The indigenisation of Citizenship Education: A Christian ethical perspective

Johannes L van der Walt
Edu-HRight Research Focus Area
Faculty of Education
North-West University
South Africa
hannesv290@gmail.com

Abstract

The populations of countries that have relatively recently gained their independence from former colonising powers increasingly feel the need to restore and revive their indigenous heritage that had been pushed to the background of their lives during the period of political and cultural domination. There are various ways of effecting this. One of these is to harness the school subject Citizenship Education. Citizenship Education as a school subject has a number of widely accepted basic functions towards the forming of mature future citizens for their own communities, nation-states and wider contexts. The subject could be infused with relevant elements of the indigenous cultures in question, thereby making it more relevant to the learners who are members of previously colonised communities, in the process equipping them to become even better citizens of their nation-states and of the wider world. Doing so is justifiable from a Christian ethical/moral perspective.

Opsomming

Die bevolkings van lande wat relatief onlangs hulle onafhanklikheid van die voormalige koloniserende magte verkry het toon toenemend 'n behoefte om hulle inheemse erfenis, wat gedurende die tydperk van politieke en koloniale oorheersing na die agtergrond verdring is, te herstel en te laat herleef. Daar is verskeie maniere om dit te bewerkstellig, onder meer om die skoolvak Burgerskapsonderwys daarvoor aan te wend. Hierdie vak het 'n aantal wyd-aanvaarde basiese funksies wat te make het met die vorming van toekomstige volwasse burgers van hulle eie gemeenskappe, nasiestate en in selfs wyer kontekste. Burgerskapsonderwys kan verryk word met die relevante elemente uit die betrokke inheemse kulture ten einde die vak meer betekenisvol te maak vir die lede van sulke gemeenskappe, en om hulle in die proses tot selfs nog beter burgers van hulle nasiestate en die wyer wêreld te vorm. Om dit te doen, is Christelik eties/moreel regverdigbaar.

Keywords: critical theory, Citizenship Education, decolonisation, education, indigenisation, power structures, Christian ethics/morality

1. Introduction and problem statement

Many citizens in/of countries formerly colonised by Western powers nowadays reflect on the issue of whether anything in their indigenous cultures and languages has remained worthwhile after the period of being politically and culturally dominated, and should be retained or revived. Most people and communities around the globe today find themselves immersed in a Western-type culture (Gaini, 2018:7). They have become so deeply domesticated in Western-orientated ways of food production and processing, transport, trade and research (Thanh & Thanh, 2015:25) that they tend to regard all these cultural goods and activities as 'normal". The same applies to schooling; from kindergarten up to university, Western-type institutions seem to be part of the 'normal' or 'standard' way of life in current post-colonised communities. This is also the case as far as language (including that of teaching and learning) is concerned; most of the previously colonised, now independent, countries still recognise and use the language of the former coloniser (often regarded as the former oppressor), and in some it has been retained as one of the official languages or as the main language of communication, the *lingua franca* (Jansen, 2017:n.p.n.). In brief, the influence and impact of the former

colonising power have permeated every facet of the minds and lives of the original inhabitants of the former colonies. Most of the formerly colonised not only have to deal with the heritage of their colonial past but also with the new threats posed to their indigenous languages and cultures by modernisation and globalisation, and the resultant social transformations that their societies are undergoing (Gaini, 2018:4, 6, 8, 14). Slowly but surely, however, concern is rising about the survival of their distinctively indigenous cultures amidst the great social and cultural changes of the late nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first centuries (Gaini, 2018:8).

Povinelli (2013:212) observed that specific techniques had been used during colonial times to dis-embed colonial subjects or, more correctly, to re-embed them in the colonial order described above. The hut tax, the (missionary) boarding school, linguistic restrictions, marriage laws and religious observances were all means of dis-embedding colonial subjects from their traditional life-world and re-embedding them in another. This process, she concludes, is the embodiment of a specific formation of power. To turn the tide towards indigenisation against cosmopolitanism and the tendency among the globally orientated to break the ties of kin and state will take a special effort. Some scholars maintain that the dispossession of indigenous goods is not a thing of the past but an ongoing process; it is still happening (Povinelli, 2013:216).

The growing awareness of not only the persistent though tacit presence of indigenous knowledge, religious and life-view convictions, culture and language but also the enduring value of the cultural possessions that have survived several centuries of colonisation, has given rise to questions such as the following: How should these valuable cultural possessions be retained and be transmitted to the upcoming generations? How can and should this be done in the context of the overwhelming presence and lingering dominance of Western (and, increasingly, Oriental) cultural goods? Should the indigenous cultural heritage be combined with the Western heritage, and if so, how can and should this be done? How might an alternative cosmopolitanism (world citizenship) be constructed with “the earth” and citizenship already absorbed into the formation of power that Povinelli (2013:212) refers to as the “governance of the prior” and Peter McLaren (1997) as the “age of the predatory culture”? Can the idea and the process of indigenisation be justified on Christian ethical/moral[1] grounds?

1 The terms “ethical” and “moral” are used as correlatives in this article since the technical distinctions between them are not central to the unfolding of its core theoretical argument.

Questions such as those enumerated above gain significance in reflection on the place and role of Citizenship Education in schools. The discourse is characterised by a plethora of questions on the mission and purpose of this subject in schools (as will be discussed in more detail below). Discourses about the subject are also taking place in the former colonising countries, among others because of the influx of citizens from their former colonies who are claiming citizenship rights there (cf. Moon, 2010, pp. 1-2). The discourse about what Citizenship Education as a school subject should be harnessed for has received impetus from the many social ills and shortcomings that have recently risen on a worldwide scale, such as drug abuse, traffic violations, alcohol abuse, gender and child violence, bullying, ill-discipline, molestation (Magano, 2018) and many more. Questions regarding the place and role of Citizenship Education have gained impetus also in the former colonies. The question that triggered the research reported in this article was: How, and to what extent, could and should Citizenship Education be harnessed in and by a formerly colonised community for not only achieving the purpose and ideals of decolonisation and indigenisation but also of reinforcing them, and how can this process be justified from a Christian ethical/moral standpoint?

2. Methodological considerations

This research question had several methodological ramifications. Firstly, it had to be ascertained whether, in principle, formerly colonised communities had the desire to retain some of their indigenous cultural goods or whether they had already surrendered those goods in favour of Western cultural goods and lifestyles. Secondly, should the findings reveal that there still was a desire to retain some of the indigenous cultural goods, how should such goods be preserved and transmitted to the upcoming generations? Thirdly, if such cultural goods were to be passed on to the upcoming generations, could Citizenship Education as a school subject be harnessed for this purpose? Lastly, how could the curriculum for Citizenship Education as a school subject be adapted for it to become a suitable vehicle for this purpose? If so, fifthly, can this adaptation be justified from a Christian ethical/moral standpoint?

The first two methodological issues could be settled on the basis of a review of literature on the subject. The answer to both, according to the relevant literature, is resoundingly in the affirmative, as will be discussed below. The last three methodological issues demanded another approach, as explained in the following paragraphs.

The research problem (see previous section) is of particular concern to the indigenous critical theory. This theory, according to Povinelli (2013:213), has at its centre of attention and critique the mode of sovereignty (power) presupposed by the nation-state and, subsequently, the cosmopolitan orientation. The indigenous critical theory is not merely a description of what occurred in the past (Povinelli, 2013:220) but is critical of the violence that accompanied colonisation (and still accompanies Western and Oriental cultural domination), the injustices that were perpetrated in the process, the racist imaginaries that subtended these processes, the moral stain that accompanied it and the law-making that crystallised the colonisation processes (Povinelli, 2013:215-216). On the other hand, it accepts that these might be things of the past and that we have to look forward to a future of decolonisation (Povinelli, 2013:216). The critical indigenous theory seeks to examine the potential that every actual world contains (Povinelli, 2013:220).

Another methodological issue was whether one had to look at the problem of indigenisation and decolonisation from a Western ([neo-]liberal) perspective or from an African (Asiatic, Indo-American, Arab-Islamic, Chinese or Indic, as the case may be) indigenous perspective versus a detached scholarly perspective – the view or position supposedly from "nowhere". I combined these three perspectives in that I, as a scholar with a Western background, gathered information and perspectives from the pens and mouths of scholars with an African indigenous background but who have themselves been immersed in Western thinking, worldview and way of life. In doing so, I contrived to develop a balanced view on the basis of an interpretivist-constructivist hermeneutic (Aldridge, 2018:245-246; Jensen, 2019:4/29; Thanh & Thanh, 2015:25) and the indigenous critical theory. However, it is possible that I might not have been altogether successful, given the fact that emotions and ethics (e.g. with regard to historical violence and injustice) are constantly involved (Povinelli, 2013:222). As Povinelli (2013:224) remarks, happiness, goodness and justice are never judged by the consequences of a set of impartial decisions or from the perspective of "a view from nowhere". Judgments and views always occur within thick and particular life projects. As a result, in any given social world, multiple moral and political calculations proliferate because no two persons ever live the exact same project or interpret data in exactly the same way. I therefore opted for a standpoint that was basically informed by a Christian ethical/moral view.

As intimated, this article cannot proffer a conclusive answer to the issue of whether it is indeed necessary to infuse Citizenship Education as a school subject with indigenous knowledge and goods, and how to do so. A multitude

of factors, both local and global, come into play when reflecting on the issue of the practical implementation of indigenisation in a specific time-space. Chaos theorists Deleuze and Guattari (1994:201-202) correctly contend that we can only strive for a semblance of order (they refer to "a little order") to protect us from the chaos of a multitude of circumstances and ideas that we recognise around us when reflecting on a problem. There are so many variables that we cannot arrive at a final solution to the problem that would serve all communities and circumstances equally well. Practical implementation of indigenisation in Citizenship Education requires dealing with a heterogeneous, yet interactive space of relationships where differences, similarities and interactions are all found, and where each becomes more or less crucial at different conceptual, historical or cultural junctures. The researcher has to engage with the plethora of factors present in a dynamic time-space, as Plotnitsky (2006:52) observed, in a sea of energy of thought, in a space at the edge of chaos. Only thinking can help us confront this potential chaos (Deleuze & Guattari, 1994:208). According to Deleuze and Guattari (1994:202), "there could not be a little order in ideas (in this case about Citizenship Education infused with indigenous knowledge) if there was not also a little order in things or states of affairs, like an objective anti-chaos … Our opinions are made up from all of this". Although one could agree with this view about the multitude of views, positions, conditions and circumstances surrounding the issue of the practical application of Citizenship Education, the Biblical view is that at its core creation is orderly, having being created by the triune God who is a God of order (I Cor 14:40). If this underlying order did not exist, we would not have been in a position to make meaningful statements or draw meaningful scientific conclusions about reality, including about Citizenship Education. People and communities, wherever they are, always remain people and communities, and hence the chances are good that much of what is concluded below might indeed be applicable and useful to many indigenous and previously colonised peoples and communities around the globe.

3. Decolonisation and indigenisation – different approaches

Post-colonialism mainly concerns principles and practices that seek liberation from the oppressive forces of the West (Jansen, 2017). In a wider sense, it could also include attempts to dismantle all imperialistic and dominating institutions and structures (Gangte, 2018:56). Van Niekerk (2019:8) sees the issue of decolonisation as referring to the possibility and the desirability of

indigenising science or education in a post-colonial world. It also entails the question whether previously colonised people, such as the citizens of South Africa, should remain satisfied that the descendants of the former colonisers represent the gravitational centre of science and education. Decolonisation, post-colonisation and indigenisation are about changing the world that has been brought about through previous political, cultural and other forms of domination and the struggle against them, the search for an alternative way that challenges the socio-political status quo to bring liberation to previously suppressed peoples and individuals. Decolonisation, Fataar (2017:n.p.n.) argues, is a call for cognitive justice. Decolonisation and indigenisation do not amount to a withdrawal from the oppressive status quo but rather to an ongoing and constant participation in world structures, with the purpose of reconfiguring the underlying power structures so that they too can account for the presence and the ideals of the previously colonised community (Gangte, 2018:57).

Literature brings to light that there are basically two ways in which decolonisation could be effected: a negative-destructive approach, in which Western-type globalism and cosmopolitanism are deconstructed, and in the process questioned and rejected, and a more positive-constructive approach in terms of which previously colonised communities attempt to find a place for themselves and their traditional ways and modes of thinking in the modern global, cosmopolitan world.

Critical, negative and destructive approaches to the decolonisation project

According to Ben-Porath and Smith (2013:10), the critical indigenous theoretical viewpoint of Povinelli (2013) and others not only probes the Western philosophic roots of cosmopolitan (among others, neoliberal) ideals but also argues strongly against activities (emanating from these ideals) that threaten to erase indigenous ways of life in quests to pursue what these critics see as repressive cosmopolitan views. According to Povinelli's (2013) version of the indigenous critical theory, its exponents conceive of the claims of today's indigenous peoples in ways that vary sharply from the worldviews of most modern cosmopolitans. Indigenous claims are seen as concerns to maintain ways of life that intertwine human and non-human, animate and inanimate, and organic and non-organic entities within distinctive but shared modes of being in the world. These perspectives, according to Ben-Porath and Smith (2013:10), are in some respects more inclusive than the human-centred ones espoused by cosmopolitan theorists, for they also incorporate concerns for animals, plants and the earth itself.

Some critical scholars contend that indigenous dispossession is an ongoing process – that it is not something of the past (Povinelli, 2013:219). McLaren (1997:185), although penning his ideas approximately two decades before Povinelli, would have agreed with her. According to him, we are now inhabiting a predatory culture, one which he explains is neoliberalism "with a stark obsession of power fed by the voraciousness of capitalism's global voyage" (McLaren, 1997:183). This predatory culture, he contends, "has blinded [people] to the ways in which [the] dominant social order continues to shut the colonised out of history, even in this so-called era of interculturalism" (McLaren, 1997: 185). Sardar (2010:182) concurs: "The dominant mode of thinking … has a western genealogy with all its attendant problems. Eurocentrism is all too evident in this mode of inquiry from the way time and space are perceived, masculinity and technology are privileged and institutional arrangements are structured, and non-western cultures are made totally invisible."

The process of decolonisation would have to deal with "the kind of historical amnesia which contemporary cultural forms … have created" (McLaren, 1997:185) as well as with the tendency to reify the previously colonised and their histories, thereby depriving the previously colonised from their actual current as well as historical context (McLaren, 1997:185; Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:240). A proper understanding of citizenship in recently liberated communities and of the place and role of the citizen in such communities should account for their sociocultural context and the citizenship context in question (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:244). Fortunately, as Sardar (2010:182) has noted, conscious efforts are now being made to open up the field to non-Western perspectives, such as methodologies as causal layered analysis and criticism of ideas that are regarded as "foundationally Western". According to Fataar (2017:n.p.n.), the critical-negative approach amounts to a "first-principle negation of a Western-centric knowledge orientation … [and] seeks to replace this with a human-centric approach".

McLaren (1997:185) offers a number of positive steps that could be taken in the process of decolonisation: students should explore and begin to historicise their identification in the context of the larger political and social issues facing their countries, and guard against collapses into a depoliticised coexistence based on capitulation to the hidden imperatives of Eurocentrism, logocentrism, patriarchy, white authenticity and social amnesia. In the next sub-section, I will follow his advice and attend to a number of constructive approaches to the decolonisation project.

Critical, though positive and constructive approaches to the decolonisation project

Some critical scholars contend that colonisation is something of the past and that we have to move on towards a decolonised future now. For them, the question becomes, given that we know that historical injustices have been inflicted upon the indigenous populations, what special measures have to be taken now? What special duties, for instance, does the state owe indigenous people? (Povinelli, 2013:216). Part of the answer to these questions is that the previously colonised themselves adopt an acute literary and historical self-consciousness (Gaini, 2018:8). McLaren (1997:183) suggests that a new world order must be called into existence, a world order that involves educators in creating a new moral order at schools and at home. Schools, schooling and school systems that can respond adequately to the neoliberal and post-modern challenges, such as the youth's apathy, should be created. His line of argumentation dovetails with that of Bazalgette (2017), who argues that we need more empathy. In his opinion, the strife currently observable in societies around the world could be ascribed to what he terms an "empathy deficit" (Bazalgette, 2017). In order to pass the moral test of our times, we have to address this shortcoming by developing the ability to place oneself in somebody else's shoes, in this case, the shoes of the previously colonised whose indigenous knowledge and cultural goods have become suppressed. Empathy is the power of understanding others and their circumstances, of imaginatively entering into their feelings. According to Bazalgette (2017), this is a fundamental human attribute (that is not always recognised and developed) without which mutually co-operative societies cannot function. My argument chimes with Bazalgette's in that I contend that, through an empathetic understanding of the conditions and worldviews of formerly colonised people and through the infusion of elements of their indigenous knowledge and culture into the school subject known as "Citizenship Education", we could stimulate greater empathy and emotional intelligence in the adults of the future. Put differently, changes in the curriculum of Citizenship Education should be inspired by a constructive approach to indigenisation, not a critical, negative and destructive approach.

Intellectuals who seek to constitute a vigorous, practical alternative (to, e.g., neoliberalism, Western-type cosmopolitanism and ex-colonialist imperialism and domination) must understand indigenous philosophies and worldviews, ideally as they have been articulated in indigenous languages. They must also understand Western philosophy in its own terms, and engage Western philosophy from the vantage of indigenous philosophies in such a way that the engagement constitutes a real political activity (Povinelli, 2013:213) and

brings something new into existence, also in terms of power structures and identity awareness among the previously colonised. This is the task that I attempt to undertake in the remainder of this article.

4. Cognisance of the widely accepted aims and purposes of Citizenship Education as school subject as a starting point

For individuals, communities and the education authorities of nation-states to decide whether Citizenship Education as a subject in their schools indeed would benefit from an infusion of indigenous elements, we first need to concentrate on what has generally been regarded as the 'standard' or 'normal' aims or purposes of Citizenship Education as a school subject (irrespective of what form the subject takes in different education systems).

Recent literature suggests that Citizenship Education as a school subject is intended to achieve at least four widely accepted aims. Its *first or main purpose* is to guide students (learners) to understand that all those in a particular sociocultural space possess a shared fate and hence have to get along and discover a workable and peaceful modus vivendi. Ben-Porath's (2012) idea of a "shared fate citizenship" encapsulates the idea that people living in a particular sociocultural and historical space, with all the diversity, similarities and differences contained therein, are sharing one and the same fate and therefore are compelled to find ways to accommodate their differences, thereby ensuring stability in their community. Petrovic and Kuntz (2014:xiii) concur by stating that shared fate citizenship "is the visions, practices, and processes that make up the civic body through engaging individuals and groups in the continuous process of designing, expressing, and interpreting their membership in the nation". The degree of success that individuals and communities attain in attempting to realise this goal depends on the nature and complexity of their social, historical and economic contexts. Citizenship Education as a school subject could be employed to make the upcoming generation more conscious of the fact that as individuals and as members of their particular communities, they, in essence, share a common fate with all others in their sociocultural and historical space.

The idea of a shared fate in a shared space is supported by UNESCO (2015:24), stating that "respect for others, and their dignity, in the same way as the self-respect of a free autonomous individual, springs from each individual's personal ethic, the will to 'live together, with and for others in just

institutions'". The fate that people and communities share does not end at national borders; in the modern world, we are all involved in larger political and economic realities and processes. As national boundaries are rendered increasingly permeable through processes of globalisation, the question of what it means to be a good and recognised citizen must be understood simultaneously along both local and global (i.e. glocal) lines (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:xiv). Citizenship Education should, therefore, be intent upon making learners more conscious of their shared fate with others in their particular space, while also preparing and equipping them with the necessary skills to be able to meet the demands of a society built on the notion of a shared fate. For them to be able to do this, they need to be guided to deeper insight into the sociocultural and historical contexts or spaces in which they personally find themselves as young people. This brings us to the *second core aim or function* of Citizenship Education as a school subject, namely the need for learners to gain insight into their respective sociocultural and -historical spaces.

Van der Walt's (2017) social space and ethical or moral function theory suggests that every person or group of people and every act and interaction occur in a specific social space. He circumscribes space as the locale, status and circumstance where people and their interrelationships orientate themselves in reality. Each action and reaction occur within the cosmic framework of social interaction. Space is not only social in nature but also displays all the other modalities of reality, including the ethical/moral, to be discussed below. The social aspect of human life and reality is interwoven with all the other modalities of reality (cf. Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:ix-xii, 243). In a differentiated society, each individual, group or social relationship has assumed the form of a virtual space with its own creation mandate, function and purpose, and each of them is expected to perform this function responsibly, accountably and effectively. Citizenship Education as a school subject can be expected to provide each learner with the opportunity to learn how to exist and conduct his or her life as a responsible and accountable future citizen in his or her particular social space, including membership of a community, a nation-state and the wider world. The subject should, among others, capacitate learners to find the spaces in which they as future citizens could live and work meaningfully, and also respect the social-cultural-historical spaces of others (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:ix). The notion of respect for others and their spaces brings us to the *third aim or objective* of Citizenship Education, namely to assist and guide learners to grow into morally responsible and accountable citizens of the future.

By recognising and respecting the social space of others, one allows these others to find meaning in their space and to live in accordance therewith, thereby contributing value to human existence (UNESCO, 2015:24). Nussbaum (2012:21, 25, 28, 57, 91) emphasises that there should be respect for other people, particularly for their dignity and equality, and sympathetic moral imagination and compassion should be displayed with regard to others and their particular conditions. Respect thus displayed, she avers, should never suppress critical discourse but should rather create more social space for others to live in, in accordance with their conscience, whether others agree with them or not (Nussbaum, 2012:119).

Citizenship Education has a conspicuous ethical and moral dimension. This dimension refers to the degree to which individuals and groups in a particular social space, such as a classroom, school, family, community, nation-state or even the world, could be expected to display respectful behaviour in the sense of diligent care for the interests of all others. This principle has seen various formulations through the ages, such as caring for and loving the neighbour as much as the self, looking after the interests of others (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:240), Kant's categorical imperative, Rousseau's dictum of doing unto others as you would have them do unto you, and *Ubuntu* – the notion that synergies in the community are released where groupings are socially and culturally bound (Magano, 2018:238; Viriri & Viriri, 2018). Vorster (2004:157-163) offers three Biblical ethical/moral principles that Citizenship educators ideally should take into account in their pedagogical theory and practice: the teleological consideration, that a deed or action should be motivated by love, and that it should be a reflection or image of Jesus Christ. The teleological principle centres on the question whether (a good) end justifies (a less than desirable) means. Vorster (2004:158) correctly points out that teachers have to be cautious in their application of this principle. The end does not always justify the means. The second principle, namely the deed to be motivated by love, is directly derived from the Great Commandment. Christian love is one of the main driving forces of Christian deeds, and is one of the main features of a Christian lifestyle. Several concepts are used in the Bible to describe the comprehensive love of Christians, but all of them point to the core meaning or characteristic of love, namely compassion. In considering a particular deed, action or choice, the Christian educator should above all show compassion with the other, that is, a true comprehension and promotion of the interests of others instead of a selfish centring on own interests and advantages. In doing so, Vorster (2004:159) insists, the Christian strives at demonstrating the true image of Christ: to live a life of compassion for true community, a life of understanding the implications of the sinful brokenness of the present.

Like Christ, the Christian educator should become a servant and should be there for others (Jn 13:1-16). Christ's life was one of deputyship; the life of a follower of Christ should therefore also be a life of deputyship (the notion of "having been sent to perform a particular task"). The attitude of a follower of Christ (a Christian) in a situation of ethical/moral conflict should also be characterised by the "fruits of the spirit", as described in Galatians 5:22-26: love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, fruitfulness, gentleness and self-control.

Citizenship Education also has a *fourth basic aim or purpose*, namely to assist learners to adopt an attitude of being critical of the status quo. Learners have to be guided and assisted to develop a critical frame of mind regarding the shortcomings in the status quo, particularly regarding the neoliberal or neo-capitalist frame of mind (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:xi, xii, 243, 244, 250) and the power structures that might affect the shape of and social balances in society (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:xi). Citizenship Education, according to Petrovic and Kuntz (2014:xi, 244), should include robust interrogation and experience in discussion and debate and the building of the capacity to engage reasonably in the public square (Koonce, 2018:101). It should ideally examine and enact radical democratic principles, including discussions on human rights, social justice, democracy, the interconnectedness of people, allegiance to provocative care and the possibility of a shared human fate. Citizenship Education, therefore, should inform and challenge; it should be education for critical engagement (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:xiv). It should guide students and learners to master the skill of asking deep and difficult questions about how societies function and to engage with the philosophic method in challenging normative claims as to how they should function, particularly with reference to power structures and forms of discrimination and social inequality (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:xii, xiii, xvi). Such a frame of mind would help learners as future citizens to be critical of existing (neoliberal as well as neo-conservative) education (systems) and practices and could contribute to possibilities for new acts of citizenship based on shared responsibility, critique and an active examination of alternatives to the status quo (Petrovic & Kuntz, 2014:243).

Having briefly looked at the widely accepted aims of Citizenship Education as a school subject, we can now proceed to the issue of how the curriculum of this subject should and could be infused with relevant elements of indigenous knowledge and goods. Jansen (2017:n.p.n.) is convinced that knowledge from, for instance, Africa, Asia and Latin America will strengthen the current curriculum. Fataar (2017:n.p.n.) expresses this sentiment in even stronger terms: The incorporation of indigenous knowledge in the standard

curriculum for Citizenship Education "is a call for knowledge pluralisation, incorporation of the complex ways of knowing of subaltern and all previously excluded groups, in other words, an expansion and complete overhaul of the Western knowledge canon".

5. Infusion of the 'standard' Citizenship Education curriculum with elements of indigenous knowledge

As explained, the issue that Citizenship Educators in previously colonised countries have to deal with, comes down to the following: people and societies, including those that have formerly been colonised by European or Western powers, cannot turn back the clock to the days before colonisation. Colonisation is a historical fact (and in some cases, is still ongoing, although nowadays rather more with a cheque book, large national loans that are difficult to repay and diplomacy than with superior weaponry). In addition, people and their communities currently live in an environment already to a large extent dominated by Western and Oriental cultural goods (television, electronic games on their computers, laptops and mobile phones), mass transport and communication. Also, in this regard, the clock cannot be turned back. On the other hand, most formerly colonised individuals and communities, as discussed, are feeling the need to restore and revive the knowledges and cultural goods that were integrally part of their community life prior to colonisation. Many of these cultural goods and values have been driven to near-oblivion due to the fact that the colonising powers might have found them to be uncivilised or because, according to the colonising powers and their agents such as Christian missionaries, they were deemed to be incompatible with the values expounded in holy books, such as the Bible. In short, as formerly colonised people and communities, they cannot evade and avoid their embeddedness in the cultures imposed on them by the former colonising powers, but at the same time, they cannot abdicate from the modern world characterised by technological advances, the new powers emerging that strive to dominate them culturally, economically and in many other ways, or from the globalised neoliberal capitalist world, both of which they, their communities and their nations inevitably form part. They, nevertheless, wish to revive and restore those elements from their indigenous culture that they are still regarding as valuable. One way of doing so is to infuse the Citizenship Education with indigenous cultural elements.

Anangisye (2019) (formerly Professor of Education Foundations in the School of Education and currently Vice-Chancellor of the University of Dar-

es-Salaam, Tanzania) sees this issue as a matter of orientation. Curriculum planners, particularly those of Citizenship Education as a subject, should first ask themselves what a community and the respective individuals that make up that community could need to be self-reliant, and construct their curriculum philosophy accordingly. The next step is to enumerate all the needs of the community and its members to achieve the desired form of self-reliance, and employ Citizenship Education, in addition to all the standard aims and purposes of the subject (as discussed), to provide in those needs. Indigenisation entails restoring and reviving those elements of the pre-colonial culture that have survived the time of colonisation and Westernisation and offering them in ways that would be useful for the individuals and communities concerned. Indigenisation, according to Anangisye (2019), is context-sensitive; it should always strive to change young people into "better" citizens in terms of their community and national structure and context. In the end, he concedes, this might mean a series of contextually differentiated curricula for the various communities for which the Citizenship Education curriculum is intended. Curriculum designers should enable the various communities and their members to take ownership of the curriculum, and this can only occur if the subject creates an environment that appeals to the learners and their community and does not alienate them. This, he argues, is important for effective teaching and learning in the subject.

As to what exactly could be considered for inclusion in a Citizenship Education curriculum that would appeal to learners, Kafanabo (2019) (Lecturer in Citizenship Education and Dean of the School of Education, University of Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania) suggests that curriculum designers should take note of what the historians have uncovered about the indigenous practices and values before colonialism, and even independence. Many of the old practices and values have disappeared, as mentioned, due to the fact that the colonialists regarded them as undesirable and even uncivilised (in Western terms). Kafanabo (2019), therefore, suggests that only those cultural practices that would not be regarded as morally undesirable and indefensible in a modern society should be restored, revived and included in the Citizenship Education curriculum. There should be more concentration on the pre-colonialist values that have somehow survived the period of colonialism and cultural domination and can be morally justified, such as those relating to personhood and relationships (as in *Ubuntu*). Such values and value systems, however, should first be assessed to discover to what extent they have been affected (and even distorted) by colonialism, and also to see how and to what extent they could be revived and restored in a context of modern technological development, globalisation and neo-

capitalism. Many of the "old" values might not have survived; others might have survived but not unscathed; some others could be found to be viable and morally acceptable; some might have to be abandoned as irrelevant to modern society.

Those elements found to be morally and otherwise justifiable should be variously accommodated in the 21st-century Citizenship Education curriculum. According to Magano (2018:238-241), there are many elements from the African indigenous cultures that have survived and could be infused into the Citizenship Education curriculum. Space does not allow a detailed discussion of her findings, but the following could be mentioned. *Ubuntu* could be adopted as an over-arching philosophy since it forms the basis of cooperation and collaborative environments – it encourages all in a community or group to participate, share and support in a particular activity and promotes the virtues of kindness, compassion, benevolence, courtesy, respect and concern for others (Van der Walt, 2010). Magano (2018:238-241) also mentions traditional games that operate with mathematical concepts, proverbs that contain traditional truths still applicable in modern societies, the use of praise poems and the search for totems as a means of reinforcing identity formation, narrative (group) counselling, folklore songs, cultural dances, the use of indigenous home languages in conversation for the purpose of honing communication skills, artwork, beadwork, weaving, sculpture and much more in order to help children to express their life experiences. Magano's advice is echoed in many other discussions on the infusion of indigenous elements in modern curricula. Gaini (2018:7-11), for instance, mentions that the younger inhabitants of the Faroese Islands should be reminded of traditional ways of "telling tomorrow's weather", about their "fluid temporal orientation", their traditional stories, tales, legends and ballads, the eating of dry-aged fish as a delicacy, the celebration of Ólavsøka (a national festival), the wearing of national costumes and the Faroese ring-dance. The young should be reminded of what is familiar and durable amidst the processes of modernisation and globalisation as part of their everyday struggle for recognition and cultural emancipation (Gaini, 2018:15).

Wolhuter (2019) (Professor of History of Education and Comparative Education at the North-West University, South Africa, and past President of the Southern African Comparative and History of Education Society) adds two further perspectives. In his opinion, all countries and nations have suffered forms of colonisation. What has been said about indigenisation above is applicable to practically all nations and communities worldwide. In some cases, colonisation was of a more recent date, while in others, it might have occurred many centuries ago. Citizenship Education indeed has, he

concurs with Anangisye (2019), a contextual dimension, and the issue of infusing indigenous knowledge always pertains to this aspect; indigenous knowledge always forms part of the background and context. According to Wolhuter (2019), the more recently colonised countries and communities understandably are more acutely conscious of the role that indigenous knowledge could play in education as a liberating factor, but as far as he is concerned, all countries and societies should develop a consciousness about their past and devote themselves to the infusion of indigenous knowledge in the education of children, particularly in the curriculum for Citizenship Education. This can only occur, he contends, if indigenous knowledge has successfully passed the filtering test of the scientific method, namely of systematisation, verification and pedagogical justifiability. This filtering test, according to Van Niekerk (2019:8), should include asking what makes sense in a particular context.

The incorporation of indigenous knowledge in what has been described above as the normal, general or widely accepted functions and aims of Citizenship Education will help the subject attain its purpose in a modern decolonised society, namely that of promoting the autonomy of society, ensuring that each person enjoys basic human rights and optimal developing of the capabilities of each. It will also provide each citizen with a more profound understanding of the past of his or her country and community, the intricacies of living together and the possibilities contained therein (Wolhuter, 2019).

The notion of infusing the 'standard' curriculum of Citizenship Education with indigenous knowledge, as described above, has not found universal acceptance. Ghana's former president John Mahama (2019), for instance, holds the opinion that "the African continent has not broken its Western colonial influence and this is detrimental to the preservation of African knowledge systems. … The question is, have we as a people shaken off the shackles of Western European control and influence? The answer is, no we have not". Whether the "shaking off" of all Western and foreign influences is realistic, is debatable; we live in a globalised modern world, and it is impossible to turn back the clock of history (colonisation) and start anew. Magano (2018:236), a student of indigenous epistemologies, also does not agree with Mahama's stance. According to her, we should not attempt to undermine Western cultural goods, but we should be aware of the fact that the previously colonised peoples think and work from a different worldview. Knowledge and theories from the West, applicable as they might be for Westerners, do not speak to the culture and the way of life of people in Africa, for instance. She concludes her argument as follows: "… as much as Western knowledge has been recognised and given hegemony over other knowledge systems,

I am pushing the Africanisation and decoloniality agenda which focuses on collectivism. Western knowledge could suit Western society. However, for Africa, indigenous knowledge systems are more relevant and … deserves recognition from the rest of the world as well" (Magano, 2018:242).

6. Synthesis from a Christian ethical/moral perspective

Although much controversy still reigns as far as the incorporation of indigenous knowledge in the Citizenship Education curriculum is concerned, the fact can hardly be overlooked that previously culturally and politically dominated groups and nations have recently increased the intensity of their efforts in this regard. The recent #RhodesMustFall and other campaigns in South Africa are still fresh in our memory. It is, therefore, ethically/morally incumbent upon those responsible for the Citizenship Education curriculum (wherever it is offered, and particularly where traces of colonialist dominance can be found) to find ways and means to infuse the current Citizenship Curriculum with elements of indigenous habits, customs, practices and principles, as discussed above. In essence, the entire indigenisation project is deeply connected to ethical/moral issues: the redress of historical injustice, the restoration of new order and respect for the previously colonised, the removal of all traces of domination, the exertion of power over suppressed communities, the removal of all forms of repression, the choice for constructive alternatives (such as the infusion of indigenous elements into the Citizenship Curriculum) instead of obstructive and destructive approaches (such as campaigns that lead to the destruction of property and even loss of life), guiding young people to be critical of power structures, of the status quo, and of the current "predatory culture" of neoliberalism and rampant capitalism, the need to show compassion with the historical situation of the formerly colonised, the ability to place oneself in their shoes, the need to gain a deep understanding of their historical situation and current plight, to develop a shared fate with them as nationals of the same country, to develop ethical/moral awareness, to develop a conscience about their plight in current conditions — the list of ethical/moral aspects involved in this process goes on.

In brief, as suggested above, the Christian response to the call for redress can be encapsulated in the three principles flowing from and associated with the Great Commandment of the Bible, namely to love the neighbour as yourself: the teleological principle (the person who revises the Citizenship Education curriculum should be convinced that he or she is doing the ethically/morally

'right', good and just thing, and do it in such a way that the new curriculum should be to the advantage of all the learners concerned), the principle of demonstrating the love of Jesus Christ (the revision of the curriculum should be such that Citizenship Education, when taught in schools, should be to the advantage of all concerned; it should cover and encapsulate all the interests involved, and should not lead to the exclusion of any individuals or groups, irrespective of background, race, religion or class), and finally, the curriculum designer should strive to emulate the image of Christ (the revision of the curriculum should attest to the fact that the designer has striven to emulate Christ: what would he have done in a similar situation?)

7. Conclusion

Citizenship Education curriculum designers' first and foremost — ethical/moral — question should be what the citizens of their country (and its respective constituent communities) need on the ground in terms of citizenship formation and skills to render the subject relevant and meaningful to them and their community. They might discover that some epistemologies of Western origin have to be retained, but also that indigenous knowledges and cultural goods have grown in importance and relevance since national independence. Curriculum designers should avoid the trap of thinking exclusively in terms of either Western knowledges or indigenous knowledges, but should be open to the notion of including both in the curriculum, or at least the infusion of relevant elements from the store of their community's indigenous knowledge and cultures into the standard curriculum for Citizenship Education. This, as Fataar (2017, n.p.n.) correctly states, will "fully dimensionalise" the human in the Citizenship Education classroom, 'valorise the learners' ambitions, identifications, personal histories and intellectual worth, and provide an educational orientation that works productively and consistently to educate for full human flourishing". The achievement of these ideals will be ethically/morally satisfying from a Christian/biblical point of view.

Bibliography

ALDRIDGE, D. 2018. Religious Education's double hermeneutic. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 403, 245-256.

ANANGISYE, W. 2019, 23 July. Personal interview. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.

BAZALGETTE: 2017. *The empathy instinct*. London: John Murray.

BEN-PORATH, S. 2012. Citizenship as shared fate: Education for membership in a diverse democracy. *Educational Theory*, 624, 381-395.

BEN-PORATH, S. & SMITH, R.M. 2013. *Introduction: Varieties of Sovereignty and Citizenship*. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania University Press.

DELEUZE, G., & GUATTARI, F. 1994. *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Graham Burchell and Hugh Tomlinson. London/New York: Verso.

FATAAR, A. 2017. Decolonizing education in South Africa: An interview with Aslam Fataar. UNIVERSITY SEMINAR 23.01.2017. Retrieved August 13, 2019, from litnet.co.za/decolonizing-education-south-africa-interview-aslam-fataar.

GAINI, F. 2018. Altered Islands: Young Faroe islanders' future landscapes. *Suomen Antropologi*, 434, 3-18.

GANGTE, Z.M. 2018. You are the light of the world Mathew 5:14-16. An impetus for Christian social engagement. In: M.J. Swamy, W. Paluri, & A.T. Koshy, Eds, *Christian engagement in social change*. *The role of theological education*, pp. 47-60. New Delhi: Christian World Imprints.

JANSEN, J. 2017. The problem with decolonization. University Seminar 20.11.2017. Retrieved August 13, 2019, from litnet.co.za/problem-decolonisation-jonathan-jansen-seminar/

JENSEN, C.B. 2019. Cosmopolitical Perplexities: Pragmatic tests for changing climates. Unpublished Paper. Retrieved April 12, 2019, from Academia.edu

KAFANABO, E.G. 2019, 23 July. Personal interview. Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania.

KOONCE, J. 2018. Critical race theory and caring as channels for transcending borders between an African American professor and her Latina/o students. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 202, 101-116.

MAGANO, M.D. 2018. Indigenising knowledge for the excluded children. *Indilinga African Journal of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*, 172, 234-244.

MAHAMA, J. 2019, July 24. Ghana's Mahama calls for visa-free travel amongst African countries. [SABC News, 8.47 pm].

MCLAREN, P. 1997. Pedagogy in the age of predatory culture. In: R. Farnen, H. Sunker, D. Timmerman, & I.U. Kolbe, Eds, *The politics, sociology and economics of education. Interdisciplinary philosophical and comparative perspectives*, pp. 183-196. London: McMillan Press.

MOON, S. 2010. Multicultural and global citizenship in the transnational age: The case of South Korea. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 121, 1-15.

NUSSBAUM, M.C. 2012. *The new religious intolerance*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

PETROVIC, J.E., & KUNTZ, A.M. 2014. *Citizenship Education around the world*. London/New York : Routledge.

PLOTNITSKY, A. 2006. Chaosmologies: Quantum Field Theory, Chaos and Thought in Deleuze and Guattari's What is Philosophy? *Paragraph*, 292, 40-56.

POVINELLI, E.A. 2013. Citizens of the earth: Indigenous cosmopolitanism and the governance of the prior. In: S. Ben-Porath, & R.M. Smith, Eds, *Varieties of sovereignty and citizenship*, pp. 211-226. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

SARDAR, Z. 2010. The namesake: Futures, future studies, futurology, futuristic, foresight – What's in a name? *Futures*, 42, 177-184.

THANH, N.C., & THANH, T.T.L. 2015. The interconnection between interpretivist paradigm and qualitative methods in Education. American *Journal of Education Science*, 12, 24-27.

UNESCO. 2015. Global citizenship education. Topics and leaning objectives. Paris: UNESCO.

VAN DER WALT, J.L. 2010. Ubuntugogy for the 21st century. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 272, 1-15.

VAN DER WALT, J.L. 2017. Forgiveness Education: Key to the prevention of unhappiness due to social injustice. *In Luce Verbi*, 511. Retrieved August, 12, 2019, from https://doi.org/10.4102/ids. v51i1.2265

VAN NIEKERK, A. 2019, March 5. Dekolonisering van die wetenskap? Decolonization of scholarship? *Beeld*. p. 8

VIRIRI, N.E. & VIRIRI, M. 2018. The teaching of Uhu/Ubuntu through Shona novels in Zimbabwean secondary schools: A case for Masvingo urban district. *Journal of African Studies and Development*, 106, 101-114.

VORSTER, J.M. 2004. *Ethical perspectives on human rights*. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom Theological Publications.

WOLHUTER, C.C. 2019, July 24. Personal interview. Potchefstroom, South Africa.