people of politically independent countries like those of Africa who want to socially produce what they consume. Remaining in and moving up the capitalist ladder is tough and not for the faint hearted. Going for an alternative to capitalism from weak capitalist production base, ridden with corruption, is even tougher. However, every country has a right to choose its own path to produce its needs in order that most of the problems of governance including the conduct of elections and poverty can be reduced significantly.

What is required to reduce the weakness in the social production will be sustained, determined, clear headed leadership and followership that are willing to pay the price. If African country can breakthrough to develop machine age, science, technology and industrial manufacturing based social production, that improves the

quality of life, then the chances for free and fair elections, security and governance will improve. Similarly, the political structures of governance will function better from a stronger social production base.

For late entrants into capitalist social production who want to keep to the capitalist path and produce their own needs, it has not been easy. For those on the path of abolition of capitalism it has not been through elections but through revolutions. The rebels may have survived so far, but the capitalists have not given up the activities of bringing them back to their fold. The struggle is fierce and deadly. The Soviet Union was the first casualty. The other rebels on the other hand are struggling to avoid the USSR calamity.

All the former colonies of the Europeans in Africa inherited the full compliments of structures and institutions of governance and security at independence from colonial rule. There are heads of governments and their assistants called by various names, there are legislative bodies, public services and ministries in virtually all aspects that are in charge of daily governance activities. Similarly, in the security subsector of governance, there are armed forces, police, Para military outfits like customs and immigration. In spite of their existence, while their counterparts in other continents are meeting their challenges comparatively fairly well, the reverse is the situation in Africa. From Nigeria to Chad, Niger, Mali, Burkina Fasso, Senegal, Libya, Sudan, Uganda, Somali, down to Mozambique, through Zaire back to Cameroon is the story of blood and tears. Rebels, terrorists, insurgents, kidnappers, bandits, etc, contest governance and challenge and often overwhelm formal governance and security outfits. As the quality of life degenerates more people join or are compelled to join the rebels and terrorists. The mass media are full of stories of how these bandits and terrorists have superior weapons to those of formal state outfits.

This state of affairs is expected from our understanding of the state of politics of social production and the level of social production in Africa. Primitive social production produces primitive output.

Whatever the type of social production, whether capitalist or socialist or mixed economy, it is important to know that very limited knowledge and skill about what is to be produced and crude tools for such labour yields very limited product compared to current scientific knowledge and technological skills. The same cannot

be said about the use of only unaided bare hands and/hand held crude and simple iron and other metals' tools like hammers, saw, hoes, cutlasses, head pans, shovels, wheelbarrows as is happening in African countries. Social production where ever there is no knowledge, skill and practice in refining metal ores to metal tools and goods, is also generally of low quality and quantity. The common denominator for the success of the competing models of social production: capitalism, mixed economy and socialism, is machine, industrial manufacturing based on science and technology. Africa will continue to ignore this fact at its own continuous peril of remaining in a primitive state of social production with leaders whose main interest is to get hold of the government in order to help themselves with public wealth, the ready main source of wealth in Africa. The dominant ethos of capitalist social production is individualism and profit as opposed to communalism/socialism and communal/collective good. The personnel in charge of governance and security cannot provide what they do not have. Their countries do not produce the modern equipment for modern armed forces and police but depend on imports which are very expensive and often out of their reach. They help themselves first with what is available before thinking about public good.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

- I. Africa is at the receiving end of the dominant politics of social production. The unofficial assigned role of Africa is politics of social production of raw materials for export and sharing of the proceeds by African leaders and importation of the processed and manufactured goods and services by the same African leaders. The undeclared war to keep Africa in this unenviable position has been on for centuries now. Most Africans and their leaders do not know it or afraid to prepare and engage in the battles to assert their legitimate sovereignty. They would rather take what they can get by persistently asking for help from those who colonized them before. The result is that having acquired the taste of the good things of life from the social production of their former colonizers and since they think that they cannot beat them they join them in exploiting their own continent for pittance. Africa continues to consume what it does not and it is not producing. Governance and security needs are not produced thus many people begin to help themselves in the ways they deem it. This is likely to

go on into the foreseeable future if drastic steps are not taken by Africans. The path may be perilous: while some who have tried have failed, a number have succeeded. It does not make sense to hope that our former colonizers will stop doing what is in their interest. The way out requires determined, sustained and concerted effort of the people and their governments to do the needful.

- I. The abandonment or at the very least, suspension of political party rule and get down to people's rule (democracy) and, at each country level, select by lot and or rotation, people from all parts of each country to rule each country and do the same at the sub-regional and continental level. This is the way out of divisive, corruptive and distractive politics of social production which degenerates into military coups and dictatorships when some soldiers think that the politicians are just there solely for themselves.
- II. The other measure is to embark on rapid scientific, technological and industrial manufacturing and in each country, sub-regional and regional levels, that meet the challenges of modern life.

References

- Adegbami, Adeleke and Uche, Charles (2015) Ethnicity and Ethnic Politics : An Impediment to Political Development in Nigeria Journal of Public Administration Vol 4. No 1,
- Ake, Claude (1981) *Political Economy of Africa*. Nigeria: Longman Group.
- Ake, Claude (ed.) (1982) *Political Economy of Nigeria*. London: Longman.
- Almond, Gabriel A, Powell, G. Bingham, J.R, Strom, Kaare and Dalton, Russell J. (2000) *Comparative Politics Today*. Patprhanj: Pearson Education (Singapore) Pte Ltd.
- Almond, Gabriel and Coleman, James, edited, (1960) *The Politics of Developing Areas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sydney (1963) *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Anifowose, Remi (1982) *Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience*. Lagos, Enugu: Nok Publishers International.
- Centre for Advanced Social Science, CASS (1998) *The Challenge of African Development Tributes and Essays in Honour of Claude Ake*. Port Harcourt: Centre for Advanced Social Science.
- Charles, Alfred (1977) Pathway to Post 2015 Nigeria's Development: Sidestepping the Millennium Development Goals and their Major Creators. *Wilberforce Journal of the Social Sciences (WJSS)*. Vol 2, No. 2, Sept, 2017, pp 4-5.
- Easton, David (1990) *The Analysis of Political Structure*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall Inc.
- Ekekwe, Eme (1986) *Class and State in Nigeria*, London: London.
- Engels, Frederick (1981) *Origin of Family, Private Property and the State*, from <http://www.marxists.org> (accessed 22/11/2011).
- Galtung's, Johan (1971). Structural Theory of Imperialism. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol, 8. No, 2 pp 81-117.
- Federalism in Nigeria: Issues and Perspectives*. Lagos: Friedrich Ebert Foundation, Produced by Malthouse press Ltd.
- Goulbourne, Harry (1976) *Politics and State in the Third World*. London: The Macmillan Press.

- Lebowitz, Michael (2016) Socialism for the 21st Century. A conference held in May 2016 Sydney, Australia.
- Marx, Karl & Engels, Fredrick (1977): Selected Works in One Volume. New York: International Publisher.
- Marx, Karl & Engels, Fredrick (1997) Manifesto of the Communist Party. Moscow: Progress Publisher
- Nnoli, Okwudiba (1978) *Ethnic Politics in Nigeria*. Enugu: Forth Dimension Publishing Co, Ltd..
- Ogban-Iyam, O. (2005) Social Production and Reproduction, Societal Conflicts and the Challenge of Democracy in Nigeria, University of Nigeria Nsukka *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol 1, No. 1., pp. 1-51.
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (2004) Admixture of Ethnicity; A Theoretical Perspective in Onuoha, Johna and Okpoko, uche Pat (2004) Ethnic Nationalism and Democratic Consolidation: Perspectives From Nigeria and the United States of America. Nsukka Great AP Express publishers limited
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (1998) Federalism in Nigeria: Past, Present and Future in Babawale, T., Olufumi, Kola and Adewunmi, Funmi edited *Re-inventing*.
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (2012) *Nigeria: The Challenges and Prospects of National Unity in the 21st Century*, A Lead Paper Presented at The School of Arts and Social Sciences, College of Education, Eha-Amufu, Enugu State Fifth Annual Conference on Nigeria: The Challenges and Prospects of National Unity in the Twenty first Century.
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (1981) *The Nigerian Iron and Steel Industry 1960-1980: A case study of problem of technology acquisition and development*. Ph.D Thesis Submitted to the Department of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. (Unpublished).
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (2021) The Social Production of Ethnicity, Political Stability and Instability, Democracy and Whatnots of Nigeria: A Call for Research.
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (2024) Social Production and Issues of Governance Political Structures. Nigerian Political Science Association (NPSA) Online Zoom Conferene Lecture Series
- Ogban-Iyam, Ogban (2025) Africa in the Politics of A Fast Changing World: The Dynamics, Issues, Challenges and Prospects, Keynote Speaker Paper, Maiden

Annual International Conference, On the Theme: Africa in a Fast-Changing World: Themes, Trends and Threats, Faculty of Social Sciences Federal University, Otuoke, Bayelsa State, Nigeria,

Rodney, W (1982). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. The works of Walter Rodney particularly 'How Europe underdeveloped Africa' are very informative.

Sklar, .R. Richard(1963) *Nigeria Political Parties Power in an Emergent African Nation*. Enugu, New York: Nok Publishers.

Smith, Mark J (1998) *Social Science in Question*, London Sage Publications in Association with Open University

Tamuno, N. Tekena (2011) *Oil Wars in the Niger Delta 1849-2009*. Ibadan: Stirling-Horden Publishers Ltd.

Wallerstein, Immanuel (1976) *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origin of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, Text Edition. New York: Academic Press;