DECOLONISATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN ZAMBIA: THE QUEST FOR EPISTEMIC LIBERATION

By

RICHARD MWAMBA

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the subject

PHILOSOPHY

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA (UNISA)

SUPERVISOR: PROF. PASCAH MUNGWINI

JANUARY 2021

DECLARATION

I declare that DECOLONISATION OF KNOWLEDGE IN ZAMBIA: THE QUEST FOR EPISTEMIC LIBERATION is my own work and that all the sources that I have used or quoted have been indicated and acknowledged by means of complete references.

I further declare that I submitted the thesis to originality checking software and that it falls within the accepted requirements for originality.

I further declare that I have not previously submitted this work, or part of it, for examination at Unisa for another qualification or at any other higher education institution.

30th January 2021

SIGNATURE DATE

RICHARD MWAMBA (Mr)

Student number: 56823428

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals were instrumental to the realisation of this dissertation. Without their assistance and support, I would not have managed to complete. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the following:

My supervisor and mentor, Prof. Pascah Mungwini, for his invaluable assistance, guidance and encouragement. From his professional comments I drew insight that always woke me up from slumber and made me to continue refining my work with the hope of bringing it to an acceptable standard. I sincerely thank him.

My friends Fr Mwenda Raphael Sankhulani, Fr Christopher Mashilipa, Emmanuel Chiluba, Emmanuel Lesa and Nalumino Akapelwa, Owen Pule and Bertha Mwape for their encouragement, without which this dissertation would not have become a reality.

My family members for their continued support and encouragement, especially when I felt like giving up.

Lastly, I owe deep gratitude to God for granting me a healthy life, resources and all the opportunities which enabled me attempt this research project. Whenever I searched, I found; whenever I knocked, the door was opened for me; and whenever I asked in prayer, I was given.

ABSTRACT

The quest for epistemic liberation remains an important project in the post-colonial era of Zambia, and entails challenging the existing inequalities in knowledge representation at the epistemic front in the country. At the core of this quest is the position that the continued dominance of Western knowledge and the corresponding marginalisation of indigenous knowledges amount to an epistemic injustice that affects the contemporary existence of the peoples in the country. This study critically examines the problem of epistemic injustice in Zambia while reflecting on the country's uncompleted project of decolonisation. It traces the problem from the theoretical assumption of modernity that Western knowledge is universal and that it should, therefore, be applied to all societies in the world. It is submitted that the current education system in Zambia is based on this assumption, and, consequently, favours Western knowledge to the exclusion of indigenous knowledges. This practice is identified as a conduit for accelerating epistemic injustice and its intensity in the country. The study approaches this problem from an African philosophical standpoint, and draws its current from the history of the political struggle against domination on the continent. To adequately confront the problem of epistemic injustice in Zambia, the study suggests parity and equilibrium in representation between indigenous knowledges and Western knowledge in the country.

Keywords: epistemic injustice, epistemic liberation, emancipation, decolonisation, Western knowledge, indigenous knowledges, extraversion, humanism, nationalistic-ideological philosophy, Zambia.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE

THE QUEST FOR EPISTEMIC JUSTICE IN ZAMBIA

1.1 Introduction

Colonialism in Zambia did not only exploit the natural resources but also introduced the hegemonic Western knowledge which marginalised, silenced, suppressed, dislocated and replaced the knowledges of the peoples in the country. The result was an epistemic injustice, a cultural injustice that is committed "when concepts and categories by which people understand themselves and their world [are] replaced or adversely affected by the concepts and categories of the colonisers" (Ndofirepi & Gwaravanda 2019:583). The problem of epistemic injustice in Zambia has affected and continues to affect the peoples and the country at large in the post-colonial era. All the peoples' systems of thought and behaviour, and the country's ideologies, institutions, policies and the economy have acquired a Western taste. In effect, the epistemic injustice has sown in the country a seed of colonial mentality – a psychological attitude that "makes a formerly colonised person over-value foreign things" (Wiredu 1992:62). "Foreign things", in this case, does not only refer to the material things, but also the modes of thought and behaviour of the colonial masters.

In the context above, it is interesting to note, for example, that English, a foreign language, is the official language of Zambia (Chishimba & Manchishi 2015:55). Being the official language, it is more widely used than any other language: in learning institutions, places of work, official meetings, and in the publication of newspapers and other official documents such as the country's constitution and statutory instruments. As a subject in the education sector, English is the only subject which is compulsory to all the learners from primary school level up to the secondary school level. After writing secondary school leaving examination and regardless of the course one intends to pursue, one is expected to score a credit or better in English in order to be admitted into any tertiary institution. The general populace of Zambia treasures and praises the fluent and the eloquent use of English and, implicitly, takes that as the measure of intelligence. Owing to this public reaction, numerous households in Zambia use English and not any of the country's indigenous languages as a medium of communication.

Colonial mentality in Zambia has been instrumental in displacing and replacing indigenous concepts and categories by foreign models. The problem is that "[o]nce peoples' concepts and categories are displaced and replaced by foreign ones, loss of epistemic confidence arises" (Ndofirepi & Gwaravanda 2019:583). The displacement and replacement of indigenous concepts and categories by foreign models in Zambia has led to an inferiority complex among the peoples. This inferiority complex has impacted adversely on national development, as noted by Guy Scott when he served as Vice President of the Republic of Zambia. During a fundraising breakfast, as reported by Chimpinde (2012), Scott overtly lamented that the peoples of Zambia had an inferiority complex which, in turn, made them lack confidence in themselves and in their products. He observed that they preferred products from outside Zambia, such as from Western countries [emphasis added]. He called on the peoples to change this way of thinking and perception of reality if the country was to develop. In other words, he encouraged the peoples to develop confidence in themselves and to begin to value their knowledges and products.

Scott's concern calls for a critical examination and interrogation of the epistemological paradigm in Zambia under which Western knowledge is highly rated to the detriment of indigenous knowledges. This research argues that the dominance of Western knowledge and the corresponding silencing of indigenous knowledges on the epistemic front in Zambia amount to epistemic injustice from which the peoples of the country should be liberated. Once they are liberated, it is assumed that the peoples would produce knowledge which is relevant to the transformation of their lives and the country at large. The argument of the research is premised on the assertion that the peoples of Zambia are human beings, endowed with the faculty of rationality and capable of producing effective and transformative knowledges.

This chapter serves as a general introduction to the study. It tries to define and to demarcate the boundaries within which the argument of the study is presented and pursued. Particularly, it outlines the following: problem statement, research questions, objectives, rationale, background and the philosophical framework, expected contribution, and organisation of the study.

1.2 Problem statement

Since the inception of modernity, Western knowledge has been presented to be universal and absolute, capable of providing solutions to all the problems in the world. This claim serves as

one of the pillars that give support to the hegemonic tendencies of Western knowledge globally. Contrary to this claim, however, it has been observed that Western knowledge has caused numerous global challenges and that it has been inefficient in providing solutions to such challenges (Ndlovu 2014:84). This observation has exposed Western knowledge to public inquiry, particularly in the 21st century where it has been scrutinised more than ever before in the history of knowledge production. In the light of the ongoing global scrutiny of Western knowledge, the study challenges the hegemonic tendencies of Western knowledge in Zambia and, alternatively, argues for the recognition of indigenous knowledges in the country. It is submitted that when all the knowledges of the peoples are given space at the epistemic front in the country, epistemic injustice would be fought and epistemic liberation achieved. Eventually, the peoples would experience the true meaning of independence in their post-colonial existence.

1.3 Research questions

The thesis which is defended by the current study is that Western knowledge is not capable of providing solutions to all the challenges that arise in Zambia. Therefore, universally applying this knowledge to Zambia and silencing the knowledges of the peoples is an epistemic injustice. The adverse effect of this injustice is that it has robbed the peoples the sovereignty and the initiative to create their own knowledge and to respond effectively to the economic, political, social and cultural challenges that arise in the country. In dealing with the aforementioned epistemic injustice, the study proposes to answer the following main questions:

1. What is the negative impact of Western knowledge on the epistemic landscape of Zambia?
2. From independence to present, what has Zambia done to decolonise its epistemic landscape?
3. How do we reappropriate indigenous knowledge in order to respond to the economic, social and cultural needs of citizens in Zambia?

1.4 Objectives of the study

The central concern of the study lies in the quest for liberation in Zambia, a quest that has underlain the peoples' struggles since colonialism. Bearing in mind that the liberation which was

achieved at independence was only partial because the epistemic injustice in the country was not addressed, the study is carried out with a view of contributing to the body of knowledge that would confront the said injustice. Particular attention is dedicated to the education sector because of its privileged position to host institutions of knowledge production which harbour and perpetuate epistemic injustice in the country. The study argues for the transformation of the education system, with the aim of paving way for diversified and pluralised production of knowledge. It is envisaged that such an exercise would not only lead to epistemic liberation among the peoples, but also to a tradition of knowledge competent enough to address, more effectively, the challenges that are encountered by the peoples of Zambia. Based on the research questions, the following are the research objectives of the study:

1. To expose the hegemony of Western knowledge on the epistemic landscape of Zambia so as to show the need for decolonisation of knowledge in the country.
2. To analyse Zambia's efforts, from independence to the present, towards decolonising knowledge.
3. To suggest a tradition of knowledge in Zambia that would reappropriate indigenous knowledges and appropriate Western knowledge.

1.5 Rationale

The study argues for diversity of knowledge systems in Zambia by challenging the hegemonic Western knowledge which has dominated the intellectual landscape and silenced all the knowledges of the peoples in the country. The study proposes a new decolonised tradition of knowledge that would account for diversity of knowledge and, consequently, recognise all the knowledges that have been silenced in the country. The ultimate idea is to contribute to the body of knowledge that can bring about epistemic liberation to the peoples in the country so that they are able to transform their own lives and the country at large.

1.6 Background and the philosophical framework

Epistemic injustice in Zambia was instituted by the British during colonialism. The British began by taking away the territory from the indigenous peoples, the rightful owners, and turning this territory into an economic, social and political extension of Britain. The peoples' minds were

equally transformed into believing that European knowledge and ways of understanding were the only authentic methods of interpreting reality and to which all the people in the world should conform. Colonialism in Zambia, therefore, was characterised by an imposition of European knowledge and modalities of thinking on the peoples so that they could begin to see reality from the European perspective and to think and to behave like Europeans.

The British drew their 'right' to settle in Zambia and to colonise the peoples, from the European intellectual conception of the African continent and its inhabitants. Prior to their settlement in Africa, Europeans shared a common rationale that the continent was occupied "by hordes of savages virtually indistinguishable from nature" (wa Thiong'o 2009:22). From this point of view, the British did not see traces of humanity in Zambia prior to their settlement in the country; they only saw uninhabited lands and primitive savages. They declared that the country was empty, unoccupied and that it did not have a legal owner. The implication is that the British would not violate any peoples' rights by settling in Zambia since the land was not occupied and owned by any human beings. Invisibility and dehumanisation, therefore, became the primary expressions of colonialism in Zambia as the peoples were reduced to invisible and non-human beings.

The loss of land dehumanised the peoples of Zambia through the terra nullius doctrine which was based on the biased view of the British that the peoples were non-rational beings. It should be emphasised that the peoples of Zambia depended on their land and natural resources for wealth and livelihood. The land was a source of life for them, without which they would not sustain their existence and survival. Further, the land formed part of what gave them identity as a group of people with the right to self-determination, among other rights. Having settled on the land from time immemorial, the peoples regarded it as a heritage that linked them to their ancestors. The claim of *de jure* control over the land by the British impacted negatively on the peoples' existence and identity; it dehumanised the peoples to the extent that it alienated them, and assaulted and dislocated their existence and identity.

The notions which were employed to dehumanise and to make the peoples of Zambia invisible were rooted in and derived from the racialised philosophy of Hume, Kant and Hegel. The trio collectively dressed rationality and irrationality in a white robe and in a black robe respectively. They associated Europeans with whiteness and rationality, and by the same token, designated

blackness and irrationality to Africans. Based on the unfounded assumption of these claims, Africans were denied their existence as human beings since rationality was the defining feature of humanity (Mungwini 2013:85). Against this background the British did not regard the peoples of Zambia to be human beings who could occupy and own the land within the territorial boundaries of the country; according to the British, being black was enough evidence to show that the peoples were irrational, inferior and non-human. Related to this interpretation was the understanding that the peoples of Zambia were non-knowing subjects who could not produce any knowledge; the knowledges of the peoples were reduced to nothing.

Epistemic injustice in Zambia was initiated through unequal power relations between the British and the indigenous peoples, with the sovereignty of the latter being denied, and their existence reconfigured as colonial subjects. The peoples were alienated from the natural, bodily, economic, political, and cultural base – the base from which they previously launched themselves into the world and gave meaning to their own existence and experiences. In effect, the peoples could not have an active engagement with their immediate environment. Under the guise of modernity and civilisation, anything indigenous in Zambia was replaced by European models. In other words, while their experiences were turned into irrelevant and insignificant particulars, the peoples were branded with an alien identity that dismembered them from their cultures and knowledges. The alienation ensured that the peoples' cultures and knowledges were buried into the bowels of European modernity and civilisation.

1.6.1 Deconstruction and reconstruction paradigms

The study has employed both deconstruction and reconstruction paradigms. Deconstruction is a strategy of interpretation whose objective is to "critique and displace the absolutist metaphysics and epistemology which are thought to identify and provide knowledge of a rational order of axioms, first principles, and postulates that are the foundation of all that is, and of knowing what is" (Outlaw 2003:163). It recognises diverse knowledges as equally valid. Further, it argues that all knowledges are constructions and products of particular histories and cultures and are, therefore, valid in those histories and cultures. As Ndofirepi and Cross (2014:293) assert, all "people classify, cipher, process and assign meaning to their experiences thereby defining their everyday forms of knowledge." What this means is that there are no knowledges that can

justifiably claim to be universal, absolute, self-evident and axiomatic, and, therefore, apply to all histories and cultures without raising the question of relativism. While displacing or particularising all knowledges, deconstruction situates knowledges into their specific histories and cultures in which they emerge. In its deconstructive exercise, the study has employed decolonisation.

Decolonisation is a critique of the hegemony of Eurocentric notions of humanity, culture, rationality and knowledge in the countries that have been previously colonised by the West. While seeking to understand assumptions, motivations and values underlying these notions, as defined by Europeans, it argues for self-determination of the formerly colonised. The ultimate purpose is to grant the formerly colonised an opportunity to rewrite their own history, in their own ways and purposes (Smith 2012:29). Decolonisation reclaims human identity, ontological dignity and the knowledges which have been suppressed by the West's claim for universality of knowledge. It tries to change the 'order' of the world as defined by the hegemonic Eurocentric tradition by overthrowing or redefining ideologies that give force to the West's claim for universality. In this way, it attempts to restore the initiative and the self-confidence which the peoples in formerly colonised nations exhibited before their encounter with the West. It is for this reason that Santos (2018:109) describes decolonisation as a process of ontological restoration, recognition of knowledges, reconstruction of humanity and granting the formerly colonised their "inalienable right to have their own history and [to] make decisions on the basis of their own reality and experience." From this point of view, decolonisation is not only a critique against Western imperialism, but also, and more significantly, a challenge to the formerly colonised to rediscover their own traditions of knowledge.

The project of decolonisation in Zambia began with the fight for independence. After gaining independence, however, the country did not take any further steps to ensure that the project was completed. In particular, the hegemonic Western knowledge that characterised the intellectual landscape of the country during colonialism was not addressed; instead, it was left to continue exercising monopoly over knowledge production in the county even after independence. In this way, the independence of Zambia was rendered peripheral because the country's knowledge was under the siege of Western knowledge and influence. Full sovereignty could be attained if at independence the country re-assumed control of its political, economic, social and cultural affairs

and systems of knowledge. Since that was not the case, the study identifies the need to complete the process of decolonisation in Zambia which was initiated by the struggle for independence. It is envisaged that completing the process of decolonisation would bestow on Zambia a sovereignty which is meaningful.

Three possible models of decolonisation of knowledge could be identified in Africa: addition approach, rejection approach and re-centring approach. Addition approach "involves adding issues from the African epistemological paradigm to a dominantly Eurocentric framework" (Ndofirepi & Gwaravanda 2019:588). This approach recognises both indigenous knowledges and Western knowledge with the former remaining subordinate as the latter maintains its dominance. The problem of this approach is that it forces African indigenous knowledges into the categories of thought which have been established already by the West. In other words, it leaves indigenous experiences and situations subordinate to those of the West because it tries to maintain the standards of Eurocentric canons. The rejection approach "demands the complete rejection of all Eurocentric forms of knowledge" (Ndofirepi & Gwaravanda 2019:589). It consists of a complete displacement and replacement of Western knowledge by African knowledges, without leaving room for positive aspects of Western knowledge that could be useful to the African enterprise. In practice, the rejection approach commits exactly the same fallacy which Europeans committed during colonialism when they displaced indigenous knowledges and replaced them with Western knowledge. Lastly, the re-centring approach places emphasis on African indigenous knowledges and modalities of knowing while recognising other paradigms of knowledge (Ndofirepi & Gwaravanda 2019:590). This approach promotes dialogue and co-existence of diverse epistemological paradigms in the world. Re-centring is the approach of decolonisation which has been used in conducting this study. Relying on this approach, the study argues for the primacy of indigenous knowledges in Zambia while recognising Western knowledge as a product of a specific fabric of historicity and culture.

Reconstruction paradigm has also been engaged to argue for the restoration of the epistemic position which the peoples of Zambia and their respective knowledges occupied before the historical upheavals of colonialism. This argument has been advanced by expanding the denotative ranges of the Eurocentric notions of rationality, humanity and knowledge, and applying such notions to the peoples of Zambia. It has been emphasised that in the history of the

country, the peoples have produced knowledges relevant to their economic, political, social and cultural situations. It is envisioned that once they regain that epistemic opportunity, the peoples would enjoy self-liberation and self-apprehension.

1.6.2 Hermeneutical approach

Hermeneutics in African philosophy is a "critical-reflexive appropriation and continuation of African emancipatory hopes and aspirations" (Serequeberhan 1994:6). It seeks to make sense of the existential challenges faced by the African peoples within the context of their history. In its post-colonial status, Africa finds itself caught up in between ideality and actuality of independence. Following the "independence" of all its individual countries, the continent is ideally expected to be in control of its cultural, political, economic and epistemic front. In actuality, however, this has not happened: the cultures, politics, economy and the knowledges in the continent are still under the siege of the vestiges of colonialism. This means that the independence of post-colonial Africa can only be talked about in a paradoxical sense; the continent is independent in theory but not in practice because it is still held hostage by European hegemony. The gap between the ideality and actuality of independence in post-colonial Africa is a painful experience and a cause of existential problems among Africans; many Africans have been victimised due to this gap (Serequeberhan 1994:8). Africans are, therefore, anxious and motivated to continue the struggle towards the actuality of independence in the continent. This struggle is expressed in the decolonisation of Africa, of which decolonisation of knowledge and the intellectual landscape in the continent is part.

The locus and concern of hermeneutics in African philosophy is the existential misery among Africans that arises from the painful hegemonic hold exerted by the legacy of colonialism. In its theoretical reflection, it endeavours to surmount this hegemonic hold by offering possibilities of emancipation in terms of understanding the challenges experienced by Africans in their post-colonial situation. In this regard, the critique of European hegemony in post-colonial Africa must help Africans to reclaim their historic initiative on the continent. Within any given culture, people face problems and ask various questions. These problems and questions are sufficiently distinctive, giving rise to different philosophies, theoretical and knowledge frameworks going forward. Philosophy, being inherently interpretative, is born as people reflect critically on their

respective cultures in their attempt to provide solutions to the problems they face and the questions they ask (Okere 1983:64). Due to differences in cultures, for any philosophical discourse to be genuine, it should arise from and directly relate to specific concerns raised within a culture in which it is sited. Thus, in order for contemporary African philosophy to be genuine, it should arise from African cultures and their overriding concerns including the questions of liberation.

In seizing back historic initiative, Africans on the continent commit themselves to rewriting and re-righting the wrongs of history most of which continue to define the present. From this point of view, it becomes clear that a hermeneutical review of the contemporary African situation is not only a critique of Eurocentrism, but a self-directed programme of continuous self-understanding for Africans; it provides an opportunity for Africans to know themselves (Mungwini 2016:528). Knowledge of the self is important for Africans to liberate themselves from the hegemony of European epistemology and to reassert epistemic authority in their own continent. Without self-understanding, Africans cannot successfully complete such an undertaking.

The central aim of this research is derived from the general objective of contemporary African philosophy to "think the problems and concerns that arise from the lived actuality of post-colonial "independent" Africa" (Serequeberhan 1994:7). Philosophical reflection and reflexivity on the lived actuality of the African peoples remains the central object of philosophising on the continent. Given the foregoing as background, this research sets out to explore the challenges particularly on the knowledge front faced by the peoples of Zambia. Using the interpretive tools of hermeneutics as its philosophical framework, this study seeks to confront the vestiges of colonialism in post-colonial Zambia which continue to impact on the country's political, economic, cultural and epistemic front. Eurocentricism and its dominance of the knowledge terrain in post-colonial Zambia is critiqued while emphasising the need to reappropriate the cultural and intellectual heritage of the country. In this regard, the study is a call for self-transformation among the peoples of Zambia; its effort is directed at articulating the inherent challenges confronting the country on the knowledge front and the ongoing struggles for the decolonisation of knowledge in Zambia.

1.6.3 Research design

A research design is "the plan or proposal to conduct research" (Creswell 2009:3). It outlines the plan and the procedure for the research, including detailed methods of data collection and analysis. Among other types is a qualitative research design. Creswell (2009:4) explains that this research design is used to understand social and human problems through exploring the attitudes, beliefs, meanings and values people attach to such problems. From this point of view, a qualitative research design has the potential to raise awareness of the need to provide necessary interventions and changes in society.

The study has employed a qualitative research design in addressing the hegemony of Western knowledge in Zambia as an epistemic injustice. While relying on this research design, the study attempts to identify necessary interventions that could bring epistemic liberation and promote the well-being of the peoples. Hence, the study tries to challenge Eurocentric notions that give force to epistemic injustice among the peoples. It also argues for a decolonised tradition of knowledge to serve as an alternative to the Western-centred tradition which frames the current intellectual landscape of Zambia.

1.7 Expected contribution of the study

Epistemic injustice in Zambia, as a distinctive product of the hegemonic Western knowledge, has been counterproductive to the extent that it has made the peoples unable to produce knowledge which is relevant to their needs. Before colonialism, the peoples exhibited the initiative and the self-confidence to create their own knowledge. Snelson (1990:1-2) outlines the knowledges which the pre-colonial societies in Zambia created for their self-sustenance; they include all the surviving skills which were taught to the young people. The knowledges in the pre-colonial societies were effective and efficient because they sustained these societies and ensured that the peoples did not go into extinction. With the inception of colonialism and the introduction of Western knowledge in the country, indigenous knowledges which had sustained pre-colonial societies for centuries were declared useless. Further, the initiative and the self-confidence of the peoples to create their own knowledge were lost. This study seeks to make a contribution towards reawakening in the peoples of Zambia the lost confidence in their indigenous knowledges, and the initiative and the self-confidence to create these knowledges, the ability

they exhibited before colonialism. An attempt by the study to achieve this objective has been expressed in two ways. The first is by offering a critique of the hegemonic tendencies of Western knowledge and its claim for universality in the light of the epistemic injustice it has exerted on the peoples of Zambia. The second is by proposing a tradition of knowledge that would value indigenous knowledges in Zambia and incorporate them into the mainstream of knowledge.

It is anticipated that the proposed tradition of knowledge would contribute to the body of knowledge in Zambia that is capable of addressing the country's problems more adequately than does the current tradition which is based on Western knowledge. The study would prove useful to the policy makers for the government of Zambia and to all the stakeholders in the education sector of the country. Further, the study is also expected to contribute towards the restoration of the confidence in the peoples of Zambia which was lost during colonialism. In this way, it is hoped, the peoples would begin to create and to use their own knowledges as opposed to the status quo where they depend on the West for knowledge. It is envisaged that with such a paradigm shift, the peoples of Zambia would witness epistemic justice which is a corollary of global justice.

1.8 Organisation of the dissertation

This study consists of five chapters. The first chapter places the quest for epistemic justice in Zambia at the centre of the argument of the project. Further, the chapter serves as a general introduction to the study and, therefore, demarcates the boundaries of the argument advanced in the study. It outlines the problem statement, research questions, objectives, rationale, background and the philosophical framework, expected contribution, and organisation of the study. The second chapter explains the foundation of epistemic injustice in Zambia. It argues that the peoples of Zambia are rational and human beings of equal ontological status to the rest of the human family. Referring to the pre-colonial history, the chapter tries to demonstrate that the knowledges of these peoples are effective and, therefore, denying the peoples space at the epistemic front amounts to an epistemic injustice. The third chapter discusses Kaunda's humanism as the major historical attempt in Zambia directed at the fight against epistemic injustice. The chapter presents humanism as an emancipatory ideology of independence and national reconstruction whose efforts, unfortunately, did not fully eradicate the vice of epistemic

injustice in the country. The fourth chapter identifies extraversion as the adverse practice illustrative of epistemic injustice in the post-colonial era of Zambia. It discusses the problem of extraversion in the country within the broader context of the African continent. A solution to the problem is also suggested. Chapter five looks into the future and proposes a new decolonised tradition of knowledge as a solution to this injustice. The study closes with the general conclusion and recommendations.

CHAPTER TWO

COLONIAL EDUCATION AND KNOWLEDGE IN ZAMBIA

2.1 Introduction

Epistemic injustice is the overall object of confrontation of this research against which the argument for the decolonisation of knowledge in Zambia[1] is advanced. This chapter tries to situate epistemic injustice in Zambia within the broader context and philosophical framework of modernity. While acknowledging Europe as the origin of modernity, it is argued that the practice spread its influence to Zambia through missionary work and colonialism. The main defining characteristic of modernity was the assumption that European knowledge could be applied universally in the world, in both European and non-European territories alike. This assumption led to the classification of human beings, on the basis of colour of their skin, into rational beings and non-rational beings. The indigenous peoples of Zambia fell in the latter bracket. In essence, the indigenous peoples of Zambia were denied the right to exist not only as rational beings but also as human beings, since, as already alluded to in chapter one, rationality is one of the essential defining features of human beings. Having been classified as non-rational beings or non-human beings, the indigenous peoples of Zambia were excluded from participating in epistemic activities and from contributing to the body of knowledge in the world. Additionally, the peoples' inherent initiative to create this knowledge was relegated to the periphery of Western models. The epistemic segregation of the indigenous peoples of Zambia is identified with coloniality, the dark side of modernity. Unfortunately, colonialism in Zambia did not end at independence; to the contrary, it has continued to rear its ugly head even in the post-colonial era of the country, and to define the worldview of the indigenous peoples of the country in their contemporary existence.

[1] The territory referred to as 'Zambia' began to exist as such only after independence. Initially, it never existed as a unitary state; instead, the indigenous peoples of the territory lived in their respective communities as ethnic groups. With the coming of colonialism, the territory became known as Northern Rhodesia and, at independence, its name changed to Zambia. Unless directly expressed, this research project uses 'Zambia' to refer to the territory in question before, during and after colonialism. This has been done deliberately in order to ensure that the use of different names for the same territory does not cause confusion for the reader.

This chapter is divided into three sections. The first examines the concept and the practice of modernity and its belief in the universality of knowledge. The second section describes the knowledges of the indigenous peoples and how these knowledges were kept alive from one generation to the other. The purpose of this section is to demonstrate the peoples' inherent epistemic initiative. The last section explains how modernity spread to Zambia, citing missionary work and colonialism as the two major forces in the spread of the phenomenon. The section attempts to highlight how modernity destroyed and disrupted the epistemic initiative of the peoples under discussion.

2.2 Concept and practice of modernity

Modernity, both as a concept and as a practice, owes its origin from Europe. In its influence the phenomenon has affected not only Europe, but also several countries in the non-European world. The contemporary context of many countries in the world today is partly defined by modernity. From this point of view, Giddens (1990:1) is right to define modernity as the "modes of social life or organisation which emerged in Europe from about the seventeenth century onwards and which subsequently became more or less worldwide in their influence." Modernity has a single source and yet its tentacles touch many parts of the world. The forces that dispersed modernity from Europe to other parts of the world, however, were not the same both in form and magnitude. Consequently, modernity was not applied uniformly in all non-European territories; instead, it was applied as a multivalent phenomenon, carrying a different connotation for different people in each case. Thus, European modernity produced various modernities in the non-European world. We have, therefore, not only European modernity, but also African modernity and other modernities around the globe. However, all the modernities in the world are a mimic of a single European modernity. This assertion is affirmed by Mungwini (2013:80-81) who describes modernity in non-European societies as "a conscious appropriation of modes of thinking, ideas, ideals and socio-cultural forms of existence typical of [European] modernity." Modernity in non-European territories signifies an attempt by the indigenous peoples concerned to organise themselves and to define their social reality in conformity with European models.

Modernity could be best explained as a phenomenon that manifests itself in three different forms: as mood, as socio-cultural form and, metaphorically, as 'the melting of solids'. As mood, modernity is understood as a philosophical, theological, ethical and ontological question. Its

main concern in this form is the views and reactions that people develop towards the implications of European modernity (Rengger 2000:4). After encountering European modernity, the indigenous peoples in every given society did not remain the same; instead, they reacted in a certain way to the encounter and its driving forces. In practice, they developed a certain way of doing things and of looking at reality. In the socio-cultural form, modernity concentrates on the changes brought by and constitutive of European modernity. These changes are captured in technological innovation, governance and socioeconomics, and are characteristic of social life and organisation of contemporary societies (Rengger 2000:4).

In all its various forms, modernity is associated with mutation and metamorphosis of indigenous traditions and social relations. As explained by Mungwini (2013:82) modernity has "the destructive and disruptive nature": wherever it manifests itself, it changes the social and cultural relations of the people, leading to the emergence of a new society altogether. Zambia has not been spared from the destructive and the disruptive nature of modernity: a new society has emerged following the country's encounter with modernity. Below we look at the knowledges of the indigenous peoples of Zambia (in order to take stock of what was destructed and disrupted in the country by modernity).

2.3 Indigenous knowledges in Zambia

Zambia is home to seventy-two Bantu-speaking ethnic groups (Simson 1985:3). By virtue of being Bantu-speaking, Zambia's ethnic groups are related to each other, to some extent. This implies that they shared one culture with a common language prior to their migration to Zambia. For this reason, it is not surprising that even today the respective languages of these groups share some common Bantu-origin words and structures although they may not be mutually intelligible. The lack of mutual intelligibility of the languages could be attributed to the influence which the groups in question encountered from other ethnic groups as they migrated to Zambia.

It should be emphasised that human beings have an intrinsic inclination towards survival, and education is born out of this inclination. It is for this reason that wherever a human society is established, education is instituted almost automatically. In the same vein, as soon as the Bantu societies established themselves in Zambia, education was equally instituted. Arguing from this point of view, any assertion that education in Zambia never existed until the arrival of modernity

would be self-contradictory. This is because the assertion would not take into account the survival of the ethnic groups in Zambia from the time of their establishment up to the time these groups encountered modernity. If the existence of an education system in Zambia prior to modernity is sustained, denying epistemic capacity to the indigenous peoples of Zambia during the stated period would be equally self-contradictory. This is because the objective of any system of education is to produce knowledge. If the indigenous peoples of Zambia possessed a system of educating the young, it follows by necessity that they participated in epistemic practices and produced knowledges for survival.

Every ethnic group in Zambia ensured that the next generation was equipped with relevant wisdom, knowledge, and experience sufficient for survival. In every generation, therefore, people were adequately prepared to endure the challenges and enjoy the pleasures of life. In as much as it supported human life and ensured continued existence of every ethnic group, education was an essential component of all the ethnic groups in Zambia before modernity. In spite of sharing a common goal, however, the education system of one ethnic group differed considerably from the next, both in content and structure because each education system depended on the environment in which it was established and on the respective customs of the local community. If members of a given ethnic group were pastoralists and the environment was suitable for this activity, the education system was aligned towards such an activity. Equally, for an ethnic group whose members were hunters, the education system of that particular group would include hunting in its curriculum. In spite of such differences, the education system of every ethnic group in Zambia included grammar, cultural norms and traditions; apprenticeship in practical skills; moral education and training; and instructions on African traditional worldview.

Young people were instructed in grammar, norms and traditions through wise sayings, heroic deeds of ancestors and myths (Snelson 1990:1). These lessons were mainly conducted in form of stories, which were told in the evening as people were warming themselves around a fire. A story would be told by elderly members of the community and later on repeated by young people after learning the story by heart. Storytelling during the day was strongly discouraged for fear that young people could concentrate on stories at the expense of work. To ensure that young people did not break this rule, they were often told that if they told stories during the day their fathers and mothers would turn into monkeys and cold lumps of porridge respectively (Taylor 2006:43).

Stories in these societies took the place of contemporary grammar books and written comprehension exercises. Additionally, besides transmitting a language from one generation to the next, stories instilled in young people cultural norms, values and traditions. They made young people to develop a sense of loyalty and pride in the membership of a society to which they belonged.

Under apprenticeship, boys and girls learnt various practical skills from their fathers and mothers respectively. The skills learnt were based and dependent on the daily and economic needs of a given society. For boys, the skills included hunting, fishing, farming and other survival skills. For girls, apprenticeship concentrated on the gender roles every society prescribed for the women folk. It began with an initiation ceremony during which instructions were given on personal hygiene, sexual behaviour, and responsibilities and rights of marriage life. Mothers, aunts and grandmothers carried the responsibility on their shoulders of ensuring that girls under their custody learnt all the expected roles and gained expertise at doing them. Learning all the prescribed gender roles for women, girls gave an assurance to their parents and guardians that they would be responsible wives and mothers, and that they would contribute positively to the wellbeing of society.

Moral education and training was another important aspect of indigenous knowledges which was taught to boys and girls in Zambia (Snelson 1990:2). Morality regulated the behaviour of individual members of society towards one another. Great emphasis was put on respecting people older than oneself, showing hospitality to strangers, and playing an active role in community projects. In general, one's own interests were not supposed to override, but conform to those of the community. In observing morality, a child was incorporated into a social fabric of society and contributed to its unity and harmony.

An African traditional worldview is another aspect of cultural heritage that was taught to young people. Material and spiritual beings in the universe were thought to exist in hierarchical order. From the greatest to the lowest, the hierarchy was posited as follows: God, spirits, humankind, animals, plants, and matter. It was believed that spiritual beings possessed power to bring good luck or misfortune to human beings. Young people learned the interventions that needed to be put in place in order to avert misfortune in the community. In this regard, they learnt the rituals, how and when such rituals were to be performed in order to propitiate spiritual beings. The value

of certain charms and protective medicines were also learnt and used to reinforce the protection by the spirits. Some circumstances needed the services of a sorcerer, herbalist or spirit diviner. Young people were taught when these circumstances arose (Snelson 1990:2).

In its transmission of knowledge from one generation to another, the education system relied on oral tradition, observation, imitation and repetition. Although learners were given verbal and explicit instructions on a number of subjects, very often they learnt through observing what other members of the community were doing and repeatedly imitated what they observed until they gained expertise at a particular subject or activity. Activities such as house-building, hunting, fishing, beer-brewing and pottery attracted no formal lessons; people learnt all these activities through observation, imitation and repetition.

As Snelson (1990:3) points out, however, all the systems of education in the world have their own share of failures. The education system in Zambia before the encounter with modernity is not an exception; it is highly probable that it was not smoothly carried out. Some teachers might have been incompetent, and some learners might have been slow at learning. Notwithstanding these possible failures, the education system in Zambia prior to modernity should be commended because it provided a thorough and well-balanced preparation for life. Arguing for this conclusion, Snelson (1990:3) asserts that the indigenous system of education in Zambia

> preserved the cultural heritage, language and institutions, taught the young people to make the best use of their physical environment and to be good providers. It fostered obedience, unselfishness and endurance of hardship, encouraged honesty, self-restraint and respect for the rights of others, and endeavoured to explain how man can come to terms with the spirit world.

Indigenous education system in Zambia before modernity was a holistic and a lifelong process of teaching the indigenous peoples of the territory to create knowledges appropriate for their survival. The knowledges which were created using this system of education were effective in as much as they helped the peoples to survive; the created knowledges addressed the challenges which societies faced and responded to the questions which members of these societies posed. If their knowledges were not effective, the peoples would have gone into extinction and would not have survived at least up to the time of modernity. Using the knowledges they acquired in their

education system, the indigenous peoples prepared themselves against both human and natural disasters.

Deducing from the foregoing, an educated person in Zambia before modernity meant an individual who learned and was able to carry out the gender roles which were prescribed by society not only for their benefit, but also, and more importantly, for the benefit of the entire community. Individual members of every society enjoyed a strong bond with others because they felt that they had the same origin and that they shared a common ancestor. Therefore, if one member of society lacked in some area, it was almost automatic that other members would rise to the occasion and assist. When all the members of a society brought together their skills as a community, no single member of society was left neglected; they all had what they needed, at least according to their standards at the time. In order to ensure that a society was well-equipped, some members of the community were provided with specialised training. Depending on individual abilities, some were trained in the art of warfare, defending the community from being attacked by other ethnic groups or raiding neighbouring groups. Others were trained in blacksmith so that they could make weapons for warriors. Those trained in blacksmith would make also hoes, axes and other simple tools which were needed by the community in which they lived. There were also others who were trained in special skills such as divining, healing, drumming and rain-making. Specialised training was not exclusively for men, but also applied to women. Besides learning the skills and responsibilities of a housewife and of a mother, some women were trained as midwives, while others gained the skill of beer-brewing, weaving and pottery (Snelson 1990:3).

It should be noted that indigenous knowledges in Zambia did not exist by chance; instead, they were a result of a deliberate effort by the indigenous peoples of Zambia. Necessity is the mother of invention. The knowledges which the indigenous peoples of Zambia produced before modernity were in accordance with the needs of individual societies: they were a response to the challenges the peoples faced in their daily life, and to the questions they asked at the time. During their encounter with European modernity, the indigenous peoples of Zambia lost their indigenous knowledges that gave them identity and meaning in life. The experience of modernity in Zambia, therefore, did not only lead to the emergence of a new society but also gave a new identity to the indigenous peoples of Zambia. The major force behind the encounter of the

indigenous peoples of Zambia with modernity is the Europeans' mission to civilise. In this mission, Europeans wanted to enable the indigenous peoples of the country "to share some of the benefits of a more developed form of civilisation" (Snelson 1990:5).

2.4 Europeans' mission to civilise

The Europeans' mission was part of the widespread conspiracy of Europeans to deny Africans the right to reason and to exist as knowing subjects. During this mission Europeans dismantled the cultural heritages in Africa, replacing the traditional epistemic pillars with European models. The reason for the replacement is that Europeans believed that their models were more solid and superior (durable) than those which were for the indigenous peoples of the country. In this way, Europe Westernised Africans and converted them to the "view that their subjection was a necessity if their territories were to progress and develop and become places of civilised human habitation. It hammered into their heads the providential and beneficial nature of their subjection" (Serequeberhan 2010). Europeans carried out the mission to civilise the indigenous peoples of Zambia in two phases. The first was through missionary work, and the second was through colonialism.

2.4.1 Missionary work in Zambia

The first Europeans to have contact with the ethnic groups in what was to become Northern Rhodesia and later Zambia were missionaries, with the first batch being Portuguese missionaries. The activities of the Portuguese, however, were insignificant until David Livingstone of the London Missionary Society appeared on the scene in 1851 (Turok 1999:22; Henkel 1999a:32). The desire of Livingstone was to promote both missionary work and trade in Zambia. In his reports to the European community, he talked about the great need for missionary work in Zambia, highlighting "the physical needs and poor living conditions of the [inhabitants] and the desperate, inhuman state to which some [ethnic groups] had been reduced by the slave traders" (Snelson 1990:5). Such reports aroused extraordinary interest in many missionaries from Europe, America and South Africa, leading to an influx of missionaries of various denominations into Zambia. Unaccustomed to the climate, missionaries were met by harsh realities of life in the country: they suffered from various diseases such as malaria and black water fever, and many of them died of such diseases (Henkel 1999a:32).

In spite of various challenges as pointed out above, the glowing zeal for missionary work in Zambia was not quenched among the missionaries. From 1851 to 1945 there was a considerable inflow of mission societies, turning the country into a hive of missionary activities. During this period the following mission societies were established in Zambia: Primitive Methodists, London Missionary Society, Church of Scotland, White Fathers, Dutch Reformed Church, Brethren Missionaries or Christian Missionaries in Many Lands, Jesuit Fathers, Seventh Day Adventist Church, Brethren in Christ, South African Baptist Missionary Society, South Africa General Mission, Universities Mission to Central Africa, Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, Church of Christ, Salvation Army, Capuchin Fathers, Franciscan Fathers, Pilgrim Holiness Church, United Missions in the Copperbelt, and the United Society for Christian Literature (Snelson 1990:6-11; Henkel 1999a: 32-34).

Virtually all the missionary societies in Zambia established mission stations and opened schools, not only at the mission stations but also in the villages surrounding the mission stations, as long as human and financial resources allowed. The first school in Zambia was established in 1883 by Frederick Arnot, the pioneer of the Brethren Missionaries in the country. From that time, the number of schools rapidly swelled. By 1925, there were about 2000 schools that had been established in the country. The schools were run by different missionary societies: 554 by the White Fathers, 448 by the Dutch Reformed Church, 308 by the Church of Scotland, 280 by the London Missionary Society, and the remaining 410 were shared among other eleven smaller missionary societies (Snelson 1990:15).

When missionaries entered Zambia they declared that the purpose of their entry into the country was to preach the Good News and to convert the indigenous peoples of the country to Christianity (Henkel 1999b:36). Contrary to this declaration, preaching of the Good News and conversion of the indigenous peoples to Christianity was only a fraction of their activities. Besides preaching Christianity and conversion, missionaries in Zambia introduced the indigenous peoples of the country to Western culture with the aim to "produce people African in blood and colour, but English in tastes, in opinion, in morals and in intellect" (Snelson 1990:v). Western culture comprised English language, Western methods of learning and knowing, and the Western worldview. In fact, this is what informed the education system which was introduced and taught by missionaries in the schools they established in Zambia (Snelson 1990:22). The

education system which was introduced in the country was imported from Europe and was deemed instrumental in spreading Western culture to all the indigenous peoples. In schools, focus was placed on the youth, from whom a ripple effect would be created. While the youth would internalise more easily than adults and would grow up practising the Western models taught, they would also teach their children, and their children would teach their children, and the chain would continue (Snelson 1990:34).

From the foregoing, the vehement determination of missionaries to stump out from Zambia indigenous cultures and knowledges and to replace these with Western models cannot be hidden. This objective was reinforced by missionaries' abhorrent attitude towards the indigenous peoples' cultural traditions and practices. Snelson (1990:11-12) explains that missionaries held that the indigenous peoples of Zambia were "immoral, lazy, and drunken, steeped in superstitions, and in witchcraft." Further, Zambia's indigenous cultures and knowledges, according to them, were rotten, bedevilled and were characterised by pagan beliefs and sorcery. Based on these charges, missionaries opined that Zambia's indigenous cultures and knowledges needed to be replaced, root and branch, with Western culture and knowledge. Implicitly, missionaries held that Western culture and knowledge were superior to those of the indigenous peoples of Zambia. They also thought that the duo was universal and that it could be applied to the Zambian situation in the same way it was applied in Europe. In general, missionary work in Zambia laid a foundation for modernity which was intensified further through colonialism.

2.4.2 Colonialism in Zambia

In Africa colonialism was not exclusive to Zambia; instead, it affected many countries on the continent with varying degrees of intensity. Europeans held that Africans were inferior generally in all aspects of human experience and existence and sought to change Africans' supposedly inferior way of life. According to Europeans, this objective could be achieved by spreading in Africa the Western thought and modes of enquiry and ensure that these European models were infiltrated in the African categories of thought formation (Wiredu 1992:59). Education became an important tool in this respect. The colonial education system in Africa was delivered in foreign languages such as English, French, German and Portuguese. By learning in Western languages, as Wiredu (1998:17) explains, Africans were not only conceptually "de-Africanised" but also "Westernised". Through the use of Western languages as medium of instruction in the

colonial education system, Africans were detached from their indigenous ways of thinking and conceptions of reality. That was possible because the syntax and the semantics of every language are not neutral, but suggest a definite mode of conceptualisation and, therefore, influence one's thinking (Wiredu 2009:12). A scholar instructed in a Western language would be influenced to think in that particular language and to perceive reality from the Western perspective. The same would hold for a scholar instructed in an African language: they would equally think in that specific African language and conceive reality from an African point of view. As wa Thiong'o (1986:16) explains, the operating principle behind the "de-Africanisation" and the "Westernisation" of Africans was the self-conception of the West as the centre of knowledge in the world. The West ensured that this conception dominated the mental universe of Africans and that it determined how Africans perceived themselves in relation to the world. The economy, politics and cultures of Africans fell under the siege of Western imperialism. As a consequence, Africans were alienated from managing their welfare, denying them the self-confidence, initiative and creativity which they exhibited in their respective cultures before the advent of modernity on the continent.

Colonialism in Zambia provided an avenue for the British to recast the negative notions about the epistemic capacity of the indigenous peoples of Africa which existed in the imagination of Europeans prior to the colonisation of the continent. These notions were meant to aid Europeans secure a superior position and dominate the world, particularly its epistemic domain. In an effort to achieve this objective in Zambia, the British government dominated the political, cultural, economic and intellectual domains of the country. This was done by displacing indigenous knowledges and ways of knowing and replacing these with Western models.

Colonial rule in Zambia started in 1891 after the British South Africa Company dubiously gained control and began administering the western part of the country on behalf of the British government. The Company was granted authority over the territory after signing the Lochner Treaty with the Paramount Chief of the Lozi ethnic group, King Lewanika. The King was not willing to sign the treaty, but was persuaded into signing it by Francois Coillard, a missionary

belonging to the Paris Evangelical Mission (Snelson 1990:19).[2] The British South Africa Company referred to the newly acquired colony as North Western Rhodesia.

In 1897 the British South Africa Company extended its authority in Zambia by bringing more land under its administration and control. It conquered the Ngoni ethnic group in the eastern part of Zambia and, after defeating them, made this territory as part of its colony. This second part of Zambia to be taken by the British South Africa Company came to be known as North Eastern Rhodesia. Zambia was later to be made up of the two blocks: North Western Rhodesia and North Eastern Rhodesia. By bringing the two blocks under its administration, the British South Africa Company turned the entire territory of Zambia into its colony. In 1911 North Western Rhodesia and North Eastern Rhodesia were amalgamated together to form Northern Rhodesia, which, at independence, would change its name to Zambia (Snelson 1990:121).

The British South Africa Company signed several treaties with traditional leaders in Northern Rhodesia which granted it rights to extract minerals and allocate land in the country to white settlers. One thing that cannot go without mention about these treaties is the paradox they raise. The lawful signing and ceding or transferring of Northern Rhodesia and its sovereignty from the indigenous peoples to the Europeans by means of treaties presupposes the application of international law, the law that is only applicable to civilised nations. Europeans, however, did not regard the peoples of Northern Rhodesia to be civilised; in fact, they perceived them to be subhuman. If the peoples of Northern Rhodesia were uncivilised and were subhuman as conceived by Europeans, it was paradoxical for them to sign treaties.

Nevertheless, following the signing of the vacuous treaties, the British South Africa Company was supposed to protect traditional leaders and their kingdoms or chiefdoms from all outside interference or invasion. Further, the Company was supposed to pay traditional leaders money and to provide industries, hospitals, roads and other facilities for economic and social development in Zambia (Snelson 1990:121-122). Unfortunately, besides bringing to an end inter-ethnic invasions and wars in Zambia, and promoting Christianity and Western education in the

[2] Coillard's role in this matter is an indication that sometimes missionaries behaved as agents of colonialism in Zambia. As argued by Snelson (1990:19), missionaries were involved in the politics of the country's ethnic groups and could easily make political calculations on behalf of other Europeans.

country, the Company did not fulfil any of the various promises it signed in the treaties with the traditional leaders. In fact, the provision of goods and social services to the native population in the country was consistently neglected. The reason for the consistent abrogation of the treaties by the British South Africa Company could be that the treaties in the first place were vacuous, as pointed out above.

The major interest of the British South Africa Company lay in subjugating the indigenous peoples of Zambia in order to have unlimited access to both human and natural resources in the country; it was not necessarily interested in the economic and social development of the country (Turok 1999:27). To serve its own interests, the British South Africa Company did not only grab land from the indigenous peoples of Zambia, but also exploited them for cheap labour. Zambia remained under the control of the British South Africa Company until 1924 when the reins of administrative power were handed over to the British government (Snelson 1990:121).

Colonial rule in Zambia by the British government was a continuation of what the British South Africa Company had already started. This was subjugation and exploitation of the indigenous peoples on the one hand, and securing the superiority position of the West on the other hand. Subjugation and exploitation in Zambia began with the introduction of a capitalist economy and imposition of tax on the indigenous people of the country. The imposed tax was meant to improve the welfare of the white settlers and not necessarily of the peoples on whom it was imposed. This tax was supposed to be paid in monetary form. In an attempt to look for money to pay as tax, indigenous peoples of Zambia, men in particular, were compelled to leave their villages and look for jobs on the farms owned by European settlers, in the mines and in the colonial civil service. Wherever they were employed, however, the indigenous peoples were poorly paid. Employed to do the same job with a European, an indigenous Zambian would be paid six times less compared to their European counterparts (Turok 1999:29).

The continuous extraction of men from rural areas while deliberately limiting their opportunities in the capitalist economy was in itself a means towards subjugation and exploitation of the indigenous peoples of Zambia. The migration of Zambian males from villages to towns in search of employment caused a reduction in food production among the indigenous peoples; the labour force that remained in villages was not sufficient to ensure a robust food production. Further, the little that was produced in agriculture by the indigenous peoples who remained in villages was

pegged, by the colonial government, at a lower price compared to the price of the same agricultural produce produced by European farmers (Turok 1999:29). This meant that the peoples in villages did not realise much money from their agricultural produce to enable them buy basic necessities. While paying tax, therefore, the indigenous men who were in employment in towns were expected to offer financial support to their families in villages. Considering their meagre wages, the workers remained subservient to their colonial masters and could not competitively participate in the capitalist economy.

Subjugation and exploitation of the indigenous peoples of Zambia was aided by racial discrimination in the economic, social and political domains of the country. The peoples were prevented by the British colonial government from taking an active role in trade, commerce and politics. They were not allowed to own big businesses; the only business they could own was tea-carts. They were also not allowed to enter some shops; instead, they bought goods from such shops through windows. Voting was another privilege which was strictly reserved for whites: the indigenous peoples were not allowed to take part in elections, to vote or contest as candidates in an election. In addition, the peoples did not enjoy the freedom of movement in the country; in order for them to move from one part of their own country to another they needed permission from the colonial government (Mwanakatwe 1994:21-22).

The colour bar was also instituted in social facilities such as schools and residential areas. Children of the indigenous peoples and of white settlers went to separate schools, residential areas for whites and the indigenous peoples were equally separate. Both schools and residential areas for the latter were very poor compared to those for the former. High-ranking and well-paying jobs were reserved for Europeans; the indigenous peoples were only employed to do menial jobs such as mining and farming, and insignificant white-collar jobs in the colonial government. The white-collar jobs for the indigenous peoples could not be better than the post of adult education assistant, urban court registrar, wireless operator, agricultural laboratory assistant, and dispensary assistant (Turok 1999:29).

In order to maintain the status quo and ensure that the avenues of advancement remained closed to all the indigenous peoples of Zambia, the colonial government denied these peoples an education that could enable them to compete with Europeans on the labour market. The type of education the British government offered to the indigenous peoples was rudimentary, it was only

sufficient for the labour force which was needed in the mines, on the farms and in the lower echelons of the colonial government. The colonial government pursued an education policy designed to protect the interests of Europeans and to neglect those of the indigenous peoples.

From the presentation above, it becomes clear that colonial subjugation and exploitation in Zambia was defined by an oppressive exercise of authority by the British over the indigenous peoples of the country and these peoples' modes of production, law and government, cultures, knowledges and languages. The colonial government grabbed the mantle of leadership in the country and exposed the indigenous peoples to excruciating economic, social and political hardships. Traditional leaders in the country were turned into colonial agents and they were no longer in charge of promoting traditional norms and customs; their concern was tilted toward enforcing the draconian policies of the colonial government. Borrowing the words of Smith (2012:1), the British government denied the indigenous peoples of Zambia a valid "claim to existence, to land and territories, to the right of self-determination, to the survival of [their] languages and forms of cultural knowledge, to [their] natural resources and systems for living within [their] environments." The indigenous peoples lost control of their existence, natural resources, indigenous cultures and knowledges. While securing and fostering the selfish interests of Europeans, the colonial government denied the indigenous peoples of Zambia an opportunity to define their own experiences.

Colonialism in Zambia, as administered by the British colonial government, was characterised by denying the epistemic capacity of the indigenous peoples of the country; it deliberately imposed Western knowledge on the indigenous peoples of the country and dismissed as irrelevant their own knowledges. It should be noted that Westerners had an ethnocentric conception of themselves: they thought they were the only race on earth which was endowed with rationality and that their culture and knowledge were superior to any other culture and form of knowledge, the knowledges of the indigenous peoples of Zambia inclusive. According to this conception, the West was "the centre of legitimate knowledge, the arbiter of what count[ed] as knowledge and the source of 'civilised' knowledge" (Smith 2012:66). In our case, this self-conception of the West meant that the indigenous people of Zambia were inferior to Westerners, and that their culture and knowledges were equally inferior to those of the West. Using colonialism as its military strength, the British colonial government displaced the 'inferior' Zambian indigenous

knowledges and replaced them with the 'superior' Western knowledge. The displacement and replacement of knowledge frames epistemic injustice in Zambia as discussed below.

2.4.3 Epistemic injustice in Zambia

To claim that the project of colonising Zambia ended with the gaining of independence would be an underestimation of the impact of this project on the country and its indigenous peoples. The project of colonising Zambia went beyond the strict borders of colonial administrations and continues to this day to exert its influence on the economic, social and political structures of the country and on the thinking of the indigenous peoples of the country in general. In its current state, Zambia is experiencing a new form of colonialism which could be described as neo-colonialism or coloniality. In describing neo-colonialism, Nkrumah (1966:ix-x) explains that

> [i]n place of colonialism as that main instrument of imperialism we have today neo-colonialism. The essence of neo-colonialism is that the State which is subject to it is, in theory, independent and has all the outward trappings of international sovereignty. In reality its economic system and thus its political policy is directed from outside... The result of neo-colonialism is that foreign capital is used for the exploitation rather than for the development of the less developed parts of the world. Investment under neo-colonialism increases rather than decreases the gap between the rich and the poor countries of the world.

Nkrumah's concept of neo-colonialism has been popularised by Latin American theorists under the term "coloniality". This concept was coined by Anibal Quijano, a Peruvian sociologist, in the late 1980s and early 1990s to denote "the oppressive and imperial bent of modern European ideals projected to and enacted in, the non-European world" (Mignolo 2011:3). The concept captures the aftermath of colonialism as the dark side of modernity. In our contemporary society, coloniality is "maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience" (Maldonado-Torres 2007:243).

In Zambia, neo-colonialism or coloniality has created a vertical social classification which, in turn, has granted Europeans superiority over the indigenous peoples of the country. In post-colonial Zambia the practices and institutions of control and patterns of political, social and

economic organisation and dominance which were established during colonialism, have continued to function in almost the same way. Although the country can boast of having gained independence in 1964, its sovereignty has not been actualised because its political policy and economic system are characterised by Western overtones. Contemporary social order in Zambia, therefore, is characterised by and provides anchorage to epistemic injustice.

Fricker (2007:1) talks about two forms of epistemic injustice: testimonial injustice and hermeneutical injustice. Testimonial injustice occurs when the credibility of what a knowing subject claims to know is rendered insignificant due to the prejudice(s) the listener has against the knowing subject. The prejudice(s) could be as a result of social stereotyping of the knowing subject in terms of social status, sex or skin colour. Examples of testimonial injustice include dismissing the views held by women "because they are regarded as lacking intellectual stamina", perceiving blacks as irrational just because of their skin colour, and thinking that slam dwellers are thieves or criminals simply because of their residential area (see Mungwini 2017:9). Another classic example of testimonial injustice is given by Kant. Referring to some "Negro", Kant (2011:61) asserts that "this scoundrel was completely black from head to foot, a distinct proof that what he said was stupid." The man is discounted as a knowing subject and what he says is equally discredited on account of the colour of the skin. The reasoning of Kant is that the man would not know because he is black. In other words, testimonial injustice happens whenever a dominant group determines the truth value of knowledge based on some social stereotypes which that particular group holds against the knowing subject.

Hermeneutical injustice takes place where there are inequalities in social structures of society. As explained by Fricker (2007:1), it happens "when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences." One example of this form of injustice is when a woman suffers sexual harassment in a culture that lacks this critical concept and that favours patriarchal systems of power relations. The more powerful individuals or groups dominate over the less powerful individuals or groups in society, denying the latter "the opportunity to contribute their experiences in the creation of shared meaning" (Mungwini 2017:9). In other words, based on the structural inequalities of society, marginalised groups are excluded from taking part in the epistemic practices that define collective understanding of humanity.

Whether presented as testimonial injustice or hermeneutical injustice, as explained above, epistemic injustice is characterised by the exclusion of the less powerful individuals or groups from the province of knowledge by the more powerful individuals or groups in society. Fricker (2007:20) explains that it is "a kind of injustice in which someone is *wronged specifically in her capacity as a knower."* By extension, epistemic injustice does not only deny the victim the right to reason, but also the right to exist as a human being. Fricker (2007:44) argues that "[t]o be wronged in one's capacity as a knower is to be wronged in a capacity essential to human value." Rationality and knowledge are the essential characteristics that distinguish human beings from other existents. When one is stripped of these characteristics, one is equally excluded from the category of humanity.

During colonialism, Zambia was caught up in the web of epistemic injustice: the indigenous peoples of Zambia were perceived by the British as irrational beings, beings that could not rationally engage themselves in intellectual creativities. In other words, the indigenous peoples were denied not only the right to reason, but also the right to exist as a knowing subject, and could not, therefore, convey knowledge to others as a knowing subject. It should be noted that the peoples were disqualified from occupying any position in the epistemic arena on the basis of their identity and not necessarily the credibility of their knowledges. Only rational beings are capable of interpreting the world around them. According to the British, the indigenous peoples of Zambia were not rational and, therefore, incapable of interpreting the world. Denying the peoples the ability to know, the British developed and donated concepts to them so that the peoples could make sense of the reality around them. The denial of rationality against the indigenous peoples of Zambia by the colonisers was one of the worst forms of injustice in the country, and it was the major motivating factor for the struggle for liberation.

2.5 Conclusion

Colonialism in Zambia could be applauded for a number of positive contributions towards development in the country. Two of such developments cannot go without mention. The first is the phonetic transcription of the country's various indigenous languages and, the other is the introduction of literacy and numeracy skills among the indigenous inhabitants (Snelson 1990:4). Literacy and numeracy skills, in particular, have played a huge role in the economic and social

development of the country. The two skills have contributed significantly towards incorporating Zambia into the global economy in which it has become an active participant. In spite of the positive contribution towards development in Zambia, however, colonialism in the country has left its legacy in form of neo-colonialism or coloniality, whose practical aspect has been the imposition of the Western thought system on the indigenous peoples. The Western thought system has encroached on the indigenous thought formation, denying the peoples their identity, self-determination and originality of thought. The peoples' consciousness has been ravaged and philosophical inquiry tilted towards answering the questions posed by the West. In the post-colonial era, this predicament was first confronted by humanism as a philosophy of decolonisation. This is discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

HUMANISM AS A PHILOSOPHY OF DECOLONISATION

3.1 Introduction

Colonialism in Zambia determined the structures of government and other institutions, political and economic organisation and the mode of thinking of the indigenous peoples as colonial subjects. It interrupted and radically reformulated the history, the thought system and the epistemic initiative of the indigenous peoples. Through its ideologies and philosophies of exclusion and negation, it imposed an alien tag of identity on the peoples and declared them irrational and subhuman beings. Against this background, there was need for the indigenous peoples of Zambia to redefine themselves and to reclaim their true identity if they were to restore their originality of thought and the epistemic initiative which they exhibited before the advent of colonialism. This attempt could be done through the process of decolonisation and self-determination.

This chapter discusses the historical perspective of national reconstruction for decolonisation and self-determination in Zambia. Particular attention is devoted to Kaunda's humanism within the larger context of nationalistic-ideological philosophy. The chapter seeks to evaluate humanism, not only as a national political ideology, but more as a developmental ideology constructed, like other ideologies of independence and national reconstruction in Africa, on the vision and imagery of emancipation. The chapter is divided into two major parts. The first gives a general overview of nationalistic-ideological philosophy. This is done in order to situate the ideology of humanism within African philosophy. The second part addresses humanism, with particular attention given to Kaunda's attempt to set the peoples of Zambia on the path of decolonisation and self-determination.

3.2 Nationalistic-ideological philosophy

In his response to the debate on the existence of African philosophy, Oruka identifies nationalistic-ideological philosophy as one of the trends in which African philosophy exists or

could exist[3]. This trend seeks to establish a "social theory for independence" and a "genuine humanist social order" in postcolonial Africa (Oruka 2003:144). It is based on the conviction that colonialism did not only affect the economic, political, social and cultural systems of African countries, but also the minds of the colonised. On this premise, it maintains that political independence in Africa is not enough to sufficiently satisfy the emancipatory hopes of the peoples; instead, it argues that political independence in the continent should be accompanied by mental liberation of the peoples (Bodunrin 1991:64). In this way, nationalistic-ideological philosophy tries to respond to the colonial situation that dehumanised, derogated and subordinated the peoples in Africa; it calls all the peoples to be conscious of their own identity and personality. Establishing a "unique political theory based on traditional African socialism" is regarded to be one of the possible ways of achieving this objective (Njoroge 1986:96). It is argued that traditional African socialism is a suitable form of social living that has the capacity to realise what is best in Africans as human beings (Tάíwó 2004:258). From this point of view, one-party parliamentary rule is preferred in nationalistic-ideological philosophy to two-party or multiparty democracy. The choice is based on the claim that the former is in conformity with traditional African socialism while the latter is alien to the peoples' cultures and traditions. Proponents do not want to construct their ideologies on foreign models for fear that "the delicate fabric ... and fragile African nations might be rent" (Tάíwó 2004:253).

At the centre of nationalistic-ideological philosophy is the question of human nature. As explained by Senghor (1964:65), human nature is given the first consideration and constitutes the measure for nationalistic ideologies. One reason for giving human nature a primary consideration in nationalistic-ideological philosophy could be because colonialists accorded Africans "the lowest rungs of the human ladder" and argued that Africans were irrational and incapable of ruling themselves (Tάíwó 2004:244). Nationalistic-ideological philosophy affirms the humanity of Africans and, thus, corrects the biased Eurocentric definition of a human being. This is seen as a precondition towards the restoration of human dignity of the African peoples.

[3]Initially, Oruka identified only four trends in African philosophy: nationalistic-ideological philosophy, ethno-philosophy, philosophic sagacity and professional philosophy. The four trends were later revised and two more trends were added to the list: hermeneutic philosophy, and artistic or literary philosophy (Oruka 2003:142).

The fight for self-identity and self-definition in Africa advanced by nationalistic-ideological philosophy has a long history. Wa Thiong'o (2003:63) traces this fight from the 1960s when the peoples grew weary of colonialism and began "demanding and asserting their right to define themselves and their relationship to the universe". The process was a critical investigation of the conceptual framework upon which contemporary African philosophical thinking could be erected. African philosophers contended that contemporary African philosophical thinking was erected on Western categories of thought. According to them, Western models could not be a foundation for contemporary African philosophical thinking because that would not serve the interests of Africans but of Westerners. Alternatively, the African thinkers opted to build the contemporary African philosophical thinking on African traditional cultures and traditions. This development signified going back to the philosophical thinking which was exhibited in the continent by the indigenous peoples prior to colonialism. It marked a significant moment in epistemology because it meant moving from a particular centre of knowledge to a pluralism of centres, all of them being equally important and legitimate in terms of human imagination (wa Thiong'o 2003:67). Nationalistic-ideological philosophy aims at a radical transformation of economic, political, social and cultural aberrations in Africa which emanate from the negative impact of colonialism on the continent. Its proponents considers it to be pragmatic and "a worthy response" to the postcolonial situation of Africa (Makumba 2007:137).

Among the proponents of nationalistic-ideological philosophy are Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, Julius Nyerere of Tanzania and Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia just to select a few. Although they were based in different countries, these post independence rulers of Africa shared in common a number of characteristics. In fact, it is on the basis of the shared characteristics that they are brought together and classified under nationalistic-ideological philosophy. Firstly, they had a keen interest in philosophy and made it a foundation of their ideologies. As noted by (Wiredu 2005:9), they "propounded blueprints for reconstruction with clearly articulated philosophical underpinnings." On this basis, Wiredu (2005:9) refers to them as "philosopher-kings."[4] Secondly, they "had an equally strong sense of the importance of cultural self-identity" (Wiredu 2008:332). They believed that there was an authentic African way of life and that it was based on

[4] It should be noted that, with an exception of Nkrumah, Nyerere and Kaunda were not trained philosophers. In their articulation of philosophy, therefore, Nyerere and Kaunda only relied on their own individual intelligence.

communalism as reflected in the practices and the values of traditional African society. That way of life, unfortunately, was interrupted by colonialism. The 'philosopher-kings' were convinced that there was need to reclaim that particular way of life in the postcolonial era of the continent in order to promote the well-being of the peoples. Based on that conviction, the rulers established their ideologies of independence and national reconstruction on traditional African communalism, and collectively referred to the ideologies as African socialism (Wiredu 2008:333). Traditional African communism was preferred because it emphasised the centrality of the human person. Oruka (2003:144) explains that "[i]n communalism the individual and society are said to have egalitarian mutual obligations: no individual would prosper at the expense of the society and the society would not ignore the stagnation of any of its members" Communalism ensures a correct attitude towards the human person; its central objective is to promote the dignity and the well-being of every person. By establishing their ideologies on traditional African communalism, these 'philosopher-kings' treated the human person as the subject of their ideologies of emancipation and self-determination. Using philosophical principles and traditional African communalism as a foundation, Nkrumah, Nyerere and Kaunda developed the ideologies of consciencism, ujamaa and humanism respectively.

3.2.1 Consciencism

Nkrumah (1972:443) observes that the humanist and egalitarian principles on which traditional African society was founded are no longer holding in contemporary African society. He calls for the restoration of these principles in order to promote the welfare of the human being who is "primarily a spiritual being, a being endowed with a certain inward dignity, integrity and value" (Nkrumah 1964:68). The contemporary African society, according to Nkrumah (1964:68), comprises three strands of influences: the African traditional way of life, Islamic tradition, and the Christian tradition and culture of Western Europe which have been infiltrated in the continent through colonialism and neo-colonialism. The three strands have conflicting and competing ideologies which threaten peace and social cohesion. If left to co-exist, they have the capacity to leave the continent "racked by the most malignant schizophrenia" (Nkrumah1964:79). In order to avert this situation, Nkrumah (1964:70) maintains that there is need for an ideology that can couch and animate the harmonising process of the three strands of influence and fine-tune them to "the original humanist principles underlying [traditional] African society". He identifies that

ideology as consciencism. This ideology is "the map in intellectual terms of the disposition of forces which [would] enable African society to digest the Western, Islamic and the Euro-Christian elements in Africa, and develop them in such a way that they fit into the African personality" (Nkrumah 1964:79). The African personality is embedded in the traditional African society, where every member saw their well-being in the welfare of the community. Due to the strong sense of communalism, "in the traditional African society, no sectional interest could be regarded as supreme; nor did legislative and executive power aid the interests of any particular group. The welfare of the people was supreme" (Nkrumah 1964:69).

Arguing for humanist and egalitarian principles in contemporary African society, Nkrumah defends socialism over capitalism. Capitalism, according to him, is not only unjust and alien to the African continent, but also "irreconcilable with those basic principles which animate the traditional African society" (Nkrumah 1964:76). He believes that unlike capitalism which is directed towards a profiteering accomplishment, socialism aims at providing the material and spiritual needs of all the people in the community. To ensure that socialism is sustainable in the post-independence period of African states, Nkrumah argues against opposition political parties. He asserts that "a people's parliamentary democracy with a one-party system is better able to express and satisfy the common aspirations of a nation as a whole, than a multiparty parliamentary system, which is in fact only a ruse for perpetuating ... the inherent struggle between the "haves" and the "have-nots"" (Nkrumah 1964:100-101). The idea of establishing a two-party or a multiparty democracy, where opposition political parties would be formed, is undesirable because it would create factions and, therefore, stand opposed to the spirit and historical experience of the traditional African society. According to Nkrumah (1964:78), consciencism is an important ideology because it has the capacity to provoke a social revolution in Africans' thinking and philosophy which is needed for contemporary living.

3.2.2 Ujamaa

After the country's independence in 1961, Nyerere adopted ujamaa as the ideology of independence and national reconstruction in Tanzania. "Ujamaa" is a Swahili concept which means 'extended family' or 'brotherhood'. According to Nyerere (1968:162), the term describes the attitude of mind under which the peoples essentially cared for each other's welfare in traditional African society as members of one extended family. During colonialism, however,

that attitude of mind was displaced and replaced by capitalism, which, in its predatory nature, exploited the indigenous peoples, leaving Tanzania and the rest of the African continent underdeveloped. The solution to this predicament, according to Nyerere, lies in the peoples' ability and willingness to turn away from the colonial exploitative capitalist system by embracing African socialism as expressed in the idea of ujamaa.

Nyerere's argument for ujamaa is informed by the conviction that all human beings are equal and that they are to be respected and treated fairly. Based on this conviction, Nyerere intends and aspires to reconstruct Tanzania on the principles of the traditional African institution of an extended family system in order to restore humanist and egalitarian principles in the country and prevent class struggles or distinctions. Hence, he argues against exploitation and private ownership of the principal means of production. Further, he grants the government leverage to intervene in the accumulation of wealth by individuals to an extent inconsistent with the vision of creating a classless society. Nyerere opines that a society built on ujamaa would pave way for equality, freedom and unity – the ideals which defined social living in traditional African society. Equality made Africans to work cooperatively; freedom made them to own and serve their communities; and unity helped them to live and to work in peace, security and well-being (Nyerere 1966:10). Ujamaa, according to Nyerere (1968:2), is the best ideology of independence and national reconstruction not only for Tanzania, but also for all underdeveloped nations in Africa because it "involves building on the foundation of our past, and building also to our own design".

Arguing for the creation of an extended family system in Tanzania, Nyerere favours one-party rule over multiparty democracy. The latter, according to him, cannot apply to Africa but to Europe and America. This assertion is based on his understanding of the historical emergence of political parties in the two regions. He explains that

> European and American parties came into being as the result of existing social and economic divisions – the second party being formed to challenge the monopoly of political power by some aristocratic or capitalist group. Our own parties had a very different origin. They were not formed to challenge any ruling group of our own people; they were formed to challenge the foreigners who ruled over us (Nyerere 1963:14-15).

The argument of Nyerere is that political parties in Africa did not emerge as factions, but as nationalist movements; from the onset they represented the collective interests and aspirations of all the peoples. The concept of multiple political parties in Africa is derived from the political structure of Europe and America, and swims against the principles of the traditional African society. A one-party rule which is identified with the entire nation, according to Nyerere (1963:7), makes the foundations of democracy in African countries firmer than where there are more than one political party, "each representing only a section of the community." In a one-party rule all the people belong to the same party and are not forced to divide themselves into different political parties. From this perspective, Nyerere finds a one-party rule to be more inclusive and more representative than a two-party or multiparty democracy.

3.2.3 Humanism

Humanism in the west is "associated historically with the period of the Renaissance which is popularly understood as having taken up the study of human beings as rational creatures set free from all theological determinations" (Franklin & Shaw 1991:23). In Africa it describes a political philosophy whose aim is to guide the "actions of the government by placing a deep concern for the welfare of human beings at the centre of all activity" (Cheeseman 2019). It is concerned with the restoration of human dignity, following the dehumanising impact of colonialism on the peoples. Humanism emphasises the centrality of the human person or the primacy of the human person over social and political institutions (Kaunda 1966:41). It is premised on the conviction that politics, society and the economy should exist for the benefit of the human being, and not vice-versa (Kaunda 1976:45).

In Zambia, Kaunda formulated humanism "as a response to a specific need arising out of the prevailing historical circumstances of decolonisation" (Bwalya 1987:31). Serving as the first President of the Republic of Zambia after the country's independence in 1964, Kaunda proclaimed humanism as the ideology on which the newly independent state should establish its economic, social and political development for the emancipation and self-determination of the peoples. The ideology was to be used in explaining and in justifying the developmental agenda of the government. Thus, in 1967 humanism was adopted as the national ideology of Zambia, and the Ministry of National Guidance was created to ensure that the ideology was implemented successfully (McKenna 1997:195; Bwalya: 1987:31). It became "the moral basis for all human

activity in the country whether it be political, economic or social" (Kaunda 1968:32). As a nationalistic-ideological philosophy, humanism shaped Kaunda's conception of society, politics, economics, ethics and education.

3.3 Humanism as a nationalistic-ideological philosophy

Kaunda establishes the ideology of humanism on his conception of the human being and the way of life in traditional African society. He opines that, established on these two principles, humanism would provide solutions to the challenges the peoples face in the post-independence African society. Such challenges include the degeneration of recognition and respect for human dignity in Africa, following the continent's encounter with colonialism. What makes Kaunda's humanism distinctive are its metaphysical and theistic overtones. According to him, all human beings in the world are created in the image of God; they are "simply God's people with a common humanity" (Kaunda 1983:3). What he tries to underscore by this statement is that human beings are sacred beings who possess an equal worth. Regardless of race, socioeconomic status and other like-differences, all human beings possess dignity and are to be respected (Kaunda 1968:4). In other words, differences such as colour of the skin, nationality, faith and material attainments are irrelevant in determining the true worth of human beings; what counts, instead, is the sacredness which is acquired by virtue of being created in the image of God. Human dignity, according to Kaunda (1968:4), is "the intrinsic worth of man[/woman]; it underlines his[/her] importance as the centre of creation, probably the highest expression of God's image in the whole of creation and the pivotal agent in the ceaseless streams of events in our changing environment."

Kaunda observes that human dignity was at the centre of life in traditional African society. Through its emphasis on communal relations, traditional African society provided fulfilment and meaning of life to all its members. In contrast, contemporary African society has lost respect for human dignity in the quest for modernisation and development. Against the original intention of God, contemporary African society does not treat human beings as an end in themselves; instead, it exploits them for economic, social and political ends. Kaunda (1976:45-46) describes this state of affairs as follows:

> Man was intended to be an end in himself, this is surely implied by the Bible's claim that he is 'made in the image of God' and has been given 'dominion over all living things'. But he has been reduced to a means. The industrialist uses him as a means to his wealth. To the demagogue he is the means to power, to the selfish lover the means to gratification. The war-monger uses him as cannon-fodder; to the economist he is a statistic; to the mass entertainer, he is an instrument to be manipulated. Everywhere Man is being used ... He ceases to be the absolute standard by which all systems should be measured.[5]

From the extract above, Kaunda notes with sadness the different ways in which the human being is exploited in the contemporary world. He realises that in spite of incredible development in science and technology, the contemporary world is characterised by injustice and exploitation. In this context, Kaunda (1968:4) concludes that "the whole concept of the dignity and the worth of the human person could be said to exist only in the realms of myth and imagination". Non-recognition of human dignity in people is an injustice which amounts to the violation of human rights. Thus, Kaunda (1973:60) condemns laws that violate peoples' rights, arguing that human rights are inherent and inalienable as contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Through his philosophy of humanism, Kaunda envisions to restore human dignity, promote human rights and improve the lives of the peoples in economic and social terms. He attempts to rid the country "of the evils of capitalism, imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, fascism and racism on the one hand, and poverty, hunger, ignorance, disease, crime and the exploitation of man by man on the other" (Kaunda 1968:5). His objective is to create a society in which all workers, villagers, intellectuals and everyone else would have a full and meaningful life. This would be "a mutual aid society" – a society whose aim would be to satisfy the needs of all the members of the community (Kaunda 1968:5). In this society, the government would take care of the interests of all the peoples in general, while individual members of the state would be required, in return, to render a service to one another (Kaunda 1968:33).

From the foregoing, as understood by Biney (2014:29), the hallmark of humanism is to promote "interdependence, dignity, self-respect, respect for others, co-operation or communism,

[5] This quotation should be read to include women where reference to man and other male pronouns are used.

forgiveness, sharing and equality." Kaunda aspires to promote the general interests of the peoples of Zambia as opposed to promoting interests of particular individuals and groups. He projects a classless and a people-centred society in which all human beings would be valued, regardless of colour of the skin, ethnicity, gender and economic position in society. While encouraging all the peoples to be actively involved in the day-to-day running of government, he discouraged the pursuit of individual acquisition of property because it would be inconsistent with the vision to transform the country into a classless society. In this regard, Simson (1985:22) understands humanism in Zambia as signifying "a broad umbrella under which all the people, irrespective of race, colour, religion or class, can shelter and from which all should benefit equally." Communalism and respect for human dignity informed the implementation of humanism in Zambia.

3.3.1 Implementation of humanism

Bwalya (1987:31) explains that through the ideology of humanism, Kaunda wanted to condition people's thinking and to mould their value systems. In order to achieve this objective, the implementation of the ideology had economic, political and educational dimensions. The economic dimension involved three stages. The first focused on the development of rural areas in order to improve the standards of living of the peoples resident in those areas. It was done by embarking on developing "a productive African agricultural sector", which meant growing enough food to feed all the peoples in the nation, particularly the rural population (Simson 1985:22). Attention was given to growing crops which were used as staple food in the country: maize, sorghum, millet and cassava. The second stage was to secure Zambian control of the economy by nationalising a number of private industries and enterprises on a 51% shareholding basis. The purpose was to allow the government to be in full control of national resources, with the hope that there would be equity in the distribution of these resources and that the basic needs of each person would be met. Thus, one year after humanism became a national ideology, the government of Zambia became the major shareholder in 26 large firms in the construction sector, commerce, and road transport. Furthermore, in 1969 and in 1970 the government nationalised the mining companies, and insurance companies and building societies respectively (Simson 1985:22). The nationalisation of major industries and enterprises turned the government of Zambia into the main producer and distributor of goods and services in the country. In other

words, the government occupied "the commanding height of the economy" in the country (Simson 1985:21). The third stage in the implementation of humanism from the economic point of view involved curbing domestic exploitation. This stage involved various measures such as abolition of paying for education and health services; the nationalization of private nursing; and rejection of capitalism in favour of indigenous traditions and socio-economic realities (Simson 1985:22). Capitalism was perceived to be an exploitative economic system based on individualism and unhealthy competition; it was seen to be an ideology that encouraged exploitation and discrimination of human beings. Alternatively, humanism promoted the traditional values of communalism. Additionally, it encouraged the peoples of Zambia to work hard so as to stop depending on Western countries and to protect themselves from any form of exploitation and discrimination. By rejecting capitalism and reasserting traditional and communal values, humanism sought "to create a just and equitable society where one man's wealth [would not be] another man's poverty" (Simson 1985:21).

The political dimension of humanism in Zambia was expressed in the use of one party participatory democracy as the governance system of the country. Kaunda banned all the political parties in the country, except United Independence Party (UNIP) – the ruling political party at the time. The idea was to promote unity and prevent factions in the nation such as those based on ethnicity.

In the education sector, no sooner had humanism become a national ideology in 1967 than it began to be taught in institutions of learning such as schools and colleges. Teaching humanistic values in institutions of learning was believed to be significant in the process of decolonisation of knowledge and epistemic liberation of the indigenous peoples. McKenna (1997:195) explains how humanism was taught in Zambian learning institutions: from grades 1 to 4, humanism included the critique of missionary Christianity, with "stories about how Europeans came with the Bible in one hand and a gun in the other"; from grades 5 to 7 it included analysing the differences between humanism and Christianity; and at tertiary level students would learn alternatives to capitalism and Marxist-Leninist strategies or bourgeois strategies. For those who were out of school, literature on humanism was equally published for them. Among other topics, the literature included the role of European missionaries in the colonial enterprise (McKenna 1997:195).

Humanism was to deal also with the problems that rose from the system of education that Zambia inherited at independence. The most striking feature of this system of education was the inequality of educational opportunities between Africans and non-Africans. Based on the racial segregation that characterised colonialism, there was no equality in the provision of educational facilities and services between Africans and non-Africans. Two education systems existed at the time: one for Africans and the other for non-Africans. The objective of the latter was to prepare learners "for the more highly developed, competitive and sophisticated society found in European countries" (Ministry of Education 1999:83). In an attempt to achieve this objective, the education facilities for non-Africans were lavishly equipped and were well-staffed, and increased in proportional to the growth of the learners' population. With such facilities in place, it was easy for the system of education to provide educational opportunities for all the non-African children according to their abilities. Besides making education compulsory for all non-African children between the ages of 7 to 15 years, the system provided opportunities for these children to continue with their education even beyond this age as long as their ability was in support (UNESCO Planning Mission 1999:86). For Africans, the situation was quite different: learning opportunities were not readily available. The few opportunities which were available were characterised by poor learning facilities and services. Given this hostile learning environment, the majority of the indigenous peoples of Zambia did not have access to an education system that could stimulate the growth of their intellectual and critical faculties so that they could compete fairly with non-Africans. This is why at independence the local human resource in Zambia was "only about one hundred African university graduates and less than a thousand African holders of a full Secondary School Certificate (Ministry of Education 1999:84). Over half and over four-fifths of the indigenous men and women, respectively, had never been to school at all. Among those who had been to school, 75% of men and 93% of women never completed four years of primary schooling (UN/ECA/FAO 1999:69).

Humanism questioned the foundation of the education system that Zambia inherited at independence. The result was a comprehensive education reform that culminated in the publication of *1977 Educational Reforms.* This policy document aimed at creating a system of education in Zambia which would be properly attuned to, and more fully meet, the needs and aspirations of the indigenous peoples. Such a system of education would function as a powerful

instrument for the country's progress in the direction chosen by the indigenous peoples after independence.

3.3.1.1Educational Reforms

The *1977 Educational Reforms* emphasised on education as an instrument for personal and national development. In particular, the document responded to two challenges in Zambia's inherited system of education. The first was access to education, and the second was alienation of the education system. In an effort to arrest the two challenges, the reforms proposed to make education not only more accessible, but also practical and "relevant to the needs of the individual and also of the nation" (Ministry of Education 1977:20). The idea was to ensure that relevant survival skills were provided to all learners, including those who would drop out of school before completing secondary school education. The knowledge and skills to be taught in the education system were to be oriented towards meaningful production of goods and services which, first and foremost, were needed by the indigenous peoples. In conformity with this objective, the *1977 Educational Reforms* proposed the restructuring of the education system while placing great emphasis on practical skills.

The reforms proposed universal basic education for children between 7 and 16 years: seven years of primary education and two years of secondary school education. Basic education was not only to provide learners with minimum basic knowledge, but also to inculcate in them attitudes, values and skills which were needed for them to realise their potential as individuals and to participate effectively in the advancement of their community. According to the Ministry of Education (1977:7), if the education system imparted in learners relevant knowledge, attitudes, values and skills,

> [t]he seven years of primary plus two years of the junior secondary ... would be sufficient to prepare the child to proceed to the next stage, or to leave school. What the child [would] have learnt by this time should be sufficient and lasting to enable him[/her] to play a full and useful role in his[/her] community if he[/she left] school.

Equipped with useful skills and knowledge, those who would leave school would engage in schemes, promoting self-employment. For the learners who would proceed to Grade 10, basic education would provide them with a firm foundation for specialised programmes at universities,

training colleges, technical colleges and other institutions of higher learning. Graduates from these institutions would be prepared adequately "for a full and useful involvement in the life of work" (Ministry of Education 1977:20). In order to make education more relevant to the needs of the Zambian society, the *1977 Educational Reforms* also recommended that educational materials and equipment would be produced locally "within the historical, social, political and economic context of the Zambian people" (Ministry of Education 1977:34). Humanism was seriously formulated to complete the process of liberation that began with political independence. In spite of its effort, however, humanism fell short of its expectations; it contributed very little towards providing solutions to the challenges in society.

3.3.2 Humanism and its shortfalls

It should be noted that humanism in Africa presented the government as a caring institution. It was in this context that Kaunda (1968:12) strongly condemned ethnocentrism, racialism and any "discrimination based on religion and creed", instituted either by the government, a group or an individual. A cursory glance at the post-colonial experiences in Africa, however, raises questions as to whether humanism has achieved its objective. Many countries on the continent have recorded extreme, unimaginable and inhumane forms of brutalities happening right in the face of African humanism. Among others, such countries include Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Burundi, Sudan, Mali, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Rwanda. Even in Zambia, with Kaunda at the helm of leadership, the government massacred the members of the Lumpa Church in the Northern Province (Kanu 2014:377). It is probably for the reasons of curbing such extremities that perhaps Kaunda found it important to develop humanism. Unfortunately, the objective has not been achieved; the continued eruption of acts of injustice and violence in African countries paint the picture that humanism and dehumanisation have coexisted in the history of the continent. The sporadic experiences of dehumanisation and human savagery in Africa raise contradictions between the normative aspect and the emancipatory praxis of humanism.

In addition, humanism as a nationalistic-ideological philosophy preached a return to traditional values and practices. The proponents of this philosophy, however, rejected traditional African self-governing institutions and embraced "the European/Westphalia project of nation-statism" (Biney 2014:38). As leaders of the post-independence Africa, nationalistic-ideological

philosophers ruled the peoples based on the colonial models of the partitioned segments of the continent as nation-states. With the "outward trappings of international sovereignty", these nation-states, according to Nkrumah (1966:ix), became neo-colonial states: both their economic system and political policy were directed from outside. Neo-colonial states further provided anchorage to the immediate post-independence African leaders to introduce authoritarian rule in their countries premised on one-party state proclamation. This was the case with Nkrumah, Nyerere and Kaunda, among others. By embracing colonial models, these leaders governed the peoples as though they had no history of their own; the history of traditional leadership that governed the peoples in the pre-colonial period was not given the consideration it deserved as part of Africa's heritage. In this regard, humanism as a movement of liberation produced its own denial and led to the alienation of the peoples from their own history.

Biney (2014:40) further points out that the effectiveness of humanism was compromised because the programme of action, principles and values was not clearly stated, and that the ideology lacked implementation mechanisms. For example, in an attempt to ensure equitable distribution of national resources, the government controlled the peoples' ownership of property on the pretext that some people would exploit others if the means of production was left unchecked. This strategy killed the inherent initiative and ability of indigenous peoples to work hard and to thrive as entrepreneurs. Lack of local investment contributed to economic bankruptcy and abject poverty in Zambia, both of which compelled the country to increase its dependence on Western countries (Kanu 2014:377). The collapse of the economy under the auspices of humanistic values was the major contributing factor that led Kaunda to lose popularity and, eventually, presidential elections in 1991.

In the education sector, humanism began with unprecedented enthusiasm, although this enthusiasm later subsided. There are a number of reasons that account for this loss of momentum. The first is that the education system under humanism alienated learners in spite of the *1977 Educational Reforms* (Lungu 1991:84). The education system did not equip learners with correct skills and attitudes that were relevant to society and their personal survival; instead, it prepared them "for the fast shrinking white-collar job market at the expense of manual, especially agricultural, vocations suitable for rural areas" (Lungu 1991:75). The result of the alienated education system was unprecedented unemployment crisis in the country. The second

is that the educational curricula under humanism did not cultivate critical thinking that was capable of illuminating the world. In this context, "even when students successfully completed schooling, their performance in the world of work and life generally left much to be desired. They scarcely exhibited creative innovative skills expected of them by their societies" (Lungu 1991:75). The third is that humanism did not provide materials and congenial environment for effective learning. Educational facilities experienced acute shortages of teachers, books, laboratory equipment, and many other necessary materials. In such a hostile environment, it was difficult for education to carry out its functions effectively. Generally, humanism in Zambia did not enhance the role of education in the transformation of society.

With its status of subsistence and dependence remaining unchanged, the system of education in Zambia does not train the peoples "to think out alternative socio-economic, political, cultural, scientific, and technological strategies that would generate new modes of … being-in-the-world" (Kasanda 1988:26). In other words, the system of education does not guarantee a kind of development that would be to the advantage of the country. One possible way of addressing this predicament is to re-structure the system of education in Zambia and tailor it towards addressing the socio-economic needs, interests, expectations, problems and dreams of the peoples. The idea is to "de-educate the consuming dependent [peoples]" and turn them into independent and responsible producers of knowledge (Kasanda 1988:28). This proposal entails research in "knowledge, know-how, manpower development, instructional materials, methods, methodologies, and the current evaluation systems" of education (Kasanda 1988:29).

The criticism of humanism notwithstanding, Kaunda (1968:9) presents one fundamental question worthy reflecting not only in Zambia, but also elsewhere on the African continent: "[h]ow does an individual ... today remain mutual aid society-minded and at the same time function in a society that is emerging from a so-called economy which has been born out of capitalism?" This question finds itself very relevant in Africa, where capitalism has become the driving force of many countries' economies, and has replaced humanist and egalitarian values that characterised life in traditional African society. Capitalism poses a threat to humane existence for the majority of the peoples in the contemporary era of the continent. The minority, public officials in particular, have accumulated wealth, while others have remained poor and, in some cases,

continue to die because they lack resources to meet the basic needs. From this point of view, Abdul-Raheem (2010:22) could be justified to assert that

> we should regard public officials and their private sector collaborators as mass murderers, killing millions of our peoples through inadequate public services compromised by corruption. Monies meant for drugs, roads, hospitals, schools and public security are siphoned away, making all of us vulnerable to premature death and our societies more unsafe and insecure for the masses.

Against such serious allegations of dehumanisation and empirical materiality in the continent, there is need to re-humanise our contemporary African society by engaging necessary social forces. In Zambia, such forces would include critical re-evaluation and re-formulation of the education system in the light of the values and the principles of traditional African society. This transformation requires breaking the colonial cultural bondage which, in the words of Ndofirepi and Gwaravanda (2019:584) "consists in being educated under a foreign epistemological paradigm that promotes Western culture and values". Breaking the colonial cultural bondage would ensure that the knowledge being produced in education is relevant to the real present needs of the peoples in the country.

From the presentation above, one would observe that although Kaunda's humanism has a recognisably Christian bent it is closely related to Nkrumah's consciencism and Nyerere's ujamaa in that it sought to draw its ideas from all the cultural heritages (both indigenous and foreign) that had come to influence the lives of people. Similar to consciencism and ujamaa, Kaunda's humanism was an ideology of independence and national reconstruction. Born out of the struggle for liberation of Africans from colonialism, it shared a common objective with consciencism and ujamaa of promoting the human dignity of Africans by creating a classless and an egalitarian society. In an attempt to achieve this objective, each of the three ideologies condemned capitalism and favoured socialism as practised in traditional African societies. The proponents opined that unlike capitalism which was exploitative, socialism would provide the egalitarian principles which were necessary for national reconstruction.

3.4 Conclusion

This chapter attempted to describe the historical perspective of decolonisation and self-determination in Zambia. Particular attention was devoted to Kaunda's philosophy of humanism. As an ideology of independence and national reconstruction, humanism is against any form of exploitation and discrimination in contemporary society. Instead, it advocates for the revival of the traditional African values and practices that are based on communalism. The aim is to promote the well-being and the dignity of all the peoples, regardless of race and other differences that define people in various groups. In spite of the efforts of humanism, however, the process of decolonisation in Zambia has remained uncompleted, and the epistemic injustice has continued to affect the peoples. The adverse effect of this epistemic injustice in the post-colonial era of Zambia is partly illustrated by extraversion of knowledge production, to which we turn in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

KNOWLEDGE AND THE PROBLEM OF EXTRAVERSION IN POST-COLONIAL AFRICA

4.1 Introduction

Extraversion is not exclusive to Zambia, but affects the entire continent of Africa. This is because African countries have deep historical connections that are mediated by the experiences of colonialism. In a bid to highlight its pervasiveness, extraversion is addressed in this chapter as a continental rather than a national issue whose implications are manifest locally in Zambia. As explained by Hountondji (2004:531), extraversion is a polemical or critical concept that describes research in Africa as "externally oriented, dependent on the questions posed by the West, and intended to feed theoretical and eventually practical needs expressed by the West." In this sense, extraversion does not only describe the nature of scientific research activities in Africa, but also how these activities define the relationship between Africa and Europe in terms of scholarship and learning. The latter has philosophical and epistemological implications as it positions the West as the Centre, and the African continent as the periphery. In that position, Africa is subordinate and its main intellectual and economic function is to serve as a means to meeting the theoretical and practical needs of the West. This chapter argues that the Centre-periphery relationship that exists between Africa and the West advocates for a single source of knowledge formulation and promotes Western hegemony in knowledge production. For that reason, it has a negative impact on knowledge production and accounts in part for the intellectual and economic underdevelopment in Africa.

The chapter is divided into two major sections. The first section traces the origin and the nature of extraversion in post-colonial Africa. This is done by analysing scientific research and knowledge production in the continent. The second section is a suggested solution to extraversion in Africa. In particular, it suggests deconstruction of the Western discourse and reconstruction of a self-centred and intellectually independent Africa by reviving indigenous African knowledges. Ultimately, the chapter argues for a radical pluralisation of sources of knowledge formation.

4.2 Scientific research and knowledge production in Africa

Hountondji (1987:389) explains that "ideally speaking, science and technology, as cultural values are not the property of anybody or any particular cultures. They are universal, insofar as the search for truth and efficiency permeates every culture". From this perspective, scientific research, as an intellectual activity, plays a significant role in knowledge production and intellectual development of any society. According to Zeleza (2002:21), scientific research is

> the lifeblood of the intellectual enterprise, the process through which ideas and insights, technologies and techniques, old and new, are nurtured and nourished, tried and tested, developed and discarded. In the 'new knowledge economy', research is even more important than ever, allowing a country not only to generate new knowledge, but also effectively process knowledge produced elsewhere, and engage in productive scholarly and scientific commerce and competition with other nations.

The scientific research activities that are conducted in Africa, however, fall short of the expectations outlined above because they are extraverted; they evolve and are arranged in such a manner that they serve the external world instead of serving the African population. Hountondji (2003:590) explains this reality as follows:

> Scientific and technological activity, as practised in Africa today is just as "extroverted", or externally oriented, as economic activity. Most of the shortcomings that can be identified should not be perceived, therefore, as natural and inevitable. They should be traced back, on the contrary, to the history of the integration and subordination of our traditional knowledge to the world system of knowledge, just as underdevelopment as a whole results, primarily, not from any original backwardness, but from the integration of our subsistence economies into the world capitalist market.

Further, Hountondji (1987:388) takes a swipe at agronomic research in Africa, asserting that it is directly in the service of economic extraversion. He observes that although this type of research is given a lot of attention by many African governments and a lot of money is spent on its programmes, it focuses more on cash crops which are intended to be exported to the factories in the West than on the food that is needed by the indigenous peoples for consumption. Agronomic research, in this way, is more at the service of the West instead of the African continent. Besides,

it is in conformity with the objectives of international Eurocentric institutions such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. Such institutions may recommend to Africa the production of cash crops like coffee, oil seeds, and flowers not because these crops are beneficial to the African countries producing them but because they are on demand in Western countries (Bekele 2007:108).

Extraversion of scientific research activities in Africa could be traced from colonialism. During that time the African continent was integrated into Western epistemology and economy. This was particularly done through the spread of Western knowledge and culture by Europeans. In this integration, however, Africa occupied a subordinate position because it lacked adequate facilities for research, and industries to turn raw materials into finished goods. Colonialism in Africa created a new standard of conducting research, exerted an adverse effect on knowledge production and prevented the peoples from tackling relevant issues that affected them. Hountondji (1987:384) provides insights into this situation by characterising research activities as made up of three basic stages: collection of data, interpretation of the data collected, and application of the findings to practical issues. The decisive and most important of the three stages is neither the first nor the last, but the middle stage – interpretation of data. This is because this stage involves theoretical processing of the collected data and formulation of theoretical statements for application at the final stage.

During colonialism, however, the central and the intermediate stage was not part of the research activities in the continent; it was completely absent in the entire process. This means that research activities at the time consisted of only the first and last stages mentioned above. In the first stage, useful data was collected from Africa; in the second stage, the collected data was not processed in Africa but exported to a colonial country such as Britain, France, Portugal or Germany for processing and interpretation; and in the last and final stage, the processed data or information was sent back to Africa for "a partial, occasional and limited application, to some local issues" (Hountondji 1987:384). Processing data outside Africa created a specific theoretical vacuum in the continent regarding knowledge production. Among other factors that contributed to this development was the lack of universities, laboratories and other facilities in the continent which were essential for carrying out scientific research. Additionally, as Hountondji (1987:384)

charges, even when they were established in the continent, such facilities lacked the capacity to conduct research that would involve proto-theoretical procedures.

Besides the theoretical vacuum, Africa, during colonialism, was further characterised by an industrial vacuum. This was regard to the production of goods. Similar to research and production of knowledge, the production of goods consists of three basic stages: extraction of raw materials, turning of the raw materials into finished products, and, finally, consumption of the finished products. Among the three stages, it is the middle and the intermediate which is the most critical. Unfortunately, this stage was not part of the economic activities in Africa during colonialism: the continent provided only raw materials and market for finished products. Europeans extracted raw materials from the continent, mainly through mining and agriculture. Instead of processing the extracted raw materials into finished products within the continent, they exported and supplied them to metropolitan industries in the colonies. The latter turned the raw materials into finished products, some of which were consumed in the imperialist countries and others brought to Africa for sale. The leap from raw materials to consumption of finished products in Africa created an industrial vacuum.

It should be made clear from the onset that knowledge is both a product and a process. On the one hand, it is a product of inquiry and, on the other hand, a process of seeking to understand the conditions of our existence and how these conditions can be improved. Central to the latter is the aspect of examining or scrutinising our beliefs and notions in order to ensure that whatever we claim to know is based on reason and, therefore, reliable (Oladipo 2001:62). The lack of research facilities and industries, as explained above, led to the creation of theoretical and industrial vacuums in intellectual and economic activities respectively. Vacuums in this sense refer to domains of knowledge generation that were never invested in and, therefore, deliberately left with no activity or rendered redundant by design. As Hountondji (1987:385) explains, the 'vacuum' stages were initially meant to be stages of transformation, "where human creativity may fully express [itself], and impose its mark on things."

With important stages of transformation completely absent in research and economic activities in the colonial period of Africa, active participation of the peoples in these activities became limited. To be specific, the peoples were denied an opportunity to exercise their inherent sense of

creativity and initiative, and propensity towards taking a risk – all of which could make intellectual and economic activities more productive in the continent. Denied the opportunity to exercise their creativity, Africans developed a dependence syndrome; they began depending on the West for knowledge. Writing from an African point of view, Bekele (2007:111-112) clearly captures the moment of dependence syndrome that emerged in Africa during colonialism:

> [i]nstead of trying to understand our problems and formulating proper questions with regard to the problems, we kept on believing that somebody else has already done the thinking and it is only sufficient for us if we could copy from that. We kept ourselves busy echoing what has been said elsewhere, something which is not as painful and exacting as trying to find out new methods and approaches to our problems.

The African academic enterprise was engulfed in epistemic consumerism; without producing their own knowledge in research activities, Africans began consuming and became dependent on Western knowledge. Although academics may have contributed to this problem, they were nevertheless also ready and prepared to assist in finding a solution, but the African governments which came after independence did not do much to address the problem of extraversion; instead, they were complicit. Mkandawire (2005:2) affirms this statement in the following words:

> [w]hat governments wanted was not critical support but subservience and sycophancy. With their ears finely tuned to the voices of foreign experts and deaf to local voices, African states simply didn't care about local debates, except when they threatened state authority. And too many intellectuals allowed themselves to be 'yoked to power' and to accept the injunction: 'silence: we are developing'.

In the post-colonial period of Africa, one may not expect industrial and theoretical vacuums, and the culture of consumerism to persist. This is because the continent has witnessed a number of developments both in the economic and academic domains. In the economic domain the continent has established a number of industries that enable it to extract raw materials and to turn these raw materials into finished products. In this regard, Hountondji (1987:386) rightly observes that the continent in its post-colonial period does not necessarily export raw, untreated data, but increasingly tries to process and to add value to its materials before exporting. Equally in the

academic domain the continent has established institutions that are able to process raw data and to produce relevant knowledge. Immediately after independence, individual African states embarked on a massive expansion of educational facilities and increased the enrolment levels. Quoting the Task Force on Higher education and Society, Zeleza (2002:10) reports that for the sub-Saharan region alone "gross enrolment ratios rose from 45 per cent in 1965 to 74 per cent in 1995 for primary schools and 5 per cent to 35 per cent for secondary schools." The increased expansion of educational facilities and enrolment levels led to the rise in literacy levels in the continent. In 1960, the putative year of African independence, literacy levels in the continent stood at 9%, and thirty years later it rose to 50% (Zeleza 2002:10; 2006:23).

Expansion of educational facilities at primary and secondary schools levels and increased enrolment ratios in post-colonial Africa have been coupled with the establishment of various universities, research institutes, libraries, equipped laboratories and publishing houses, serving as "central players on the African research landscape and in the production, dissemination, and consumption of scholarly knowledge" (Zeleza 2002:17). With these intellectual facilities in place, post-colonial Africa is able to carry out all the three stages of research: collection of data, interpretation of the data collected, and application of the findings to practical issues. In other words, the educational facilities that have been established in the post-colonial period of Africa have made it possible for the theoretical processing of data to take place within the continent as opposed to taking place in the West, as was the case during colonialism. This development is supposed to fill up the theoretical and industrial vacuums in Africa and eventually bring to an end extraversion in the continent. Contrary to this expectation, however, the geographical transfer of processing data from the West to Africa has not broken the traditional monopoly of the former in the field of research and knowledge production. Hountondji (2002:229) explains that

> the research institutions [in Africa] are very often only annexes to the mother institutions situated in the centre [or Europe]. Finally and above all, whatever the performance of the researchers in [Africa] and their institutions, their work aims at giving answers to questions that are of prime interest to the mother institutions or industries that sponsor them. Yesterday like today, the theoretical demand comes from elsewhere just like the economic demand. Theoretical demand here means the set of

> questions that determine and shape the collection of data, the theoretical tradition from which at a certain point in time emerges, as a result of many complex factors, this set of questions.

The major issue with regard to research in Africa remains that of Theory, Funding, Language, and the Canon. Theory is developed in the West and only gets to be applied to Africa. Hence, Africans pose questions of their own, but the theories they apply in trying to answer those questions are imported particulars under the guise of universality. In this regard, research in the continent fails to bear the desired outcome. Theory must be married to the place and thus be generated out of Africa as a centre. This is not the case, however, because the education system which is advanced in Africa is Eurocentric; it is built on European models and serves the interests of Europe. By expanding educational facilities in form of schools, colleges and universities, and increased levels of enrolment for learners, post-colonial Africa has improved human capital and laid the institutional basis for the social production of intellectual capacities, communities and commitments. This is supposed to close the theoretical vacuum in the continent, unfortunately that has not been the case because the education system that is pursued in Africa is Eurocentric. Being Eurocentric, it is intolerant towards indigenous knowledges and is prejudiced against nearly the entire heritage which the African peoples are supposed to treasure. Further, in spite of expanding educational facilities and improving human capital, the Eurocentric education system in the continent has made it difficult for the peoples to master the art of making technical equipment that is needed in conducting scientific research (Hountondji 1987:387). Most of the equipment, from the most sophisticated to the simplest, used in research activities in the continent is manufactured in the West. This is one indication that the education system which is currently pursued in post-colonial Africa is structured in such a way that it does not stimulate creativity among the peoples for them to manufacture the said equipment.

Hountondji (1987:388) observes that the research conducted in post-colonial Africa is applied research as opposed to basic research. Basic research, on the one hand, is driven by curiosity and aims at expanding knowledge and at increasing understanding of fundamental principles. On the other hand, applied research aims at solving practical problems. Unlike basic research, applied research tends to respond to specific questions and has specific commercial objectives. Although applied research in Africa is used in solving innumerable practical issues, Hountondji (1987:388)

maintains that in order for it to do that it uses theoretical results that have been attained in the West. Applied research, in this way, makes the intellectual vacuum discussed above far from being filled up in Africa because it makes research to remain dependent on the West.

Research Funding is another issue that affects research and knowledge production in Africa. This problem first presented itself seriously on the continent in the 1980s during the economic crisis. State support towards research in African universities increasingly dwindled, and these educational institutions were compelled to source funds for research on their own (Zeleza 2002:17). One way in which they sourced the funds was by developing relations with foreign donors, by which they substituted dependency on the state for dependency on these donors. Foreign donors provided funds not only for research activities, but also for "teaching and curriculum innovation, university administrative reform, staff development, and community development" (Zeleza 2002:13). As one would expect, the relationship that developed between the two partners, foreign donors and African universities, was inherently unbalanced owing to the fact that the former had resources while the latter did not have. Foreign donors, in possession of resources, set the research agenda based on "the research priorities and paradigms in their home countries" (Zeleza 2002:14). In order to have access to the funds, African universities carried out, without much adjustment, the research agenda set by foreign donors. By implication, the universities conducted research on topics which were of interest to the foreign donors and not necessary to Africans. From this point of view, the research which was conducted by African universities was not only extraverted but also eroded the universities' mission for basic research.

A number of years after the economic crisis of the 1980s, universities in Africa are still not adequately funded by African governments. In order to raise additional funds, universities are compelled to hike students' fees and to work for foreign universities and research centres in the North, providing them with empirical data (Zeleza 2002:21). The latter makes the research agenda for African countries extraverted, and the universities in these countries unable to produce relevant knowledge for modernising economies in the continent. With their universities unable to produce relevant knowledge for the continent, African countries have continued "to import appropriate packages of 'universal' theory [and] to be consumers of advanced research conducted in the universities of the North" (Zeleza 2002:21).

Lastly, conducting research in European languages has significantly contributed to extraversion in Africa. A survey among African countries reveals that, at independence, the majority of these countries adopted exoglossic language policy; they chose the language of the erstwhile colonial country for communication in various areas of activity such as politics, administration, media and research. To be specific, communication in these activities is carried out in English, French, German or Portuguese. Zeleza (2002:14; 2006:20) asserts that "the concept of an African Marxist, economist, physicist, or any other scientist who does not speak a European language, or an academic conference conducted primarily in an African language is, for the time being 'sociologically impossible'." This gives the reader a glimpse into the dominance of foreign languages on the African scene; they have displaced African languages from their rightful position, and "act as though the African languages are corpses that will not rise from the dead to claim their house" (wa Thiong'o 2009:92. The dominance of European languages in Africa, according to Zeleza (2006:23) "reflects the failure by African states to fully decolonise their educational systems."

It should be noted that language is the carrier of a specific culture and a system of knowledge, memories and imaginations (Zeleza 2006:20). As scientific research in Africa is conducted in foreign languages, an alien culture and system of knowledge is imposed on the indigenous peoples. Thus, the peoples in the continent are not only de-Africanised and Westernised, but also excluded from participating in the production of knowledge since the production of knowledge is conducted in European languages. In every given African country the European language used in research is not known by all the peoples; in fact, the peoples who do not know the language account for the majority. For such individuals the European language is a barrier which divorces them from knowledge; it makes them incapable of neither acquiring knowledge nor participating in the production of knowledge because the languages do not constitute ordinary people's day-to-day social communication. Chumbow (2005:169) explains that

> all education takes place as a result of effective communication of knowledge, skills and techniques by a knowledgeable and competent source to one who lacks such knowledge or skills. Language is the normal medium of communication of knowledge and skills in all educational (instructional) systems. Effective acquisition of knowledge and skills can take place only if effective communications via a language medium has taken place ... education by means of an appropriate language medium provides the

> knowledge, skills and values necessary for humans to become effective, efficient and qualitatively valuable agents of change in the interests of national development.

The use of colonial languages in scientific research in Africa has defeated the goal of research in general which is to improve the quality of life of the peoples (Hountondji 2004:535). By using colonial languages in research, post-colonial Africa has not been able to ground scientific knowledge for development.

The foregoing analysis demonstrates that Africans have not been able to develop an intellectual discourse in the continent which is independent from that of Europeans. It also shows that Africans have become very much accustomed to the Western discourse, making it very difficult for them to disentangle themselves from it and to begin to think independently as Africans. They appear to hold the view that the West, through its scientific discoveries and innovations, has produced enough knowledge for development and that by engaging in the production of their own knowledge they would be reinventing the wheel. Tapping from the already existing knowledge is, therefore, perceived to be the norm. Unfortunately, while they tap from the already existing Western knowledge, Africans do not serve their own interests but of Europeans. In this regard, they continue to perpetuate extraversion of economic and intellectual activities in Africa through "feverish importation of paradigms, problematics, and perspectives and the search for legitimation and respectability from the intellectual establishments of the North" (Zeleza 2002:21).

Extraversion in post-colonial Africa, theoretical, economic or any other form, is characterised by a social insertion of the Western discourse in the continent. The discourse was planted in Africa during colonialism, and became one of the major determining forces of the thought systems in the continent. It presented Western knowledge and its underlying model of rationality as universal. By implication, Africans, together with their culture, knowledge and values, became particulars who were expected to give way to the universal. As it emphasised the universality of Western culture and knowledge, the discourse denied the plurality of human experiences and took the European experience as the only appropriate experience for human-kind. In this sense, the Western discourse marginalised African peoples, their knowledge and traditions. It had no regard for local realities, experiences and history; it denied Africans their identity, pride and

confidence and, consequently carried an assault on their Africanness, the very being that defined them. In this way, the Western discourse played a leading role in eroding the initiative and the self-confidence of Africans. It had a negative psychological effect on the African mind: while forcing Africans to unlearn their traditional ways of life, it made them develop hatred for the self, their culture and traditional knowledge in preference for "universal" European models. On the one hand, it held the African mind in perpetual bondage of emulating Europeans, and on the other hand, it made Africans to lose the means and confidence to think and to produce knowledge independently.

In the post-colonial era, the Western discourse makes it impossible for the continent to experience pluralisation of knowledge and to have a contextualised approach towards solving its technical and social problems (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:115). Pluralisation of knowledge in Africa would not only integrate indigenous communities and their knowledge into the process of knowledge-formation, but also avail a wide range of contextualised solutions to problems experienced and questions posed by the peoples. Based on the foregoing, a solution to extraversion and struggle for epistemic liberation in post-colonial Africa could be sought in deconstruction of the Western discourse and reconstruction of an African discourse.

4.3 Deconstruction and reconstruction in post-colonial Africa

Deconstruction and reconstruction in post-colonial Africa is born out of the realisation of the inappropriateness of Western discourse in the continent and the quest to value indigenous knowledges and practices. Thus, deconstruction is a critique of the Western discourse which universalises Western culture and knowledge and, reconstruction is an attempt to develop a formidable African discourse by reviving indigenous African cultures and knowledge both of which have been overshadowed by the Western discourse. To borrow the words of Zeleza (2002:22), this would entail "jettisoning Eurocentric theories and paradigms and developing authentic African intellectual discourses."

Deconstruction of the Western discourse signifies discarding from the African mind the colonial mentality that the European culture, knowledge and values are universal. It involves the realisation that the hierarchical structure of humanity under which Africans have found themselves occupying the lowest rank was a creation of Europeans in order for them to dominate

the world. The argument advanced in the deconstruction of the Western discourse is that there is nothing specifically distinctive about Europeans which by necessity grants them superiority over other human beings, particularly Africans. On the contrary, Europeans are human beings, like any other group of people, and their culture is not in any way superior to other cultures, but simply one among the many cultures in the world. Under the command of this understanding, the claim of universality by Europeans turns out to be nothing but a self-serving myth. The aim of the deconstruction exercise is to expose "the contradictions and false assertions and assumptions contained in the Eurocentric [or Western] discourse" (Bekele 2007:118). From this standpoint, deconstruction would enable Africans to realise the bias embedded in the Europeans' claim for universality. This development is fundamental for conceptual decolonisation in Africa because it would make the peoples of Africa to shift their attention from Europe as the centre to their own continent as an alternative source of knowledge.

Reconstruction, the corresponding force to deconstruction, involves what wa Thiong'o (2009:98) calls "re-membering Africa." It brings into perspective indigenous knowledges as a "counter-hegemonic instrument" for African renaissance and epistemic liberation of the continent (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:116). In the words of Mungwini (2017:9) reconstruction refers

> to those efforts aimed at reclaiming African historicity and African philosophical historicity in particular. The aim is to literary (re)member Africa as a legitimate contributor to world knowledge(s) by revisiting and more importantly, re-appropriating that which modernity had discarded and disparaged in the process of building its own self-image.

Essentially, the purpose of reconstruction is to rehabilitate African values, capabilities, memories and knowledge systems. Proponents of reconstruction are driven by a conviction that in order to develop a self-centred and intellectually independent Africa, the inhabitants should turn to their cultures, knowledges and values which they nurtured and cherished for a long period of time before the arrival of Europeans in the continent (Hountondji 2004:532, 534). Broadly speaking, therefore, reconstruction in Africa began with the attaining of political independence of the formerly colonised states. Although political independence was a great achievement, it was not sufficient to successfully complete the process of reconstruction of a self-centred and an intellectually independent Africa. This is because it did not address epistemological issues in the

continent, particularly the devastating effect of Western discourse on the local formation of knowledge. In other words, epistemological issues should be addressed in order to complete the process of reconstruction in post-colonial Africa. In addressing these issues, decolonisation of the African mind is essential. According to the rationalist temper in African philosophy, the mind is very important "to social transformation and to the quest for African renewal" (Oladipo 2001:63).

Decolonisation of the African mind entails getting rid of all undue influence of the Western categories of thought from the minds of the indigenous peoples in Africa. In fact, it is only when their minds are decolonised that the peoples in the continent would realise the fruits of their political independence; they cannot claim to be independent when their minds have been held hostage by the Western discourse. As Kebede (2004:160) explains

> [n]othing genuinely African and good can be realised without the radical extirpation of the internalised colonial discourse. So long as the colonial ideas of Africa survive – and the idea survives, nay, prospers through the Western education of the young Africans – the conception of a truly African project of modernisation is impossible, still less the design of policies and methods to turn modernisation into reality. Mental decolonisation is the key to Africa's numerous impediments and continuous marginality.

One important aspect in the decolonisation process of the mind in Africa is to ensure that intellectual activities, scientific research in particular, are conducted in indigenous languages as opposed to colonial languages (wa Thiong'o 2009:93). Given a variety of languages in Africa, products of research activities should be translated to ensure a shared modern heritage in the continent. From this point of view, translation becomes "the language of languages, a language through which all languages can talk to one another" (wa Thiong'o 2009:96-97). Indigenous languages are significant for scientific research and knowledge production as they enable a person to grasp and to form concepts faster and more easily. A person learns better in their mother-tongue and there is no other language that can replace a person's mother tongue for the purposes of knowledge acquisition and self-expression. It is from this perspective that indigenous languages could be said to be crucial for the production, delivery and acquisition of knowledge in science as argued by Mkandawire (2005:7)

> the issue of [an indigenous] language is not merely an expression of cultural chauvinism or romanticism. The interest in [an indigenous] language is not only because it is a vehicle of regaining Africa's memory but also because the language medium is crucial for harnessing human resources and grounding scientific knowledge in African realities. It is the only way science and technology can become part of the common sense and world-view of the wider African public and underpin the scientific and technological knowledge required for the development of the continent.

In the reconstruction exercise care should be taken not to fall "into the trap of an essentialising cultural revivalism that homogenises Africa's diverse cultures and histories and poses them in binary opposition to other cultures and histories" (Zeleza 2002:22). The emphasis on African cultures and knowledges should not be construed as an attempt to establish a hierarchy among human cultures and forms of knowledge under which African cultures and forms of knowledge would occupy the apex. Such an undertaking would not be different from the assumption that European humanity and knowledge are universal – the idea that dominates the Western discourse, and which we would be trying to deconstruct.

Further, the emphasis on indigenous knowledges should not necessarily imply seclusion of knowledge that is specifically African "and declaring that [Africans] have nothing to do with the outside world or the North" (Bekele 2007:119). Other cultures in the world have definitely contributed to the development of the knowledge that would be thought to be purely 'African' (Hountondji 2004:535). Hence, any attempt to seclude knowledge which is specifically African would be rendered unreasonable. The world has become a global village and "the intensity and extent of international interactions across continents, countries, communities and cultures have been growing for centuries" (Zeleza 2002:10). Through such interactions societies have been exchanging knowledge(s) and, therefore, any "useful knowledge that has been developed so far is the monopoly of nobody but something that humanity must possess communally" (Bekele 2007:119). Even the scientific achievements, for example, which "some people tend to consider, abusively indeed, as "Western science"" is to be seen as an achievement and a treasure of the entire human kind from which the African continent, together with other continents, should benefit (Hountondji 1987:389).

In the light of the foregoing, deconstruction and reconstruction in Africa should take an intercultural approach – an approach that recognises the value and the contribution towards knowledge of all human cultures in the world. This implies recognising and acknowledging the value of both indigenous and exogenous forms of knowledge. The aim is to make Africans return to their own source while learning from others, Europeans in particular, all the knowledge which is appropriate and useful to the African economic, political and intellectual landscapes. As Bekele (2007:122) asserts, humanity benefits "more from enrichment through intercultural dialogue rather than from a monologue." An intercultural approach to knowledge would enable Africans learn that knowledge in the world has been developed by human-kind in general, and not by a single group, Westerners in particular. Further, the approach would give an opportunity to all forms of knowledges embedded in African cultures to remerge. Intercultural approach to knowledge entails reappropriation and appropriation of knowledge.

4.3.1 Reappropriation and appropriation of knowledge

The premise for reappropriation of knowledges in Africa is that when indigenous knowledges are integrated into the main stream of global knowledge, there would be development as the continent would be able to respond more effectively to the challenges experienced and questions posed by the peoples. Hountondji (2002:257-258) explains that

> if this ideal [appropriation and reappropriation] is shared, then the need will be acknowledged, in the field of knowledge and know-how, for this double movement-indispensable to the construction of a self-centred and intellectually independent Africa: a movement of critical appropriation of the scientific and technological heritage available internationally, and at the same time, a no less critical effort of reappropriation of endogenous knowledge and know-how. As a matter of fact both movements are similar, because the knowledge that is accumulated in the North, and which we must possess today, has been produced over centuries with our collaboration and that of all peoples of the world. To appropriate it for ourselves is therefore to reappropriate a heritage that for a long time has been misunderstood and neglected, in order to contribute, in a conscious and methodical way, to its promotion and development.

Reappropriation and appropriation would resolve the epistemological constraints that stem from the universality of Western knowledge in Africa and would satisfy the quest to value indigenous knowledges and practices. In particular, reappropriation and appropriation "consist in, first, acknowledging the fact of diversity, including diversity of opinion and belief, in every human society, and, second, valuing diversity as a sign of cultural health, or wealth, and as a condition for more intense creativity" (Hountondji 2004:530-531). The two sides of the same coin involve realising that every country in the continent is unique and distinct from Western countries – African countries such as Zambia, Zimbabwe and South Africa are not England, France, Germany, United States nor Portugal. The difference is not only nominal, but also and more importantly cultural and epistemological. The ultimate purpose is to pave way for a pluralistic approach to knowledge in Africa by demanding that indigenous knowledges are made operational. Before they are made operational, however, Hountondji (2004:535) cautions that the knowledges "should be tested again and again by the people themselves, [and] reappropriated in a way that makes it possible to make the indispensable linkage with ongoing scientific and technological research." Such an approach would integrate indigenous knowledges into the mainstream of knowledge so that all forms of knowledge are granted the same status at the epistemic front. In this way, the African continent would enjoy reciprocal exchange of knowledge with the West on an equal footing.

4.4 Conclusion

The chapter has tried to provide an analysis of the historical problem of extraversion in Africa – a problem which persists to this day including in Zambia. This state of affairs has a negative impact on the production of genuine knowledge in Africa for sustainable development. In order to end the problem of extraversion and to appreciate the role of scientific research in the development of Africa, it has been proposed that there is need to establish for the continent strong research capacities. This involves integrating into the global mainstream of knowledge Africa's primordial and pristine knowledges that lies beneath the contaminations of European epistemic invasions. There must be an attempt to select in Africa what is valuable; hence, Hountondji speaks of 'critical reappropriation'. The purpose is to provide for pluralistic approach to knowledge and intercultural dialogue in terms of knowledge production between African countries and other countries of the world.

The next chapter asserts that reappropriation of indigenous knowledges would be instrumental in finding a lasting solution to the epistemic injustice in Zambia. Based on this assertion, the chapter argues for a new decolonised tradition of knowledge in the country.

CHAPTER FIVE

TOWARDS A NEW DECOLONISED TRADITION OF KNOWLEDGE IN ZAMBIA

5.1 Introduction

The historical and humanistic project of decolonisation in Zambia began with the struggle for independence, whose achievement, unfortunately, led to a false sense of success and complacence among the indigenous peoples. Instead of regarding the event as a convenient starting point, they considered it to be the final moment of the project, leaving colonialism and its corrosive effect unabated. Independence was supposed to be followed by a more critical process of confronting the epistemic injustice in the country. As Serequeberhan (2010) explains, "the demise of colonialism by force of arms and political confrontation has to be, not merely the termination of the physical force that made colonialism possible, but also and more importantly, the end of the hubris that gave it intellectual and moral currency". Without confronting the epistemic injustice, it is illusory to claim that colonialism has ended in Zambia. Such a claim would simply demonstrate the speaker's ignorance of the colonial project and its impact on the country and the peoples. As a matter of fact, the independence which Zambia achieved in 1964 has not yet been actualised because in the post-colonial era the peoples in the country still experience epistemic injustice which has been exerted by the Western hegemony. In the quest for epistemic liberation in Zambia, this chapter argues for a new decolonised tradition of knowledge with particular attention given to the country's education system.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first presents the 'Rhodes Must Fall' Movement as a campaign illustrative of the problems that still persist regarding knowledge and education in Africa. The section focuses on the last decade of the 21st century and tries to capture the recent attempts, at global level, directed at promoting epistemic liberation in learning institutions as a necessary disposition for fostering human well-being. The section seeks to show that the quest for epistemic liberation is a global issue. The second section turns its attention to Zambia and tries to demonstrate that the education system pursued in the country serves as a seat for and sustains the Western epistemic hegemony. The section raises the need for decolonisation of the education system as a necessary means towards epistemic liberation in the country.

5.2 ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ Movement

In the 21st century the quest for epistemic liberation is increasingly being heard in many countries in Africa and elsewhere in the world. It is particularly a renewed struggle to define what should be taught in educational institutions. The argument being advanced is that education systems across the globe have historically discouraged diversity in their approaches to knowledge production and dissemination, leading to an acute frustration and dissatisfaction among the indigenous peoples, and lack of meaningful progress in their respective societies. Among the formerly colonised countries, the call for epistemic liberation is even louder because “beyond the end of colonialism, the project of domination, which constitutes its practice, endures in the subservient mode-of-life and self-awareness.... Its staying power is a residual, but tenacious, interiorised extroversion focused on the West” (Serequeberhan 2010). The rallying cry in the formerly colonised countries, therefore, is to purge the colonial residue that still controls the actuality of independence and, in turn, to empower the indigenous peoples with necessary resources for the production of knowledge which is relevant for the transformation of their own lives and societies at large. While there could be various approaches towards epistemic liberation, some “eschew the particularity of Eurocentrism through the construction of a new universality” (Bhambra, Gebrial & Nişancıoğlu 2018:2-3), and others seek pluralism of methodological perspectives, arguing that “this pluralism would facilitate an inclusion of non-Euroamerican [epistemological paradigms] into the academy” (Kirloskar-Steinbach 2019:1490). In its quest for epistemic liberation, the ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ Movement employed the latter while demonstrating that the quest for epistemic liberation is a global issue.

The ‘Rhodes Must Fall’ Movement began in March 2015 at the University of Cape Town. It was led by the protesting students whose aim was to bring down the statue of Rhodes and to address lack of diversity in the curriculum of the University, among other concerns. Mungwini (2016:532) rightly states that at the centre of the students’ protest was “the quest for transformation and the desire to bring an end to the perpetuation of a culture of alienation reminiscent of colonialism several years after independence.” Students focused on the statue of Rhodes and the curriculum as the major areas at the University that reflected colonialism and, consequently, that exerted an adverse effect on the South African society. The two areas shared historical trajectories of colonialism. They contained colonial elements which evoked trauma and

caused distress not only among students, but also among the ordinary members of the South African society, particularly members of African origin who were hit the hardest by apartheid.

Cecil Rhodes, whose statue the protesting students wanted to be brought down, was "a mining entrepreneur, politician, colonialist and philanthropist with an outspoken racist ideology" (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:122). The statue was erected in his honour because he is said to have donated both the land where the University of Cape Town is built, and the money which was used for this magnificent project (Mbembe 2016:30). The donated land and money, however, were dubiously acquired from Africa, particularly "from the colonial exploitation of Southern Africa's black population" (Gebrial 2018:27). From this point of view, the 'donation' of Rhodes raised eyebrows among the protesting students. They wondered how Rhodes would exploit South Africans for land and money and pretend to 'donate' these resources to the same population he exploited. The students found the 'donation' paradoxical.

More significantly, Rhodes was "widely considered to have laid the legislative groundwork for South African apartheid" (Gebrial 2018:20). Students noted that when he lived, he tormented and violated anything that Africanness stood for, because, according to him, being an African was nothing but a liability to Europeans. He did not consider Africans to be human beings, and deployed every single means in his power to remind them of their supposed worthlessness. From this perspective, the protesting students perceived his statue at the University to be a symbolic expression of white supremacy and a reminder of epistemic segregation and marginalisation characteristic of apartheid. They argued that to have the statue of Rhodes in front of the University and to ask them to bow to it in deference was demeaning. Honouring Rhodes in that manner, according to them, would amount to an act of self-humiliation and self-debasement since Rhodes was behind the untold miseries of apartheid in South Africa.

Besides the Rhodes statue, protesting students observed that the University of Cape Town pursued a curriculum that sustained colonialism. They noted that instead of offering a solution to the racial inequality which was prevalent in the country's economic and political systems, the University was in fact perpetuating this inequality through its racialised curriculum (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:123). They realised that the University portrayed striking inequalities reminiscent of apartheid in knowledge production; black, coloured and Indian students were structurally

discriminated from participating as agents of knowledge production. In other words, the curriculum did not cultivate a culture that was representative of the diversity of students at the campus; instead, it encapsulated policies characteristic of apartheid and, consequently, excluded the aforementioned from the province of knowledge.

Protesting students demanded to rid the University's curriculum of its colonial elements. The demand meant transformation of the terms upon which the University and its education existed, the purpose of the knowledge it produced and imparted in the learners, and its pedagogy (Bhambra, Gebrial & Nişancıoğlu 2018:1). Protesting students demanded fair allocation of learning opportunities to all South Africans regardless of their races and ethnic origins in order to foster diversity of cultural and biographical experiences at the University. In this sense, the students sought to de-racialise the University by pointing out deficiencies in the curriculum that made it unable to provide room for marginalised groups to contribute to knowledge production. The vision behind raising such awareness for curriculum reform was to radically integrate marginalised groups into the daily solutions towards social, economic and technical challenges (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:126). As they called for the integration of marginalised groups and formerly excluded knowledges, protesting students tried to create at the University "the possibility to inhabit a space to the extent that [every student could] say, 'This is my home. I am not a foreigner. I belong here'" (Mbembe 2016:29). In this sense, the University would create a conducive learning environment for every student at the campus and allow them to take an active role in the acquisition and production of knowledge.

As students at the University of Cape Town wrestled with the statue of Rhodes and lack of diversity of their University's curriculum, students from other universities joined in the protest to offer solidarity. Even in Zambia, the protest of South African students found favour: some people, particularly students, could be spotted clad in T-shirts branded "Rhodes Must Fall". The protest that began at a single university, the University of Cape Town, rapidly spread to other universities within and outside South Africa.[6] The demand of students at these universities was

[6] Outside South Africa, the 'Rhodes Must Fall' campaign was actively supported in the universities of the United States and the United Kingdom. In the United States the campaign was in unison with the Black Lives Matter Campaign, which was ignited by the gruesome murder of Ferguson (Bebrial 2018:34). In the United Kingdom, the

similar to that of the students at the University of Cape Town: they demanded to get rid of statues and other material embodiments of colonial history, and to reform the Eurocentric curriculum. In other words, they addressed Eurocentric domination and lack of diversity in the curricula, under which people, particularly of African origin, were excluded from the province of knowledge.

The ideals of the 'Rhodes Must Fall' Movement, together with those of the other related students' protests presented above, are drawn from and inspired by epistemologies of the global South. According to Santos (2018:1), the world is made up of two distinct blocks of epistemologies: those of the global North and of the global South. These epistemologies are polar opposites: the former is dominant and is associated with European modernity; the latter is accorded a subordinate role and is identified with tradition (Masaka 2017:72). Epistemologies of the global North are premised upon the abyssal line, an invisible line that separates "metropolitan societies and forms of sociability from colonial societies and forms of sociability" (Santos 2018:6). The line identifies the metropolitan side with what is valid, normal and ethical; the colonial side is associated with ignorance.

Based on the abyssal line, epistemologies of the global North celebrate monolithic understanding of reality. They consider Eurocentric knowledge as the only source of valid knowledge, and any other forms of knowledge as a collective realm of ignorance. According to Santos (2018:5), the current that gives Western knowledge force and superiority is modern science as developed in the global North in the seventeenth century. Modern science is seen to be radically distinct from other forms of science that originate from other regions and cultures of the world. Unlike other sciences, modern science is perceived to be characterised by rigorous observation and controlled experimentation. Based on its methodology, modern science is considered to be better than any other ways of knowing – lay, popular, practical, commonsensical, intuitive, or religious. Modern science has played a critical role in converting Western epistemology into the hegemonic way of representing the world. Thus, based on modern science, coupled with superior economic and

---

campaign was contextualised as 'Rhodes Must Fall Oxford' and led to the formation of two flagship campaigns in the country: 'Why is My Curriculum White' and '#LiberateMyDegree' (Bhambra, Gebrial & Nişancıoğlu 2018:1).

military power, the geographical global North has granted itself imperial domination over other cultures and epistemologies.

The epistemologies of the global North try to compress the entire world into a homogenous society bound by threads of Eurocentric knowledge and modes of thinking. They regard Western knowledge as the only valid understanding of the world, and as the universal standard or hallmark from which all the peoples should perceive the world. They declare as non-existent any knowledges that are produced either without following the methodology of modern science or by absent subjects – "subjects deemed incapable of producing valid knowledge due to their subhuman condition or nature" (Santos 2018:2).[7] Epistemologies of the global North, in this way, plunge themselves into a serious error of "glossing over the obvious particularities of some people of this world and imposing one paradigm ... as if it is the only one in existence" (Masaka 2017:63). They perpetuate epistemic injustice as they destroy an immense variety of knowledges and ways of knowing of the peoples on the colonial side of the abyssal line, and as they prevent the peoples on the same side from representing the world as their own and in their own terms.

As part of their resistance to the epistemic injustice of the epistemologies of the global North, social groups that have been victims of this injustice have developed epistemologies of the global South. These epistemologies are not epistemologies in the conventional sense, which may focus on the study of knowledge; rather, they are ways of knowing that emerge from social and political struggles. They are non-geographical as they are produced in any region where there is occurrence of such struggles, both in the geographical North and the geographical South. These epistemologies "are technically and culturally intrinsic to certain [social] practices – the practices of resistance against oppression" (Santos 2018:3). In other words, they are a direct response to the pervasiveness of injustice in the present world order, identified as "lack of acceptance and respect for the diversity of the peoples of this world by hegemonic cultures" (Masaka 2017:63). Epistemologies of the global South advocate for diversity of paradigms in the world as a proposed solution to the injustices underlying social and political struggles in the world; they emerge as a possible panacea to such injustices in the world. They argue for the acceptance and

[7] Absent subjects include Africans who are denied the faculty of rationality and humanity by Europeans (Mungwini 2018:3).

respect for diversity of the peoples and their knowledges, and recognition of the peoples' contribution to the world civilisation (Santos 2018:9). The ultimate aim of epistemologies of the global South is not to replace the epistemologies of the global North, but to establish parity between the global North and the global South so that the two are treated as equal partners in world affairs. Respect for the diversity of peoples from different geopolitical centres is taken as a precondition to this objective (Masaka 2017:59).

Epistemologies of the global South seek to identify and validate all the knowledges of the peoples who have been oppressed, silenced and radically excluded from the dominant modes of being and knowing. These are knowledges that are declared non-existent by epistemologies of the global North, and whose subjects are not allowed to make epistemic claims which they would make without being dominated (Kirloskar-Steinbach 2019:1495). Epistemologies of the global South try to identify such knowledges and to give them a status equivalent to the dominant forms of knowledge, particularly those that are recognised by the epistemologies of the global North. Epistemologies of the global South want to create an environment where all the peoples, regardless of the geographical location in which they find themselves, are able to interpret the world in their own ways and to transform it according to their own aspirations. While contending that knowledge and theories of knowledge produced in the geographical global North are not necessarily universally valid, epistemologies of the global South question and challenge the subordinate role accorded to other systems of knowledge and modes of thinking that are found outside this geographical area. In brief, epistemologies of the global South could be described as the contemporary search for new paradigms of thinking and interpretation of reality, divorced from the dominant epistemologies of the global North. They seek to open new horizons regarding cultural and epistemological diversity in the world.

Epistemologies of the global South promote pluriversality – "a kind of thinking that promotes decolonisation [of knowledge]" in order to restore the lost humanity and epistemological paradigm of the peoples who have been victims of epistemologies of the global North (Santos 2018:8). At the centre of pluriversality lies a demand for a pluralised and contextualised knowledge production. While providing for epistemic diversity, pluralised and contextualised knowledge production creates opportunities for all the peoples, including the indigenous "to ask new, radical and more localised questions" (Dübgen & Skupien 2019:119). In this regard, all the

peoples are accorded space for autonomous and responsible decision-making in various fields of interest such as epistemology, economic and scientific fields. Pluralised and contextualised knowledge production resuscitates knowledge-systems in the world which have been silenced and replaced by more dominant knowledge and modes of knowing (Mungwini 2018:4). The marginalised knowledge-systems and modes of knowing are made part of the mainstream knowledge in the world and, therefore, are included in the activities of knowledge production and acquisition such as research and teaching in learning institutions.

In the light of what has been presented above, epistemologies of the global South could provide the answer to the quest for epistemic liberation in Zambia. In its postcolonial condition, the country is dominated by the colonial legacy, not through the force of weapons but through the Western models which were planted in the country by the British during colonialism, and have been adopted after independence. The colonial legacy has led to a covert control of the minds, cultures, epistemologies and philosophies of the indigenous peoples. More than anywhere else, the colonial legacy has been sustained in the education sector; educational institutions in the form of schools, colleges and universities mask, constitute, institute and sustain this colonial legacy. In this sense, an attempt to get rid of the colonial legacy and arrive at a new tradition of knowledge in Zambia should begin with scrutinising the education system in the country through decolonisation.

5.3 Decolonisation of education in Zambia

The current education system in Zambia is based on epistemologies of the global North which emphasise Western knowledge at the expense of other knowledges in the world. As already stated in chapter two, modern institutions of learning in Zambia and the education system pursued in these institutions were brought by missionaries under the guise of modernity. This is not to suggest that the peoples of Zambia did not have their own modernising tendencies. Following in the path which was paved by the missionaries, colonialists arrived in the country and began using the education system to advance their own selfish agenda, as was the trend in other colonies (Bhambra, Gebrial and Nişancıoğlu 2018:5). This marked the inauguration of European domination and epistemicide in Zambia, affecting the well-being of the indigenous peoples. The epistemologies which the indigenous peoples in the country used in pursuing their

autonomous paths of development and modernity were thwarted and replaced by the dominant Eurocentric epistemology. The epistemologies of the indigenous peoples were perceived not to conform to the epistemological 'universal' standard set by Europe; they were seen to be unphilosophical and irrelevant to the mainstream of world knowledge. In this regard, Europe was presented as the sole creator of knowledge and civilisation; its knowledge became hegemonic and assumed a position of unchallenged superiority in Zambia. As Eurocentric knowledge became hegemonic, the country was disabled to conduct education in its own indigenous terms. To put this idea differently, by the British elevating the particular knowledge of Europe to the status of global knowledge and portraying it as though it deserved to be applied transculturally by necessity, the peoples of Zambia were denied the opportunity to contribute to knowledge and human civilisation because their creative potential was suppressed. To that extent, the peoples in the country, to borrow the words of Kirloskar-Steinbach (2019:1494), became "epistemic dependents" on European epistemic tradition.

Independence presented a great opportunity for Zambia to challenge and bring to an end epistemicide which was instituted during colonialism. This was to be achieved by decolonisation, transforming and modifying the education system to suit the local conditions and needs. Unfortunately, this was not done. Hence, the education system in Zambia, together with its institutions, has remained radically Westernised in the post-colonial era; it grants sole authorship of knowledge and civilisation to one geopolitical centre which is Europe. The selection of canon in education is based on the Western modalities of thinking. The organisational structure, curricula, social relations, discursive scientific practices and the knowledge advanced are all Western in character, and all of them have eluded adequate scrutiny. Schools, colleges and universities in Zambia support the untenable thesis that the geographical global North is the 'universal' standard from which the country should perceive and interpret the world. As these institutions promote this thesis, however, the education system in Zambia marginalises the knowledge paradigms of the indigenous peoples and, broadly speaking, justifies the asymmetrical relations between the epistemologies of the global North and those of the global South. In other words, the dominant and privileged position of Western knowledge in Zambia has been secured by silencing knowledges of the indigenous peoples; the latter have continued to be treated as though they are non-existent. This is because the education system in Zambia

mimics Western epistemology, it presents the West as the sole producer of knowledge while remaining oblivious to the epistemic diversity available in the country and in the world at large.

From the foregoing, it is clear that lack of epistemic diversity is at least one of the major problems facing the education system and, consequently, contributing to epistemic injustice in Zambia. With its intellectual thought and pedagogy situated and shaped by the historical forces of colonialism, the education system reproduces and justifies colonial hierarchies as initiated by the British during the colonisation of the country. It does not recognise and value indigenous knowledges and the contribution of the local population to the epistemic diversity in the world at large. In this way, it could be described as repressive towards the indigenous peoples; it does not serve the indigenous peoples, and yet it is for their service that it is supposed to exist. This is a cause for concern in the quest for epistemic liberation. Based on what has been presented above, this liberation could be sought in accepting and respecting the diversity of the peoples in the country and their knowledge paradigms. This assertion entails establishing parity between the supposed superiority of Western knowledge which characterise the current education system and the corresponding inferiority of the knowledges of the indigenous peoples in the country.

According to Masaka (2017:77), "parity of epistemologies is only ensured if the structural mechanisms that sustain epistemicide are challenged and rejected." In this vein, there is need to scrutinise the education system and to discard colonial elements that sustain Western epistemic hegemony to the exclusion of the knowledges of the indigenous peoples. This exercise should begin with the acknowledgement that besides the West and its knowledge, the world comprises diverse knowledge paradigms and geopolitical centres. The assertion is drawn from the understanding that knowledge arises from a specific, spatiotemporal and socio-material contexts of the people as they try to understand the world from their own vantage point of view, in space and time (Kirloskar-Steinbach 2019:1491). The point here is that if knowledge in Zambia is to be defined meaningfully, it should make reference to the historical and corporeal particularity of the peoples in the country. From this premise, the education system in Zambia should accept and respect the knowledges of the indigenous peoples and their various versions of modernity. Further, establishing parity between Western knowledge and indigenous knowledges in Zambia also entails challenging the specific epistemic diversity deficits in the current education system that exclude some people from the province of knowledge.

The education system in Zambia, as an intellectual activity, has been turned into a marketable product that can be priced, bought and sold using standard units. Since the recent past, the country has witnessed a sharp rise in the number of schools, colleges and universities, both public and private. Although they have created more learning opportunities for the growing population in Zambia, these institutions, universities in particular, demand exorbitant study fees from students. In this regard, universities are characterised by epistemic diversity deficits since they are biased towards serving only the elite who can afford to pay these fees; would-be learners from poor families are excluded from knowledge acquisition and production, as they are unable to pay the study fees. The high cost of education in Zambia does not only end by creating an epistemic diversity deficit, but also reinforces socioeconomic inequalities in society and makes it difficult to create an egalitarian society.

In addition, the knowledge which is produced and acquired in the institutions of learning in Zambia is compartmentalised and measured in numerical terms. To borrow the words of Mbembe (2016:31), the knowledge that is produced in these institutions is measured in terms of "numbers of publications, numbers of conference papers presented, numbers of committees served on, numbers of courses taught, numbers of students processed in those courses." Similarly, the knowledge which is acquired is measured in terms of numbers of credits accumulated. In view of the foregoing and in the words of Mbembe (2016:30), it appears logical to argue that institutions of learning in Zambia "are *large systems of authoritative control*, standardization, gradation, accountancy, classification, credits and penalties." They attach more value to the pursuit of credits than to the free pursuit of knowledge. A lot of time is spent on assessments as they are highly valued with their respective procedures, language and attendant mentality. This arrangement runs from primary school education up to tertiary education: in order to climb the academic ladder from one level to the next, learners need to score high marks in the examinations that are set at every level of exist.

The numerical measurement of knowledge, emphasising on grading and credits, only increases epistemic diversity deficits in education. It does not encourage learners to think outside what is provided for in the curricula because examinations are set, and credits awarded based on the prescribed curricula. The main concern of learners, therefore, is to pass examinations and proceed to another level on the academic ladder. They are also interested in the material payoff

or the utility value which the knowledge gained has on the open market, and not necessarily in acquiring knowledge for its own sake. In this sense, as Mbembe (2016:31) asserts, learners are turned into customers and consumers of "vendible educational commodities, primarily courses, credits, certifications and degrees". From this point of view, the education system of Zambia does not encourage students to be versatile and to pursue pluralised epistemic activities.

In the quest for epistemic liberation in Zambia, there is need to overcome the epistemic diversity deficits outlined above and to search for strategies that can uncover diversity enriching practices that are available in the country but have been undervalued or disregarded. Such strategies include democratisation of access to education and liberalisation of the curricula. Kirloskar-Steinbach (2019:1490) calls the latter "content diversity". The two strategies are liberating perspectives that do not allow a single culture to dominate other cultures, but that ensure that every culture is given an audience at the epistemic front. They are inclusion strategies whose aim is to encourage all the learners

> to develop their own intellectual and moral lives as independent individuals; to redistribute as equally as possible a capacity of a special type – the capacity to make discipline inquiries into those things we need to know, but do not know yet ...; the capacity to make systematic forays beyond our current knowledge horizons (Mbembe 2016:30).

Democratisation of access to education and liberation of the curricula in Zambia would ensure that all the peoples in the country, regardless of their social status and location, are availed the opportunity to participate in the epistemic activities of knowledge acquisition and production. In this way, to borrow the concept from wa Thiong'o (1986:87), all the peoples in Zambia would emerge from their indigenous cultures, and state of silence and blindness and begin to see themselves clearly in relationship to themselves and to others in the universe. Education, from that point of view, would demonstrate its primary role of transforming lives and society. It would also reinforce a sense of national unity rather than socioeconomic divisions in the country.

Democratisation of access to education and liberation of the curricula in Zambia would involve including in the curricula the historic epistemic initiative of all the cultures, and developing a pedagogy which is centred on this inclusion. Such a pedagogy, as Dennis (2018:197) explains,

"is one that accepts 'cacophony of voices', where the risk of disintegration is preferable to selective silencing." Without ever creating 'we' – 'they' relationship, democratisation of education and liberalisation of the curricula in Zambia would promote plurality of knowledge production while recognising both Western knowledge and indigenous knowledge. The two strategies have the potential to initiate dialogue, alliances and solidarity between Zambia and the West, leading to a relationship where both Western knowledge and indigenous knowledges in Zambia would enjoy an equal epistemic status.

Dialogue between Zambia and the West is important because the knowledge in our times has both local and global dimensions; we cannot neglect the latter and concentrate only on the former or vice-versa. In fact it is on this premise that one specific group, Europe for example, cannot develop knowledge for all the people in the world; its experience of the world cannot be taken as the universal way of making sense of our experience. As noted by Kirloskar-Steinbach (2019:1500), "meaning-making activity is not restricted to our own context ... Other people from near and afar have attempted to make sense of their own worlds, albeit in different ways."

The struggle for parity between Western knowledge and the indigenous knowledges in Zambia falls within the broad philosophical context of the struggle for epistemic liberation in Africa. In describing this struggle, wa Thiong'o (2003:67) uses the terms "de-centring" and "re-centring". De-centring involves moving away from the current practice where Western knowledge and modes of knowing are the default positions for learning and research in the formerly colonised countries in Africa. It involves rejecting the Western discourse that the West is the centre of epistemology and cultural heritage, and that Africa is an extension of the West. Re-centring, as Mungwini (2016:524) explains, "is an attempt "to centre again", to de-marginalise and to ensure that in any intellectual endeavour both our theory and praxis is rooted in African experiences." It refers to the need to recapture the imagination and vision that made possible the struggle for independence in the continent. From the education point of view, re-centring encompasses practices where the curricula and the research tradition of the formerly colonised countries in Africa are established on Africa's traditional values and practices. At the core of re-centring in Africa is a quest for authentic liberation of the continent and for the peoples to come "to terms with the concrete conditions of being an African in Africa … [and to know] who [they] are through a critical and hermeneutical elaboration of [their] contemporary situation" (Mungwini

2016:528). Through the two processes of de-centring and re-centring, it is envisioned, the peoples in the formerly colonised countries in Africa, including Zambia, would develop a new positive relationship with their traditional values and of themselves as knowing subjects and agents of knowledge production. As explained by Mungwini (2018:2), "the idea is not only to prioritise Africa as the place and intellectual territory from which philosophical activity takes place, but also to reposition the continent as a centre of creative possibilities *within the world of diverse epistemological paradigms and geopolitical centres*" (emphasis added).

5.4 Conclusion

This chapter has argued for a new decolonised tradition of knowledge in Zambia in the quest for epistemic liberation. After gaining its independence, the country did not take any deliberate effort to decolonise its intellectual landscape in order to actualise the reality of independence so gained. For that reason, a vacuum was created between theory and praxis: the independence which was gained remained elusive in the real life experiences of the peoples. It is in a bid to fill up this vacuum that this chapter has proposed a new decolonised tradition of knowledge in Zambia, with a view of delivering epistemic liberation to the peoples. In presenting a new decolonised tradition of knowledge, the chapter has argued for the epistemologies of the global South. It asserts that Zambia should draw strength and inspiration from these epistemologies and promote epistemic diversity by embracing indigenous knowledges in its education system.

6. General conclusion and recommendations

This research project has sought to present a philosophical argument for decolonisation of knowledge in Zambia in its quest for epistemic liberation. It has critically examined the epistemological paradigm which informs the current intellectual practice in the country where Western knowledge is favoured to the exclusion of indigenous knowledges. While presenting this practice as an act of epistemicide directed at exterminating indigenous knowledges, the research has charged that it is an epistemic injustice whose effect makes the mainstream knowledge incapable of responding successfully to the questions posed and the challenges encountered by the peoples in the country. In other words, the research has argued that making indigenous knowledges part of the mainstream knowledge in Zambia would play a crucial role in addressing the real contemporary needs of the peoples. In this context, the research has submitted that there is need for the country to establish a new tradition of knowledge, a tradition which would take into full consideration indigenous knowledges while recognising other existing and possible forms of knowledge. In the light of this submission, the research recommends that Zambia should:

1. Establish research centres in Zambia that could ensure that indigenous knowledges from surrounding communities are examined and institutionalised. That would assist in revising the thinking that Western knowledge is the only form of knowledge through which the peoples of Zambia could gain a correct understanding of the world.
2. Confront the problems of extraversion through deconstruction of the Western discourse and construction of a self-centred and intellectually independent nation. The country should become the centre of its own intellectual and economic activities and ensure that the primary function of these activities is directed towards meeting the theoretical and practical needs of the peoples.
3. Champion epistemologies of the global South by granting the knowledges of the peoples of Zambia an epistemic status that is equal to that of Western knowledge. The efficacy of indigenous knowledges is well documented in the pre-colonial history of the country, and that should serve as enough evidence for these knowledges to be recognised at the epistemic front in the post-colonial era.

4. Formulate a new philosophy of education in order to drive the process of transformation inspired by the global decolonial framework of the 21st century. This involves revising the curricula of education by confronting the hegemonic tendencies of Western knowledge that inform the current intellectual practice.
5. Strengthen research into indigenous languages, their development and deployment as instruments for education and the dissemination of critical knowledge in the country.
6. Reappropriate some of the key elements of humanism such as the dignity of the human person and the recognition of the different communities and their contribution to knowledge by promoting pluralism in the generation of knowledge.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abdul-Raheem, T. 2010. Corrupt Leaders are Mass Murders, in A. Biney & A. Olukoshi (eds). *Speaking Truth to Power Selected Pan-African Postcards*. Oxford: Pambazuka Press, 20-22.

Bekele, G. 2007. "Extraversion and the Goal of Education in the African Context", *African Study Monographs,* 28(3), 107-123.

Bhambra, G. K.; Gebrial, D. and Nişancıoğlu, K. 2018. Introduction: Decolonising the University?, In G.K. Bhambra; D. Gebrial & K. Nişancıoğlu (eds). *Decolonising the University*. London: Pluto Press, 1-15.

Biney, A. 2014. The Historical Discourse on African Humanism: Interrogating the Paradoxes, in L. Praeg & S. Magadla (eds). *Ubuntu: Curating the Archive.* Pietermaritzburg: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press, 27-53.

Bodunrin, P. O. 1991. The question of African philosophy, in T. Serequeberhan (ed). *African philosophy: The essential readings.* New York: Paragon House, 63-86.

Bwalya, R. M. K. 1987. "On Kaundaism", *Quest: An International African Journal of Philosophy*, 1(1), 31-38.

Cheeseman, N. 2019. *A Dictionary of African Politics*. 1st edition. Oxford: University press.

Chimpinde, K. 2012. *Zambians have a Complex – Scott.* Maravi. <http://maravi.blogspot.com/2012/04/zambians-have-complex-scott.html> [Accessed 15 April 2019]

Chishimba, G. M. & Manchishi, P. C. 2015. "The Language Strategy in the Zambian Educational System from 1924 to 2014", *International Journal of Language and Literature, 4(1), 54-59.*

Chumbow, B. S. 2005. The Language Question and National Development in Africa, in T. Mkandawire (ed.). *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development.* London: Zed Books, 16-17.

Creswell, J. W. 2009. *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Third Edition). Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Inc.

Dennis, C. A. 2018. Decolonising Education: A Pedagogic Intervention, In G.K. Bhambra; D. Gebrial & K. Nişancıoğlu (eds). *Decolonising the University*. London: Pluto Press, 190-207.

Dübgen, F. & Skupien, S. 2019. *Paulin Hountondji: African Philosophy as Critical Universalism.* Gewerbestrasse: Palgrave Macmillan.

Franklin, W. R. & Shaw, J. M. 1991. *The Case for Christian Humanism.* Grand Rapids: W.M.B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Fricker, M. 2007. *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gebrial, D. 2018. Rhodes Must Fall: Oxford and Movements for Change, In G. K. Bhambra; D. Gebrial & K. Nişancıoğlu (eds). *Decolonising the University*. London: Pluto Press, 19-36.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henkel, R. 1999a. Early Mission Settlements up to 1900, in M. J. Kelly (ed). *Origin and Developments.* Lusaka: University of Zambia, 32-34.

Henkel, R. 1999b. The Significance of the Missions in the Development of the Educational System, in M. J. Kelly (ed). *Origin and Developments.* Lusaka: University of Zambia, 35-38.

Hountondji, P. 1987. On the Universality of Science and Technology, in B. Lutz (ed). *Technik und sozialer Wandel: Verhandlungen des 23. Deutschen Soziologentages in Hamburg*

1986. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verl, 382-389. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-149164>[Accessed 20 October 2020]

Hountondji, P. 2002. *The Struggle for Meaning: Reflections on Philosophy, Culture and Democracy in Africa.* Ohio: Ohio University.

Hountondji, P. 2003. Producing knowledge in Africa today, in P. H. Coetzee & A. P. J. Roux (eds). *The African Philosophy Reader: A Text with Readings*. New York: Routledge, 589-596.

Hountondji, P. 2004. Knowledge as a development issue, in K. Wiredu (ed). *A Companion to African Philosophy.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 529-537.

Kant, I. 2011. *Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime*. Trans. P. Frierson & P. Guyer. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Kanu, I. A. 2014. "Kenneth Kaunda and the Quest for an African Humanist Philosophy", *International Journal of Scientific Research (IJSR),* 3(8), 375-377.

Kasanda, S. M. 1988. "The African Scholar Through the "UNZA Graduate"", *Quest: An International African Journal of Philosophy,* II(2), 23-29.

Kaunda, K. D. 1966. *A Humanist in Africa: Letters to Colin M. Morris from Kenneth D. Kaunda.* Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Kaunda, K. D. 1968. *The Imperative of Human Dignity.* Lusaka: Zambia Information Service.

Kaunda, K. D. 1976. *Humanist Handbook.* Lusaka: Freedom House.

Kaunda, K. D. 1983. *Opening Address by President Kaunda to the 9th UNIP General Conference at Mulungushi Kabwe, 22nd August.* Lusaka: Government Printer.

Kebede, M. 2004. *Africa's Quest for a Philosophy of Decolonisation.* Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kirloskar-Steinbach, M. 2019. “Diversifying philosophy: The art of non-domination.” *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 51(14)1490-1503.

Lungu, G. F. 1991. “Pragmatism or Crude Utility? A Critique of the Education with Production Movement in Contemporary Africa”, *Quest: An International African Journal of Philosophy*, V(2), 75-89.

Makumba, M. M. 2007. *Introduction to African philosophy.* Nairobi: Pauline Publications.

Maldonado-Torres, N. 2007. “On the Coloniality of Being”, *Cultural Studies,* 21(2), 240-270.

Masaka, D. 2017. “‘Global Justice’ and the Suppressed Epistemologies of the Indigenous People of Africa.” *Philosophical Papers,* 46(1)59-84.

Mbembe, A. J. 2016. “Decolonizing the university: New directions.” *Arts: Humanities in Higher Education*, 15(1), 29-45.

McKenna, J. C. 1997. *Finding a Social Voice: The Church and Marxism in Africa.* New York: Fordham University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. 2011. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Ministry of Education, 1999. Educational Policy, in M. J. Kelly (ed). *Origin and Developments.* Lusaka: University of Zambia, 83-84.

Ministry of Education, 1977. *Educational Reform: Proposals and Recommendations.* Lusaka: Government Printer.

Mkandawire, T. 2005. Introduction, in T. Mkandawire (ed.). *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development.* London: Zed Books, 1-9.

Mungwini, P. 2013. “African modernities and the critical reappropriation of indigenous knowledges: Towards a polycentric global epistemology”, *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies – Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity,* 8(1), 78-93.

Mungwini, P. 2016. “The Question of Recentring Africa: Thoughts and Issues from the Global South.” *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 35(4)523-536.

Mungwini, P. 2017. ““African Know Thyself”: Epistemic Injustice and the Quest for Liberative Knowledge”, *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies – Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity*, 12(2), 5-18.

Mungwini, P. 2018. “The Question of Epistemic Justice: Polemics, Contestations and Dialogue.” *Phronimon*, 19(3252)1-13.

Mwanakatwe, M. J. 1994. *End of Kaunda Era.* Lusaka: Multimedia Publication.

Ndlovu, M. 2014. “Why indigenous knowledges in the 21st century? A decolonial turn.” *Yesterday and Today* [online], (11), 84-98. Available from: <http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2223-03862014000100006&lng=en&tlng=en> [Accessed 4 January 2021].

Ndofirepi, A. P. & Cross, M. 2014. “Transforming Epistemologies in the Postcolonial African university? The Challenge of the Politics of Knowledge.” *Journal of Education and Learning*, 8(4)291-298.

Ndofirepi, A. P. & Gwaravanda E. T. 2019. “Epistemic (in)justice in African universities: a perspective of the politics of knowledge.” *Educational Review*, 71(5)581-594.

Njoroge, R. J. 1986. *Philosophy and education in Africa: An introductory text for students of education.* Nairobi: Transafrica Press.

Nkrumah, K. 1964. *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonisation and Development with particular reference to the African Revolution.* London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Nkrumah, K. 1966. *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism.* New York: International Publishers.

Nkrumah, K. 1972. *Revolutionary Path.* London: Panaf.

Nyerere, J. K. 1963. *Democracy and the Party System.* California: University Press.

Nyerere, J. K. 1966. *Freedom and Unity/ Uhuru na Umoja.* Dar es Salaam: The Government Press.

Nyerere, J. K. 1968. *Ujamaa: Essays on Socialism.* Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.

Okere, T. 2005. *Philosophy, Culture and Society in Africa.* Nsukka: Afro – Orbis Publications.

Oladipo, O. 2001. "Knowledge and the African Renaissance", *Philosophia Africana,* 4(1) 61-67.

Oruka, O. 2003. Four Trends in current African Philosophy, in P.H. Coetzee & A.P.J. Roux (eds). *The African Philosophy Reader: A Text with Readings*. New York: Routledge, 141-146.

Outlaw, L. 2003. African 'philosophy': Deconstructive and reconstructive challenges, in P.H. Coetzee & A.P.J. Roux (eds.). *Philosophy from Africa: A Text with Readings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 162-191.

Rengger, N. J. 2000. *International relations, political theory and the problems of order: Beyond international relations theory?* London: Routledge.

Santos, B. S. 2018. *The End of the Cognitive Empire: The Coming of Age of Epistemologies of the South.* London: Duke University Press.

Senghor, L. S. 1964. *On African Socialism.* Trans. M. Cook. London: Pall Mall Press.

Serequeberhan, T. 1994. *The Hermeneutics of African Philosophy.* New York: Routledge.

Serequeberhan, T. 2010. "Africa in a changing world: An inventory", *Monthly Review: An Independent Socialist Magazine.* <https://monthlyreview.org/2010/01/01/africa-in-a-changing-world-an-inventory/> [Accessed 5th December 2020].

Simson, H. 1985. *Zambia: A Country Study*. Uppsala: Scandinavian Institute of African Studies.

Smith, T. L. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Second Edition. London: Zed Books.

Snelson, P. 1990. *Educational Development in Northern Rhodesia 1883-1945*, Second Edition. Lusaka: Kenneth Kaunda Foundation.

Taylor, S. D. 2006. *Culture and Customs of Zambia.* London: Greenwood Press.

Turok, B. 1999. Colonial Rule in Zambia, in M. J. Kelly (ed). *Origin and Developments.* Lusaka: University of Zambia, 22-30.

Táíwó, O. 2004. Post-Independence African Political Philosophy, in K. Wiredu (ed). *A Companion to African Philosophy*. Oxford: Blackwell, 243-259.

UN/ECA/FAO 1999. Education at the Time of Independence. *Origin and Developments*. Lusaka: University of Zambia, 68-72.

UNESCO Planning Mission. 1999. Viewpoint, Inequalities and Selected Recommendations, in M. J. Kelly (ed). *Origin and Developments*. Lusaka: University of Zambia, 84-88.

Wa Thiong'o, N. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: the Politics of Language in African Literature.* Nairobi: Heinemann Kenya.

Wa Thiong'o, N. 2003. Moving the centre: Towards a pluralism of cultures, in P.H. Coetzee & A.P.J. Roux (eds). *The African Philosophy Reader: A Text with Readings*. New York: Routledge, 63-69.

Wa Thiong'o, N. 2009. *Something Torn and New: An African Renaissance.* New York: Basic*Civitas* Books.

Wiredu, K. 1992. Problems in Africa's Self-Definition in the Contemporary World, in K. Gyekye & K. Wiredu (eds). *Person and Community: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies, I.* Washington: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, 59-70.

Wiredu, K. 1998. “Toward Decolonizing African Philosophy and Religion”, *African Studies Quarterly*, 1(4), 17-46.

Wiredu, K. 2005. “African philosophy, Anglophone” in *The shorter Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by E. Craig. London: Routledge.

Wiredu, K. 2008. “Social philosophy in postcolonial Africa: Some preliminaries concerning communalism and communitarianism,” *South African Journal of Philosophy,* 27(4), 332-339.

Wiredu, K. 2009. “An Oral Philosophy of Personhood: Comments on Philosophy and Orality”, *Research in African Literatures,* 40(1), 8-18. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Zeleza, P. T. 2002. “The Politics of Historical and Social Science Research in Africa”, *Journal of Southern African Studies,* 28(1) 9-23.

Zeleza, P. T. 2006. The Inventions of Africa Identities and Languages: The Discursive and Developmental Implications, in O. F. Arasanyin & M. A. Pemberton (eds). *Selected Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 14-26.