Stellenbosch Theological Journal 2021, Vol 7, No 1, 1–24
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17570/stj.2021.v7n1.a31
Online ISSN 2413-9467 | Print ISSN 2413-9459

"And no one pours new wine into an old wineskin": Discourse in religion and sustainable development for Sub–Sahara Africa

S.T. Kgatla
University of Pretoria, South Africa
kgatla@mweb.co.za

Abstract

On 25 September 2015 a high–level forum of the United Nations met in New York to adopt the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which provided a framework for member states to fulfil the goals set out. The agenda contained an action plan for people, planet, and prosperity with seventeen (17) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to be achieved by 2030. All countries and stakeholders, acting in collaborative partnerships, would implement this plan, to which the delegates declared and committed themselves. The plan concurred with the African Union Commission's Agenda 2063 – "Africa that we want". Sequential to these developments, some religious organisations joined the discourse and advocated for the place of religion in sustainable development. This article employs deconstruction qualitative research methodology to explore the religious pathways in the SDGs as determined by historical colonial choices in Sub–Saharan Africa. The modern discourse of religion and sustainable development cannot be assumed to be value free. The Jewish proverb that "new wine is not poured into an old wineskin" is used as a historical lens to debunk the underlying legacy of colonialism that continues to hide the coloniality epistemic of dominance and power underlying the language of sustainable development that tends to endorse universality and ignore historical praxis of colonialism.

Keywords

Development; missionary; universality; decolonisation; coloniality; Pentecostalism; agenda

Introduction

This article explores the issues of religion and development in a post–colonial paradigm in Sub–Saharan Africa in view of concerted assertions

that sustainable development is viable in a post–colonial environment and African countries, including Pentecostal churches becoming part of actors in development (Austin 2010). The religious agenda sponsored by the Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations 2030 (SDGs), coupled with the new wave of Progressive Pentecostalism informs the focus of this study (Shettima 2016:1; Kroll, Warchold, Pradhan 2019). In an attempt to be relevant and constructive to future ideals for participatory development between Africa and the West, much needs to be deconstructed and reconstructed. The essay further questions the concept of development within the context of Africa's strategic framework, which aims to deliver on its goal for inclusive sustainable development after the demise of colonialism in Africa (African Union Agenda 2063; Matohino 2015). It ventures to critique the apparent convergence between newly found revival of African development on one hand and the United Nations agenda for SDGs on the other.

The pertinent question raised is whether the SDGs can be achieved without first unravelling historical colonial underpinnings in an authentic liberatory agenda by the people in Sub–Saharan Africa. It is possible that the colonial perspectives of racially hierarchised Eurocentric power structure, embedded in the language of the sustainable development of African people, continue unabated and undetected (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012). Western religious tradition has always wanted to help people perceived to be constituted by negatives such as poverty, lacking development, lacking civilisation, and lacking correct politics by providing them with resources (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012). It has been the western colonialism and missionary expansionism that has supported social structures that oppressed the poor and contributed to inequality and conflict amongst African people (Tomalin 2018:). The modern economic system benefits from colonialism to further new pathways in a post–modern environment. In neo–liberal capitalism, its operations are often obscured and hidden by the language of the post–colonial agenda. The demise of the apartheid system in South Africa, for example, did not signal the end of racism but, as American scholar Walter Earl Fluker (2015) puts it, "after colonialism there has been a "ghost of social shape–shifts and re–invents" of racism in myriad configurations".

The old colonialism of the right of domination and conquest has undergone modifications and sometimes emerges in rhetorical language with subtle preordained agendas (Earl Fluker 2015). This is often perpetuated in the discourse of development of the other (Kohn, Margaret & Reddy 2017). Any attempt in venturing into the noble task of development with African people needs authentic introspection, especially by the people on the receiving end. The Pan–African declaration to redirect and rededicate the African content towards the achievement of a 50–year vision (2013–2063), as captured by former African Union Commission Chairperson, Dr Nkosazana Dlamini Zuma's address, may not achieve the desired goals without first going deeper to ascertain the impetus that shaped the colonial consciousness (Richard 2018).

New initiatives pertaining to the development of African people and their challenges can never be fully fathomed without seriously drawing on historical records and works on development discourse influenced by colonialism (Graham 1999). A fresh new start to venturing into this old terrain of development needs to be infused with the new post–colonial discourse and should be treated with deconstruction modalities (Comaroff 1986). The Jewish proverb that "new wine is not poured into an old wineskin" is apt in such a situation as already stated. Assumptions unchecked are stronger than conscious willpower. Only when we fully understand what is really going on at the level of unconscious behaviour can we take control of our actions in sustainable development (Flyke 2014). New results with old behaviour are not, in fact, "new", but rather a perpetuation of the old harmful ideology.

Qualitative deconstruction methodology

The article utilises the Deconstruction Qualitative Methodology of Jacques Derrida (in Hendrick 2016) and the Hermeneutic of Suspicion as espoused by Paul Ricoeur (in Stewart 1989). Pursuing the question "How can the underdevelopment of Sub–Saharan Africa be delinked from the experience of the past in any discussion on their development?" Richard (2018) asserts that developing countries might have moved away from blaming colonial legacies for their economic plight but a critical evaluation of colonialism's link to developmental approaches adopted by, and for, the Global South is

crucial in any debate on development. A critical review of the link between colonialism and development for the Global South should precede any collaborative exercise (Richard 2018). Therefore, the research question pursued in this article is: "In which way has colonialism–influenced development discourse guided the development of African people"?

The pursuable entry into this debate would be best served with the philosophy of deconstruction. Mambrol (2016) postulates that deconstruction involves the close reading of texts in order to demonstrate that any given text has irreconcilably contradictory meanings, rather than being a unified, logical whole. Deconstruction as a method allows the reader to decipher the writer's hidden meanings and intentions. Through the deconstruction lens, the reader is able to identify both (hidden) intended and unintended meaning. The discourse of sustainable development as postulated in Western culture has inherent tendencies that view issues as positive and beneficial to the underdeveloped world while, in essence, they are negative and condescending (Hendrick 2016). Hence the United Nations 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda cannot blindly be embraced without questioning the imperial forces that are at play in discourse.

Combined with the deconstruction method, this article uses the hermeneutic of suspicion to explicate the maximum care one should take in analysing the language of development in the neo–colonialist environment. Both methods share a commitment to unmasking "the lies and illusions of unconsciousness"; they are the architects of a style of interpretation that circumvents obvious or self–evident meanings in order to draw out less visible and less flattering truths that may be assimilated without notice (Stewart 1989). In loaded and hidden meaning, such as the intellectual analysis of colonial vested discourse, one needs the correct tools to dissect and reveal the implicit meaning and interest of Western power metrics. Without the purposive decolonisation epistemology of liberatory goals, new discourse on sustainable development may remain the project of the invisible power structure of coloniality[1] (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012).

1 Coloniality is the invisible power structure that continues working for the objectives of neocolonialism (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2012).

Explicating the disguised and camouflaged language that results in deceiving actions, Fyke (2014) of Marquette University came up with what he calls euphemisms and coded language in order to render actions invisible through words. Words used may technically disguise true meaning in the minds of both the listener and also in the mind of the sender (Keiser 2014). What may eventually happen in a situation of altered meaning is that the sender may create a "double life" layered with lies or half–truth (Miller 2014). Discourse on the role of religion in sustainable development, as articulated in seventeen Millennium Sustainable Development Goals of the United Nations, may never be a safe springboard for the role of religion in sustainable development in former colonial territories. Below the surface, there are unresolved tensions and contradictions (Guth & Rico 2019).

Sustainable development debunked

It must be admitted from the outset that the meaning of development is complex, multi–layered, and multi–dimensional, and has always been misunderstood or construed as simple and straightforward. The concept of development always implies power relations between the perceived developed and underdeveloped (Moncrieeffe 1917). Its meaning has always been a site of contestation (Molosi & Dipholo 2016) and narrowly understood as aimed at the empowerment of the less privileged. Its historical baggage of coloniality is perpetuated[2] within the envisaged empowerment of the grassroots communities and is shrouded in the very disempowerment it seeks to combat (Molosi & Dipholo 2016:45),.

By dictionary definition, development involves the reorganisation and reorientation of economic order as well as social systems in the pursuit of a better life for the Other (people of colour) (Soares & Quintella 2008:106; Bulhan 2016). The notion of development is highly debatable and may mean different things to different people under different circumstances. As a

2 Sakupapa (2018) defines coloniality in theology as the continuation of colonial vestiges in a more subtle and undercover manner. Bulhaan (2015) refers to it as meta–colonialism masquerading as a more euphemistic global hegemonic mystification that blurs the effects of colonialism. Biko (2004) sees coloniality as a potent weapon in the hands of the oppressor to continue having the right to define what is good for Africans while promoting the interest of the West.

process of improving the quality of human lives for the better, development had always had an implicit or explicit agenda for power through which it operates (Guo 2014). This article unpacks the historical and religious power relationships between the powerful and less powerful in the process of participatory relationships. It does this by briefly exploring the close collaboration between missionaries and colonial powers over the years, the process of neo–liberal ideas and the practices of avoiding the real causes of poverty (or even explaining it in less palatable terminology), inequality, desperation, and the delusional escapism caused by colonialism. It achieves this by first analysing the discourse of "defining and assisting the Other", eloquently discussed by Dutch scholar Van Rimsum (2001:11) in his book *Slaves of Definition*.

Power of definition and control of minds

Scholars like Moncrieffe (2017) as well as Molosi & Dipholo (2016) are convinced that power relations should figure prominently in any explanation of poverty and inequality in Africa and thus act as a determinant of development and underdevelopment. Fraught with its vagueness and the contradictions within its application, development became an ambiguous catch phrase for colonisation (Bulhan 2015). This concept featured prominently during the heyday of colonialism and the conquest of Africa. Historically, North America and Europe appropriated to themselves the right to first define who people of the colour were, what their needs were, and how they could be developed to meet European needs. In this respect, Tempels (1959:25) claimed that the Bantu people of Africa were not capable of formulating a philosophical treatise complete with the necessary vocabulary without the assistance of the West. Western sciences and philosophical formulations were conceptualised and constituted as determining and destining Africans to become better–developed people (Van Rimsum 2001:2). The premises of these assumptions were based on notions of the Western ability to research and know the Other and help the Other to know who they were in terms of Western standards (Sanneh 1992), resulting in the marginalisation of Africans, who were pushed to the ghettos of knowledge. Africans were left to recognise themselves only

in Western descriptions (Van Rimsum 2001:3) and, in that discourse, to recognise their development in terms of altruistic Western institutions.

The concept of power relations within the colonising Western force defined how development should be defined and understood (Moncrieffe 2017). Power defined how people could relate to and understand their roles in the interaction. Power – as expressed by physical force, material means, language use, inequality in status or gender, technological advancement, and psychological manipulations – remains, undetected, in the neo–liberal environment of today's globalised world. Based on these aspects, power defines the identities of those involved, as well as their roles (2017). Any deviation to the rule may be sanctioned, either overtly or covertly. The capacity to define and label was in itself a measure of power in any development process. It could be the power of resources that calls the ignoramus, underdeveloped [unbeliever] to realign to Western "civilisation" (Van Rimsum 2001:11) for their own development.

Are African Independent Churches (AICs) actors of development?

It is against this background that I now turn to the notion that African Independent Churches (AICs) are said to be "actors" of development. Many scholars have recently shown an aversion to this idea (Adedibu 2018; Swart 2005:323–326; Ohlmann, Frost & Grab 2016; Freeman 2012: 1–235; Myers 2019:11–37; Kakwata 2017, Soars & Quintella 2008). Some of these scholars mistakenly lump together the traditional AICs with what is called "progressive Pentecostalism" and, in that, confuse the original intentions of the AICs within the African context of liberation. For the purpose of this article, a clear distinction should be made between the AICs and progressive Pentecostalism[3] since the two movements have different origins in terms of time, place, and stimulants. They operate on different axes.

---

3 The new Pentecostalism is called "Progressive Pentecostalism" because its approach is more encompassing within development–oriented ministries (Anderson 2020:130; Myers 2015:115; Freeman 2012:2). Kakwata (2017:6) found that Progressive Pentecostalism as a movement does not separate religion from development but promotes a new and different conception of development. The new conceptualization, which is also called a third approach to development, emphasises the betterment of humanity, especially for the poor (Freeman 2012:9).

Efforts should be made to indicate nuances that make them different. Although the AICs consist of large and complex constellations owing to the circumstances from which they originated and the period of their origin, their pursuit was different and served a different epistemological agenda. It never served the globalising Western agenda; it resisted it. Their aspirations were located in religious, socio–political, and economic conditions with the sole purpose of promoting African interests. They pursued a different interest to progressive Pentecostalism[4]. AICs' difference from progressive Pentecostalism should be emphasised and appreciated. While there are different expressions of Pentecostalism, scholars generally agree that the movement is a newcomer to African soil, having started in the 1960s in America (Freeman 2012:1–2; Kakwata 2017:3; Wariboko 2019), hence it is called the third wave movement (Omotoye 2010; Wariboko 2019) that arrived in Africa. It originated mainly in the United States of America during the first decade of the twentieth century (Frahn–Arp 2018). Classical (progressive) Pentecostalism has close resemblance to mainline churches in that it could be said to have adopted the Eurocentric theology of personal and individualistic salvation as opposed to the nuances of African traditional practices.

The progressive Pentecostalism movement does not exhibit a search for African identity and uniqueness, or the space to express Africanness, protest against restrictions on traditional customs, racial inequality, and explicit resentment against white domination and political oppression (Anderson 2001). Primarily, AICs see themselves as "a reformation of Christianity from Europeanised Christianity" (Anderson 2001:107). AICs, where spirit–filled experiences are pronounced, focus on an African Christian experience in protest against European epistemology (Etherington 1977, Chiwanza 2017). Some of the spiritualities that AICs are fighting for include "prophetic healing or spiritual healing" with special emphasis on African freedom and liberation from evil forces associated with witchcraft and evil spirits (Anderson 2005).

4 Accordingly, the new stance taken by Progressive Pentecostalism favors imperialism and the elite of globalizing capitalism and unquenchable consumerism. It does not fight against unjust social structures (2012:9) but sees the problem of underdevelopment, poverty and suffering in the global South as the work of the devil (Freeman 2012:2) but not in unjust systems of the elite.

The convergence of AICs' religious enemies with that of progressive Pentecostalism as evil forces is merely a religious coincidence (La Fontaine 2012). Christianity has a similar view of good and evil as other monoethnic religions, like Islam and Judaism, which is that evil originates from Satan, while good comes from God, and yet these three religions cannot be said to be the same. Scholars who see AICs as a suitable partner in development cite the following reasons or grounds as bases for their argument (Adedibu 2018; Ferguson 1990, Jones 2019; Kakwata 2017; Ohlmann 2016):

- Their religion may serve as a *praeparatio epistemica* grid for development; their beliefs in spiritual forces are preparatory grounds for development.
- Their transformative potential and their mitigation of poor conditions in contexts of marginalisation and discrimination, together with their notion of salvation that is related to people's present lives, is regarded as a necessary element for development.
- Ethical standards (including work ethic, the prohibition of destructive behaviour such as the use of drugs, and gambling, as well as strict morals regarding sex) are points of contact for development and are vital to the true success of development.
- Collective individual support in a time of need (being spiritual or material) is necessary for collective action and, therefore, for development.
- Self–help projects already existing within and initiated by communities may serve development.
- The AICs' ability to pull people out of historical environments of poverty and negativity and move them to centres where people are nurtured and empowered, is an element of development.

AICs constitute majority of churches in Africa. It is estimated that in 1990 their constituency was represented by over 83 million (Wolanin 1996). To their adherents AICs represent a place to feel at home. They represent an indigenizing movement of Christianity as they offer a celebrative religion, using symbols, music, and dance. They can be portrayed as cultural renaissance in reaction to the cultural imperialism of the missionary churches. They are a renewal movement particularly in terms of effective community reconstruction and building.

Positive elements within AICs that promote development

AICs were founded by African leaders for African people in the context of adversity, racism, exploitation, oppression, and the demeaning of their cultural heritage. Their response was the affirmation of their worth, integrity and humanness (Bulhan 2015; Bediako 2000, Sakupapa 2018). Scholars such as Ohlmann, Frost & Grab (2020) allude to the following as constituent elements that make AICs potential development actors: demographic significance, development activities, African solutions, empowerment and agency, transformation, and a decolonising development.

All these constituent elements mean nothing if these are used as co–option for neo–liberalism. Any attempt influenced by a post–colonial Eurocentric agenda to partner with an AIC in any sustainable development programme should be carefully examined. Africans should first go through a rigorous process of decolonising their minds before joining any development that is supposed to benefit them.

A decolonisation agenda, as proposed by Ohlmann, Frost & Grab (2020) that merely includes "resistance and indigenisation", "decentralisation and empowerment" and "dismantling Eurocentric patterns of thought" but which falls short of "decolonising of the mind", as proposed by Biko (2004), and of radical re–educating Africans from Western epistemologies, does not mean anything. As long as AIC programmes are driven by Europeans finances and globalized agenda, they remain stillborn. The liberation of the mind (being) should precede any discourse of development and much investment should be built into achieving that. Liberatory consciousness should be a prerequisite (Pityana 2012:11). Steve Biko (in: Kritzinger 2008:102) rejected any development that stood for integration between the white and black in South Africa. Black people had to discover for themselves what they had been colonised to think about themselves, and then emancipate themselves fully from any form of Western domination. AIC has become an ideal platform to give African Christian expression in a globalizing world where African identity is blurred with individualism, inequality, poverty while serving capitalized consumerism.

Prominent features of Progressive Pentecostalism[5]

The AICs have been on the African scene for more than a century while progressive Pentecostalism is a relatively new phenomenon. The convergence between the two is their response to traditional Western Christianity and the environment of the African traditional setting (Myers 2015:115–120). Both movements see Western Christianity and the idea of its secular development as less progressive than their cosmology (Elphick 2012). But, by and large, the two movements are different and rotate on different axes. Progressive Pentecostalism puts emphasis on individual and personal salvation, while the AICs hold a communal holistic approach to existential wellness. Progressive Pentecostalism is tailored along the lines of Western mega–churches, which are aligned with the globalised massification of resources for the benefit of elite leaders (and AICs focus on the authentic liberation of Africans from the yoke of coloniality). AICs fight neo–colonialism while progressive Pentecostalism promotes a new globalizing ideology that has nothing to do with African liberating development. Progressive Pentecostalism is a new liberal thought that enslaves the mind of its victims through the camouflage of globalising and hegemonizing consequences. Its implicit agenda of massification of resources for powerful leaders through religion is a new form of western imperialism and coloniality. Instead of developing pathways for decolonisation and economic liberatory agenda for Africa often Progressive Pentecostalism finds itself opening paths for coloniality (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012). Coloniality is defined as an invisible power structure that sustains colonial relations of exploitation and control after the end of direct colonialism (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012). Coloniality of power works as a critical structuring process to ensure continuation of imperial designs, sustaining the superiority of the Global North (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012).

The following propositions, which overlap with that of AICs, form some of the nuances of Progressive Pentecostalism (Freeman 2012; Jones 2019; Myers 2015, 2019; Omotoye 2010):

5 The movement Progressive Pentecostalism is large with myriad manifestations. It would be a serious mistake to paint them with one brush.

- Progressive Pentecostalism is fighting the war for development against the devil and demons, but not against poverty or unjust social structures as perceived by the secular world and conciliar churches.
- A new, re–imagined theology of development for Africa is propagated. The traditional village is seen as a place of traditional religion, occupied by angry ancestors and demons. Poverty is located here, while urban centres are liberated zones which deliver their inhabitants from the devil and demons.
- Western capitalism, with its unquenchable accumulation of wealth, is viewed as part of a developmental strategy for a better life.
- Conversion is personal, exuberant, and accompanied by signs and wonders. One becomes aware that one is loved and should live a life of freedom in God only after the salvation experience event (Freeman 2012).
- Progressive Pentecostals are optimistic and confident of victory over evil and demons, and of liberating people from the slavery of poverty, diseases, and ignorance (Myers 2015).
- Progressive Pentecostalism is epitomised by the wellness spirit of prosperity, wealth, health, and consumerism (Coleman 2000:36; Kgatla 2013:5–17), with strong emphasis on success.
- Their identification of anti–development as the enemy is located in spiritual forces and the devil, who should be confronted aggressively in personal faith, providing excuses for rich countries exploiting the poor countries.
- The message of Progressive Pentecostalism is prone to unrealistic success in the midst of an adversarial environment, flourishing in the wings of Western globalisation and consumerism (Myers 2015).

The critical questions to impose here is "In which way has colonialism–influenced development discourse disadvantaged the development of African people? How does Progressive Pentecostalism betray the liberatory agenda of African people?" There is an emerging critical thinking among African scholars that accepts that western hegemony is no longer sustainable in Africa, a thinking that questions the dominant thinking that the development discourse for Africa should still be informed by the western epistemology (Ndlovu–Gatsheni 2012). The moment for Africans

to doubt and interrogate the western epistemology in development has arrived. Africans should push forward the decoloniality projects in that way empowering Africans for "unthinking" some ideas coming from Euro–America on development.

Critical Observations on the "health and wealth gospel" of Progressive Pentecostalism

Despite progressive projects for humanitarian relief and development by Progressive Pentecostalism, the movement remains ambiguously linked to Western neo–colonialism (Bulhan 2015) and global neo–expansionism. Van Rimsum (2001:130) defines this new mode of thinking in economic terms of transforming the world into one global market with dire consequences, both politically and culturally, to the less–developed nations. Globalisation, as some scholars (Beerkens 2006; Ibrahim 2013; Moss 2009) call it, is a global "hegemonisation" of the global village by large companies, for example, Coca–Cola and McDonald's, for the interest of the West. Some people speak of "Coca–Cola–isation" or "McDonald's–isation": Industrial expansionism of large Western companies in a multifarious process that spreads out their tentacles – economically, politically, culturally, and religiously – over the entire world in order to subject it to their (new) sphere of influence (Abebe 2006; Ibrahim 2013; Moss 2009).

On the modern religious front, mega–churches export the prosperity gospel in unprecedented measures, seriously distorting social values and community life (Holland 2011). Globalisation is driven by the spirit of capitalist colonialism's massive trade glossed with the spirit of consumerism. Even beyond the period of colonialism, the effects of coloniality and neo–colonialism are still felt on the decolonised African continent (Kgatla 2013). Conditioned by mass passion for wealth and consumer goods from abroad, Progressive Pentecostalism occupies a fair share of the market when it comes to distorting and realigning indigenous religious values to support neo–colonialism and re–entrench colonisation in the African mind (Biko 2004:164). As a partner in new development initiatives, it perpetuates the same distortion of the past by diverting attention from the real problems of slavery and poverty (Bulhaan 2015). Progressive Pentecostalism is rooted in a narrow diagnostic definition of liberty that is skewed to individualism

instead of advancing the collective African well–being of "the converted and the unconverted" (Bulhan 2015).

Furthermore, Pentecostalism, under the influence of the health and wealth gospel, has become a globalised entrepreneurial spirit that flourishes on the appalling social conditions in which poor people live, while enriching powerful self–styled preachers (Kgatla 2018:8). It is built on the notion that God loves his people and wants them all to have material possessions in abundance, and brushes aside all scriptures that clearly locate human suffering as part of God's plan (Job & Psalm 73). Portions of Scripture are quoted out of context and are applied selectively to support this new ideology Like advertising in consumerism, it promises satisfaction of one's unlimited (and artificial) wants if one buys into the system of globalisation. Tithes and love offerings are no longer gifts of gratitude, but investments, and the church becomes a pyramid scheme. A new materialistic mindset is promulgated worldwide in the name of God and in the interest of "consumerism culture" (Kgatla 2013).

Framing the cause of poverty as the work of Satan and evil spirits could serve delusional escapism in that it prevents people facing responsibility for corruption, greed, and unfair policies by blaming abstract forces that cannot answer for themselves (Myers 2015). Portioning blame to metaphorical beings while ignoring evil social structures of inequality and violence is a manifestation of chronic delusion that betrays the entire agenda Christianity tries to promote (Cannon 2014). If religion is used to escape our direct responsibilities to the poor for greed and suffering, then it serves as delusional consciousness (Kiran 2009:3–18) and a flight from the responsibilities it is expected to face.

Decolonisation[6] of the mind as an authentic way to African development

In my recent research into the files of the South African Council of Churches for the period between 1970 and 1990, I found something that black people, under the guidance of the Black Consciousness Movement, understood as development (Kgatla 2018). The Black Consciousness Movement embarked on projects aimed at developing African people during the apartheid struggle. The movement introduced community projects which were meant to concretise the process of liberating the colonised mind (D'Errico 2011). Black Consciousness was understood as way of life, and a cry for authentic humanity in the midst of adversaries negating it (Kritzinger 1988:46). Many projects were launched with the sole purpose of developing Africans in their own right and away from Western influences.

Many commentators on decolonisation[7] of the mind agree that the only way out of the entrapments of colonisation is to inculcate change in the belief systems of the colonised in order for them to embrace self–definition, self–reliance, self–determination, self–affirmation, self–love, self–development, and self–defence (Biko 2004:164; Dascal 2007; D'Errico 2011; Hotep 2008; Ngugi wa Thiong'o 1986:39; Shongwe 2016). In any meaningful programme of emancipation from slavery by neo–colonisation, the colonised should re–discover their lost humanness (Hadfield 2017), pick themselves up and appreciate themselves as human beings of worth. According to Hadfield (2017), the first step to re–discovery is for the oppressed to come to

---

6 To decolonize means to set the politically, socially, economically and spiritually colonized free. It is to set the captive free (Isaiah 61:1)). Regarding the decolonization of African theology, Nkrumah (1964) famously said: "Seek ye first the political kingdom and everything else shall be added unto it." This means that the political kingdom in Africa, which is the power of Africans, must lead Africa out of the condition of impotence to which it had been reduced by European colonialism.

7 Dascal (2007:1) defines the colonization of the mind as subtle manifestations of political, economic, cultural and religious beliefs taking possession of and control of victims' minds by the colonizers. According to Dascal (2007:1), the purpose of colonization was to introduce new forms of seeing reality and unconsciously or consciously relinquishing one's cultural norms and adopting new ones. Its primary aim was to twist the logic and take over the thought and actions of its victims in a manner that was less violent as violence would only ensure that the victims were openly resistant to incorporate the new desired change (Dascal 2007:27–47; Biko 2004:81; Oelofsen 2015:130–146; D'Errico 2011).

their senses – "pump back life into their empty shell", so to speak – and infuse themselves with pride and dignity (Kgatla 2018), renouncing their complicity in their crime of entanglement within the colonial system.

In a similar way, Bulhan, Somalian–born and teaching at Frantz Fanon University, argues that the correct starting point for African development is the system that comes after colonialism (Bulhan 2015), which he calls meta–colonialism. According to him, meta–colonialism refers to the psychological after–effects of colonialism. Sakupapa (2018) alludes to the same reality (he calls it coloniality) that tends to hide the hegemonic mystifications of defunct colonialism, which tends to benefit the elite in African countries. The purpose of coloniality in post–colonial Africa is to draw us away from our everyday troubles and sometimes even to make us fantasise about being better off than we really are (Longeway 1990:1). Religion, and the political distortion of reality, may make us indulge in a form of entertainment that helps us to avoid unpleasant truths about our situation. Immanuel (2011) cites the culture of dependency syndrome as part of the meta–colonialism vestige of colonialism. Western development aids are never value–free but are invariably given with the hidden motive of lodging suspicious partnerships that will, in the long run, prove to have retrogressive effects on the less developed. Leaders depending on aid from the West have learnt the language and behaviour of continuously eliciting sympathy from their benefactors (Immanuel 2011). Aid is then used for their personal interest and against their own people.

As already mentioned (see section: "Power of definition and control of minds"), the key indicator of domination is the power to name the world and the self, interpret the past, preserve archival records, and the ownership of digital information (Bulhan 2015). The colonised should start defining themselves in new, positive terms in the face of their adversaries. In the same vein, Biko (2004:164) attests that the starting point of the process of decolonisation (development) has to do with diminishing fear in black minds. Fear of pain, even death, is an impediment to real liberation (development), according to Biko (2004:164). On a psychological level, the colonised should throw away the shackles of the images deposited on their brains by the coloniser by consciously becoming what they really are, even if that means pain.

Conclusion

This article attempted to seriously explore the role of colonisation and development during the height of Western imperialism on the enslavement of the African mind. It sought to show the intricacy of power dynamics in the discourse of development as defined by Western missionaries (Ott & Strauss 2010) and their colonial counterparts in the process of imposing ideas of development on the African psyche. In their attempt to civilise, educate, Christianise, and Europeanise Africans, they inculcated asymmetrical relationships which triggered African religious and political resistance, which eventually led to the decolonisation of land but not of being. The effects of colonialism left Africans unable to define themselves (Biko 2004; Bulhan 2015) and untangle themselves. The logic of colonisation now operates as coloniality (meta–colonialism), which has raised many tensions and left the face of poverty largely black (Bowers Du Toit 2018:24–35). The worst that neo–colonisation may do is to normalise its dominant role and camouflage exploitation to look like the way things should be (Molosi & Dipholo 2016:55).

The essay further argued for authentic liberative development as the radical decolonisation of the African mind (being). Authentic development, whereby community development is preceded by a radical programme of liberation and consciousness (Bowers Du Toit 2018: 24–35), should be embarked upon. In this respect, the programme of retrieving the lost African "being" should precede the agenda of development. Where charity development projects are proposed, they should first be replaced with training in conscientisation, implementing justice, and eliminating inequality and poverty in ways that are ground–breaking and fundamentally driven from the "bottom" by the underside of history. The concept of agency should be redefined and understood as goals and acts of the underside of history to make their choices and freely implement them. They should be able to question the status quo and conscientiously create and implement their new reality (Molosi & Dipholo 2016:55). Africans should be given the opportunity to respond to their own challenges without relying on external insights or aid. Initiatives for development should come from the soul of Africans and be guided by them, free of any form of external imposition (Bragg 1987:21). The discourse of development should, therefore, not be

framed in the language of religious triumphalism or global consumerism. The language of emancipation from pious and unrealistic religious experience should be the norm in discarding inequalities and listening to the cries of hunger and poverty camouflaged by euphemised exploitation.

Bibliography

Abebe, Zeleul. 2006. Urbanization for national development in Ethiopia, in Economic focus Bulletin of the Ethiopian economic association (EEA), 9(2).

Adedibu, B. 2018. The changing faces of African Independent Churches as development actors across borders. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies,* 74(1). DOI: 10.4102/hts.v74i1.4740

African Union 2020. Agenda 2063: The Africa We Want. [Online]. Available: https://au.int/en/agenda2063/overview. [Accessed: 12/11/2020].

Allen, R. 1927. Missionary Methods: St. Paul's Or Ours? [Online]. Available: https://newchurches.s3.amazonaws.com/wp–content/uploads/2016/02/Essential–Church–Planting–Module–4–Missionary–Methods.pdf [Accessed: 12/11/2020].

Anderson, A.H. 2001. *Types and Butterflies: African Initiated Churches and European Typologies*. [Online]. Available: https://doi.org/10.1177/239693930102500302 [Accessed: 27 May 2019].

Anderson, A. H. 2005. *Pluriformity and Contextuality in African Initiated Churches.* [Online]. Available: http://artsweb.bham.ac.uk/aanderson/Publications/plurifotmoty–and–contextuality–i.htm [Accessed: 27 May 2019].

Austin, G. 2010. African Economic Development and Colonial Legacies. *International Development Policy,* 1:11–32. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4000/poldev.78

Bediako, K. 2000. Africa and Christianity on the Threshold of the Third Millennium: The Religious Dimension. *African Affairs*, 99(395):303–323.

Beerkens, E. 2006. Globalisation: Definitions and Perspectives. [Online]. Available: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Globalisation–Definitions–and–Perspectives–by–Eric/38c57353e2dc966fa01ed3ccaadb442b9ab569c6. [Accessed: 12/11/2020].

Bell, M. 2017. *The biggest Megachurch on Earth and South Korea's "Crisis of Evangelism".* [Online]. Available: https://www.pri.org/stories/2017–05–01/biggest–megachurch–earth–facing–crisis–evangelism [Accessed: 2/3/2020].

Biko, S. 2004. *I Write What I Like.* Johannesburg: Ultra Lithuli.

Bowers Du Toit, N. 2018. Decolonising Development? Re–claiming Biko and Black Theology of Liberation within the context of Faith–Based Organisation in South Africa. *Missionalia*, 46(1):24–35. DOI: https://doi.org/10.7832/46–1–219

Bragg, W. 1987. From Development to Transformation. In: Samuel, V. & Sugden, C. (eds.). *The Church in Response to Human Need*. Oxford: Regnum Publishers.

Brown, A. 2013 The Prosperity Gospel Makes a Mockery of Christianity. [Online]. Available: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/andrewbrown/2013/may/29/prosperity–gospel–mockery–christianity [Accessed: 3/4/2018].

Bulhan, H.A. 2015. Stages of Colonialism in Africa: From Occupation of Land to Occupation of Being. *Journal of Social Political Psychology*, 3(1) 239–256.

Cannon, L. 2014. *What is the Value of Religion?* [Online]. Available: https://ieet.org/index.php/IEET2/more/cannon20141204. [Accessed: 25 May 2019].

Chiwanza, T.H. 2017. *How Christianity was used to exploit Africans.* Unpublished paper.

Coleman, S. 2000. *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity. Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comaroff, J. 1986. Christianity and Colonialism in South Africa. *American Ethnologist,* 13(1):1–22. DOI: 10.1525/ae.1986.13.1.02a00010

Dascal, M. (2007). *Colonizing and decolonizing minds.* Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.

D'Errico, P. 2011. *What is a Colonized Mind?* [Online]. Available: https://indiancountrymedianetwork.com/news/opinions/what–is–a–colonized–mind/ [Accessed: 1 June 2019].

Derrida, J. 1986. Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy: Deconstruction. [Online]. Available: https://iep.utm.edu/derrida/#:~:text=Jacques. [Accessed: 20/11/2020].

Elphick, R. 2012. *Reconsiderations in Southern African History.* Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Etherington, N. 1977. Social Theory and the Study of Christian Missions in Africa: A South African Case Study. *Africa* 47(1): 31–40.

Ferguson, J. 1990. *The Anti–Politics Machine: Development, Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Frahn–Arp, M. 2016. The Rise of Megachurches in South Africa. *Global Renewal Christianity: Spirit–Empowered Movements Past, Present and Future*, 3:263–284.

Freeman, D. (ed.) 2012. *Pentecostalism and Development.* Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Fyke, J. 2013. Euphemisms and Ethics: A Language–Centred Analysis of Penn State's Sexual Abuse Scandal. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122:551–569.

Graham, M. J. 1999. The African–Centred Worldview: Toward a Paradigm for Social Work. *Journal of Black Studies*, 30(1):103–122.

Guth, H.P. & Rico, G.L. 2019. Discovering Poetry. [Online]. Available: http://ads.baa.uk.com/0B8F0B0/ads–132219875–discovering–poetry.pdf. [Accessed: 21/11/2020]. \

Hadfield, L. A. (2017). *Steve Biko and the Black Consciousness Movement*. [Online]. Available: https://hts.org.za/index.php/hts/article/view/3825/8883. [Accessed: February 2017].

Hendrick, G. P. 2016. Deconstruction the end of writing: "Everything is a text, there is nothing outside context". *Verbum et Ecclesia*, 37(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v37i1.1509.

Holland, C.P. 2011. The Impact of Globalisation and Information Technology on the Strategy and Profitability of the Banking Industry. *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, Wailea, HI, USA, 1997, pp. 418–427. Vol.3, doi: 10.1109/HICSS.1997.661663.

Hotep, U. 2008. *Decolonising the African Mind: Further Analysis and Strategy*. Pittsburg, PA: KTYLI.

Ibrahim, A.A. 2013. The Impact of Globalization on Africa. [Online]. Available: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/322753263_The_Impact_of_Globalization_on_Africa [Accessed: 02 November 2021].

Immanuel, F. W. 2011. *Are Western Aid to Africa the solution to the embattled continental economy?* Unpublished paper read at the International Symposium on Cultural Diplomacy in Africa at the Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin in July 2011.

Jones, B. 2019. Have We Reached Peak Pentecostalism? Social Development and The Limits of Personal Transformation. [Online]. Available: https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/religionglobalsociety/2019/04/have–we–reached–peak–pentecostalism–social–development–and–the–limits–of–personal–transformation [Accessed: 4 May 2019].

Kakwata, F. 2017. The progressive Pentecostal conception of development within African context of poverty. *STJ*, 3(1).

Kgatla, S. T. The Dutch Reformed Church Mission in the Northern Transvaal, 1865–1964: A critical evaluation of motives, goals and methods. Unpublished M.Th dissertation submitted to the University of South Africa. Pretoria: UNISA.

Kgatla, S.T. (2013). Globalization: Facts and Fictions. *Asian J. Soc. Sci. Arts Human*, 1(1):5–17., 2013

Kgatla, S. T. 2018. The Decolonisation of the Mind: Black Consciousness Community Projects by the Limpopo Council of Churches. *Missionalia*, 46(1): 146–162.

Kiran, C. 2009. Understanding delusions. *Industrial Psychiatry Journal,* 18(1):3–18. DOI: 10.4103/0972–6748.57851

Kohn, M., Reddy, K. 2017. Colonialism. [Online]. Available: https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2017/entries/colonialism [Accessed: 19 November 2020].

Kritzinger, J.N.J. 1988. *Black Theology – Challenge to Mission*. Unpublished Thesis: The University of South Africa.

Kritzinger, J.N.J. (2008). Liberating Whiteness: engaging with the anti–racist dialectics of Steve Biko. In: Toit, C. (ed.). *The Legacy of Stephen Bantu Biko: Theological Challenges*. Pretoria: UNISA.

Kroll, C., Warchold, A., Pradhan, P. 2019. Sustainable Development Goals (SGDs): Are we successful in turning trade–offs into synergies? *Palgrave Communications,* 5:140. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599–019–0335–5

Lamin Sanneh 1992. *Translating the Message: The Missionary Impact on Culture*. New Yor: Orbis Books.

Longeway, J.L. 1990. The rationality of Escapism and Self–Deception. *Behaviour and Philosophy*, (18)2:1–20.

Matolino, B. 2015. Universalism and African Philosophy. *South African Journal of Philosophy,* 34(4):433–440.

Miller, J.D. 2014 Alternative Realities Myths, Lies, Truths, and Half–Truths. *The Lincoln Humanities Journal*, 6:21–45.

Mills, J. S. 2017. The importance of religion in the development of our societies today and tomorrow. [Online]. Available: https://eprints.ucm.es/46057/1/Presentation Rafael Palomino (sin vínculos notas).pdf [Accessed: 12 November 2020].

Molosi, K. & Dipholo, K. (2016). Power Relations and the Paradox of Community Participation among the San in Khwee and Sehunong. *Journal of Public Administration and Development Alternatives*, 1(1).

Moss, T. 2009. Where does Africa fit in the globalization puzzle? [Online]. Available: https://insights.som.yale.edu/insights/where–does–africa–fit–in–the–globalization–puzzle [Accessed: 01/12/2020].

Myers, B.L. 2015. Progressive Pentecostalism, Development, and Christian Development NGOs: A Challenge and an Opportunity. [Online]. Available: http://www.internationalbulletin.org/issues/2015–03/2015–03–115–myers [Accessed: 24 May 2019].

Myers, B.L. 2019. Mission and Development: Two New Opportunities and a Continuing Challenge in Mission Studies. *Journal of the International Association for Mission Studies*, 36(1).

Ndlovu–Gatsheni, S. J. 2012. Coloniality of Power in Development Studies and the Impact of Global Imperial Designs on Africa. Unpublished Inaugural Lecture read at the University of South Africa on 16 October 2012, Pretoria.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o, N. 1986. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: J. Currey.

Nkrumah, K. 1964. Consciencism: Philosophy for De–Colonization and Development with particular reference to the African Revolution. *Monthly Review Press*. New York.

Öhlmann, P., Frost, M.L., Gräb, L.W. 2016. African Initiated Churches' potential as development actors. *HTS Theological Studies*, 72(4):1–12.

Omotoye, R.W. 2010. A critical examination of the activities of Pentecostal Churches in National development in Nigeria. [Online]. Available: https://www.cesnur.org/2010/omotoye.htm [Accessed: 25 May 2019].

Ott, C. & Strauss, S. J. 2010. *Encountering Theology of Mission: Biblical Foundations, Historical Developments, and Contemporary Issues*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academics Publishing Group.

Pityana, B. (2012). *Black Consciousness, Black Theology, student activism and shaping of a new South Africa*. Inaugural Steve Biko Memorial Lecture, Europe, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, 9 October 2012.

Richard, G. 2018. On Colonialism and Development – Why the Underdevelopment of the South Cannot be Delinked from the Experience of the Past. *African Journal of Governance & Development*, 7(1):6–16.

Sakupapa, T.C. 2018. *The ecumenical movement and development: the case of the All–Africa Conference of Churches (AACC), 1963–2000 (Part 1). Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, 44(3):1–15., 2018

Shettima, K. 2016. Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals in Africa: Call for a Paradigm Shift. [Online]. Available: http://www.bioline.org.br/pdf?rh16030. [Accessed: 21/11/2020].

Shongwe, B.M. 2016. Decolonising the mind and restoring the dignity of black people. News24. [Online]. Available: http://www.news24.com/MyNews24/decolonising–the–mind–andrestoring–the–dignity–of–b [Accessed: 14 July 2017].

Soars, J. Jr & Quintella, R.H. 2008. *Development: An Analysis of Concepts, Measurement, and Indicators.* Universidade Federal Bahia Salvador, Salvador.

Stewart, D. 1989. The Hermeneutics of Suspicion. *Literature and Theology*, 3(3):296–307.

Swart, I. 2006. *The churches and the development debate: Perspectives on a fourth generation approach.* Stellenbosch: African Sun Media.

Tempels, P. 1959. Bantu Philosophy. *Journal of Religion in Africa*, 13(2):83–100. DOI:

https://doi.org/10.2307/1581204

Thumma, S. 1996. Exploring the Megachurch Phenomena: Their characteristics and cultural context. [Online]. Available: http://hirr.hartsem.edu/bookshelf/thumma–article2.html [Accessed: 23/3/2018].

Tomalin, E. 2018. Religions, Poverty Reduction and Global Development Institutions. *Palgrave Communications*, 4:132. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599–018–0167–8.

Van Rimsum, H.J. 2001. *Slaves of definition.* Maastricht: Shaker.