Message from the Director

Towards Democratizing the World?:
American Policy and Africa’s Experience

At least in rhetoric the administration of George W. Bush would like to democratize not only Iraq but the whole of the Middle East. That is indeed a tall order, especially since this administration has done more damage to American democracy at home than any other administration since the days of Senator Joseph McCarthy in the 1950s.

But since the United States has now become the undisputed superpower, it is still worth considering whether its immense resources and influence should not be channeled to such great long-term causes as the democratization of the whole world. America can be a power for good or a power for evil. American militarism is a danger to the human race, but can American democratic idealism be tapped to benefit the human race? If the Roman Empire two millennia ago left a legacy of the Rule of Law, can the new American Empire of today leave behind a legacy of global democracy?

Such dreams appear hollow in the present atmosphere of detention without trial in America, a “Patriot Act” which legitimizes extensive surveillance of citizens, a “Big Brother” who is prepared to interrogate libraries secretly about which books citizens read, a readiness to engage in pre-emptive and preventive war on others with little respect for international law.

But in the larger view of whether America can be a benevolent or malevolent empire, it is worth encouraging the forces of benevolence in American political culture towards influencing the world for the better. Nonetheless, the American ambition to democratize the world, though worthy of consideration, is fraught with risks. Let us explore both the promise and the peril by using as an example the interaction between the United States, Africa and the Middle East from a democratic perspective.

Symposium in Honor of Mazrui for his 70th Birthday

A symposium and gala in honor of the scholarship and life’s work of Dr. Ali A. Mazrui was organized by Dr. Robert Ostergard and Dr. Al’Amin Mazrui. The symposium, entitled “Africa’s Triple Heritage Revisited,” took place in Binghamton, NY on February 14-15, 2003. Unbeknownst to Mazrui, the two co-organizers—or co-conspirators as he later referred to them—called on friends, colleagues, and family of the professor to attend the symposium and gala celebrating Mazrui’s 70th birthday.
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(continued on p. 12)
Speakers at the symposium reflected on the impact of Mazrui’s scholarship across multiple disciplines while focusing on one of his most famous concepts, Africa’s Triple Heritage—that Africa is the confluence of indigenous, Islamic and western civilizations. Presenters demonstrated how Mazrui’s forty years of scholarship had helped to shape the study of a continent and our perceptions of the modern world. The symposium closed with an emotional session dedicated to personal reflections and comments from the Professor’s family and friends. That evening, President and Mrs. Gowon (two more members of the conspiratorial team!) escorted Mazrui and his wife Pauline (another conspirator!) to the hotel ballroom under the pretense of having dinner with the Gowons. Upon entering the ballroom, the drummers played, the dancers danced, and the crowd cheered as traditional African music played for Prof. Mazrui in celebration of his 70th birthday. Much to the delight of everybody, Prof. Mazrui immediately got into the mood for the evening and danced with his wife and Mrs. Gowon. The evening was filled with fun and celebration, speeches, live performances, and the presentation of several awards and honors bestowed upon Prof. Mazrui.
MORE PHOTOS FROM THE SYMPOSIUM AND GALA
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Prologue: A Message from IGCS
Associate Director, Robert Ostergard

Needless to say, both myself and Al’Amin Mazrui of Ohio State University are thrilled that the symposium and gala were such a great success. However, they would not have been without the dedicated assistance of the IGCS family, our group of “co-conspirators.” On behalf of Al’Amin and myself, I want to extend our appreciation to AnnaMarie Palombo, Nancy Levis, Barbara Tierno, Goretti Mugumbwa, Patrick Dikirr, Shalahudin Kafrawi, Ruzima Sebaharara, and Jacky Kaba, and to the numerous students who gave up their time to assist in making these events a success. We are also grateful for the participation of all the panelists at the symposium and to the family and friends who traveled great distances to be here. We also want to extend a special thanks to Prof. Ricardo Laremont who gave us the idea for the theme of the symposium and to President and Mrs. Gowon who graciously became “co-conspirators” to help get Prof. Mazrui to his own birthday party! Happy Birthday Professor Mazrui, may you have many, many more!
Interdisciplinary Research on Globalization

The Africana Studies Department at Binghamton University (SUNY) started a research workshop on Globalization, Democratization, and Transition in Developing Countries during the 1997 academic year. The workshop, directed by Professor Darryl C. Thomas, was successful in attracting undergraduate, graduate and faculty participants from diverse academic units including Africana Studies, Sociology, Philosophy, Interpretation and Culture (PIC), Economics, Political Science, the Institute of Global Cultural Studies (IGCS) and the Latin American Caribbean Area Studies (LACAS). Meetings were held semimonthly during the fall and spring terms, with approximately 15-20 participants to the workshop meetings and 25 or more for public deliberations.

Over the years, guest speakers at the workshop included: Locksley Edmundson (Africana Studies and Research Program, Cornell University); Horace Campbell (African American Studies Department, Syracuse University); Tajudeem Abdul Raheem (General Secretary of the Global African Movement); Sundiata Cha-Jua (African American Studies Research Center, University of Illinois); Cedric J. Robinson (Black Studies, University of California at Santa Barbara); Carole Boyce-Davies (Director of New World Africans Center at Florida International University); Gregg Thomas (African American Studies at Syracuse University); and David McBride (African & African American Studies, Pennsylvania State University). All workshop participants, including undergraduate and graduate students, used the regular meetings to interrogate and critically evaluate divergent perspectives on globalization, democratization and transitions in developing countries.

During the spring term 1998, Africana Studies along with the Globalization, Democratization and Transition Workshop, the Institute of Global Cultural Studies and the Graduate Student Association at Binghamton University co-sponsored the 22nd Annual Conference of the New York African Studies Association in April 24-25, 1998. The theme of the Conference was Africa and the Challenge of Globalization. The conference was a success and attracted over 120 participants. Visitors were so impressed with the diversity, breadth, and intellectual stimulation of the panels and roundtables.

Selected papers from work presented at the conference and at the annual workshop during the 1997-2000 period appeared in a special edition of the International Journal of African Studies organized around the theme: Global Africa and the Challenge of Globalization, Democratization and Transition (Fall 2001, Volume 3, Issue 1). Professor Thomas edited this special issue with Dennis Canterbury who was a Ph.D. candidate in the Sociology Department at the time (he is currently an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Eastern Connecticut State University). Canterbury and Thomas are still collaborating, and are currently editing a book that explores the concept Global Africa—that is, Africa and the African Diaspora—and the impact of globalization, democratization, and transition—as well as of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attack on the United States—on a particular transnational community, and that maps out the intersectionality of class and gender differentiations, and social inequality with reference to the broad range of issues challenging Global Africa.
The Center on Democratic Performance at Binghamton University, SUNY

The Center on Democratic Performance (CDP) was founded in September 1999. The mission of the Center is to assist the academic and policy communities in understanding the functioning and performance of democratic political institutions. The Center's activities are designed to generate and communicate insights into how democracies work and to collect and disseminate information about democratic practices around the world, foster collaborative research among the academic community on democratic practices, and encourage application of research knowledge from the academic in related policy development and program implementation. Specific initiatives have included the organization of conferences and seminars, the publication of reports and research papers, the development of a state-of-the-art website, and the provision of expert advice.

The Center takes as its core inspiration two sets of questions about democratic performance in more recent and more consolidated democratic polities. The first concerns the establishment and consolidation of democratic institutions. How do we know when a country is democratic? What makes one country democratic and another non-democratic? Is democracy more of a continuum, with shades and gradations? How long does it take for a country to "become" a democracy? How can one tell which direction(s) a country is headed in democratic development terms? What methods can be used to determine this?

The second set of questions addresses issues related to how well democracy functions in more consolidated contexts. What trade-offs have to occur, for example, in balancing efficiency with pure democratic principles? What are the consequences of making choices? How do these affect performance? How do people interact as a result? How do institutions change? What are the outcomes of democratic performance?

The Center seeks to focus its work on the performance of governing institutions (e.g. the three branches of government and election administration) and non-state actors (e.g. civil society, political parties, and public opinion) that directly affect the functioning of governing institutions.

Project activity has included studies on public opinion regarding the functioning of democratic institutions; analysis of how well democratic institutions (e.g. parliaments, political parties, judiciaries) actually fulfill their roles; military-to-military seminars on civil-military relations in democratizing countries; analysis of existing models to judge democratic development; assessments of international projects designed to strengthen democratic development; and creation and maintenance of a database of election results.

In addition, the Center is actively seeking funding opportunities for the following types of illustrative projects: seminars for government officials in Afghanistan on relations between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches in a democracy; a program in Rwanda on peaceful political competition in a multi-party context; working with civic organizations in Haiti to heighten their advocacy effectiveness; election monitoring in Zambia; and training for legislators in Indonesia on how to introduce and draft legislation.

Edward McMahon, Dean’s Professor of Applied Politics and Director of the Center on Democratic Performance, will be leaving his position at Binghamton University to join the University of Vermont. Professor Patrick Regan of the Political Science Department at Binghamton will become Director of the Center effective August 2003. McMahon who is a Research Fellow at the Institute of Global Cultural Studies, also serves as a Senior Research Associate at Freedom House, assessing democratic development in Africa for Freedom House's Annual Survey of Political Rights and Civil Liberties. He holds graduate degrees from Boston University (Political Science) and Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Affairs (International Relations). He has published a number of articles and chapters in edited publications, has co-edited a volume entitled Democratic Institution Performance: Research and Policy Perspectives (Greenwood/Praeger, 2002), and is a Contributing Editor of the Political Handbook of the World (CSA Publications). His current research interests include African politics; legislative functioning in developing democracies; evaluating the effectiveness of foreign democracy/governance assistance; and the role of regional intergovernmental organizations in promoting democratic norms and development.
IGCS News

* The Institute’s Director, Prof. Ali Mazrui, and its Associate Director, Prof. Robert Ostergard along with other nationally and internationally renowned scholars have been listed on a website called “Campus Watch” (http://www.campus-watch.org/) as “extremists.” According to the website and its founder Daniel Pipes, the director of the Middle East Forum, the website “[…] reviews and critiques Middle East studies in North America, with an aim to improving them.” While sounding noble and benign, it only takes a couple of minutes for a visitor to the website to realize that “improving” Middle East studies means adopting Daniel Pipes anti-Arab and anti-Islamic agenda. The website and Daniel Pipes’ writings have drawn strong criticism from academics, public interest groups, and even United States Senators. Pipes listed both Ostergard and Mazrui in his June 25, 2002 New York Post article entitled “Extremists on Campus,” citing a speech that Mazrui delivered in Ostergard’s Terrorism and War class at Binghamton University as “anti-Zionist.” In subsequent email correspondence with Ostergard, Pipes admitted that he knew nothing about the class, its content, the subject matter, or the purpose of the class and that the information came from a sophomore student in the class who had taken offense to Mazrui’s speech.

After Pipes’ accusations appeared in the New York Post, the Institute’s email accounts were attacked in a form of “cyber-terrorism.” The accounts were spammed or inundated with thousands of hate emails, knocking the accounts offline for a period of time. Hackers were even able to send thousands of emails under the name of the Institute to unsuspecting recipients. The emails contained offensive and hateful messages. While the attacks have subsided, the furor over Daniel Pipes and his website has not.

In the spring of 2003, President George W. Bush nominated Daniel Pipes to fill a mid-term vacancy on the board of directors of the United States Institute of Peace. The nomination stunned members of the academic community and public advocacy groups who first thought it was a joke. The Institute’s staff joined thousands of academics and concerned citizens to express in writing their concern about Pipes’ nomination and the message that it will send to the Arab and Muslim communities in the United States. In a letter sent to President Bush, Vice-President Richard Cheney, Senator Hillary Clinton, and Senator Charles Schumer, Prof. Ostergard wrote:

“As a researcher who has benefited from the work and support of USIP, I must express my deepest reservations that Dr. Pipes’ professional work and opinions do not, in any way, reflect the objectives and mission of USIP. While USIP’s mission has been to seek to support a variety of avenues of peaceful resolution to conflict, Dr. Pipes’ opinions clearly have not done so. Dr. Pipes’ recent writings are overtly hostile to the American Muslim community and to the international Muslim community as a whole.

Additionally, part of USIP’s mission is to work closely with the academic community in supporting research on conflict and conflict resolution. However, in the past year, Dr. Pipes has begun an internet webpage that included ‘dossiers’ of professors who he deemed too critical of Israel or who portrayed too positive a picture of Islam. Despite the fact that the webpage is loaded with factually incorrect or distorted information, Dr. Pipes has refused to correct or rescind accusations and articles placed on the webpage. Moreover, he has encouraged students in professor’s classes to turn in professors they feel fall under the category of being too critical of Israel or too positive toward Islam. Given that Dr. Pipes would have direct oversight of how monies would be allocated in research, such a website illustrates that Dr. Pipes cannot use objective judgment in the determination of qualified, legitimate research projects without allowing his own ideological predilections to interfere in his judgment. The nomination of Dr. Pipes to the USIP sends absolutely the wrong message on the proper way to build a stronger relationship between the academy and the government, particularly given Dr. Pipes publicly expressed dislike for the academy and for academics.

Given Dr. Pipes’ public commentary that is not in line with USIP’S mission and his overt prejudice against Islam, and his dislike for the academy, I strongly urge you to rescind your nomination of Dr. Pipes to the USIP board of directors. Likewise, I am encouraging all of my colleagues concerned with conflict and peace research to express their opposition to his nomination. His nomination will send the wrong message about USIP’S mission, its future, and its relationship to universities, colleges, and other research institutions in this country that have a strong commitment to conflict and peace research.”

* In December 2002, Kenya elected a new President, Mwai Kibaki—after being ruled by Daniel arap Moi since 1978. While Professor Mazrui was a persona non grata under Moi and was ostracized by most Kenyan universities at that time, the situation has changed drastically. In June 2003, President Kibaki eced his role as chancellor of all public universities and appointed new chancellors; Mazrui was appointed the new Chancellor of Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology.

* Becoming 70 has not deterred Mazrui from pursuing his extensive local and international travel for conferences, seminars, and lectures. His latest international destinations included England, Ethiopia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Kuwait, Malaysia, South Africa, Spain, Tanzania, Trinidad, Uganda, and the United Arab Emirates.
* Professor Ricardo René Laremont, previously Associate Director of the Institute and currently Chair of the Sociology department at Binghamton University, is still working closely with the institute on various projects, including the Carnegie grant studying political conflict in Africa. The Institute congratulates Professor Laremont and Professor Lisa Yun on the latest additions to their family, their two baby daughters Liana and Alina.

* Ms. Barbara Tierno, Secretary of the Institute since 1999 retired from service in 2003. The Institute celebrated her retirement (photos) after fifteen years of service in the State University of New York system at Binghamton. Ms. Tierno started her career at Binghamton University as a Keyboard Specialist in the Human Development division of the School of Education and Human Development (SEHD) in 1988. She distinguished herself at SEHD and through her conscientious work and continuous learning moved up to become Secretary 1.

* Starting in the Fall of 2003, Fouad Kalouche, Research Associate at the Institute from 2001 to 2002, will join the faculty of Albright College, in Reading, Pennsylvania, as Assistant Professor of Philosophy.

* Ms. Nancy Hall has joined the staff of the Institute as Secretary. Hall previously worked as Secretary of the Sociology Department at Binghamton University.

---

* Starting in January 1999 and has since become an indispensable member of the IGCS family. Her energetic devotion to her work and her friendly and kind assistance will be greatly missed.

She is currently trying to enjoy her retirement by spending some time reading and writing (short articles), gardening (her very large yard complete with flowers, grass, and weeds), and she is getting very interested in bird watching! She is taking care of her ailing mother and is helping out at the New Life Ministries in Endicott, NY.

---
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**IGCS Research Highlights**

* Professor Darryl C. Thomas, Chair of the Africana Studies Department at Binghamton University is currently working on finalizing a book entitled: *African Americans and the Challenge of Globalization, Democratization and Pan-Africanism in the New Millennium*. The manuscript traces the spirit of resistance in the African American experiences during the first wave of globalization in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. It draws attention to the battle to create authentic democracy in the United States and ties this struggle to the debate and conflict over reparations while interrogating citizenship, national identity and Pan-Africanism from the 19th to the 21st centuries in light of globalization. Thomas will also be initiating a new project: “Globalization and Crisis of the Postcolonial State in Africa and the Post-Soviet State in Central Asia: A Comparative Analysis of Conflict Resolution in the Horn Africa and Central Asia, 1990-2002.” This project explores the relationship between globalization, fragmentation and state crises in the Horn of Africa and Central Asia where conflicts abound around issues of identity politics, religion, ethnicity, governance and economic development.

* Etin Anwar, A Research Assistant at the Institute of Global Cultural Studies from 2001 to 2002, received her Ph.D. from Philosophy, Interpretation, and Culture (PIC) Program at Binghamton University (SUNY). She holds an M.A. degree from the Institute of Islamic Studies, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, and a B.A. from Indonesia. Dr. Anwar is currently a Postdoctoral Fellow at Hamilton College, Clinton, New York. Her research interests include Islamic feminism, Ibn Sina’s mysticism, and medical ethics. She is currently working on a Mazruiana collection on the politics of gender and population entitled *The Body Politic and the Human Body: Politics, Patriarchy and Procreation*.

* Patrick Maison Dikirr, Project Research Assistant at IGCS from August 2002 is a Ph.D. candidate in Binghamton University’s Philosophy, Interpretation, and Culture (PIC) program. He is currently finalizing a dissertation entitled: *Reconstructing An African Ecologically Centered Ethics from the African Experience*. Dikirr specializes in Ethics and Social and Political Philosophy, and his wide-ranging areas of expertise include Environmental Philosophy, Medical Ethics, African Philosophy, History of Western Philosophy, and Comparative Philosophy. After receiving a B.A. and M.A. from the University of Nairobi, Kenya, Patrick M. Dikirr came to Binghamton University (SUNY) to pursue his Ph.D. and where he taught classes on environmental ethics and policy, medical ethics, and philosophy. His work at the institute involves being a teaching, research, and editorial assistant. He is currently editing Mazrui’s Harvard Lectures of the year 2000, tentatively titled *The Black Experience and The American Empire: The Globalization of Race Relations*.

* Goretti Mugumbwa, Project Research Assistant at IGCS from August 1998 to August 2003, received her M.A. in Social Sciences in May 2003 from Binghamton University’s School of Education and Human Development. Her specialization is in the study of women in Africa and of multiculturalism and diversity in the United States and her M.A. Thesis was entitled *The Psychosocial Dynamics of HIV/AIDS in Uganda*. Throughout her five-year association with the Institute, Mugumbwa has assisted in research, editing, teaching, as well as in organizing international conferences held by the Institute in Binghamton, NY. She presented a paper on “The Struggles of African Women with HIV/AIDS” at the African Studies Association 2003 meeting at Cornell University. She is currently co-editing essays of Professor Ali A. Mazrui collected in a manuscript tentatively entitled *African Founding Father: The Flawed Heroism of Julius K. Nyerere*.

* Shalahudin Kafrawi, Research Project Assistant at IGCS since August 2002, joined the Institute after working as Associate Director of Global Publications from 1999 to 2002. After completing his B.A. in Islamic Studies at Indonesia’s State Institute for Islamic Studies in Bandung, Kafrawi received an M.A. degree in Qur’anic Hermeneutics from McGill University’s Institute of Islamic Studies. He is a Ph.D. candidate in the Philosophy, Interpretation, and Culture (PIC) program at Binghamton University where he is finalizing his dissertation on *The Notion of Necessary Being in the Islamic Intellectual Tradition: Philosophy, Theology, and Mysticism*. Kafrawi’s major responsibilities at IGCS are research and editing. He is co-editing a collection of essays by Ali A. Mazrui, *Islam Between Globalization and Counter-Terrorism*, and is editing selected papers from the Institute’s 2001 international conference on “Islam and Africa.”

---

**Newsletter Editorial Team for Volume 4**

Fouad Kalouche; Robert Ostergard, Jr.; Darryl C. Thomas; and Edward McMahon
HIV/AIDS and the Problem of Africa’s Security
By Robert L. Ostergard

More than 28 million people in sub-Saharan Africa are infected with the HIV/AIDS virus as of the end of 2001. But that number alone does not establish the severity of the AIDS problem. Individually, infection rates for countries range as high as 38.8% in Botswana to less than 1% for several countries. In twelve countries, more than 10% of the population of adults between the ages 15-49 (the most economically productive demographic group for a country) is infected. Additionally, 11 million children in Africa have been orphaned (losing the mother or both parents to the virus) by the pandemic. In total, about 9% of sub-Saharan Africa’s population is infected with the HIV/AIDS virus. In sheer numbers, the magnitude of the pandemic in Africa is staggering. However, these data only present part of the problem. Compared to other regions, sub-Saharan Africa possesses 71% of the infected people in the world and 78% of those children orphaned by the virus, exceeding the percentages of all other areas combined. On the whole, the data reveal that Africa has been hit hardest by the virus compared to other regions of the world.

The long-run impact is in the loss of human life and in Africa’s economic decline. People may be able to live 10 years or more with the virus before AIDS develops and takes their lives. With inadequate health care and the lack of access to life-extending drugs, there appears to be little that can be done for those already infected in Africa; government efforts now focus on AIDS prevention (the reactive policy elements) to curb the epidemic there. The human catastrophe in Africa is extensive and poses a long-run threat to one of the base elements of the nation-state—population. In traditional security terms, however, the threat appears in the short run in the form of indirect effects that the virus has on the political and military security of African countries.

The more obvious security problem is with the military and the impact that the HIV/AIDS virus has on the military’s capacity to carry out its duties. This issue appears at a critical time in Africa’s history when it has been freed from external influences to manage its own affairs. The post-Cold War period has placed responsibility for Africa’s problems in Africans’ hands, almost by default. Given the lack of interest the international community has in Africa, the options for maintaining peace have narrowed, perhaps for the better in terms of the managing of Africa’s affairs by Africans. In one sense the idea of Africans handling their own crises has tremendous appeal, particularly given that the will of others was the determining factor in settling such crises during the Cold War. But the additional responsibility being taken up by African governments puts a strain on already scarce resources. Much of these resources have been devoted to expanding military operations in conflict areas.

After the USA’s disastrous peacekeeping efforts in Somalia in 1992, regional and sub-regional organizations have acted to maintain peace in Africa, most prominently the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and its monitoring group ECOMOG. Nigeria, the primary ECOMOG state that intervened in the civil wars in Liberia and Sierra Leone, had to confront not only the external military foe in its operations, but the HIV/AIDS viral foe as well. Some soldiers serving in the Sierra Leone intervention returned to Nigeria infected with the HIV/AIDS virus. United Nations peacekeeping forces, which come from a number of non-African countries, have also experienced HIV infection incidences, although it is unclear whether the infections occurred before or after their duty in Africa.

War-torn regions promote an indiscriminate sexual culture among soldiers. The presence of the military attracts sex trade workers, which promotes the spread of the virus to soldiers who may return home to their families. Of course, their families back home are then at risk. However, war-torn regions can also promote the spread of the virus through terror. In Sierra Leone, violence against women has been used as a weapon of terror and torture by revolutionaries fighting the government army and peacekeeping forces. Rape and sexual slavery have been systematic and indiscriminate. From the very young to the very old, women have been raped and tortured by revolutionary soldiers, further spreading the HIV virus. Reports of soldiers raping civilians in the Democratic Republic of the Congo’s ongoing civil war have also emerged. But perhaps most disconcerting has been the reaction of government
officials, who look upon such behavior in war regions as ‘boys being boys’.

The HIV threat to the military has great implications. But Nigeria is not the only state faced with a high incidence of HIV infection among the military. Armies across Africa are experiencing infection rates that exceed those in the general population. While data are variable and scant, as infection rates for military personnel can be a sensitive security issue, some data have been reported. The US Census Bureau Population Division International Programme Centre data reveal that the extent of the problem is growing. HIV prevalence data for the military show that Tanzania, Chad and Gabon have infection rates of 12.9%, 10.1% and 5.8% respectively. For military recruits, high prevalence rates have also been reported in Uganda (26.7%), Guinea-Bissau (17.3%), and Ethiopia (6.7%). Domestic police and security forces have been hit equally hard: Zambia (15.4%), Tanzania (14.3%), Cameroon (12%) and Guinea-Bissau (11.3%). At best, all these data are estimates and, without formal study of the impact of HIV/AIDS on the military and police, confirmed data may never be available. However, if these figures are close to actual infection rates, the percentage of HIV-positive people in Africa’s militaries seriously compromises the security of a number of African countries.

In the short run the virus has the potential to compromise military performance because of the chance for opportunistic infections to appear as a result of soldiers’ weakened immune systems. In the long run fewer capable people will be able to join military forces as the number of suitable recruits declines from increasing death rates. At the same time troops incapacitated by the virus and the decrease in suitable recruits will also have an impact on the available corps of experienced military leaders. The decrease in available, experienced military leadership may contribute to a decline in military performance and even to a further breakdown in military discipline, particularly in war-prone areas.

The war in the Democratic Republic of Congo involved at some times seven countries whose armies are reported to be from 50% to 80% HIV-infected, seriously calling into question the capacity of the armed forces to carry out duties. Domestically, the same problem confronts political leaders as additional questions have been raised concerning the capacity of the military to maintain stability under conditions of high HIV infection rates. The weakness of the military can also promote the opportunity for invasion if other countries perceive a major weakness in the military. In battle, the soldiers’ compromised immune systems also make them more vulnerable to chemical and biological attacks, even on a small scale. Hence HIV infection of military personnel in Africa poses serious challenges for security and stability in the continent.

The challenges faced by African countries with the HIV/AIDS epidemic are overwhelming. In the short-run, potential political destabilization poses threats to the security of African states. With the increasing regional security responsibilities that African states have taken on in the wake of the Cold War, the impacts of the HIV/AIDS epidemic are magnified. The threat of the military becoming incapacitated and economies being decimated bears considerable weight in African domestic and international affairs. How African countries deal with these issues remains one of the most pressing, immediate problems that these governments face.
Message From the Director (cont. from p. 1)

The United States’ impact on the fortunes of democracy in Africa is only partially an outcome of the foreign policy of U.S. governments. A more sustained process is through non-governmental organizations—ranging from American philanthropic and religious groups to the Carter Center in Atlanta, and ranging from concerned scholars in the United States to the TransAfrica Forum in Washington, D.C., and ranging from the novelist Alice Walker to first generation American citizens who are immigrant Africans. This is quite apart from the ambiguous role of U.S. transnational corporations.

Here again it is worth distinguishing between normative democracy and institutional democracy. Normative democratic concerns focus on issues like human rights and freedom of speech and the right to a fair trial. Institutional democratic concerns include promoting the right to vote, the holding of free elections, the championing of political pluralism, and the presumed link between political liberalism and economic liberalism. Non-governmental American promotion of democracy in Africa is highly normative. It is often targeted at issues like detention without trial, freedom of the Press and such barbarities as the crude execution of Ken Sarowiwa of Ogoniland in Nigeria in 1995.

Since September 11 there is the complicating factor of the U.S. war on terrorism. Does it help or hurt democratization in Africa? Some African governments may use the war repressing their political opponents. Increasingly, female circumcision has been denounced as "female genital mutilation" and a violation of human rights. The term is clearly much more partisan than the term "slavery"—for the term "slavery" was used by both defenders and critics of the institution. But the word "mutilation" is used only by those who criticize the ritual. In the campaign against the genital ritual the United States’ government has joined forces since 1996. From then on running away from the danger of female circumcision has become grounds for political asylum in the United States, following the precedent set by a Togolese asylum seeker in 1996. Canada has also made running away from female genital surgery grounds for political asylum into the country. Some have seen such a development as the emergence of cultural asylum—to deal with cultural threats to human rights in other societies.

The problem of where to draw the line between cultural imperialism and promoting cultural democracy is still persistent. African cultural nationalists protest that Western society whose pressures on Western women to be slim create female eating disorders, and whose pressures on women to have artificially inflated breasts through implants, create so many blood and skin disorders in women, are not the best qualified to throw the first stone at African conceptions of female legitimacy—even if both forms of sexism are reprehensible.

The main ideological exports of the United States government are first, market economics and second, liberal democracy. From the United States’ point of view, the export of market-economics to the rest of the world is self-regarding. It is directly intended to serve the interests of the United States. (This is to paraphrase John Stuart Mill’s distinction between self-regarding and other-regarding actions.) The export of liberal democracy is other-regarding. It is intended to serve the interests of the beneficiary-state, at least in the first instance. The export of market economics, although clearly self-regarding, has been quite often the more candid and sincere. But the promotion of liberal democracy by the U.S. government has often been selective, manipulative, moralistic and often hypocritical. In the new post-war Iraq, is the United States promoting democracy or choosing puppet rulers?

Because the export of market economics is self-regarding to Americans, it has been pursued with greater vigor and greater consistency than the promotion of liberal democracy. Market ideologies have also been pursued and promoted energetically by the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund—while at the same time both Bretton Woods Institutions have insisted that their statutes did not allow them to promote democratic values. When I served on the World Bank’s Council of African Advisors in the 1980s and 1990s I repeatedly asked the Bank to devise a calculus of democratic indicators by which an African country would be judged democratically before a loan was granted—the Mobutus and Mois of the 1980s. Vice-President Kim Jaycox of the World Bank repeatedly protested that it could not be done.

Partly because market ideologies have been pushed with greater vigor and consistency than has liberal democracy, the market is almost triumphant by the beginning of the twenty-first century. There are more countries that have been forced to privatize and adopt market-oriented programs than there are countries that have been penalized for not democratizing. The United States has played a big role in universalizing market ideologies in the twentieth century—but America’s record in promoting democracy is mixed at best, and window-dressing at worst.

But even if the United States is a vigorous marketeer in Africa and poor democratizer, is that necessarily a bad thing? Is it not conceivable that the greatest preparation for a liberal democratic order in Africa is learning the skills of capitalism? Is the direct empire of capitalism inadvertently laying the foundations of the democratization of the world?

(cont. on next page)
It is certainly true that all liberal democratic countries in the world today are also capitalist countries—though not all capitalist countries are liberal democracies. All liberal donkeys are capitalist animals but not all capitalist animals are liberal donkeys. Is the fact that all liberal democracies are capitalist countries an accident of history or a logical necessity? I am prepared to believe that it is a logical necessity. For example, I am prepared to believe that it is not possible to have a pluralistic press independent of the government without advertising from the private sector. So a free press needs the existence of independent powerful advertising interests in the economy. A free press needs some degree of capitalism—but the capitalism can be as contained as that of Sweden and not as reckless as that of the United States.

If then the United States, the World Bank and IMF are laying the foundations of capitalism in Africa, are they also laying the foundations of future global democracy? In reality capitalism may be a necessary condition for liberal democracy, but it is not a sufficient condition. A number of other things need to develop before economic liberalism (i.e., capitalism) evolves into political pluralism (i.e. liberal democracy). It is therefore vital that the kind of market ideologies that the United States, the World Bank and IMF have been imposing upon Africa do not stifle the emergence or growth of those other necessary conditions for liberal democracy in Africa. For example, if external infusion of capitalism would favor foreign capitalists and stifle local entrepreneurship, it would not serve its democratizing purpose.

There is an American innovation which is missing in Africa, has not been externally promoted by the United States, and which may be far more relevant for liberal democracy in Africa in the twenty-first century than many have realized. The missing American agenda is Federalism. For the first half-century of postcolonial experience in Africa, the word “federalism” has been anathema almost everywhere in Africa apart from Nigeria. And in Nigeria federalism has been substantially negated by three decades of military rule since independence. State rights and human rights have been trivialized by military arbitrariness. The civilian rule of Obasanjo has been only marginally better. Clearly federalism too is at best only a necessary condition for a pluralistic liberal order and not a sufficient condition. What has been remarkable since independence has been, loosely, Africa's reluctance to seriously consider it as a solution to its tumultuous ethnic upheavals and, secondly, the United States' reluctance to sell federalism as part of the American liberal legacy.

Indeed, Africa worked itself up into a condition of acute psychological denial. Loyalty to tribe was regarded as political pathology—in spite of the fact that such loyalties will remain part of Africa for at least another century. The UNESCO General History of Africa even banned the use of the word "tribe" in all its massive eight volumes (including Volume VIII edited by this author). Ignoring the salience of ethnic loyalties has cost Africa three to four million lives in civil conflict since independence. On the other hand, some of the countries that have attempted to make concessions to those loyalties have reduced the risks through the utilization of "ethnic arithmetic" as a principle of representation. Botswana has been cited as one such country. Sometimes ethnic arithmetic in an African government constitutes a kind of informal ethnic Senate House. Post-Manguistu Hailu Mariam's Ethiopia has taken the issue even further, decentralizing power from the center to ethno-cultural groups and attempting to create a federation of cultures.

In the twenty-first century should the United States consciously seek to export its expertise on federalism and the federal experience to countries trying to find ways of reconciling the imperative of unity with the reality of diversity in a democratic order? One country that could have benefited from a federal structure if it had been promoted early enough, and with enough inducements, was Sudan. This was not merely a federation between a northern region and southern region but a multi-state federation, re-defining both northern units and southern units. That may still be the answer, although there are some who would describe such a solution as "too little, too late."

Such a new federal vision that is crying out for experimentation would also help solve the problem of the Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda. We start from the premise that Rwanda and Burundi are dual societies and not plural societies. Dual societies have a high propensity towards polarization—as in the case of Greek Cypriots versus Turkish Cypriots, Catholics versus Protestants in Northern Ireland, Tamils versus Sinhalese in Sri Lanka, Czechs versus Slovaks in the old Czechoslovakia, and Hutu versus Tutsi in Rwanda and Burundi. Dual societies do not have enough political space for alliances and coalitions, and therefore not enough space for compromise and accommodation. One solution for Rwanda and Burundi is to federate them with Tanzania and make the Hutu and Tutsi part of a wider plural society. The separate armies for Rwanda and Burundi, and for the Tutsi and the Hutu, would need to be dissolved. As part of Tanzania the Hutu and Tutsi would discover how much they have in common, and possibly form a political alliance among themselves against other Tanzanians.
Is there a precedent for this? The answer is yes. Uganda has Hutu and Tutsi of its own, only they pass under different names. The Ugandan Tutsi are called Hima, of whom President Museveni is one. The Ugandan Hutu are called the Iru. On most issues in Uganda politics the Hima and Iru have rallied together under the collective name of Banyankole. In other words, in pluralistic Uganda, the Hima and Iru have had enough political space to form alliances against other Ugandans. But in dualistic Rwanda and Burundi there has not been enough political space for compromise between the Hutu and the Tutsi. Federation with Tanzania would open up such possibilities. The United States should lead the way with inducements not only to Hutu and Tutsi, but also to Tanzania to make it worth Tanzania’s while. Above all the United States should make available its immense experience—however troubled—in the constant give-and-take of the politics of federalism.

American policies in the Middle East have often hurt Africa. American Embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam were bombed in 1998 because of U.S. policies in the Middle East—resulting in the deaths of hundreds of East Africans. America’s uncritical support of Israel has led to anti-Israeli terrorism in Africa, often killing many more East Africans than either Israelis or Americans. Africa is hurting because of the United States’ blunders in the Middle East. But will American policies in Africa, on the other hand, help the United States’ humanitarianism in the Middle East? The Bush administration has declared war not only on terrorism but also on AIDS and HIV. The war on terrorism is targeted especially on the Middle East, but is also hurting Africa. The war on AIDS and HIV is targeted especially on Africa but may deepen American humanitarianism in the Middle East. Globalization has given us an American Empire of unprecedented might and power. But globalization has also given us opportunities for humane interdependence. The triangular relations between the United States, the Middle East and Africa are at the core of the interplay between global power and mutual human vulnerabilities.

AFRICAN CANON SERIES

Just before the twentieth century ended, Professor Toyin Falola of the University of Texas at Austin launched a series entitled The African Canon in collaboration with Africa World Press. The idea was to identify major scholars who had contributed the most to our understanding of Africa in the twentieth century, and then republish their most influential articles. In the words of Falola: “This series re-presents classic African texts in order to recover their contributions, give recognition to past accomplishments, challenge dominant paradigms, invigorate the discussion of Africa, and position the continent in the forefront of intellectual debates and trends.”

Each scholar was assigned a single large volume for his or her articles. Volumes which have already been published include those in honor of Jacob Ade Ajayi of Ebadan, Nigeria, Adu Boahen of Ghana, Bethwell Alan Ogut of Kenya, Richard Sklar of the University of California, Los Angeles. In the case of Ali A. Mazrui, three volumes of his selected articles will be published, instead of only one. This was partly because of the sheer quantity of Mazrui’s output and partly because of its range and diversity.

Volume I of the Mazruiana Canon is devoted to Mazrui’s essays on the crisis of identity in Africa. The volume is entitled AFRICANY REDEFINED, edited by Ricardo Rene Laremont, Tracia Leacock Senghatolislami, and Michael Toler, and published by Africa World Press in 2002. Volume II re-edits and republishes Ali A. Mazrui’s influential essays that have compared the African experience with the experience of other civilizations. This second volume is edited by Ricardo Rene Laremont and Fouad Kalouche, and was also published by Africa World Press in 2002. For both volumes Toyin Falola at the University of Texas has served as the Series Editor. The title of Volume II of Mazrui’s selected articles is AFRICA AND OTHER CIVILIZATIONS: CONQUEST AND COUNTER-CONQUEST. Volume III, edited by Robert L. Ostergard, Jr., is currently being finalized and will appear shortly under the title: POWER, POLITICS, AND THE AFRICAN CONDITION.
Africanity Redefined is the first volume of the Collected Essays of Ali A. Mazrui, a three-volume set of Mazrui’s most important essays. The three-volume work will provide readers with a broad spectrum of Professor Mazrui’s writings during his four decades as a scholar and a public intellectual. This first volume redefines the meaning of Africanity across geographical spaces, time, and cultures. The resulting definition is dynamic. It forces us to reject neo-imperialist paradigms and ontologies of what it means to be African. By encouraging us to think about Africanity as an idea rather than as a point of origin, the essays contained in this volume force us to reposition ourselves in the debate of our place in global cultures and civilizations and they prepare us to take a more active role in social and political affairs.
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