



The African Intellectuals' Project

Simphiwe Sesanti

To cite this article: Simphiwe Sesanti (2020) The African Intellectuals' Project, International Journal of African Renaissance Studies - Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity, 15:1, 1-24, DOI: [10.1080/18186874.2020.1831738](https://doi.org/10.1080/18186874.2020.1831738)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/18186874.2020.1831738>



Published online: 19 Oct 2020.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 203



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

The African Intellectuals' Project

Simphiwe Sesanti

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4546-5218>

Editor

University of the Western Cape, South Africa

ssesanti@uwc.ac.za

At the beginning of 2019, the editorial board of this journal, *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies (IJARS)*, appointed me to pilot this plane. As I indicated in an earlier editorial, I requested to be allowed to serve only a year of my three-year term, so as to pave the way for my two anticipated deputy female editors. Prof. Jimi Adesina, professor of sociology at the University of South Africa (Unisa), and one of the editorial board members, dismissed my proposal out of hand, and told me in no uncertain terms that I would serve my term to the end. Prof. Adesina could do and did what he did because he knows that I have deep respect and affection for him and that I therefore would not defy him. Of course, I submitted to his bullying me. Even as I accepted his bullying, I had my own plans. I planned, as I indicated in an earlier editorial, that in my three-year term, of the six editorials I was expected to write, I would only write three, and I would let the rest be written by my sister deputy editors, Profs Zethu Cakata and Nokuthula Hlabangane. These efforts to centre our African sisters were in line with plans to maximise the chances of a woman succeeding me as editor, which would be a first for *IJARS*.

My commitment to women's issues is informed by a conviction that the African liberation struggle would be incomplete, and that the African Renaissance would be meaningless, without the liberation of women from patriarchy. Consistent with that, I believe that the liberation of women is not going to come about as a result of sympathetic men who want to be in charge of women's efforts to free themselves from patriarchy. What revolutionary African men must do is support—and the emphasis is on *support*—women's endeavours in this regard. This means that women must have the space to lead. I argued this point strongly when I joined the Institute for African Renaissance Studies (IARS) at Unisa in 2016, such that Prof. Shadrack Gutto, my predecessor and the founding editor of this journal, called me a “womanist” (Sesanti 2018a, 1).

True to this commitment, when I became acting editor in 2018, I was proud to announce in the editorial of *IJARS* volume 13, issue 1, that “of the four single-authored articles in this edition, two are authored by women. Of the four shared bylines, women feature in three [...] [W]e are determined to see to it that women take their rightful space in the

intellectual and academic community” (Sesanti 2018a, 1). In the subsequent edition it was with huge pride that I announced in the editorial that “out of the seven single-authored articles in this edition [...] five are written by women and two by men. Of the two co-authored articles, a woman is represented in one” (Sesanti 2018b, 2). This commitment was shared by my predecessor, Prof. Gutto, who expressed the view that the editorial team of *IJARS* had to go out of their way to make sure that women were published in this journal (in Sesanti 2018b, 2).

At the time of making these declarations, I had no idea that come June 2020, I would no longer be in the employ of Unisa, but in the Faculty of Education of the University of the Western Cape (UWC). When this appointment was made, I requested the editorial board to relieve me. However, after some negotiations, during which Prof. Siphamandla Zondi, one of the editorial board members, insisted that being the editor of *IJARS* was not tied to being an employee of Unisa, which houses our journal, I agreed to serve until the end of the year 2020 to enable a smooth transition. There was no desire on the part of the editorial board to see my back. I am grateful to all the editorial board members for the enthusiastic support they gave me. It has been a privilege to serve!

The 2019 African Intellectuals’ Project Presentations at Unisa

Soon after taking the position of editor of *IJARS* at the beginning of 2019, I was contacted by the dean of Unisa’s College of Graduate Studies (CGS), Prof. Lindiwe Zungu, who informed me that the university’s principal and vice-chancellor, Prof. Mandla Makhanya, had decided to revive his project, the African Intellectuals’ Project (AIP). I was asked to coordinate this project, through which Makhanya sought to invite scholars, academics, and intellectuals, both on and outside of the African continent, to deliver presentations reflecting on the ills afflicting Africa and, at the same time, to offer possible solutions. In pursuing the AIP, Prof. Makhanya was carrying on a perennial tradition.

One recent aspect of this tradition was a conference held in Dakar, Senegal, in 2003, marking the 30th anniversary of the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (Codesria) (Mkandawire 2005, 1):

The conference was both a celebration of an institution that has played a vital role in the sustenance and promotion of intellectual activities in Africa and also an occasion for somber reflection, for looking back and for self-re-examination. It was an occasion for drawing up a new road map for tomorrow. It was a meeting of the old and the young, covering four “generations” of African intellectuals. The inter-generational encounter suggested that the torch was being passed, dimmed perhaps but definitely not extinguished by the travails and tribulations the African intellectual enterprise has lived through during the last half-century.

Having informed us that intellectual work is “quintessentially the labour of the mind and soul”, Thandika Mkandawire goes on to say that “[n]ot surprisingly intellectuals have played a major role in shaping passions, ideologies and societal visions”, and that the “relationship between African intellectuals and pan-Africanism and nationalism has been both a symbiotic and a fraught one” (2005, 1): “Few movements have stirred the minds of African intellectuals as much as pan-Africanism. In their turn, intellectuals have played an important role in shaping this pan-African concept, by reconstructing the past, interpreting the present and mapping out visions of the future” (1–2).

Those invited were expected not only to provide papers that would be presented to the university’s community—both academics and students—but also to present papers of such a quality that they could be published in a peer-reviewed academic journal. They did, and the result is this special edition dedicated to the presentations. Prof. Zungu, the coordinator of the entire AIP, asked me to be the coordinator of the AIP on behalf of the CGS. At the same time, she asked me to consider, as the editor of *IJARS*, publishing the papers in our journal. I accepted both requests.

The mission was urgent, and Prof. Zungu pointed out that Prof. Makhanya wanted us to deliver “yesterday” already. My task was to select and invite the speakers, and Prof. Zungu’s task was to handle the logistics—getting Prof. Makhanya’s approval of the speakers and arranging their flights, accommodation, and everything else. We wanted the best of the best among Africa’s intellectual daughters and sons. To a great extent we succeeded, but in some instances, we failed. Below, we list the names of those who came, and we explain how and why they were selected. They are listed in the order in which they were invited.

Prof. Molefi Kete Asante

Prof Asante is currently professor and chair of the Department of Africology and African-American Studies at Temple University, and president of the Molefi Kete Asante Institute for Afrocentric Studies. Both his university and institute are based in Philadelphia, in the United States of America (USA). Prof. Asante is also the founding editor of *Journal of Black Studies (JBS)*. At the time of our invitation, he had 83 books to his name.

Having been involved in the struggles, in the USA, for the recognition of Black Studies and Afrocentric education, we wanted Prof. Asante to share his experiences and insights, especially in the light of calls for decolonised and Afrocentric education by student movements in South Africa. A very short summary of his reflections is given, below, in this editorial, and his full article is published in this edition.

Prof. Nkiru Uwechia Nzegwu

Prof. Nzegwu is a professor of Africana Studies and Philosophy at Binghamton University, State University of New York, in the USA. In her book *Family Matters: Feminist Concepts in African Philosophy of Culture* (2006), Prof. Nzegwu argues that, contrary to the popularised view that Africa is historically and culturally the mother of patriarchy, the “problem of gender subordination in Africa over the last sixty years or so can be traced to European colonial policies and African men’s view and construction of the family”. Because patriarchal African men’s construction of the family was not challenged, it became dominant and gained legitimacy, thus lending support to the “characterization of African societies and African families as historically oppressive to women”. The concession by scholars to the claim that “women in African societies are culturally subordinate to men” makes it difficult to uphold a human rights charter that “simultaneously offers equality to women and safeguards the integrity of cultural traditions” (Nzegwu 2006, 2). In her scholarship, Prof. Nzegwu invokes African indigenous concepts in the Igbo language to demonstrate the recognition of women’s prominence and significance in African traditional culture/s. She shares her insights in her paper, which is published in this edition and summarised below in this editorial.

Dr Reuel Jethro Khoza

Dr Khoza is a philosopher and the author of a number of books. He is a firm believer in the value of Ubuntu philosophy as a viable instrument in the quest for re-humanising our dehumanised world. In fact, in his book *Attuned Leadership: African Humanism as Compass*, which “deals with the role of African values and philosophy in the direction of our affairs”, Dr Khoza points out that he sees Ubuntu philosophy “as Africa’s campus for governance [...] the moral centre upon which legitimate authority rests” (2011, vii, viii). This, Dr Khoza believes, can be achieved through the African Renaissance, which “can be realised only through ethical leadership” (vii). But, Dr Khoza argues, for the African Renaissance to succeed, there must be, on the part of African people, (a) a “full, unconditional admission and acceptance that there is a problem”, (b) “a clear understanding of the problem and its causes”, (c) “a desire to be rid of the problem”, and (d) “an unwavering will to do something about the problem” (1999, 280).

At the time of writing the paper concerned, in 1998, Dr Khoza saw a number of challenges that had the potential to seriously undermine the success of the African Renaissance. It was, at the time, “a vision that has not yet found expression in a manner accessible and practical to the layperson”. As a result of the inaccessibility of the African Renaissance to the African masses, they “understand the vision as an intellectual preoccupation of the political, economic and academic elite”, a further consequence being that the African Renaissance “has come to mean anything and signify nothing to those lives it is meant to transform”. Not helpful “were those in the media and those generally derisive of Africa”, for whom the African Renaissance became a “caricature, a rod to lash those leaders who have been brave enough to articulate and promote this vision”, pronouncing the African Renaissance “a failure as

they gleefully watch Africa continue to struggle with generations-old problems”. If the African Renaissance were to be meaningful to the African masses, its advocates, Dr Khoza argued, had to appreciate the need to take a “micro-focused approach”. This approach entailed getting “every individual [to understand] that the vision is about individual and institutional excellence”, as opposed to the then existing perception that the African Renaissance was “the concern of continental leadership and governmental institutions with little relevance to individual effort and application in our personal, occupational and civic responsibilities” (Khoza 1999, 286).

We were eager to include Dr Khoza because of his idea that the African Renaissance project must make sense to and serve the interests of the *African masses*, and he shared with us his ideas of how we can do this practically. In his paper, “Revisiting the African Renaissance and Africa’s Global Competitiveness Imperative”, presented at Unisa, Dr Khoza reiterated these concerns and also expanded on them. Regrettably, we do not have his paper in this edition. Due to constraints he had to contend with, he was not able to rework it for the journal to be submitted for peer reviewing.

Prof. Malegapuru William Makgoba

Prof. Makgoba is a former deputy vice-chancellor of the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits University) and a former vice-chancellor of the University of KwaZulu-Natal. Both universities are based in South Africa. He is the author of *Mokoko—The Makgoba Affair: A Reflection on Transformation* (1997) and the editor of *The African Renaissance: The New Struggle* (1999). In the first book, Makgoba reflects on what a former president of South Africa, Thabo Mbeki, calls “an extraordinary battle about the future of one of the premier academic institutions in the country, the University of the Witwatersrand”, in which Makgoba “was one of the major combatants in this fascinating conflict” (Mbeki 1997, vii). In his article, briefly summarised below and published in this edition, Makgoba reflects on this “fascinating conflict” and on much more.

Prof. Makgoba was of interest to us for two reasons. First, we were interested in his reflection on how his commitment to the Africanisation of academic institutions and education in South Africa drew vicious reactions and hostility from many white liberals in South Africa, both inside and outside of Wits University. The conflict ultimately saw him stepping down from his position as deputy vice-chancellor at Wits University. It is worth noting that Prof. Makgoba made this call in 1995, 20 years before the #RhodesMustFall movement rose up in 2015 and demanded a decolonised and Afrocentric education in South Africa.

The second reason is related to his commitment to the Africanisation of education. On September 28 and 29, 1998, Prof. Makgoba was a co-convener, together with Thaninga Shope and Thami Mazwai, of the African Renaissance Conference held in Johannesburg. The main objectives of the African Renaissance Conference, as pointed out by Makgoba, Shope, and Mazwai, “were to define who we are [as Africans] and

where we are going in the global community”. While the foregoing was important, the main issue that was of greater significance was Makgoba and his colleagues’ observation that the conference sought to “formulate practical strategies and solutions for future action that would benefit the African masses” (Makgoba, Shope, and Mazwai 1999, i). Here were elite African scholars and intellectuals declaring an unequivocal commitment to finding *practical solutions* for the *African masses*! When we invited Prof. Makgoba to Unisa in 2019, it had been 21 years since this declaration was made. How *practical* had this *declaration* turned out to be? He accepted our invitation and honoured his commitment to deliver a paper for peer reviewing.

Prof. Thoko Mayekiso

Prof Mayekiso, a clinical psychologist, is the founding vice-chancellor and principal of the University of Mpumalanga (UMP). We were keen to hear from her what her university meant by committing itself to developing as an “African university providing leadership in knowledge creation and dissemination”. We were also interested in hearing not only what it meant to be the first vice-chancellor of the UMP, but what this meant for her as a woman in a so-called “man’s world”. She honoured our invitation and delivered her paper, “Principled Leadership in Higher Education: What Does It Entail?” Unfortunately, we did not receive her paper for this issue.

Advocate Mojanku Gumbi

Advocate Gumbi has had the honour to serve, firstly, as advisor to Thabo Mbeki when he was deputy president of South Africa, between 1994 and 1999, and secondly, during Mbeki’s term as president of South Africa, between 1999 and 2008, as his special advisor. During this period, Advocate Gumbi spearheaded South Africa’s economic diplomacy, ensuring a global presence for South African companies as well as peace-making initiatives in countries and regions such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Côte d’Ivoire, Sudan, Lesotho, Somalia, the Balkans, and the Middle East.

We felt that, with such a wealth of experience, Advocate Gumbi was uniquely positioned to share with us her perspective on the challenges facing Africa. She accepted our invitation and delivered her paper, “Africa and Her Perennial, Elusive Quest for Peace: A Reflection on Possible Causes and Solutions”. Her paper, which is summarised below, is published in this special issue of *IJARS*.

Prof. Phumla Gqola

Prof. Gqola is a feminist and scholar of literature and, at the time of her address at Unisa, she was a dean of research at the University of Fort Hare. She has since moved to the Nelson Mandela University (NMU). A prolific scholar, she has three books to her name: *What Is Slavery to Me? Postcolonial/Slave Memory in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (2010), *A Renegade Called Simphiwe* (2013), and *Rape: A South African Nightmare* (2015). She honoured our invitation and delivered her paper, “Hypervisibility,

Shrinking Freedoms, and Cultures of Fear in Contemporary African Contexts”. Unfortunately, we did not get her paper for this special edition.

Prof. Bhekithemba Mngomezulu

Prof. Mngomezulu is a professor of political science and a deputy dean of research at UWC. In his career he has served as a senior researcher/policy advisor at the Department of International Relations and Cooperation (DIRCO) in South Africa. Among his books published are *Politics and Higher Education in East Africa: From the 1920s to 1970* (2012) and *The President for Life Pandemic in Africa: Kenya, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Zambia and Malawi* (2013). Prof. Mngomezulu is also a political analyst whose views are often featured on television and radio programmes. His presentation, “Impediments to an Active African Intelligentsia in Championing the Africanisation Agenda”, is published in this edition and summarised below.

Those Who Were Unable to Attend: bell hooks and Prof. Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela

While we succeeded in getting the abovementioned esteemed scholars to address us at Unisa, we also failed in getting certain others to come. And, tragically, both scholars in question are female African scholars, which dealt a blow to our passionate commitment at *IJARS* to publish and promote female African scholarship. We invited the African-American feminist bell hooks, but received a note that she was no longer accepting invitations from abroad. Sad as we were, we understood and accepted this. We also invited Prof. Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela. She politely declined our requests due to commitments already made prior to our invitation. Even though we did not have the benefit of our invitations being accepted by these African sisters, we find it necessary to give an indication of why their participation was necessary, and how it would have enriched the AIP conversations. We begin with hooks.

hooks is a leading intellectual in black feminism, a philosopher, and a prolific writer of articles and books. Among her celebrated books are *Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism* (1982), *Sisters of the Yam: Black Women and Self-Recovery* (2014), and *Reel to Real: Race, Sex and Class at the Movies* (1996).

hooks's piece “Black Women: Shaping Feminist Theory” (1998) gives a fascinating narrative of her encounter with feminism and of how, as a black woman, she grappled with the contradictions within the feminist movement and the theory of feminism, which are dominated by white feminists. hooks's awareness of feminist struggles was stimulated by her own social circumstances of growing up in a Southern, black, “father-dominated” working-class household where she experienced varying degrees of “patriarchal tyranny”, which made her angry. Her anger led her to “question the politics of male dominance” and enabled her to “resist sexist socialization”. This understanding of “patriarchal politics”, which she had developed by the age of 13, created in her

“expectations of the feminist movement that were quite different from those of young, middle class white women” (hooks 1998, 343).

This observation—about her own political consciousness—is important for a number of reasons pointed out by hooks herself. The first is that, as hooks notes, “[f]requently, white feminists act as if black women did not know sexist oppression existed until they [white feminists] voiced feminist sentiment”. This false assumption on the part of white feminists leads them to “believe they are providing black women with ‘the’ analysis and ‘the’ program for liberation”. White feminists “do not understand, cannot even imagine, that black women, as well as other groups of women who live daily in oppressive situations, often acquire an awareness of patriarchal politics from their lived experience, just as they develop strategies of resistance (even though they may not resist on a sustained or organized basis)”. White feminists confused black women’s non-knowledge of the term “feminism”, and the fact that black women had no organised feminist movement, with ignorance of sexist oppression and passivity regarding the evil practice. As a result of this false notion on the part of white feminists, when hooks participated in feminist groups, she found that “white women adopted a condescending attitude” towards her and other “non-white participants”. This condescension was one of “the means they [white feminists] employed to remind us that the women’s movement was ‘theirs’—that we were able to participate because they allowed it [...] They did not see us as equals. They did not treat us as equals.” These experiences led hooks to observe that “[a]ttempts by white feminists to silence black women are rarely written about” (1998, 343).

In 1981, hooks enrolled in a graduate class on feminist theory, where they were given a course reading list that had “writings by white women and men, one black man, but no material by or about black, Native American Indian, Hispanic, or Asian women”. When hooks had the courage to point out this anomaly, “white women directed an anger and hostility at [her] that was so intense” she found it hard to attend the class. When hooks pointed out that the purpose of the white women’s anger was to “create an atmosphere in which it would be psychologically unbearable” for her to speak, hooks was told that she was the one who was angry, not them (hooks 1998, 344). The absence of reading material about black women was an act of colonial and Eurocentric education. It centred the thoughts and the experience of Europeans and their descendants, and marginalised the thoughts and experiences of the rest of the members of humankind. In fact, a friend told me once that while she was studying at a South African institution of higher learning, hooks’s books were banned—students were told never to cite her because “she is not an academic”.

As a student, and later a scholar, hooks made it her business to challenge the marginalisation of black women’s experiences, pointing out that “white women who dominate feminist discourse today rarely question whether or not their perspective on women’s reality is true to the lived experiences of women as a collective group”. hooks’s reading of feminist literature led her to observe that “[w]hite women who

dominate feminist discourse, who for the most part make and articulate feminist theory, have little or no understanding of white supremacy as a racial politic, of the psychological impact of class, of their political status within a racist, sexist capitalist class” (1998, 339). For the theory of feminism to have meaning, and for the feminist movement to be effective, hooks argues that these must move beyond addressing the concerns of a privileged few, to also confront the “pressing political concerns of masses of women [...] Masses of women were concerned about economic survival, ethnic and real discrimination” (338–39). hooks argues strongly that feminism does not have the same meaning for all women, with particular reference to the rich and the poor: “Women who were not opposed to patriarchy, capitalism, classism, or racism labeled themselves ‘feminist.’ Their expectations were varied. Privileged women wanted social equality with men of their class; some women wanted equal pay for equal work; others wanted an alternative lifestyle. Many of these legitimate concerns were easily coopted by the ruling capitalist patriarchy” (341).

The co-option of a few privileged women does not serve what hooks has committed herself to, as a black feminist—that is, the “pressing political concerns of masses of women” (338). This is because, as Antoinette Fouque argues, “Bourgeois order, capitalism, phallogentrism, are ready to integrate as many feminists as will be necessary. Since these women are becoming men, in the end it will only mean a few more men. The difference between the sexes is not whether one does or doesn’t have a penis, it is whether or not one is an integral part of a phallic masculine economy” (quoted in hooks 1998, 341). Further, clearly distinguishing what feminism is and what it is not, what it means and does not mean to her, hooks (341) cites Carol Ehrlich, who points out that

[w]omen need to know (and are increasingly prevented from finding out) that feminism is *not* about dressing for success, or becoming a corporate executive, or gaining elective office; it is *not* being able to share a two career marriage and take skiing vacations and spend huge amounts of time with your husband and two lovely children because you have a domestic worker who makes all this possible for you, but who hasn’t time or money to do it for herself; it is *not* opening a Women’s Bank, or spending a weekend in an expensive workshop that guarantees to teach you how to become assertive (but not aggressive).

While hooks recognises and acknowledges that, on the one hand, white women may be victims of sexism, she points out that, on the other hand, “racism enables them to act as exploiters and oppressors of black people” (1998, 345).

In pointing to the reality of some having the status of oppressed and oppressors at the same time, hooks draws our attention to black males, whose “sexism has undermined struggles to eradicate racism just as white female racism undermines feminist struggle”. hooks warns that as long as white women and black men define liberation as “gaining social equality with ruling class white men, they have a vested interest in the continued exploitation and oppression of others” (1998, 345). An examination of hooks’s writings reveals that it is not true, as some black males have alleged, that black feminism

promotes hatred for black men. For the record, even if it were true, such hatred would be understandable, taking into consideration the atrocities black males have inflicted on the bodies and spirits of black women. Even in spite of this betrayal, black women continue to be generous to black men, especially to those who have led black liberation movements, both in Africa and in the diaspora.

It is noteworthy that, as hooks points out, although the focus of black feminism is on black females—and rightly so—“our struggle for liberation has significance only if it takes place within a feminist movement that has as its fundamental goal the liberation of all people” (1982, 13). In the black feminist movement, the liberation of “all people” means the liberation of black men, white women, and white men, too. In the continuing struggle for the liberation of humankind, conceptualisation must have clarity. The situation which must change is, as hooks correctly points out, that “[w]hen black people are talked about the focus tends to be on black *men*; and when women are talked about the focus tends to be on *white* women” (1982, 7). The erasure of black women in life generally, and in the liberation struggle in particular, has to be drawn into sharp focus because, as hooks observes, “[s]ince the culture we live in continues to equate blackness with maleness, black awareness of the extent to which our survival depends on mutual partnership between women and men is undermined. In renewed black liberation struggle, we recognize the position of black men and women, the tremendous role black women played in every freedom struggle” (hooks and West 1998, 474). This recognition of black women’s significant role in both public and private spaces must begin, first and foremost, as hooks points out, in our homes (hooks and West 1998, 478):

On a fundamental level, when we talk about home, we must speak about the need to transform the African-American home, so that there, in that domestic space we can experience the renewal of the political commitment to the black liberation struggle. So that there in that domestic space we learn to serve and honor one another. If we look again at the civil rights, at the black power movement, folks organized so much in homes. They were the places where folks got together to educate themselves for critical consciousness [...] As we talk about black power in the twenty-first century, about political partnership between black women and men, we must talk about transforming our notions of how and why we bond.

In outlining our attraction to Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela, it is appropriate to make reference to Aimé Césaire’s book *Discourse on Colonialism*, first published in 1955. In this book, Césaire declares that “colonization is based on psychology” ([1955] 2000, 59). The point that Césaire made then, and which came to be appreciated by many revolutionaries later, was that colonialists realised that for the colonial project to be successful, physical brutal force alone was unsustainable in maintaining their project for a long period. Physical force had to be used to achieve the psychological defeat of the oppressed, so that the oppressed would see the oppressor as a powerful and invincible enemy against whom the oppressed could do nothing, and so that, therefore, the oppressed would perceive the act of trying to liberate themselves as futile. The psychological defeat of the oppressed was aimed at instilling in the minds of the

colonised the view that the coloniser was superior to the colonised in every respect imaginable.

If, as Césaire noted, “colonization is based on psychology”, it follows that the project of decolonisation must be based on psychology! The truth, though, is that this important lesson has not been fully recognised by many, both during and after the liberation struggle that secured Africans the right to vote—and little, if anything, more than that. We identified Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela as a suitable person to come and share her insights with us with reference to the psychological condition of African people who continue to suffer from the psychological scars inflicted by the apartheid regime’s colonialism.

Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela is the author of *A Human Being Died That Night* (2013), a fascinating account of a black woman clinical psychologist’s penetration into the mind of Eugene de Kock, an Afrikaner “self-confessed [...] ruthless and highly skilled murderer of countless opponents of apartheid” (Sachs 2013, iii). The Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) in South Africa had assigned Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela the task of visiting De Kock in Pretoria Central Prison, where he was serving his sentence for his “horrendous deeds”, in the TRC’s quest to seek to “understand something of the mind of such a wrathful and cruel person” (Sachs 2013, iii). Gobodo-Madikizela gives us insight into not only De Kock’s mind, but also the leadership which created the basis and the environment in which De Kock committed his crimes.

Specifically, Gobodo-Madikizela recalls an encounter she had with F. W. de Klerk, the last apartheid president, at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government in 2001, where De Klerk gave an address. When De Klerk was asked whether or not De Kock was justified in attributing his acts to the apartheid government, which De Klerk had led, De Klerk told his audience that De Kock was an overzealous operative who committed acts that were beyond legality and beyond the authorisation of the apartheid government; he therefore did not even deserve to apply for amnesty (Gobodo-Madikizela 2013, 60). Gobodo-Madikizela disagrees. She argues that the “sophistication and subtlety with which apartheid drew its followers to support its mission threw the idea of choice into chaos”. This is because, Gobodo-Madikizela further argues, “apartheid turned religion on its head, and through various church-based structures in the military, the police, the academia, and the church itself, provided a theological vocabulary to disguise the naked evil of what was being done. Chaplains who prayed that the ‘enemy’ be defeated encouraged de Kock and many like him as forcefully as any covert coaching” (2013, 59). Instead of acknowledging this, and taking responsibility for what De Kock became, the leadership of the apartheid government denounced De Kock and disassociated themselves from his misdeeds. An added irony to the tragic story of De Kock is that when he was arrested by the post-apartheid government, “the same Afrikaner judges, Afrikaner prosecutor, and Afrikaner state counsel—Anton Ackerman, the state attorney, set the scene for de Kock’s trial by isolating him from the system that he had served”. Ackerman declared De Kock’s trial

as “not a political trial” (Gobodo-Madikizela 2013, 59). De Kock thus became a criminal, not a political agent. Without either absolving or defending De Kock from and for the crimes he committed against humanity, Gobodo-Madikizela points out that the manner in which the court tried him and handled his case was a failure of justice. Gobodo-Madikizela (2013, 60–61) points out that one of the

problems with trying individuals who have committed crimes under the explicit or implicit orders of their governments is that the law focuses strictly on the question of individual responsibility. All law does and must focus on individual responsibility because it is not possible to hold some “thing” responsible. It is the individual who must take the stand and be accused. But where the law fails in trying apartheid’s—and so many other—human rights violations is that it focusses too heavily on particular individual crimes. The prosecutor in de Kock’s case paid little or no attention to the question of structural and systematic crimes—the surrounding ideological/political philosophy [...] an administrative executive system that protected and directed de Kock to commit the crimes for which he is now serving two life sentences. That the state attorney intended to frame de Kock’s deeds as purely individual criminal acts was clear from his opening remarks.

In this regard, the psychologist in Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela, in trying to make sense of De Kock’s misdeeds, brings to the attention of philosophers and lawyers how their thoughts and practices contribute to making people the monsters that they become. Rightly so, because it is a historical fact that philosophers have, through their philosophies, contributed in no small measure to dehumanising fellow humans through justifying slavery, colonialism, and patriarchy. Legal minds created laws that justified racism and criminal acts of dispossessing some people of their lands. Unequivocally taking a pro-justice stance, Gobodo-Madikizela points out that “[t]rue transformation—and the healing of victims—will come about only if the issues of economic justice and the myriad problems that post-apartheid South Africa faces are addressed”. True transformation, of necessity, requires an application of democracy. Gobodo-Madikizela, as shown above, does not reduce democracy to a ritual of elections. She points out that “democracy—and democratization—necessarily involves settling differences through the politics of contestation and compromise among equals, which is different from the goal of simply preserving law and order or of making sure that people remain or are put where they belong”. This observation by Gobodo-Madikizela demonstrates her appreciation that the law can be used, on the one hand, to advantage the privileged rich, and, on the other hand, to the disadvantage of the underprivileged poor. The law can be used to “protect the privileged, and their property, against encroachments”, while democracy, in the true sense of the word, “seeks to create new relationships and repair old ones” (2013, 126). If Prof. Gobodo-Madikizela had made it to our AIP sessions, with such insights she would have certainly enriched our discourse.

Remembering Some Significant Events and People

The year 2020 is very important in the calendar of Pan-Africanism and the African Renaissance, for a number of reasons. It marks the 120th anniversary of the Pan-African Conference held in London, 1900, from July 23 to 25. This year also marks the 80th anniversary of the departure of one of the most celebrated Pan-Africanists, Marcus Garvey, to the spiritual world of the Ancestors, in 1940. While on the one hand our African Ancestors beckoned one of their best sons, Garvey, to the world yonder, in the same year, 1940, they gifted the African continent one of the best daughters Africa has had: the bright, black, and beautiful Wangari Maathai. Maathai was the first African woman in East and Central Africa to gain a PhD, the first woman to head the Department of Veterinary Sciences at the University of Nairobi in Kenya, and the first African woman to be awarded the Nobel Peace Prize (Musila 2020, 3). Had she been physically still with us, Maathai would be celebrating her 80th birthday in this year, 2020. Before she moved on to the world of the Ancestors, Maathai left us, among her writings, with the following three celebrated books: *The Green Belt Movement: Sharing the Approach and Experience* (2003), *Unbowed: One Woman's Story* (an autobiography) (2008), and *The Challenge for Africa: A New Vision* (2009). Maathai deserves to be celebrated not only because of the achievements mentioned above, but also because of her determination to use “her higher education [to] work hard, help the poor, and watch out for the weak and vulnerable” (Maathai 2008, 95). She lived up to her commitment and paid a high price for it. This year also marks the 40th anniversary of the departure to the world of the Ancestors of one of Africa's historians of note, Walter Rodney, whose body was blown up in a car bomb on June 13, 1980. Rodney wrote a number of texts, but is celebrated mostly for his book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* ([1972] 2018). We reflect, briefly, on these historical African figures and events below.

The Pan-African Conference of 1900

The 1900 Pan-African Conference is celebrated as the “world's first Pan-African Conference” (Sherwood 2011, xiii; see also 81–97). Henry Sylvester Williams from Trinidad is celebrated as the prime mover behind this initiative, which was held in London (xiii). A less well-known fact—which should, however, be celebrated—is that the organisation that hosted the Pan-African Conference, the African Association (AA), was the brainchild of an African woman by the name of Alice Kinloch (Adi 2018, 20; Sherwood 2011, xiii, 41, 58). This historical fact is very important because often, when the history of Pan-Africanism is celebrated, little attention is paid to the immense contribution made by African women in this regard. Unfairly, greater attention and credit are given to males who contributed to the development and growth of the Pan-Africanist movement. It can be said, though, to the credit of the pioneers of the Pan-Africanist movement, that they made great efforts to ensure that African women's leadership was appreciated and centred. History has recorded that Henry Sylvester Williams made a point of declaring that “our womanhood must be represented also”. That was because, as Williams further pointed out, they “deserve a prominent position in the Conference and it must be given to them” (quoted in Sherwood 2011, 69). This

declaration was no mere lip service. On the first day of the Pan-African Conference, two African-American women, Anna Jones and Anna J. Cooper, delivered addresses (Sherwood 2011, 82–83).

A reading of the history of Pan-Africanism suggests that there has been inconsistency regarding the question of gender in the movement of Pan-Africanism. At the celebrated 1945 Pan-African Congress held in Manchester, Britain, “Amy Ashwood Garvey reminded the predominantly male delegates that ‘for some reason very little has been said about the black woman’, who ‘has been shunted into the social background to be a child bearer’” (quoted in Adi 2018, 126). Making reference to a gathering in 1968 known as the “Congress of Black Writers”, where prominent male Pan-Africanists such as C. L. R. James, Stokely Carmichael (later known as Kwame Toure), and Walter Rodney spoke, Hakim Adi significantly observes that “[w]omen were certainly involved in organizing the event but were conspicuously absent from the list of main speakers” (2018, 168). It appears, though, that Ashwood Garvey’s objection at the 1945 Manchester Pan-African Congress was taken seriously, because at a subsequent Pan-African meeting, the 6th Pan-African Congress, held in Tanzania in 1974, “[t]here were also important resolutions on the oppression of black women” (184). Among the male Pan-Africanists whose movement, the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA), is recorded as having taken women and their concerns seriously, is Marcus Garvey.

Marcus Garvey

Born in 1887 in Jamaica, Garvey led the formation of the UNIA in 1914 (Adi 2018, 28). Garvey’s organisation is celebrated as the “largest political movement of Africans during the twentieth century, embracing not just a few intellectuals but the masses both on the African continent and throughout the diaspora” (30). As if the foregoing statement is not clear enough, Adi emphasises that the UNIA “was the largest Pan-African organization in history” (31). Cognisant of the power and the effectiveness of the media in spreading ideas far and wide, in 1918 Garvey’s UNIA launched its own newspaper, *Negro World*, which was read not only in Jamaica but also on the African continent and across the world by the African diaspora (30). Like Kinloch’s AA, Garvey’s UNIA appreciated and supported the significance of African women’s political activism: “It could be argued that women were central to the development of the UNIA and formed its ‘backbone’ from the time of the movement’s founding” (33).

An examination of how Garvey put Pan-Africanism into practice through the UNIA reveals that he was aware of the need to decolonise and re-Africanise education. In 1937, at the UNIA conference held in Canada, “Garvey instituted summer schools in African Philosophy to train UNIA leaders [...] He also established a correspondence course in Black Studies” (Sherwood 2003a, 80). This African philosophy and leadership training benefited participants from west and east Africa, South Africa, and Canada (80). In this regard, Garvey’s initiatives and intervention went beyond the condemnation

of what he recognised very well as the “inculcation of White superiority by the education system” (78).

So influential was Garvey in advancing African philosophy that the first prime minister of independent Ghana, Kwame Nkrumah, an acclaimed Pan-Africanist heavyweight in his own right, wrote in his book *Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah* that “of all the literature that I studied, the book that did more than any other to fire my enthusiasm was *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey* published in 1923” (1971, 45). It must be said that had it not been for the foresight and leadership of an African woman, Amy Jacques-Garvey, who was the wife of Marcus Garvey, but more importantly, who edited the book, this piece of literature might never have seen the sun, and Nkrumah might never have laid eyes on the book that fired his imagination. In her preface to *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*, Jacques-Garvey ([1923] 2017, xix) notes that she decided to compile her husband’s speeches and articles

in order to give to the public an opportunity of studying and forming an opinion of him; not from inflated and misleading newspaper and magazine articles, but from expressions of thoughts enunciated by him in defense of his oppressed and struggling race; so that by his own words he may be judged, and Negroes the world over may be informed and inspired, for truth, brought to light, forces conviction, and a state of conviction inspires action.

Jacques-Garvey had a full appreciation of the lengths to which her husbands’ enemies could go in vilifying him. Neither Garvey’s newspapers nor the publication of the collections of his writings spared him from attacks: “In his last years he slid into isolation, suffering the final indignity of reading his own obituaries a month before his own death on June 10, 1940” (Jacques-Garvey [1923] 2017, xvi).

We now turn to Maathai.

Wangari Maathai

Born on April 1, 1940, in a small village of Ihithe, in Kenya, on a day marked as April Fool’s Day by some, Wangari Maathai was no fool (Maathai 2008, 3). To the contrary, she was (and still is) one of Africa’s brightest intellectuals and philosophers. Her brightness was to the benefit of not only Africa, but also the rest of humankind; hence, she was the recipient of a Nobel Prize.

Maathai appreciated and recognised what has yet to be appreciated and recognised by many political leaders, namely that African culture should be key and central in African development. Maathai pointed out that “THE IMPORTANCE of Africans’ cultural heritage to their sense of who they are still isn’t recognized sufficiently by them or others”. She further noted that “[c]ulture is the means by which a people expresses itself, through language, traditional wisdom, politics, religion, architecture, music, tools, greetings, symbols, festivals, ethics, values, and collective identity”. Culture, Maathai

further observed, “enhances their ability to guide themselves, make their own decisions, and protect their interests [...] without culture, a community loses self-awareness and guidance, and grows weak and vulnerable” (2009, 160).

To be sure, Maathai noted that “culture is a double-edged sword that can be used as a weapon to strike a blow for empowerment or to threaten those who would assert their own self-expression and self-identity”. Maathai’s observation was informed by her realisation that “[i]n many communities in Africa and other regions, women are discriminated against, exploited, and controlled through prevailing cultures, which demand that they act a certain way” (2009, 164). With reference to women being expected to act in a “certain way”, Maathai came to realise that a patriarchal interpretation of African culture dictated that “a good African woman” should be submissive and live to fulfil the interests of her husband (2008, 110). As if this was not bad enough, women were expected to be “carriers and promoters of culture” (111)—a distorted culture at that! In the Kenyan society in which she lived, acting in a “certain way” was not an expectation reserved for women; it applied to men, too. Society “placed constant pressure on men to behave in certain ways. Even if their wives had more education or more achievements, they were expected to demonstrate that they were in control of their households and were not henpecked by and under control of their wives [...] People have ways of asking a man whether he is the one ‘wearing the pants at home,’ and having to prove that he is in charge can put a lot of pressure on a man” (140).

Maathai refused to conform to these “certain ways” and, consequently, rebelled. She wanted to think and act independently. That attitude cost her her marriage and earned her hostility from Kenya’s patriarchal men (Maathai 2008, 145, 157). She became an activist for women’s rights. For that she paid a heavy price, suffering physical and mental abuse at the hands of policemen and politicians as she led marches and protest actions (190, 214, 220). Maathai (214) describes her imprisonment conditions thus:

I was in jail again, confined to a holding cell at Lang’ata police station. For a day and a night I tried to sleep without any covers on the floor of a cell that was wet, freezing cold, filled with water and filth. I wondered whether the floor had been flooded deliberately. Unlike the first time I was imprisoned, I did not have a blanket and I was alone in the cell. I was also fifty-two years old, arthritic in both knees, and suffering from back pain. In that cold, wet cell my joints ached so much that I thought I would die [...] By the time of my court hearing, my legs had completely seized up. Crying from the pain and weak from hunger, I had to be carried by four strong policewomen into the courtroom.

In celebrating the power of traditional African culture in confronting the modern challenges faced by African women, Maathai (2008, 221) recalls an incident in which she was knocked unconscious by the police:

The mothers in the tent refused to be intimidated and they did not run. Instead, they did something brave: Several of them stripped, some of them completely naked, and showed the police their breasts. (I myself did not strip.) One of the most powerful of African

traditions concerns the relationship between a woman and a man who could be her son. Every woman old enough to be your mother is considered like your own mother and expects to be treated with considerable respect. As they bared their breasts, what the mothers were saying to the policemen in their anger and frustration as they were being beaten was “By showing you my nakedness, I curse you as I would my son for the way you are abusing me.”

We now turn to Rodney.

Walter Rodney

Walter Rodney, a Pan-Africanist and socialist, was born on March 23, 1942, in Guyana, and assassinated in a car bombing on June 13, 1980, when he was 38 years young (Sherwood 2003b, 163; Harding, Hill, and Strickland 2018, xv, xviii). As a Pan-Africanist and socialist, he was “deeply committed to the spiritual, political and economic liberation of Black peoples everywhere” (Sherwood 2003b, 163). His political consciousness was born in his teens, when he attended and distributed leaflets for his parents’ Peoples Political Party (PPP), a Marxist/socialist organisation (Harding, Hill, and Strickland 2018, xviii). Rodney’s political consciousness grew further when he joined a study group under the guidance of C. L. R. James, a Pan-Africanist and Marxist intellectual, in London, where Rodney was working on his doctorate in African history at the University of London’s School of Oriental and African Studies from 1963 to 1966 (ix). From 1966 to 1967, Rodney went to Tanzania, where he taught at the University College in Dar es Salaam (xx).

In his contribution to the debate on the role of the university in Tanzania, Rodney argued that in order to overcome the entrenched colonial education system, “a new, socialist ideological perspective should be introduced”. While in Tanzania, in an effort to reduce the “physical and psychological distance between the university and the people [...] Rodney began a practice he was to follow for the rest of his life. He gave history lectures to groups of students off campus, and to workers in both Dar and in the countryside”. Rodney’s academic approach was informed by at least two convictions. The first was that “[k]nowledge of early African history [...] would free and mobilise Black peoples”. The second was that “the black intellectual, the black academic must attach himself to the activity of the black masses” (Sherwood 2003b, 164).

In 1968, Rodney went to the University College of the West Indies, in Jamaica, with a plan to develop a major in African and Caribbean studies. In pursuit of the academic approach he had followed in Tanzania, Rodney “also gave open lectures on African history and was soon asked to give similar talks to off-campus groups, including the Rastafarians” (Sherwood 2003b, 164). Noticing the growth and development of political consciousness and activities in Jamaica, the Jamaican government identified Rodney as being responsible for such activism and expelled him from the country in 1968.

Subsequent to his expulsion from Jamaica, Rodney returned to the University College in Dar es Salaam, where he taught between the years 1969 and 1972. Rodney made contact and developed a relationship with similar-minded African-American scholars when he attended an annual gathering of the African Heritage Studies Association at Howard University in 1970 (Harding, Hill, and Strickland 2018, xxi). Impressed with Rodney's views on the role of Eurocentric and colonial education in promoting capitalism, the African-American scholars Vincent Harding, Robert Hill, and William Strickland (xx–xxi) of the Institute of the Black World (IBW), a centre for research, publication, and advocacy, invited Rodney to contribute to a book-length monograph, *Education and Black Struggle*. This was the period of the Black Studies movement in the USA (xxi). The time that Rodney spent with revolutionary African-American scholars, recalls Harding, Hill, and Strickland, helped to “crystallize much of our thinking about the role of black intellectuals in our own society, and the role that IBW might play in that development” (xxiv).

In 1974, Rodney was offered an appointment as professor and chair of history at the University of Guyana (xxiii). However, the offer was withdrawn even before he had time to assume his duties there, apparently due to pressure coming from the highest levels of the Guyanese government (xxiv). As Sherwood notes, Guyana's “Prime Minister Forbes Burnham ensured that Rodney would be refused employment at any level in the education system. Soon his wife [Patricia Henry] also lost her job and the family's (there were three children) economic situation became serious” (2003b, 166). The move against Rodney saw him participating in the Working People's Alliance (WPA) as his political base “in the relentless struggle to build a force that would bring about the revolutionary transformation of the Guyanese society” (Harding, Hill, and Strickland 2018, xxiii). Harding, Hill, and Strickland further note (xxvi):

Whenever Walter travelled abroad, especially as the government's repression increased, many friends urged him to leave Guyana and bring himself and his family to some place of relative safety. Walter's response to us generally had two parts. First was his sense of the responsibility he had to his comrades and the people of Guyana. He said that he was working among them to encourage them in a fearless struggle for the transformation of themselves and their society, and that he could not leave simply because he happened to have ready access to the means of escape.

Rodney's book *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* was derived from, in Rodney's own words, “a concern with the contemporary African situation”. The book delved into Africa's past “only because otherwise it would be impossible to understand how the present came into being and what the trends are for the future” ([1972] 2018, xiii). In a clear indication that Rodney did not regard himself as a neutral and detached scholar, he declared that the purpose of his book was “to try and reach Africans who wish to explore further the nature of their exploitation, rather than to try to satisfy ‘standards’ set by our oppressors and their spokesmen in the academic world” (xiv). His approach was not just to detail how Europe underdeveloped Africa, so that we can understand the past and the present, but also to point us to the future, making firm proposals about what

Africans would have to do in order to secure meaningful liberation. Unequivocally, Rodney pointed out that “African development is possible only on the basis of a radical break with the international capitalist system, which has been the principal agency of underdevelopment of Africa over the last five centuries” (xiii). Of great and particular significance for African scholars and intellectuals committed to genuine African emancipation is Rodney’s observation that the “phenomenon of neo-colonialism cries out for extensive investigation in order to formulate the strategy and tactics of African emancipation and development” (xiii).

Rodney’s commitment to Africa, his insight into the challenges faced by Africa, and his foresight regarding what needs to be done are captured in a significant and moving tribute to him by Angela Davis (2018), an African-American revolutionary scholar and activist intellectual in her own right. She notes that at the young age of 38, Rodney “had already accomplished what few scholars achieve during careers that extend considerably longer than his”. Such is the case for a number of reasons, which cannot all be listed here. Chief among these, though, is the fact that thanks to the publication of *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, “[t]he field of African history [will] never be the same”. Rodney is a “brilliant” example “of what it means to be a resolute intellectual who recognizes that the ultimate significance of knowledge is its capacity to transform our social worlds”. Rodney’s recognition and appreciation of the need to use scholarship, practically, in the service of changing for the good humankind’s condition, led Davis to state that “the term ‘scholar-activist’ acquires its most vigorous meaning when it is employed to capture Walter Rodney’s research in his determination to rid the planet of all of the outgrowths of colonialism and slavery” (2018, ix). Because Rodney “was such a meticulous scholar”, Davis further points out, “he did not ignore gender issues, even though he wrote without the benefit of the feminist vocabularies and frameworks of analysis that were later developed”. Rodney’s progressive and sensitive stance in terms of gender issues, captured in *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, was a welcome breath of fresh air, especially in the USA, where “Black activism [...] was influenced not only by cultural nationalist notions of intrinsic female inferiority, often fallaciously attributed to African cultural practices, but also by officially sponsored attributions of a matriarchal—in other words, defective—family structure to US Black communities” (xi).

About This Special Issue

Having celebrated Garvey, Maathai, and Rodney—all African intellectuals and scholars who immersed themselves in the struggles of the African masses, and paid high prices for such a standpoint—we hope that his unusually long editorial has made a contribution in locating the role that has been played, and continues to be necessary, by the AIP. Below we briefly summarise the inputs of our invitees to the AIP conversations at Unisa.

In his article, “Toward a Transformative African Curriculum for Higher Education”, Asante argues that for too long Africans have been subjected to a Pan European

Academy that has occupied intellectual space in institutions of learning—in both schools and universities. This Pan European Academy, Asante further argues, has pushed Africans, even in their own narratives of their history, to the margins. Taking this into consideration, Asante calls for an Afrocentric reorientation in all epistemes in order to bring about a transformation of curricula in African universities. Asante’s message is certainly not falling on deaf ears, because in his fascinating book, *The World Looks like This from Here: Thoughts on African Psychology*, Prof. Kopano Ratele observes that the “notion of centre, centredness, or what Molefi Kete Asante (1991) refers to as centrality, is key to my efforts to contribute towards African-centred psychology”. Ratele continues: “I have come to see how I have walked some of the same paths walked by other black scholars in African countries and in America, like Asante; I feel cheated, I am afraid, for not having known the notions of centrality and Afrocentricity when I was struggling with my voice, perspective and sense of alienation while teaching psychology, between October 1996 and April 2004” (2019, 68).

So deep and heavy was Ratele’s “sense of alienation” that he observes that a decade ago he “would not have advised anyone to study psychology” because “it is bad for your mental health, and were it to turn out that being a psychologist is good for your economic status, the likelihood is that you would be supporting the marginalisation of people who most need your psychological help”. Ratele has now reassessed his attitude towards psychology. Should he be approached by an aspirant African psychology student, he would first make sure the would-be student of psychology is conscious of the discipline’s history and contemporary complicity with “coloniality”, racism, apartheid, and Euroamerican-centrality. Ratele would make sure that the aspirant student “understands how many psychologists tend to remain silent in the face of psychological torture and oppression” (2019, xi). Having revisited his position of discouraging African students from studying psychology, Ratele would now urge the would-be student of psychology to study the subject “beyond its methods, interpretations, theories and conclusions” (xii). The need to look beyond psychology as it is offered currently is informed by Ratele’s (3) consciousness that

[w]e live in the age of American psychology—the psychology of the United States of America (US)—and to a lesser extent Western European psychology, taken as a universal psychology. And a consequence of the hegemony of American and Western European psychology is that psychology produced outside those regions of the world, and fully conscious of its situatedness in the places where it is practised, requires an adjective in order to be granted recognition.

The above being the case, Ratele would give the following advice to the would-be psychology student: “Most of all, don’t be satisfied with American psychology in Africa; search for Africa in psychological theories, build a cultural home for Africans in psychology, which is to say, build a psychology that centres Africa, a conscious, critical, reflective African psychology” (xii). Having observed that the “world of African psychology is a world in which Africa itself is off-centre, blurry, even pathologised”, Ratele calls for an “Africa-centred” psychology, referring to “positions

in psychology that centre Africa, that take Africa as a place from which one sees, from where the voice projects, and those that apprehend Africa as one among several sites of investigation or as a site of application” (14).

While accepting the point made by Ratele that many psychologists “tend to remain silent in the face of psychological torture and oppression” (xi), we are also in a position to say that there are many psychologists who have recognised injustice in their midst and consciously took a stand to fight against oppression. Amongst those is the “first African clinical psychologist” in South Africa, Chabani Manganyi, whose contribution to the struggle for justice was recognised by Rhodes University’s Department of Psychology. The department rewarded him by making him the “first recipient” of its award termed the “Psychology and Social Change Project”, in which “prominent members of the psychology community in South Africa are honoured for their contribution to social change in the country” (Manganyi 2016, xi). Manganyi “put psychology to work in the service of ordinary black South Africans who were oppressed and exploited by a racist and unyielding government”. His early work “tended to focus on the experience of being black in apartheid South Africa, and his highly influential 1973 publication *Being-Black-in-the-World* caught the attention of a nascent anti-apartheid and critical psychology readership”. His commitment to and activities in service of liberating “black subjectivity could well be taken up by the proponents of the de-colonisation project in contemporary South African affairs in institutions of higher learning” (Hayes 2016, ix).

In her article, “*Omumu*: Disassembling Subordination, Reasserting Endogenous Powers”, Nzegwu argues that colonial/neo-colonial/postcolonial patriarchy advances a myth of the “proper woman” to whip African females into line. Pointing out that a reconceptualisation of power is necessary, Nzegwu provides an examination of how *omumu* power disassembles female subjugation and clears the way for the re-emergence of the “proper African woman”.

In his article, “The African Renaissance Conference, Twenty-One Years Later: A Critical Reflection”, Makgoba reflects on the journey of the African Renaissance project, 21 years after the historical African Renaissance Conference, held in Johannesburg in 1998. Contrary to a view held and expressed by many, Makgoba points out that the African Renaissance project was not a “sentimental project, [...] but a political project that became the centre-piece of President Thabo Mbeki’s administration” during his presidency between the years 1999 and 2008. Makgoba points out a fact unknown to many, namely that so passionate was (and is) Mbeki about the African Renaissance project that at the conference in 1998, Mbeki, who was at the time South Africa’s deputy president, set up a temporary “office of the deputy president” at the conference’s venue in order to attend as much as possible and participate in the rest of the conference.

In her article, “Africa and Her Perennial, Elusive Quest for Peace: A Reflection on Possible Causes and Solutions”, Gumbi examines the African continent’s elusive quest

for peace. She does this in the context of the conflicts that have afflicted many African countries soon after they regained some form of independence from European colonialists. As she examines the cases of conflicts, she simultaneously attempts to point towards possible solutions.

In his article, “Impediments to an Active African Intelligentsia in Championing the Africanisation Agenda”, Mngomezulu argues that despite the re-emergence of the Africanisation debate following calls by students in South Africa for a decolonised education, with a few exceptions, the African intelligentsia seem to have been slow in championing this idea, and not as active as they should be. Mngomezulu therefore interrogates some of the impediments that the current intelligentsia have to contend with.

Over to you, Profs Zethu Cakata and Nokuthula Hlabangane—I pass on the spear and the shield, given to me by Prof. Shadrack Gutto, to you.

References

- Adi, H. 2018. *Pan-Africanism: A History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Césaire, A. (1955) 2000. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Translated by Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Davis, A. Y. 2018. “Foreword.” In *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, by W. Rodney, ix–xii. London: Verso.
- Gobodo-Madikizela, P. 2013. *A Human Being Died That Night: A Story of Forgiveness*. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Gqola, Pumla D. 2010. *What Is Slavery to Me? Postcolonial/Slave Memory in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18772/12010045072>.
- Gqola, Pumla D. 2013. *A Renegade Called Simphiwe*. Johannesburg: MF Books.
- Gqola, Pumla D. 2015. *Rape: A South African Nightmare*. Johannesburg: MF Books.
- Harding, V., R. Hill, and W. Strickland. 2018. “Introduction.” In *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, by W. Rodney, xv–xxxiii. London: Verso.
- Hayes, G. 2016. “Foreword.” In *Apartheid and the Making of a Black Psychologist*, by N. C. Manganyi, ix–x. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- hooks, b. 1982. *Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. London: Pluto Press.
- hooks, b. 1996. *Reel to Real: Race, Sex and Class at the Movies*. New York: Routledge.

- hooks, b. 1998. "Black Women: Shaping Feminist Theory." In *African Philosophy: An Anthology*, edited by E. C. Ede, 338–45. Oxford: Blackwell.
- hooks, b. 2014. *Sisters of the Yam: Black Women and Self-Recovery*. New York: Routledge.
- hooks, b., and C. West. 1998. "Black Women and Men: Partnership in the 1990s." In *African Philosophy: An Anthology*, edited by E. C. Ede, 472–78. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Jacques-Garvey, A., ed. (1923) 2017. *Philosophy and Opinions of Marcus Garvey*. Accra: Africanstories Press.
- Khoza, R. J. 1999. "The Institutional Structures That Should Underpin the African Renaissance." In *African Renaissance: The New Struggle*, edited by M. W. Makgoba, 279–88. Johannesburg: Mafube; Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Khoza, R. J. 2011. *Attuned Leadership: African Humanism as Compass*. Johannesburg: Penguin.
- Maathai, W. 2003. *The Green Belt Movement: Sharing the Approach and Experience*. Lagos: Lantern Books.
- Maathai, W. 2008. *Unbowed: One Woman's Story*. New York: Arrow Books.
- Maathai, W. 2009. *The Challenge for Africa: A New Vision*. London: William Heinemann.
- Makgoba, M. W. 1997. *Mokoko—The Makgoba Affair: A Reflection on Transformation*. Florida Hills: Vivlia.
- Makgoba, M. W., ed. 1999. *The African Renaissance: The New Struggle*. Johannesburg: Mafube; Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Makgoba, M. W., T. Shope, and T. Mazwai. 1999. "Introduction." In *The African Renaissance: The New Struggle*, edited by M. W. Makgoba, i–xii. Johannesburg: Mafube; Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Manganyi, N. C. 2016. *Apartheid and the Making of a Black Psychologist*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.
- Mbeki, T. 1997. "Foreword." In *Mokoko—The Makgoba Affair: A Reflection on Transformation*, by M. W. Makgoba, vii–xi. Florida Hills: Vivlia.
- Mkandawire, T. 2005. "Introduction." In *African Intellectuals: Rethinking Politics, Language, Gender and Development*, edited by T. Mkandawire, 1–9. Dakar: CODESRIA Books; London: Zed Books.
- Mngomezulu, Bhekithemba R. 2012. *Politics and Higher Education in East Africa: From the 1920s to 1970*. Stellenbosch: African Sun Media.
<https://doi.org/10.18820/9781920382247>.

- Mngomezulu, Bhekithemba R. 2013. *The President for Life Pandemic in Africa: Kenya, Zimbabwe, Nigeria, Zambia and Malawi*. London: Adonis and Abbey.
- Musila, G. A. 2020. "Introduction." In *Wangari Maathai's Registers of Freedom: Selected Writings of Wangari Maathai*, edited by G. A. Musila, 3–9. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Nkrumah, K. 1971. *Ghana: The Autobiography of Kwame Nkrumah*. New York: International Publishers.
- Nzegwu, N. U. 2006. *Family Matters: Feminist Concepts in African Philosophy of Culture*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Ratele, K. 2019. *The World Looks like This from Here: Thoughts on African Psychology*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press. <https://doi.org/10.18772/12019093900>.
- Rodney, W. (1972) 2018. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Verso.
- Sachs, A. 2013. "Foreword." In *A Human Being Died That Night: A Story of Forgiveness*, by P. Gobodo-Madikizela, iii–vi. Cape Town: David Philip.
- Sesanti, S. 2018a. "Editorial." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies* 13 (1): 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18186874.2018.1484546>.
- Sesanti, S. 2018b. "Editorial." *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies* 13 (2): 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/18186874.2018.1562606>.
- Sherwood, M. 2003a. "Marcus Garvey (1887–1940)." In *Pan-African History: Political Figures from Africa and the Diaspora Since 1787*, by H. Adi and M. Sherwood, 76–81. London: Routledge.
- Sherwood, M. 2003b. "Walter Rodney (1942–1980)." In *Pan-African History: Political Figures from Africa and the Diaspora Since 1787*, by H. Adi and M. Sherwood, 163–68. London: Routledge.
- Sherwood, M. 2011. *Origins of Pan-Africanism: Henry Sylvester Williams, Africa, and the African Diaspora*. New York: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203840375>.