This issue of the
Australasian Review of African Studies
is dedicated to

Cherry Gertzel OA (1928– 2015)

Former Editor of the Australasian Review of African Studies; Founding member and former President of the African Studies Association of Australasia and the Pacific

For your inspiration and dedication to African Studies.

THE AUSTRALASIAN REVIEW OF AFRICAN STUDIES
VOLUME 36 NUMBER 2 DECEMBER 2015

CONTENTS

Book Reviews

ARTICLES

Decoloniality in Africa:
A Continuing Search for a New World Order[1]

Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni
Archie Mafeje Research Institute
University of South Africa
sjndlovugatsheni@gmail.com

Abstract

Decoloniality is re-emerging within a context of crisis of imagination of liberation, freedom, development and the future. The crisis is mainly manifesting itself at the ideological, theoretical and epistemological levels. Ideologically speaking, socialism as a utopic register has failed, and capitalism is battling to emerge from a deep crisis. Epistemologically and theoretically speaking, dominant social science theories (structuralism, post-structuralism, postmodernism and postcolonialism) are experiencing an epistemic limit. In the Global South, decolonisation that was aimed at liberating colonised peoples and deimperialising imperial power, has only succeeded in pushing 'the physical empire' to the background but failed to deal effectively with 'the metaphysical empire.' This article is a historical reflection on genealogies and the ideological basis of decoloniality in Africa in general, and an assessment of its current manifestations in South Africa in particular—the 'little Europe' of Africa and the last outpost of empire in Africa. Broadly speaking, decoloniality as posited in this article is part of the continuing search for a new base by the excluded and subordinated subjectivities from which to launch themselves into a new world order that is humane and inclusive.

---

[1] Keynote Address Delivered at the *38th African Studies Association of Australasia and the Pacific International Conference: 21st Century Tensions and Transformation in Africa,* Deakin University, Melbourne City Centre, 28-30 October 2015.

Dismembered from the land, from labour, from power, and from memory, the result is destruction of the base from which people launch themselves into the world (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2009b, p. 28)

Introduction

How can a 'dismembered' people be 're-membered'? How can they re-launch themselves from the world of 'non-being' into the world of 'being'? How can they re-capture their lost land, power, history, being, language and knowledge? These are fundamental decolonial questions crying out for a response. At stake in decolonial thinking is the question of how to understand the impact of colonialism, not as an episode, but as a global process of dismemberment, subjectivisation, domination, control and exploitation. Decoloniality is also a search for better ways of theorising, explaining the meaning of liberation and freedom as well as taking the struggles forward in contemporary conjecture.

As one of the undying liberation discourses, decoloniality is concerned with how a 'dismembered' people should re-launch themselves into the world (that is, be 're-membered') (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2009a). It within a context of a history of enslavement and colonisation, underpinned by imperial discourses of denial of black people's history as well as questioning of the very humanity of black people. It is, therefore, part of knowledges produced in struggle. This means that decoloniality is ranged against imperialism, colonialism and coloniality as a constituent part of the modernist politics of dismemberment, alienation, exploitation and alterity.

At the centre of decoloniality is the idea of remaking the world such that the enslaved, colonised, and exploited peoples can regain their ontological density, voice, land, history, knowledge and power. Patrick Chabal (2012) captured very well the epistemological and theoretical crisis within which decolonial thinking and doing emerged when he boldly stated that "those instruments—that is, the social sciences we employ to explain what is happening domestically and overseas—are both historically and conceptually out of date" (p. viii). Chabal's argument resonates with that of Immanuel Wallerstein's (1999), who urged scholars and scientists to "unthink nineteenth-century social science, because many of its presumptions" are now "misleading and constrictive" and "serve today as a central intellectual barrier to useful analysis of the social world" (p. 4).

Ideologically speaking, socialism has collapsed and capitalism is battling to survive a devastating terminal crisis that has become known

as the global financial crisis. Slavoj Zizek (2010) identified "four horsemen of this coming apocalypse: the worldwide ecological crisis; imbalances within the economic system; the biogenetic revolution; and exploding social divisions and ruptures" (from the cover. Indeed capitalist, communist and nationalist "teleologies of development" and the long-standing post-enlightenment ideas of 'progress' have collapsed, if not perpetually struggling to regain lost appeal (McClintock, 1992, p. 93). But decoloniality is not part of what Anne McClintock (1992) critiques as the 'cacophonous' proliferation of the 'posts': postcolonialism, post-structuralism, post-modernism, post-Cold War, post-Apartheid, post-Soviet, post-Fordism, post-Marxism, post-national, post-historic and even post-contemporary (see also Rao, 2012).

Decoloniality attempts to make sense of what is actually happening, actually being faced, and actually being experienced, particularly from geo-political sites that were the recipients of the 'negatives of modernity' known as 'coloniality' (Quijano, 2007). The ultimate horizon of decoloniality was well-captured by Frantz Fanon (1968) in terms of setting afoot a new humanity, creating new forms of life, and escaping from if not subverting the logic of repetition without change. Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986) understood decoloniality to be a search for a liberating perspective aimed at facilitating self-understanding ('seeing ourselves clearly') after centuries of suffering dismemberment and alienation.

This article is a historical reflection on genealogies and ideological lineages of decoloniality in Africa and a critical assessment of current decolonial manifestation South Africa—a geo-political and social construct that was imagined as a 'little Europe' in Africa and which is considered in anti-colonial discourses as the last outpost of empire in Africa. The article is divided into five sections. The first section provides a detailed background to the long-term impact of modernity/coloniality and challenges the historicist notion of colonialism being a mere event/episode in African history. The second section gives some critical reflections on genealogies and lineages of Ethiopianism, Garveyism, Negritude, and Pan-Africanism as a representative sample of decoloniality initiatives in Africa. The third section reflects on the differences, divergences and convergences of decoloniality and postcolonial thinking/theory. The fourth section tries to make sense of current movements in South Africa, particularly the Rhodes Must Fall Movement (RMF) as signifying the incompleteness of decolonisation and the search for common public spaces in which people meet as equals. The last section is the conclusion.

Dismemberment/coloniality

Dismemberment is a concept developed by Ngugi wa Thiong'o, a leading African decolonial theorist, to highlight the depth of colonialism, coloniality and alienation in Africa. It captures not only physical fragmentation but also epistemological colonisation/colonisation of the mind, as well as the 'cultural decapitation' that resulted in deep forms of alienation among Africans. Ngugi wa Thiong'o posited that the contact between Africa and Europe was characterised by dismemberment, which he defined as an act of absolute social engineering. The continent's dismemberment, according to Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009b), was "simultaneously the foundation, fuel, and consequence of Europe's capitalist modernity" (p. 2. He noted that "dismemberment of Africa occurred in two stages", covering the age of the Atlantic Slave Trade during which "the African personhood was divided into two halves: the continental and its diaspora" and the Berlin Conference of 1884-5, which "literally fragmented and reconstituted Africa into British, French, Portuguese, German, Belgian, and Spanish Africa" (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2009b, p. 5).

In addition to these two dismemberment processes correctly identified by Ngugi wa Thiong'o, one can add two more. The first is the foundational one in which the 'colour line' inscribed fundamental racial differences, as advanced by William EB Du Bois (1903). The constituent parts of this process included: 'imperial/racist reason' (that left black people out in the cold) as defined by Lewis R. Gordon (1995); 'imperial Manichean Misanthropic Skepticism' (that questioned the very humanity of black people) as articulated by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007); and 'abyssal thinking' (that bifurcated humanity into two) as understood by Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2007). This thinking was deployed to justify pushing black people out of the human family and consign them to what Frantz Fanon (1968) named as the 'zone of non-being'. This is where the beginning of understanding of dismemberment is traceable genealogically and historically speaking. The second form of dismemberment can be conceptualised as a process of deliberately disconnecting African people from their history, culture and memory. As part of pushing forward the frontiers of this form of dismemberment, the racist German philosopher Hegel actively promoted the idea of a people without history and who possessed an underdeveloped spirit. He put it this way:

> At this point, we leave Africa not to mention it again. For it
> is not historical part of the world: it has no movement or

development to exhibit […] what we properly understand by Africa is the Unhistorical, Underdeveloped spirit, still involved in the conditions of mere nature, which had to be presented here only as on the threshold of the world's history (Hegel, 1944, p. 99).

A Hegelian-Conradian-Hugh Trevor Ropian racist imperial discourse of writing Africa 'out' of human history and reducing it to a site dominated by nothing other than darkness is part of the long-standing process of dismemberment. This form of dismemberment goes as far back as the era of the slave trade during which enslaved black people were forcibly made to undergo a process of forgetting not only their original names but also their languages. Valentin Y. Mudimbe (1994) understood this form of dismemberment very well, to the extent of positing that "the geographical expansion of Europe and its civilization […] submitted the world to its memory" (p. xii).

According to Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009b), the colonialist in his "attempt to remake the land and its people in his image" gave himself the power and right "to name the lands and its subjects, demanding that the subjugated accept the names and culture of the conqueror" (p. 9). In this process even African bodies became "branded with a European memory" (p. 10). Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009b) explained this destruction of memory and history in this illuminating way: "Get a few of the natives, empty their hard disk of previous memory, and download into them a software of European memory" (p. 21). The long-term consequences of this dismemberment process were human beings out of sync with their history and memory, out of sync with their being, and human beings who have lost name, language, culture and identity. At play here were broader processes of mapping, naming and owning as part of the inscription of coloniality.

Departing from the perspective of dismemberment, which goes far back to the foundational time of pushing black people out of the human family, there is need to effectively challenge the episodic school on colonialism represented by Jacob Ade Ajayi of the Ibadan History School. It took dates and periodisation "as strong virtues in historiography" and calculated that colonialism only lasted for about seventy-five years (from 1884-5 when Africa was partitioned to 1960 when many African countries gained political independence) (Osaghae, 1991, p. 24). This is an inadequate conception and understanding of the colonial impact on Africa. To deny that colonialism marked an epochal

watershed in African historical experience is tantamount to misunderstanding what colonialism fundamentally is.

Colonialism is not just an episode. It is at once a practise of power and a reconstitution of society as well as a production of knowledge and subjectivity (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2012). Fanon (1968) understood colonialism in a deeper sense when he described it this way:

> Colonialism is not satisfied merely with holding a people in its grip and emptying the native's brain of all form and content. By a kind of perverted logic, it turns to the past of oppressed people, and distorts, disfigures, and destroys it (p. 210).

Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2012) emphasised colonialism's long-term alienating effects:

> Your past must give way to my past, your literature must give way to my literature, my way is the high way, in fact the only way … The colonial process dislocates the traveler' s mind from the place he or she already know to a foreign starting point even with the body still remaining in his or her homeland. It is a process of continuous alienation from the base, a continuous process of looking at oneself from outside of self or with the lenses of a stranger. One may end up identifying with the foreign base as the starting point toward self, that is from another self towards one self, rather than the local being the starting point, from self to other selves (pp. 38-39).

Therefore, colonialism cannot be simplistically understood as an event of conquest and rule over Africa by Europeans. To gain a deeper meaning of colonialism, Peter Ekeh (1983) distinguished it from 'colonisation' even though they are connected. He emphasises that colonisation is an event/episode, whereas colonialism is a process/movement and elaborates on this distinction this way:

> In addition to the disparate activities of the colonizers and the colonized, and in addition to the … colonial situation, colonialism may be considered as a *social movement* of epochal dimensions whose enduring significance, beyond the life-span of the colonial situation, lies in the *social*

formations of supraindividual entities and constructs. These supraindividual formations developed from the volcano-sized social changes provoked into existence by the confrontations, contradictions, and incompatibilities in the colonial situation (emphasis in the original) (Ekeh, 1983, p. 5).

Consequently, Africans can easily give a date of when they were colonised and when colonisation (understood simplistically as the dismantling of direct colonial rule) ended. But it is not easy for Africans to understand the depth of colonialism in their psyches, for instance, and its real epochal dimensions. The work of Ali A. Mazrui (1986) supports the epic school of colonialism just like Ekeh. This school underscored the fact that colonialism amounted to "a revolution of epic propositions" (Mazrui, 1986, p. 12). Mazrui identified six long-term consequences of colonialism. First, colonialism and capitalism forcibly incorporated Africa into the world economy, beginning with the slave trade, "which dragged African labour itself into the emerging international capitalist system" (Mazrui, 1986, p. 12). African labour contributed immensely to the economic rise of a Euro-North American-centric trans-Atlantic commerce. Second, Africa, which had been excluded from the post-1648 Westphalian sovereign state system and was physically partitioned after the Berlin Conference of 1884-5, was later incorporated into the post-1945 United Nations' sovereign state system. One can add that the fragmented and weak African 'postcolonial' states were admitted into the lowest echelons of the Euro-North American-dominated state system of the world (Clapham, 1996).

Third, Africa was incorporated into a Euro-North American-centric world culture and European languages. Four, Africa was incorporated into a heavily Euro-North American-centric world of international law. Five, as a consequence of colonialism, Africa was incorporated into the modern technological age, including being "swallowed by the global system of dissemination of information" (Mazrui, 1986, p. 12). Finally, Africa was dragged into a Euro-North American-centric moral order dominated by Christian thought. Mazrui's (1986) conclusion was, therefore, that: "what Africa knows about itself, what different parts of Africa known about each other, have been profoundly influenced by the West" (p. 13).

The epic school is countered by the episodic school, which posits that "the European impact on Africa has been shallow rather than deep, transitional rather than long-lasting" (Mazrui, 1986, p. 13). It was the

Nigerian historian Jacob F. Ade Ajayi (1969) of the Ibadan nationalist school, who depicted colonialism as 'an episode in African history' While the episodic school is correct in underscoring African agency and initiative in the making of history, even under the constrained circumstances of colonial rule, the danger lies in its decoupling of colonialism from the broader wave of Euro-North American-centric modernity that radically transformed human history. Understood from this perspective, colonialism cannot be considered as an event/episode. Colonialism was a major part of what Walter D. Mignolo (2000) termed "global designs" that became entangled with "local histories".

While it is true that; "each African entity—village, town or kingdom—viewed the challenge of European conquest as a new historical factor" and that "Africans could either resist the white man, form alliances with the newcomers, or exploit them as far as possible in the continuous struggle for survival, wealth or power", it remains true that these initiatives did not crack or change the bigger enveloping wave of Euro-North American-centric modernity that unfolded from the fifteenth century (Ajayi, 1969, p. 172). Even decolonisation struggles of the twentieth century failed to substantially 'move the centre' or to effectively 're-member' Africa after over 500 years of 'dismemberment' to use Ngugi wa Thiong'o's (1993) terminology. What happened as a consequence of decolonisation is that the dismantling of direct colonial administrations did not give rise to a 'postcolonial world', rather, as noted by Ramon Grosfoguel (2007), global coloniality ensued. Global coloniality cannot be separated from Euro-North American-centric modernity. Today, African leaders continue to manage and maintain the global system after replacing direct colonial rulers.

This is why Grosfoguel (2011) characterised Euro-North American-centric modernity as a racially hierarchised, patriarchal, sexist, Christian-centric, hetero-normative, capitalist, military, colonial, imperial and modern form of civilisation. Grosfoguel (2011) used the term 'hetararchies' of power to underscore the complex vertical, horizontal, and crisscrossing invisible entanglements in the configuration of the modern global power structure that emerged from colonial encounters. The negative consequences of this modernity included the slave trade, imperialism, colonialism, apartheid, neo-colonialism, underdevelopment and neo-liberalism, including the Washington Consensus and structural adjustment programmes (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013). Globalisation is today still driven by coloniality on a world scale. The epic impact of colonialism led the leading Caribbean decolonial theorist and poet Aime Cesaire (2000) to pose the question:

"what, *fundamentally*, is colonialism?" (p. 32). Cesaire (2000) understood colonialism to be a disruptive, 'decivilising,' dehumanising, exploitative, racist, violent, brutal, covetous, and 'thingfying' system.

It is the continuation of colonial-like relations after the end of direct colonialism that has come to be termed coloniality. The concept of coloniality was introduced by the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano (2000a; 2000b) but was further elaborated by the Argentinean decolonial semiotician Walter D. Mignolo (2000; 1995; 2011) and others such as Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007). Quijano (2007) identified four key levers of coloniality. The first is control of the economy. The second is control of authority. The third is control of gender and sexuality. The fourth is control of knowledge and subjectivity. Mignolo (2000) emphasised 'colonial difference' as a central leitmotif of coloniality. Coloniality is a name for the "negative side/underside" of modernity that needs to be unmasked because it exists as "an embedded logic that enforces control, domination, and exploitation disguised in the language of salvation, progress, modernization, and being good for everyone" (Mignolo, 2005, p. 6). Building on the work of Quijano and Mignolo, Maldonado-Torres (2007) elaborated on the meaning of coloniality and its difference from colonialism in these revealing words:

> Coloniality is different from colonialism. Colonialism denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation, which makes such a nation an empire. Coloniality, instead, refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerged as a result of colonialism, but that define culture, labour, intersubjectivity relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations. Thus, coloniality survives colonialism. It 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. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day (p. 243).

Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986) emphasised the psychological/ epistemological as well as cultural and linguistic impact of coloniality. He detailed the workings of coloniality on the minds of its targets:

The biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other people's languages rather than their own. It makes them identify with that which is decadent and reactionary, all those forces which would stop their own springs of life. It even plants serious doubt about the moral rightness of struggle. Possibilities of triumph or victory are seen as remote, ridiculous dreams. The intended results are despair, despondency and a collective death-wish. Amidst this wasteland which it has created; imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependent sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: 'Theft is holy.' Indeed, this refrain sums up the new creed of neo-colonial bourgeoisie in many 'independent' African states (p. 3).

Coloniality is, therefore, an invisible power structure, an epochal condition and epistemological design which lies at the centre of the present Euro-North American-centric modern world. At the centre of coloniality is race as an organising principle that not only hierarchises human beings according to racial ontological densities, but sustains asymmetrical global power relations and a singular Euro-North American-centric epistemology that claims to be universal, disembodied, truthful, secular and scientific (Grosfoguel, 2007). At another level, as articulated by Mignolo,

coloniality names the experiences and views of the world and history of those whom Fanon called *les damnes de la terre* ('the wretched of the earth,' those who have been, and continue to be, subjected to the standard of modernity). The wretched are defined by the colonial wound, and the colonial wound, physical and/or psychological, is a consequence of racism, the hegemonic discourse that

questions the humanity of all those who do not belong to the locus of enunciation (and the geo-politics of knowledge) of those who assign the standard of classification and assign to themselves the right to classify. (Mignolo, 2005, p.8)

Decoloniality as a process of re-membering

'Re-membering' is defined by Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009a) as a quest for wholeness. In this quest, there is a strong African desire for self-definition and attainment of sovereign subjectivity. To Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009b), Africa constituted 'something torn' or 'dismembered' as a consequence of colonialism and coloniality. Departing from this interpretation of Africa, decoloniality can be understood as an overarching project of re-membering aimed at addressing problems of colonisation of the mind, alienation and fragmentation.

At the centre of the re-membering process is a restorative recovery project that is ranged against dismemberment and 'Europhonism' (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2009a). The inscription of Europhonism took the form of mapping, owning and naming. These imperial and colonial processes were underpinned by genocides (killing of colonised peoples in large numbers), epistemicides (killing and expropriation of colonised peoples' knowledge and history) and linguicides (destruction of colonised peoples' languages and cultures/communal memory and their replacement with colonial names and foreign cultures/religions) (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 2009a). Re-membering is meant to deal with these forms of dismemberment.

Analytically speaking, decoloniality as a process of re-membering is premised on three concepts/units of analysis. The first concept is that of *coloniality of power*. It helps in investigating how the current 'global political' was constructed, constituted, and configured into a racially hierarchised, Euro-American-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, sexist, capitalist, hetero-normative, hegemonic, asymmetrical, modern, colonial and imperial power structure (Grosfoguel, 2007). The concept of coloniality of power enables us to delve deeper into how the world was bifurcated into the 'Zone of Being' (the world of those in charge of global power structures and beneficiaries of modernity) and the 'Zone of Non-Being' (the invented world that was the source of slaves and abode of victims of imperialism, colonialism and apartheid) and maintained what Santos termed 'abyssal thinking' (Santos, 2007; Fanon, 1968). Abyssal thinking is informed by imperial reason and manifests itself in

the bifurcation of the world into 'this side' (the side of complete beings governed according to the dictates of emancipation, law and ethics) and 'that side' (the side of incomplete beings governed according to expropriation and violence) (Santos, 2007). In short, coloniality of power is a concept that decolonial theorists use to analyse the modern global cartography of power and to understand how the modern world works.

The second concept is that of *coloniality of knowledge,* which focuses on teasing out epistemological issues, the politics of knowledge generation, as well as questions of who generates which knowledge, and for what purpose (Quijano, 2007). Coloniality of knowledge is useful in enabling decolonial thinkers to understand how endogenous and indigenous knowledges have been pushed to what came to be deemed as 'the barbarian margins of society' where they subsist as folk lore and superstitions. Africa is today saddled with irrelevant knowledge that saves to disempower rather than empower, and alienate rather re-member individuals and communities. Ake (1979) emphasised that Africa had to seriously engage in struggles to free itself from the "knowledge of equilibrium" (p. 16), that is, knowledge that serves the present asymmetrical global power structure. On the sphere of knowledge, decolonial theorists are at the forefront of decolonising what they have termed 'Westernised' universities that have been built throughout the world (Grosfoguel, 2013).

The third concept is that of *coloniality of being*, which gestures into the pertinent questions of the making of modern subjectivities and into issues of human ontology (Wynter, 2003). African decolonial scholars have engaged with the question of coloniality of being from the vantage point of what they have termed 'African Personality' and 'Negritude' among many other registers used in the search for restoration of denied ontological density and sovereign subjectivity, as well as self-pride and self-assertion (Blyden, 1967; Nkrumah, 1965). Both 'African Personality' and 'Negritude' are concepts developed in struggle by Africans as they tried to make sense of their predicaments within a context of dehumanising colonialism. Coloniality of being is very important because it assists in investigating both how African humanity was questioned and the processes that contributed to the 'objectification' / 'thingification' / 'commodification' of Africans (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013; MacKittrick, 2015). One of the continuing struggles in Africa is focused on resisting the objectification and dehumanisation of black people on a world scale. It is a struggle to regain lost subjecthood and

eventually citizenship and to answer many other questions to do with being and humanism as politicised states of existence.

Empirically speaking, what occupied the minds of early decolonial thinkers such as Marcus Garvey, Edward Wilmot Blyden, William EB Du Bois, as well as later ones such as Cheikh Anta Diop, Kwame Nkrumah and Leopold Sedar Senghor to mention but a few, were such issues as the common destiny of the black race, the distinctive mentality of Africans (African personality/negritude), the place of religion in African lives, and African values and societal principles (the immanent socialist nature of African society) as well as black consciousness, self-determination, and pan-African unity (Frenkel, 1974). Taken together, these concerns gave rise to such movements as Garveyism, Negritude, Ethiopianism, the Black Consciousness Movement, and African Renaissance and many others. For example, while Garveyism was geographically rooted in the Caribbean and United States of America, it was aimed at re-membering black people of the Diaspora and those from the continent. Its three core calls were for black self-improvement/black self-pride, 'Africa for Africans' and 'back to Africa' (Garvey, 1969). Ethiopianism, Garveyism, Negritude, and Pan-Africanism intersected tendentiously as re-membering visions. For example, Garvey's Universal Negro Improvement Association aimed at inspiring black people:

> […] with pride in self and with determination of going ahead in the creation of those ideas that will lift them to the unprejudiced company of races and nations. There is no desire for hate or malice, but every wish to see all mankind linked into a common fraternity of progress and achievement that will wipe away the odor of prejudice, and elevate the human race to the height of real godly love and satisfaction (Garvey, 1969, pp. 25-26).

Garvey highlighted a planetary dimension of decoloniality, of not only seeking 're-membering' of black races but the entirety of the human races that have been fragmented by race and class. Decoloniality has always been subversive of the hierarchisation and social classification of human races in accordance with invented racial ontological densities. Wiping away "the odor of prejudice" continues to be one of the consistent demands of decoloniality from as far back as the time of the slave trade.

Ethiopianism is another early decolonial initiative that converted the biblical verse: 'Princes shall come from Egypt; Ethiopia shall soon stretch out hands unto God' (Psalms 68 verse 31) into an ideology of liberation of re-membering and self-discovery in the domains of religion and politics. Ethiopia, because it was not colonised, became a symbol of black pride and black capacity for self-rule in a context of colonialism (Muchie, 2013). Ethiopia's defeat of the Italians at the Battle of Adowa in 1896 further boosted its image among Africans—a people "who were experiencing the full shock of European conquest, and were beginning to search for an answer to the myth of African inferiority" (Asante, as cited in Worrell, 2005, p. 16). But the most successful manifestation of Ethiopianism was in the creation of what became known as African independent churches that were headed by Africans and embraced African cultures, customs and values as part of the indigenisation of Christianity (Ayandele, 1971).

The glue that brought together Ethiopianism, Garveyism, Negritude, Pan-Africanism, the Black Consciousness Movement, and even African Renaissance is what can be termed 'black race consciousness.' This is why Toyin Falola concluded that Blyden's consistent demand for self-pride and self-assertion for Africans in the context of the ambiguities of modernity and tradition influenced later intellectual discourses of liberation. This is how he put it: "His sociology of race anticipated later works of Negritude, Pan-Africanism, and the African Personality" (Falola, 2001, p. 35). Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2009b) also articulated the connections this way:

> Negritude is the intellectual and literary reflection of Pan-Africanism. Garveyism centres on race; Pan-Africanism, on Africa and blackness; and Negritude on blackness. Afro-centrism, a method of viewing the world, is the opposite of Euro-centrism (p. 38).

Anti-Eurocentrism was another glue that ideologically brought together advocates of Ethiopianism, Garveyism, Negritude, African Personality, African Socialism, Pan-Africanism, and the Black Consciousness Movement. African socialism as articulated by such thinkers and politicians as Julius Nyerere and Leopold Sedar Senghor was aimed at restoring humanism in a situation where capitalism and colonialism had authorised and enabled the exploitation of some human beings by others. Humanism, as propounded by Kenneth Kaunda, becomes another concern that cuts across all the decolonial initiatives.

Decoloniality as a movement also has a strong cultural component. This is logical because colonialism was an alienating process. Negritude and African Personality were meant to address the challenges of cultural alienation. Five elements were identified as constitutive of African personality: humanism, communalism, spirituality, cooperation and intuition. These were to be the basis of African harmony (Falola, 2011). All these distinctive features were distilled as part of the decolonial struggle to launch Africanity into the world.

Senghor explained that he and Aime Cesaire had to launch the Negritude movement between 1933 and 1935 because they ,

> were plunged into a pan-stricken despair …No reform was in sight and the colonizers were justifying our political and economic dependence by the theory of the *tabula rasa.* In order to establish an effective revolution, our revolution, we had first to divest ourselves of our borrowed attire— that of assimilation—and assert our being; that is to say our *negritude.* (Senghor as cited in Ahluwalia, 2001, p. 23).

Gary Wilder (2015) dug into the planetary dimension of Negritude, particularly its focus on restructuring the imperial world. He emphasised how Senghor and Cesaire deploy Negritude ideas to 'unthink France'.[2] To Wilder (2015), Negritude was not a simple "affirmative theory of Africanity" but rather was also "a critical theory of modernity" (p. 8). Senghor (as cited in Wilder, 2015) had this to say about the struggle for inclusive civilisation that transcended both "abstract universalism" and "concrete particularism":

> I believe that in the Civilization of the Universal into which we entered in the last quarter of century, Negritude will constitute, or already constitutes […] an assembly of essential contributions […] it will again play its essential role in the edification of a new humanism, more human because it will have reunited in their totality the

---

[2] 'Unthinking France' began from a critique if both colonialism and republicanism as part of imagining a new global order. France has to be rethought not as a metropolitan entity or European ethnicity. It has to attain a transnational democratic federation as a result of decolonization. Decolonization has not to be limited to national liberation and national sovereignty.

contributions of all continents, of all races, of all nations (pp. 51-52).

Senghor articulated that Negritude began as a search for the "return to [our] sources and the discovery of the black Grail" (ghetto-negritude he termed it) tainted by racism before moving forward to "open-negritude" (planetary negritude) (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 52). Building on "open-negritude", Senghor understood "decolonization as a process of global restructuring wherein the fate of humanity and the future of the world were at stake" (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 59). However painful the experiences of imperialism and colonialism were according to Senghor, they brought colonisers and colonised peoples together and the way forward was to create new inclusive transnational democratic arrangements as the colonised and the colonisers' worlds remain entangled forever (Wilder, 2015).

Senghor remained critical of the Cartesian notion of being that privileged reason as a marker of being human. He said this notion reproduced the human as a "reasonable animal" and he proceeded to spell out the gift of Negritude: "to remake the unity of man and the World; to link flesh to spirit, man to his fellow man, the pebble to God" (Senghor, as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 61). Senghor envisaged a postcolonial world as "a global mélange to which each civilization contributed its most distinctive and fully realized attributes" (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 61). Politically, Senghor favoured a democratic union of people irrespective of colour, rather than territorial political independence, and this made him the target of criticism as an apologist of colonialism in some quarters. Senghor, just like Fanon and Cesaire, emphasised human liberation over the sovereignty of states ("*Man* remains our ultimate concern, our *measure*") (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 224). He elaborated that:

> *Man* must be the centre of our preoccupations. One does not construct a modern State for the pleasure of constructing it. The action is not an end in itself. We must therefore protect ourselves from the will to power that defines the State, that crushes *Man* beneath the state. It is, in fact, about creating the black man within a humanity marching towards its total realization in time and space (emphasis in the original) (Senghor, as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 230).

Senghor's idea was informed by four broad propositions: the first is that the world is composed of many distinct civilisations, each of which places the accent on a singular aspect of the human condition; the second is that every great civilisation is a cultural crucible that accommodates contributions from other civilisations; the third is that imperialism created a situation of intense cultural interaction in which metropolitan and African peoples had an historic opportunity to fertilise each other; and, finally, that both colonisers and colonised will have to create a new civilisation and a new humanism (Wilder, 2015).

The essential pre-requisite for this was "we must all kill the piece of [Hitler] that lives within us" (Senghor, as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 143). The second condition of possibility for the new humanism was a double decolonisation involving colonisers abandoning their "superiority complex" so as to recognise the colonised as equal human beings and the colonised rising up from an imposed "inferiority complex" (Senghor, as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 162). These ideas led Senghor to present the idea of decolonisation as "a dialogical and dialectical gift between partners" (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 162). More profoundly, Senghor understood decolonisation as a third revolution ranged against "capitalist and communist materialisms" and aimed at bringing moral and religious concerns to the centre of the world while at the same time enabling "peoples of colour" to play their role and "contribute to the construction of the new planetary civilization" (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 228).

Senghor pushed for a combination of Negritude (old African collectivism) with Socialism (scientific socialism) as the building blocks in the creation of a better world (better than the colonially created one) and also "better than our world before European conquest" (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 149). Consequently, Senghor also became a critic of both colonialism and territorial nationalism, as he strongly believed that the unitary state was now historically outmoded. He pushed for a common French citizenship, not as an ethnicity or race, but as a political product of the empirical realities of encounters and interactions. His warning to fellow Africans was that even European nations were gravitating towards a larger pan-European community (the European Union) and that small colonies would never be "truly independent", rather independence would be "a poison gift" (Senghor, as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 152). He explained that

> […] a mere nominal independence is a false independence.
> It can satisfy national pride, but it does not abolish the

consciousness of alienation, the feeling of frustration, the inferiority complex, since it does not resolve the concrete problems facing the underdeveloped countries: to house, clothe, feed, cure, and educate the masses (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 244).

Senghor envisaged a world that was not wholly African or European, but "it will be a Métis world" (sort of Eurafrique) (as cited in Wilder, 2015, p. 161). Based on this understanding of Senghor's version of decolonisation, Wilder (2015) concluded that:

An independent Senegal marked not the realization but the eclipse of his ultimate vision for decolonization. Rather than condemn Senghor as a failed national president, we should remember his warning that the form of freedom promised by territorial nationalism for African people was bound to fail (p. 244).

The decolonial interventions of Senghor indicate that there was no singular understanding of decoloniality. They also highlight the planetary quality of decoloniality, whereby it was pitched at the level of human redemption and the re-making of the world.

Pitched at the planetary level, the question of the knowledge that underpins oppressive and exploitative political systems becomes important, just like the power question. This is why Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Claude Ake, and Dani Nabudere engaged in rethinking social science and its relationship to history, knowledge, economy, politics, power and identity in the context of an incomplete if not failed decolonisation (see Ake, 1979; Falola, 2001; Connell, 2007; Nabudere, 2011; Comaroff & Comaroff, 2012). Ngugi wa Thiong'o (2013) argued that "the physical empire" has been pushed back but "the metaphysical empire remains" (p. x). As I have previously reported (see Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p.52), Ngugi wa Thiong'o has also previously emphasised, that imperialism is not a slogan: "It is real; it is palpable in content and form and in its methods and effects." He further elaborated that "[i]mperialism is total. It has economic, political, military, cultural, and psychological consequences for people of the world …" (Ngugi wa Thiong'o, 1986, p.2, cited in Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013, p.52).

Since 1962, Ngugi wa Thiong'o has been at the forefront of decolonial struggles arguing for cultural and linguistic freedom (the reversal of cultural imperialism and restoration of African languages);

decolonisation of the mind (psychological rehabilitation, relevance and identity reconstruction); moving the centre (shifting from bondages of Eurocentrism and narrow nationalism); re-membering Africa (pushing forward the quest for wholeness and unity); and globalectics/pluriversality (fighting for a plural world in which all human beings, cultures and worlds have equal space and recognition) (Ngugi wa Thiong'o 1986; 1993; 2012). On the other hand, active politicians like Kwame Nkrumah have not only fought for political independence but also produced intellectual works that reveal continuities of the coloniality of power after the demise of direct colonial administrations.

In his book *Neo-Colonialism: The Highest Stage of Imperialism*, Nkrumah (1965) introduced the concept of 'neo-colonialism' that sustained what he termed the "tentacles of the Wall Street octopus" (p. x). He explained that "a state in the grip of neo-colonialism is not master of its own destiny" (Nkrumah, 1965, p. x). The concept of neo-colonialism captured an 'invisible' form of global imperial governance as a successor to direct colonial forms of governance (Wise & Thomas, 1964). Nkrumah (1963) actively pushed for pan-African unity and the formation of a United States of Africa as the main guarantee for African self-determination and protection from neo-colonialism.

By the 1970s and 1980s, coloniality became increasingly understood from the perspectives of dependency and underdevelopment. On the African continent, the leading lights of this perspective were Walter Rodney, the author of *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (1972), and Samir Amin who wrote, among other works, *De-Linking: Towards a Polycentric World* (1990).

At the turn of the twenty-first century, Latin American scholars, particularly the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano (2007), introduced the concept of 'coloniality' as a reference to the continuation of a colonial-like situation and the perpetuation of asymmetrical power relations long after the dismantling of direct colonialism. Coloniality is a useful analytical concept as it speaks to how modern global power is constituted and configured asymmetrically; how a particular epistemology/knowledge has been dominant; and how humanity itself has been racially hierarchised and socially classified in accordance with differential ontological densities (Quijano, 2000b).

Inevitably, decoloniality crystallises as a direct response to coloniality. Today, there is increasing articulation of the decolonial in terms of the 'epistemologies of the South' or 'Southern Theory' (Connell, 2007). Epistemologies of the South emphasise the importance

of shifting the 'geography' and 'biography' of knowledge as part of decolonial subversion of the "epistemic scaffolding" on which western enlightenment thought is "erected" (Comaroff & Comaroff, 2012, pp. 1-2). This shifting of the geography and biography of knowledge is happening within a context in which the Global South is being recognised as the epistemic site from which "privileged insight into the workings of the world at large" can be better understood (Comaroff & Comaroff, 2012, pp. 1-2).

Is decoloniality the same as postcolonialism?

Decoloniality is often confused with postcolonial theory/postcolonial thinking/postcoloniality. The reality is that decoloniality and postcolonial theory converge and diverge in many ways. On the convergence side, they are both aimed at dealing with the colonial experience. Sabine Broeck and Carsten Junker (2014) have effectively delineated the converging and diverging positions, approaches and trajectories of decoloniality and postcoloniality. They are both heterogeneous and eclectic in character. Both decoloniality and postcoloniality provide a range of critiques of modernity. They converge in their focus on the critique of European humanism. The most comprehensive and by no means exhaustive definition of postcolonial theory has been provided by Homi Bhabha (1994):

> The postcolonial perspective…departs from the traditions of sociology of underdevelopment or 'dependency' theory. As a mode of analysis, it attempts to revise those nationalist or 'nativist' pedagogies that set up the relation of Third World and First World in a binary structure of opposition. The postcolonial perspective resists the attempt at holistic forms of social explanation. It forces recognition of the more complex cultural and political boundaries that exist on the cusp of these often opposed political spheres. It is from this hybrid location of cultural value—the transnational as the translational—that the postcolonial intellectual attempts to elaborate a historical and literary project…the encounters and negotiations of differential meanings and values within 'colonial textuality,' its governmental discourses and cultural practices, have anticipated , *avant la lettre*, many of the problematics of contemporary theory—aporia, ambivalence, indeterminacy, the question of discursive closure, the

threat to agency, the status of intentionality, the challenge
to 'totalizing' concepts, to name but a few (p. 248).

While both postcolonial theory and decoloniality claim their
genealogy from the tradition of anti-colonial thought, they also diverge
in their intellectual lineage in many ways. Walter D. Mignolo (2014)
posited that decoloniality emerges "from the receiving end of Western
imperial formations" (p. 22). Decolonial theory is genealogically
traceable to those thinkers from the zones that have experienced the
negative aspects of modernity. These thinkers include Aime Cesaire
(Caribbean), Frantz Fanon (Caribbean), William EB Dubois (United
States of America), Kwame Nkrumah (Africa), Ngugi wa Thiong'o
(Africa), Enrique Dussel (Latin America), Quijano (Latin America),
Mignolo (Latin America), Ramon Grosfoguel (Latin America),
Maldonado-Torres (Latin America) and many others.

Postcolonial theory, unlike decolonial theory, is traceable to post-
structuralists and postmodernists such as Jacques Derrida and Michel
Foucault. The theory was then articulated by scholars such as Edward
Said, Gayatri Spivak, Homi Bhabha and Achille Mbembe (Grosfoguel,
2007). Mbembe (2006) credits Said's work *Orientalism* with having laid
the foundation for postcolonial theory as it inaugurated a shift from
Marxist interpretations, which emphasised the economic and military
aspects of the colonial project, to considerations of the epistemological
violence of the colonial project. If this is correct, then postcolonial
theory emerged in the 1980s. This means that it is far younger than
decoloniality, which is traceable to the very unfolding of colonial
encounters in the fifteenth century and can even be traced as far back as
the slave revolts in the Diaspora. While in decoloniality the Haitian
Revolution is privileged as a decolonial struggle, postcolonial theory
highlights the colonisation of India by the British to explicate the
technologies of empire and the complexities of colonial subject
formation.

Mbembe (2006) traced the origins of 'postcolonial thinking' to a
transnational genealogy and to a combination of the anti-imperialist
tradition, subaltern studies and globalisation. He explained that
postcolonial thinking also draws from Western philosophy.
Decoloniality does not claim a Western philosophical pedigree and
heritage. Postcolonial theory was also mainly used in literary and
cultural studies before it broadened to other fields of study. It
inaugurated what became known as a 'cultural turn' whereas
decoloniality claims what is termed a 'decolonial turn'. The decolonial

turn is the opposite of the colonial turn. It is a long-standing 'turn', as it marks a shift from colonial discourse to the decolonial tasks of decolonising knowledge, power and being. The deepening demand for the decolonisation of such institutions as the university is informed by decoloniality not postcolonialism (Maldonado-Torres, 2011).

Postcolonial theory and decolonial theory also vary in terms of where they begin their critique of modernity/coloniality. Decolonial theorists begin their critique as far back as 500 years, covering Spanish and Portuguese colonialism. Most postcolonial theorists begin their critique with the British colonisation of India in the 19ᵗʰ century, in the process ignoring some 300 years of the unfolding of modernity/coloniality. Because of this, postcolonial theorists somehow try to decouple modernity and colonialism, in the process missing the fact that modernity and coloniality are, paradoxically, inextricably intertwined.

But just like postcolonial theory, decoloniality is against essentialism and fundamentalism. This point is eloquently presented by Grosfoguel (2007):

> This is not an essentialist, fundamentalist, anti-European critique. It is a perspective that is critical of both Eurocentric and Third World fundamentalisms, colonialism and nationalism. What all fundamentalisms share (including the Eurocentric one) is the premise that there is only one sole epistemic tradition from which to achieve Truth and Universality. (p. 212)

Decoloniality is essentially a repudiation of what Aime Cesaire (2000) described as the "European fundamental LIE: Colonization=Civilization" (p. 42). Decoloniality provides ex-colonised peoples a space to judge and expose Euro-American deceit and hypocrisy (Cesaire, 2000). In this way, decoloniality enables a re-telling of the history of humanity and knowledge from the vantage point of those epistemic sites that received the 'negatives' of modernity, highlighting appropriations, epistemicides, linguicides, and denials of the humanity of other people as part of the story of science. Finally, decoloniality accepts the fact of ontological pluralism as a reality that needs 'ecologies of knowledges' to understand (Santos, 2007).

In short, one can say that postcoloniality and decoloniality converge and diverge across genealogies, trajectories and horizons. Decoloniality embraces Fanon's vision of setting afoot a new humanity as its horizon,

unlike postcolonial theory, as represented by Bhabha (1994), which favours a political dialectics without the possibility of transcendence into an envisioned horizon ("politics without the dream of perfectibility") (p. 91).

The current manifestation of decoloniality

Today, decoloniality is pushed through a number of summer schools that are spread across the world. These summer schools focus on such issues as the decolonisation of islamophobia, aesthetics, knowledge, power and being. Some are focused on particular issues like the decolonisation of the mind and the legacies of slavery.[3] Decoloniality is also manifesting itself within the domains of indigenous peoples' movements, who are demanding recognition of their languages, cultures and knowledges. In Asia, decolonial movement has assumed the idiom of 'transversity', that is, aimed at decolonising knowledge and transforming universities.

In Africa, South Africa is currently the hub of various decolonial movements mainly spearheaded by students and youth. This is not surprising, because South Africa was imagined by imperialists and colonialists as a 'little Europe' in Africa and it attracted the highest number of white settlers than any other part of the African continent (Magubane, 1979). The spirit of the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) that was inspired by Steve Bantu Biko continues to operate as a hidden script beneath the public script of rainbowism. This political and social consciousness is intersecting with decolonial Fanonianism to inspire youth and students to mount a critique of the post-apartheid political and social order. Such movements as *Abahlali Basemjondolo* (shack-dwellers movement), Landless People's Movement (LPM), Black Sash, September Imbizo, Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF) and Land First, Black First (LFBF) are inspired by a combination of ideological springs including decoloniality. They embody cultural, intellectual and political demands.

The year 2015, witnessed the rise of the Rhodes Must Fall movement (RMF), which was provoked by the continued presence of Cecil John Rhodes' statue at the centre of the University of Cape Town. Cecil John

---

[3] Examples include *Decolonizing Power, Knowledge and Being International Summer School* based in Barcelona in Spain; *Decolonizing Europe* based in the Netherlands, *Decolonizing Islamophobia* based in Grenada, *Decolonizing Power, Knowledge and Identity* based at the University of South Africa in Pretoria and many others.

Rhodes was a leading British imperialist who dreamt of colonising Africa from the Cape to Cairo (Magubane, 1979). He amassed massive wealth through genocide, enslavement, plunder, dispossession and primitive accumulation informed by racism as an organising principle. He became the prime minister of the Cape Colony and used his position and the British South Africa Company (BSAC) to establish the British colonies of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, as well as the 'protectorates' of Bechuanaland, Lesotho, and Swaziland (BLS). His remains are buried at Matopos Hills in Zimbabwe. Having a statue of such a person in a post-apartheid South Africa has inaugurated a student and youth demand for decolonising space and landscape through the removal of colonial and apartheid statues, symbols and names.

Interestingly, what began as an attack on Rhodes' statue, has grown into students' demands for the decolonisation of South African universities. This struggle is pushed forward by such movements as the Open Stellenbosch Collective (OSC) at the predominantly white University of Stellenbosch, the Black Students Movement (BSM) at Rhodes University—a university carrying the name of an arch imperialist; Black Thought UJ at the University of Johannesburg; and Transform Wits (TW) at the University of the Witwatersrand. The University of South Africa (UNISA) has, since 2011, witnessed the formation of the Africa Decolonial Research Network (ADERN) and has since 2013 been hosting an annual *International Summer School on Decolonizing Power, Knowledge and Identity*. Some of the students and youth who are at the forefront of current decolonial movements are products of the UNISA decoloniality summer schools.

Decoloniality is brewing like a heavy storm and is at the moment manifesting itself as a psychic state of both 'agonism' and 'antagonism.' Universities, as part of those global institutions that continue to reproduce coloniality, alien cultures and 'whiteness,' are legitimate targets of decolonisation. Deep frustrations over the slow pace of transforming and decolonising universities have produced the current student- and youth-led decolonial movements in South Africa. For black students, universities have remained alienating spaces and sites in which they have to undergo a form of epistemicide and linguicide (emptying of heads and change of language) in order to fit in. Curriculum has remained Eurocentric. Africa-centred knowledges remain marginalised. Africanisation initiatives have not resulted in decolonisation (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2013).

Conclusion: Decoloniality as the utopic register of the future

What is clear is that decoloniality as liberation discourse cascading from the anti-colonial archive remains a creative space of imagining, debating and struggling for liberation, freedom and development. It is not a site of a singular, univocal and fundamentalist position on the complex questions of liberation, freedom and development. Decolonisation, deimperialisation, depatriarchalisation, and deracialisation of the modern world are still viewed as worth struggling for today. Therefore, the envisaged horizon of decoloniality is that of creating a new humanity in which racism and coloniality has no space, so as to build "a room for all at the rendezvous of conquest", to borrow Cesaire's (1956/1968, p. 125) expression. The imagined future is often named as a pluriversal world in which many worlds fit. Decoloniality becomes, in this sense, a way of thinking, doing and imagining a better future.

Bibliography

Ahluwalia, P. (2001) *Politics and postcolonial theory: African inflections,* London: New York, Routledge

Ajayi, J. F. A. (1969). Colonialism: An episode in African history. In L. H. Gann & P. Duignan (Eds.), *Colonialism in Africa, 1870-1960* (Vol. 1) (pp. 497 – 509). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ake, C. (1979). *Social science as imperialism: The theory of development*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Amin, S. (1990). *Delinking: Towards a polycentric world*. London: Zed Books.

Ayandele, E. A. (1971). *A visionary of the African church: Mojola Agbebi*. Nairobi: East African Publishing House.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London: Routledge.

Blyden, E. W. (1967). *Christianity, Islam and the negro race*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Broeck, S., & Junker, C. (Eds.). (2014). *Postcoloniality-decoloniality-black critique: Joints and Fissures*. Frankfurt & New York: Campus Verlag.

Cesaire, A. (1968). *Return to my native land.* (E. Snyders, Trans.). Paris: Presence Africaine. (Original work published 1956).

Cesaire, A. (2000). *Discourse on colonialism.* (J. Pinkham, Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press. (Original work published 1955).

Chabal, P. (2012). *The End of conceit: Western rationality after postcolonialism*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Chen, K-H. (2000). *Asia as method: Towards deimperialization*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Chinweizu. (1975). *The west and the rest of us*. New York: Random House.

Chinweizu. (1987). *Decolonizing the African mind*. Lagos: Pero Press.

Chinweizu, J. O., & Madubuike, I. (1980). *Toward the decolonization of Africa literature*. London & Boston: KPI Limited.

Clapham, C. (1996). *Africa and the international system: The politics of state survival.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J. L. (2012). *Theory from the south, or, how Euro-America is evolving towards Africa.* Boulder & London: Paradigm Publishers.

Connell, R. (2007). *Southern theory: The global dynamics of knowledge in social science*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Du Bois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of black folk.* New York: Dover Publications, Inc.

Ekeh, P. (1983). *Colonialism and social structure: University of Ibadan inaugural lecture, 1980*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Falola, T. (2001). *Nationalism and African intellectuals*. Rochester: Rochester University Press.

Fanon, F. (1968). *The wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Frenkel, M. Y. (1974). Edward Blyden and the concept of African personality. *African Affairs*, *72(292)*, 277-289.

Garvey, M. (1969). *The philosophy and opinions of Marcus Garvey, or, Africa for Africans* (Vol. 2) (Compiled by A. Jacques-Garvey). New York: Arno Press.

Gordon, L. R. (1995). *Fanon and the crisis of European man: An essay on philosophy and the Human Sciences*. New York & London: Routledge.

Grosfoguel, R. (2007). The epistemic decolonial turn: Beyond political-economy paradigms *Cultural Studies*, *21(2/3)*, 203-246.

Grosfoguel, R. (2011). Decolonizing post-colonial studies and paradigms of political economy: Transmodernity, decolonial thinking, and global coloniality. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, *1(1)*, 1-25.

Grosfoguel, R. (2013). The structure of knowledge in westernized universities: Epistemic racism/sexism and the four genocides/epistemicides of the long 16th century. *Human*

    Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge, *XI (1)*,
    73-90.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1944). *The philosophy of history*. New York: Grove
    Press.

MacKittrick, K. (Ed.). (2015). *Sylvia Wynter: On being human as
    praxis*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Magubane, B. M. (1979). *The political economy of race and class in
    South Africa*. New York & London: Monthly Review Press.
    Maldonado-Torres, N. (2006).Cesaire's gift and the decolonial
    turn. *Radical Philosophy Review*, *9(2)*, 110-123.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2007). On the coloniality of being:
    Contributions to the development of a concept. *Cultural Studies,
    21(2-3)*, 240-270.

Maldonado-Torres, N. (2011). Thinking through the decolonial turn:
    Post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy, and
    critique—an introduction. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral
    Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, *1(2)*, 1-28.

Mazrui, A. A. (1986). *The Africans: A triple heritage.* London: BBC
    Publications.

Mbembe, A. (2006). What is Postcolonial Thinking?
    http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2008-01-09-mbembe-en.html
    (accessed 20 October 2015)

McClintock, A. (1992). The angels of progress: Pitfalls of the term
    'post-colonialism.' *Social Text*, *31/32*, 84-98.

Memmi, A. (1974). *The colonizer and the colonized*. London:
    Earthscan.

Mignolo, W. D. (1995). *The darker side of renaissance: Literacy,
    territory, and colonization*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of
    Michigan Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2000). *Local histories/global designs: Essays on the
    coloniality of power, subaltern knowledges and border thinking*.
    Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2005). *The idea of Latin America*. Malden, MA:
    Blackwell Publishing.

Mignolo, W. D. (2007). Introduction: Coloniality of power and de-
    colonial thinking. *Cultural Studies*, *21(2-3)*, 150-176.

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of western modernity: Global
    futures, decolonial options*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. D. (2014). Further thoughts on (de) coloniality. In S.
    Broeck & C. Junker (Eds.). *Postcoloniality-decoloniality-black*

critique: Joints and fissures (pp. 15-33). Frankfurt & New York: Campus Verlag.

Muchie, M. (2013). The relevance of Ethiopianism to Africa today. Unpublished Seminar Paper Presentation at the Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC), Pretoria, South Africa, 17 May.

Mudimbe, V. Y. (1994). *The idea of Africa.* Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Nabudere, D. W. (2011). *Afrikology, philosophy and wholeness: An epistemology.* Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2013). *Empire, global coloniality and African subjectivity*. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonizing the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Oxford: James Currey.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (1993). *Moving the centre: The struggles for cultural freedom.* London: James Currey.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (2009a). *Re-membering Africa*. Nairobi: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (2009b). *Something torn and new: An African renaissance*. New York: Basic Civitas Books.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (2012). *Globalectics: Theory and the politics of knowing*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (2013). *In the name of the mother: Reflections on writers and empire.* Oxford: James Currey.

Nkrumah, K. (1963). *Africa must unite*. London: Heinemann.

Nkrumah, K. (1965). *Neo-colonialism: The last stage of imperialism.* London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Osaghae, E. E. (1991). Colonialism and African political thought. *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies*, *19(2-3)*, 20-45.

Quijano, A. (2000a). Coloniality of power and social classification. *Journal of World Systems*, *6(2)*, 342-386.

Quijano, A. (2000b). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism and Latin America. *Nepantla: Views from the South*, *1(3)*, 533-579.

Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, *21(2-3)*, 168-178.

Rao, R. (2012). Postcolonialism. In M. Freeden, M. Stears & L. T. Sergent (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political ideologies* (pp. 271-292). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodney, W. (1972). *How Europe underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.

Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledge. *Review, XXX(1)*, 45-89.

Spivak, G. C. (1990). *The post-colonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogues.* London: Routledge.

Wallerstein, I. (1999). Introduction: Why unthink?. In I. Wallerstein (Ed.), *Unthinking social science: The limits of nineteenth-century paradigms.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wilder, G. (2015). *Freedom Time: Negritude, decolonization and the future of the world.* Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Wise, D., & Rose. T. B. (1964). *The invisible government.* New York: Random House.

Worrell, R. (2005). *Pan-Africanism in Barbados.* New York: New Academic Publishing.

Wynter, S. (2003). Unsettling the coloniality of being/ power/ truth/ freedom: Towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation - an argument. *CR: The New Continental Review*, *3(3)*, 257-337.

Wynter, S. (1991). Columbus and the poetics of the propter nos. *Annals of Scholarship*, *8(2)*, 251-286.

Zizek, S. (2010). *Living in the end times.* London & New York: Verso.