Downloaded from UvA-DARE, the institutional repository of the University of Amsterdam (UvA)
http://dare.uva.nl/document/66267

File ID 66267
Filename 10. CONCLUSION

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):
Type Dissertation
Title The state, the crisis of state institutions and refugee migration in the Horn of Africa : the cases of Ethiopia, Sudan and Somalia
Author W.A. Degu
Faculty Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences
Year 2002
Pages 294

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:
http://dare.uva.nl/record/220393

Copyright

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other then for strictly personal, individual use.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)

10 CONCLUSION

Most of the explanations for the state failure and refugee crisis in Africa and in many other parts of the world provided in the literature (see Chapter 2, 5 and 6) failed to answer the following fundamental questions, which are crucial for understanding refugee migration in post-colonial Africa: how was the pre-colonial political system constituted and how was it reconstituted during colonialism? How did the post-colonial state come into being; how was it constituted and/or reconstituted? How were the boundaries of the colonial and post-colonial states constituted? How were the different and competing identities (re)constituted during colonialism and after? How did post-colonial states attain their sovereignty, or to use Jackson's term their 'negative sovereignty', and at what expense? Thus, in order to make the argument that the social (re)construction of the territorial sovereign state and the crisis of the real existing states are the major factors behind refugee migration more plausible, these questions should be answered. A modest attempt has been made to answer these questions in this research project. In other words, the whole project was geared towards developing the thesis that ***refugee migration has mainly been, on the one hand, the result of the social (re)construction of the state as territorial sovereign entity. This involves the creation of bounded communities with rigid boundaries, the conflict of interests within these bounded communities and the violence involved in all of these, and the resulting failure/collapse of the real existing states. On the other hand, refugeeism has also been the result of the (re)construction of the international states-system with all its injustices, inequalities, exploitation and uneven development. The more recent restructuring of the world economy and its globalization, in which Africa has further been marginalized, has also significantly contributed to the crisis in the continent and the resulting refugee migration. These internal and international factors are dialectically related in intensifying Africa's crisis and the production of refugees.***

To fruitfully develop this thesis, like any other researches which focuses on the non-Western world, one of the difficult tasks was finding relevant theory/ies which would help analyse the state, the crisis of its institutions and refugee migration in Africa in general and the Horn of Africa in particular. Many of the dominant theories are not as relevant, for the Third World in general and Africa in particular, as their proponents make us believe, for most of them are based on the experiences of the West and reflect the political and socio-economic aspects of Western society. This shortcoming may mainly be because, on the one hand, most of the theoreticians in international relations believe that studying the Western experience alone is empirically sufficient to make general statements on individuals, groups and state behaviour irrespective of the point in time, geographical location or historical experiences. Very few look into the non-Western world to seek evidence for their arguments. They do not concern themselves with the behaviour of the large majority of members of the international system - the non-Western part of the world.[1] They therefore fail to provide adequate explanation for what has been and still is happening in the non-Western world. On the other hand, they tend to reflect the interest of the Western world by making the existing relations, institutions and order work smoothly. Liberalism, realism and rationalism are the cases in point, which Cox calls problem-solving theories. They do not question the pattern of relations and institutions which have been favourable for the West. As a result, they usually fail to show an alternative to the existing structure of the state and the international system other than reproducing what is prevailing. They ignore the fact that both the state and the international system are socially

[1] **Refer to their conception of anarchical international system, the unitary nature of the international system, state as 'like units', sovereignty, war and peace, etc. in Chapter One.**

constituted and reconstituted. Rather, they take the state and the international system as given and permanent. In other words, their concern with continuity and a logic of reproduction led them neglect the existence of a logic of change. They neutralise and reify the international system by treating structures, which have specific and transitory history as if they were permanent. Because of their sole focus on the powerful, especially the superpowers and the West, and their obsession with balance of power, objective law, hierarchy and anarchy, international order, war, etc., they ignore or fail to give due attention to the Third World. Most importantly, they do not focus on the betterment of human kind, its emancipation and freedom.

Contrary to the theories mentioned above, however, Marxism, critical and post-modern theories have relatively more relevance in understanding and/or explaining the complex situation in Africa and the resulting refugees. The focus of Marxism on the expansion of capitalism and its exposure of its evil nature, its analysis of globalization and fragmentation as two sides of the same coin of capitalist development and the resulting global inequality, its concern for the human race in general and its emancipation, and its emphasis on the inevitable transformation of the existing system provide useful insights. In addition, the different and refined versions of Marxism, dependency and world system approaches, critical and post-modern theories, which are not only based on but transcend Marxism, are more helpful for understanding the complex problems of the Third World in general and Africa in particular with its resulting refugee migration.

Critical theory's philosophical inquiry into the conditions under which emancipation in world politics is possible is one important insight for refugee studies. For the critical theorist the sovereign state, as a central actor on the world stage, is the foremost example of a particularistic or exclusionary political institution; and, as a result, it is a formidable obstacle to emancipation. Critical international theory's aim to develop an alternative theory and practice of international relations thus centres on the possibility of overcoming the sovereign state and inaugurating post-sovereign world politics. The two other crucial insights of critical theory are, first, that knowledge does not arise from the subject's neutral engagement with an objective reality but reflects pre-existing social purposes and interests. Second, critical theory denies that the claims of the existing structures are immutable. The central objection of these claims is that the notions of immutability supports structured inequalities of power and wealth which are in principle alterable. Critical theory investigates the prospects for new forms of community in which individuals and groups can achieve higher levels of freedom.

What is the relevance of critical theory for refugee studies? Refugee migration is a direct result of the social construction and reconstruction of the sovereign state and the structure of the prevailing international system and its crisis. Critical theory's concern and emphasis on: the conception of the emancipation of human kind; questioning things which are taken as given by realists - the international system, sovereign state, interdependence, international order etc.; the conception of the prevailing system and structure as is not neutral, necessarily invariable but as a historical production which must not be only explained but transformed; and explaining the sovereign state as a particularistic and exclusionary political institution and as a result, a formidable obstacle to emancipation; all are crucial for understanding the territorial sovereign state, its crisis and refugee migration in Africa.

With regard to post-modernism, its understanding of the arbitrary nature of modernity; the realisation that what exists in the world is choice posing as truth; reality is a social construct, language and conceptual frame-works are prone to self-fulfilling prophecies, all are important insights in understanding how states have been (reconstituted) and how our conception of refugees has been constructed. Moreover, post-modernism's contribution in understanding the relation of knowledge and power; the introduction of the genealogical and deconstruction approach, in general; its critical account of how particular representation circulates, dominates and takes hold to produce practical political effects and marginalizes others; insight on how the discourses on territorial state and statecraft shape our imagination; are all relevant in analysing the historical development (political, economic and social) and the current situation in Africa and in explaining the refugee crisis in the continent in general and in the Horn of Africa in particular. Most importantly, the focus of both critical theory and postmodernism on freeing human beings from unnecessary social constraints and emancipation of the human race is crucial for refugee studies, for it has been and will be the refugees that need freedom, the right to live and emancipation more than anybody else

With the important insight acquired from Marxism, critical and postmodern theories, it seems possible to provide a more relevant explanation for the complex socio-political and economic crisis of the state in Africa and the resulting refugee migration. To be more specific, it is possible to understand not only how our conception of a refugee is socially constituted, as we know it today in international law, but also how it has been shaped by the global political discourse. In this respect, the principles of inclusion and exclusion, identity and difference, citizens and aliens, inside and outside are fundamental to belief systems that determine who does and does not belong to a certain category, be it the state, the nation, ethnic group or refugee in this case. The constitution of the state as sovereign territorial political entity also has the same effect. The constitution of the state as a territorially sovereign entity implies, first, that what is going on within its territorial jurisdiction is the responsibility of that state. No other state or international organization has the right to interfere without the permission of the state. Second, citizens of a state have to cross the border of their country to be regarded as refugees. Moreover, the asylum request should be accepted by the state, which is sovereign, and it is only then that the asylum seeker would be given a status of a refugee and would be under the protection of international law. What this means is that the needs of the people are not considered as primary, rather it is the sovereignty of the state.

Another important discourse that shaped our understanding of who is a refugee is our conception of cause and effect, and our categorisation of economic and political phenomena (circumstances) as if they are separate. In many cases specific causes are attached to specific effects: For instance, economic deprivation and poverty as the causes of economic migration; political repression and persecution as the causes of refugee migration; and natural disasters as the cause of population displacement. However, in reality economic deprivation, poverty, political repression, and natural disasters are interconnected (see Chapter Two). This has been the case in the definition and typology of refugees. The discourse of rigid categorisation, the conceptualization of cause and effect as a linear process prevent us from focusing on the needs of the displaced people regardless of the causes and regardless of our category which we believe they belong to. It is crucial, therefore, to re-conceptualise that a certain

phenomenon (circumstance) can be a cause in one circumstance and an effect in another, or it can be both at the same time. It is also important to understand that an effect can be a result of a mixture of causes.

The other side of the coin must also be considered. This is the impact of such discourses and practices (especially national and international law) on the behaviour of the would be refugees. If victims of the state and other organised forces are aware of the fact that they will be under international protection (as a refugee) only if they cross an international border, they will be forced to do so. Similarly, when people are aware of the fact that they will be accepted in a country of destination only if they claim that they are political refugees, they will present themselves as refugees, regardless of their reasons (motivations) for migrating. This has been the case in many situations in general and in the case of anticipatory refugees in particular. This is what self-fulfilling prophecy means. The principles we use to organise our political system (sovereignty and territoriality), the language we use in defining who a refugee is, the criteria we use to decide who should and should not be under international legal protection, the laws governments adopted to accept migrants, etc. create the type of refugees we know now as a reality.

It should also be noted that in the same way as the various definitions have not been the reflection of the reality 'out there' (refugees) but part of the constitution of the reality itself (the type of refugees we know today), developing different typologies has also been part of the process of constituting the type of refugees we recognise as refugees today. It is an excellent example of how our attempts to draw the picture of the world out there and the language we use to explain this picture contribute to the constitution of the picture itself (the reality). Such a picture shared among many people defines reality for them; and because they think of reality in the same way, their actions and words tend to reproduce this reality.

The same insights, especially the emphasis of critical theory on eminent critics, opens the door not only to critically analysing the various partial explanations of the refugee crisis in Africa provided by many scholars, but also helps us to go deeper than before, to be able to explain refugee migration fruitfully. Thus, one has to dig deeper to unearth the factors and the processes which are behind all the factors identified by various scholars in the first place. Possibly one has to understand how the existing territorial state and the states-system have been constituted and reconstituted to explain the ever-increasing refugee migration. It may only be then that it will be possible to develop a more comprehensive explanation and understanding of refugee migration. What this means is that displacements, whether under the name of the refugee or the exile, have been a manifestation of statecraft, something that happened and still is happening in the course of statecraft, something that escaped the control of statecraft but also harnessed to the task of statecraft. The state occupying a circumscribed space is authorised not only to secure its external borders against enemies but also with the desire to shape its content (its population) to serve the preference of the state. Thus, the construction of the state by adherence to the official ideology, religion, etc.; creating loyalty and ensuring a more homogenous population and national consolidation and/or integration have all been part of the process. This desire has been the characteristic of and essential to any territorial sovereign state. The attempt to meet this desire creates refugee events.

The fundamental point here is that the histories of state and identity construction, and refugeeing have been intimately bound up with each other. In other words, the construction of the refugee has been an integral part of state and identity construction, the art of imagining and socially producing the state's territorial universal order. Thus, in order to understand better the refugee crisis it is imperative to understand the process of modern statecraft and the role it plays in the production of refugees and vice versa. It may also be important to acknowledge the inherent difficulty in distinguishing and categorising complex life experience into those of the refugee and those of the citizen based on a prior presence of the context of state sovereignty as an already fixed and stable context, a finished project. Rather, the state should be seen as it having been in a never-ending process of social (re)construction and refugee migration as one of its results.

In this never-ending process, it can be argued that African countries in general and the countries in the Horn of Africa in particular, first, failed to (re)construct political communities based on the unity of community and purpose. Rather they are fragmented into different sub-national communities. Second, political leader and elites have not been successful in creating new principles of political accountability, which correspond to their newly independent countries. Third, post-colonial nationalist leaders failed to create deeply rooted national identity over and above sub-national identities. Fourth, the process of European styled state-building failed as a universal idea, and the institutions and structures of the existing post-colonial states collapsed producing huge refugee flows.

This means that in order to fruitfully understand contemporary politics in Africa (or politics in contemporary Africa), the prevailing crisis and the resulting refugee migration it is believed that it would not be enough to focus only on the state per se. For the post-colonial state is the result of complex factors and process, both pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial, notably the process of the construction of political community, political accountability, national and sub-national identities, state-making and the resulting insecurity, and the complex and never-ending process of statecraft. Therefore, all these factors and processes were taken into account in analysing the situation in the continent. Furthermore, the impact of the dominant ideologies, development and state theories, political discourses and practices which have been shaping the overall political development have also been analysed with the hope of understanding the failure/collapse of the state (or the crisis of the state in general) in Africa in general and the Horn of Africa in particular and the resulting refugee migration.

One of the important issues that should be critically (re)conceptualized is the concept of the collapse of the real existing states. States fail or collapse when structure, authority, legitimate power, law, and political order fall apart. State collapse can thus generally be conceptualised as a situation in which the basic functions of the state are no longer performed. The state ceased to be an effective decision-making centre and no longer acts as a symbol of identity for its citizens. It has lost its legitimacy and its right to command and conduct public affairs as an authoritative institution. It no longer receives support from nor exercises control over its people, and it is no longer the target of demands, because its people know that it is incapable of providing supplies. It should be well noted that state collapse is not a short-term phenomenon but a cumulative and incremental process.

Various factors and actors and their interrelations contributed to the chronic crisis (collapse) of the state in Africa. It is, therefore, not possible to pinpoint one single factor which has been behind the demise of the African state. Pre-colonial development, the slave trades and later the colonial intrusions have all played a significant role. In the post-colonial era, the irrelevant nature of development theories, the imposition of various policies and programme packages which are hardly related to the situation in the continent and the adoption of contradictory ideologies have all significantly contributed to the overall crisis of the continent. In addition, the globalization and regionalization of the political and economic structure of the world have also marginalized Africa more than ever before. This process which is dominated by the Western powers has weakened the capacity of the African states.

The post-colonial internal political development, namely: (over)centralisation of politics, concentration and monopolisation of power, personalization of leadership, and militarization of society and politics contributed not only to the political crisis but also to the economic deterioration. In turn the economic collapse, which has mainly been the result of the failure of the mainstream economic theories, models and policy packages (or simply the failure of the developmental state) aggravated the political crisis. Moreover, the involvement of external forces as the result of both the foreign policies of the African states themselves and the interests of external powers, notably super-powers, has also significantly contributed to the political crisis in Africa.

Thus, one can safely conclude that the crisis of the post-colonial state in Africa has been the result of both historical and current developments. It has been the result of economic and political processes, domestic or otherwise, which are not only interrelated but also a cause and an effect at the same time. However, in order to plausibly explain the crisis of the state in the Horn of Africa the specific situation of each country should be considered. This is what has been attempted in the last three chapters. In the light of this, there follows an attempt to make some general points to show the relevance of the pre-colonial history to the post-colonial failure/collapse of the state and to help make clear what was destroyed (distorted) later and what was maintained. First, there was no one centralised political system, which brought the whole of Sudan and Somalia under its control. The different political structures (kingdoms/sheikhdoms/chiefdoms) both in the north and the south were destroyed and replaced by one Sudan only under the Turco-Egyptian rule. However, the division between the mainly Islamic north and the south remained unchanged. Thus, the major problem of Sudan can be traced back to the existence of this division. The pre-colonial Somali society continued without a central political structure up until the creation of post-colonial Somalia. The Ethiopian case was different. Ethiopia as a state, especially in the northern and central part, had existed for a long time. In the south, however, there existed many autonomous political entities (states). This does not mean that there was no relation between the north and the south. Even though there had been interruption when the central government was weak, there were political relations mainly through tribute payment to the central government. More importantly, there was important long-distance trading connecting most of the political entities in both north and south. However, it was at the end of the nineteenth century that a unitary state was created (recreated) in Ethiopia. The incorporation of the different political entities into a unitary state, through violence and war, and at the expense of the autonomy of the various political communities has been the source of the ongoing political conflict in

Ethiopia. The problem of the Ogaden, Oromo and the other ethno-nationalist movements can be traced back to this historical development.

Second, the various pre-colonial political entities - kingdoms, chiefdoms, sheikhdoms - had decentralised political structures (sometimes confederal structures) in which lower levels of government or regions enjoyed wider autonomy. Even in the case of Ethiopia where centralised government existed for a long time, regional leaders enjoyed wider autonomy up until the establishment of the unitary state at the beginning of the twentieth century. It is important to compare such political structures with what was created by colonialism and after.

Third, the boundaries between the various political communities were fluid as compared to the rigidity of the colonial boundaries. These fluid boundaries facilitated a relatively free movement of people and the establishment of different long-distance trade routes connecting the various communities throughout the Horn of Africa. Those important trade routes were later destroyed by the creation of rigid colonial boundaries. Fourth, the different societies in this part of Africa had been capable of constructing complex and diversified political structures (systems). Those societies and their political structures were dynamic, there were changes and continuities. The centralised political entities were later weakened, disintegrated and reconstituted into many kingdoms and chiefdoms (sheikhdoms in some cases). Decentralised political entities were reconstituted into more centralised ones. Contrary to the mainstream Eurocentric historical account, most of those political entities were multi-ethnic/tribal. The existence of a more diversified political structure served the society better than the colonial and post-colonial political structures.

In the very long history of Africa, colonialism was an interlude of comparatively short duration. But it was an interlude that made a fundamental and lasting political, economic and socio-cultural impact on the direction and momentum of African history. To start with the political, firstly, the very physical appearance of the independent states of Africa is the creation of colonialism. The boundaries are artificially fixed to serve only the interest of colonial rulers without any other consideration. The division of various ethnic groups into different political entities and the creation of ethnic identities and hierarchies have had a long lasting effect. Almost all conflicts, both within and between the Horn of Africa countries, can partially be attributed to those developments. Second, the authoritarian and centralised nature of the colonial state and its institution has had a lasting impact, which has not yet been solved.

In the economic field, in virtually all parts of Africa, the money economy had become the rule rather than the exception by the end of the colonial period. Colonialism thus accelerated the integration of African economies into the world capitalist economic system. This integration was very disadvantageous and exploitative for Africa. In addition, colonialism not only accelerated the pace of change but also did so in a way which sought to deny the Africans themselves, who were most intimately affected, any meaningful and beneficial role. Furthermore, those changes were not only traumatic but also ended up setting the economy of Africa on a course - and a very unhealthy and exploitative one - from which it could not and has not deviated.

In the social field, one significant legacy of colonialism is the introduction of European languages. The introduction and domination of foreign languages hindered the development of indigenous languages in many African countries. Another legacy of colonialism is the emergence of a new elite in both civil and military sectors. The members of these elite groups are definitely different from the majority of the people. Though these groups are a small minority, they dominate the economy and politics of their countries. As a result, many of the policies adopted by these groups mainly reflect the interests of the urban areas at the expense of the rural population which is the majority. Colonial education is another legacy, which produced Europeanised Africans who try to think and act as Europeans rather than as Africans. The introduction and domination of Western culture as superior and modern (advanced) which has to replace the African culture, 'the backward' and 'stagnant', destroyed the self-esteem of the society, especially the of educated elite. The impact of colonial education and cultural domination proved far more difficult to redress than the political and economic impact.

In general, though there is no doubt that colonialism was a mere chapter in the numerous chapters of the long history of the continent, a mere episode of interlude in the many faceted and variegated experiences of the peoples of Africa, which lasted no more than a century, it is nonetheless an extremely important episode politically, economically and even socially. It marks a clear watershed in the history of Africa and the subsequent development of Africa, and therefore its history has been and will continue to be much influenced by the colonial impact on Africa, and is destined to take a course different from that which it would have taken had there not been any colonial interlude. Therefore what the leaders and the peoples of Africa should do is not to write off colonialism, but to deeply understand the impact of colonialism and to try to redress its shortcomings and failures.

Though it is true that both the pre-colonial and colonial developments of Africa are contributing factors to the failure of contemporary African states and the resulting refugee migration those historical developments alone can not satisfactorily explain what happened and is happening in post-colonial Africa. The major explanation lies within the post-colonial socio-political and economic development (underdevelopment) of the continent. Decolonization created an opportunity in which it would have been possible to (re)construct new political communities, national identities, and establish a new order of political accountability. It also created an opportunity to embark on a development of more indigenous political and economic structures. This opportunity, however, was not fruitfully used. This was because, among other things, the imagination and understanding of the anti-colonial leaders and later on that of the state elites were shaped by the dominant discourse of the territorial sovereign state, ideologies of both West and/or East, and mainstream development theories. They failed to develop indigenous alternatives to the European styled state and economic development. It is, therefore, possible to soundly argue that the crisis that Africa has been suffering from emanates from missing the opportunity of constructing their own political and socio-economic systems that are relevant to Africa and to individual states.

Moreover, the deepening crisis (failure/collapse) of the state in Africa may also be better explained as the problem of the ideological commitment of the political leaders to both East and/or West, the failure of state and development theories, which resulted in poor political,

economic and social performance. In addition, external factors: intervention of both superpowers and others, globalization and regionalization, marginalization of the continent, which is the result of the restructuring of the world economy, have also played a significant role. Among other things, Eurocentric (mainstream) economic development did not work in developing countries as expected, for theoretical, ideological and practical reasons (see Chapter 9). What should be done to rectify it? This is the fundamental question that the political leaders and elites of individual African countries should ask themselves in order to create their own alternative solutions. However, a few general points could be made. African countries should assert their own domestic needs and requirements in tandem with increasing responsiveness to domestic demands for a better quality of life. In other words, they have to indigenize the whole conception of their socio-economic and political structure by searching not for an alternative development but for an alternative to the mainstream development paradigm. The process of indigenization, in development theories as well as in the social sciences, should be seen as a fundamental movement of liberation from the colonial legacy and the imperialist world system. This approach may empower and enrich local cultures and institutions, thus creating a more self-reliant, and hence a more natural and organic, relationship between the rulers and masses. Moreover, African countries should lay the groundwork for a new endogenised model for economic and social development - a model grounded on a broadened base for social development. The issue here should not be alternative development or anti-development but a more radical imagining of an alternative future, an alternative to development, that is, a rejection of the entire mainstream development paradigm. This new alternative should take the specific conditions of each society into account and it should be elaborated and executed on the basis of the needs and priorities expressed by the people.

To do so the African intellectuals and political leaders should, first of all, radically change their attitude by looking for solutions within their respective societies. They have to start to recognise that the diversified political and socio-economic systems that have helped the African societies to survive for centuries had a lot of things which the present generation can learn from. What the African people, especially the intellectuals, need to do is to return to their roots and learn from their history in order to build their own indigenous institutions. They have to look deeper into their history to lean how various political entities (states) were created and recreated; how different boundaries were (re)constructed and how it affected the people's lives; how different identities were created and recreated and what they were; what the checks and balances they used to control the use of power were; how they organised popular consultation and participation in the decision making processes; how the various ethnic/religious/regional groups coexisted; how they resolved conflicts between those groups; what the role of religion was; what the moral, political and social values they cherished were; etc.. The lessons to be learned will not necessarily be only from the strength of the pre-colonial political and socio-economic systems but also from their shortcomings.

This is not to advocate a re-traditionalising of the African societies, rather creative an critical adaptation of historical expertience. The objective is to learn from the time-tested experiences of the past and to build a new system that can serve the present and will be a sold base for the future. To effectively use the historical lessons the intellectuals and political leaders of each

country should also understand the current domestic developments of their respective countries and international developments at large.

Based on the historical lessons learned and taking into account the current development (domestic and international) the political elites and intellectuals, with active participation of the citizens, should develop a system that can help to reach negotiated consensus, in each country, on what the nature of the political structure (state) should be or how it should be reconstituted if the problems of their respective countries encountered are to be solved. There has to be an effective rule (constitution) which will govern how state power is attained, exercised and checked and how power will be peacefully transferred from one regime to another. What has been witnessed in Africa in general and the Horn of Africa in particular, up until now, is that political power is attained and maintained through the power of the gun. This has to be effectively changed. This implies, among other things, that the legitimate claims and aspirations of the various groups, with regard to the nature of the political system to be reconstituted, have to be taken into serious consideration. The active participation of the citizens of individual countries, which has been non-existent and/or ignored by the political leaders and elites, has to be enhanced. The intention here is not to say that these measures are easy to take and can be done by official declaration. Not at all. These changes to be effective will take time, maybe longer than we may think. But the first step should be taken now so that the process will start and take its time. It will also need the political will of the leaders and the determination of the citizens to fight for a better future. It will be only then that African societies will be able to solve their problems and minimize, if not stop, the human displacement and suffering.