

Modernity, Cultural Dislocation and the Crisis of Development in Africa

Emmanuel Adetola Layode & Omotade Adegbandin

Abstract

This essay interrogates the phenomenon of modernity in Africa by focusing particularly on the attendant predicaments of cultural dislocation in African countries. This is based on the notion that cultural affirmation and identity determination play fundamental roles in the quest for sustainable development. It argues that the incursion of western indices of modernity into Africa has birthed legions of development crises in Africa and has stunted Africa's growth. In the final analyses, it examines the imperatives for Africa's development despite the reality of modernity by averring the indispensability of salient African cultural norms as essential in addressing the crises of development in Africa.

Introduction

Several alternating theoretical and conceptual perspectives project social evolutionist ¹ presuppositions about historical progress, indicating a historical succession of cultures ² and developmental trajectories from cultural sameness to cultural diversities, ³ barbarity to refinement, ⁴ stagnancy to economic progression, ⁵ and/or provincial tribal manorial agriculture to free enterprise, social democracy and public ownership. ⁶ In whichever guise, social evolutionism suggests a justification for foreign/external intervention in backward countries otherwise known as economically challenged societies via colonization and other attendant and/or similar imperialisms,⁷ presupposing that the extant cultural norms and practices in the so-called backward societies are development-resistant ⁸ and that the influence of more advanced foreign/external cultures will enhance the development of traditional societies.

Modernity has thrived upon these sorts of social evolutionism. However, critics ⁹ have argued pointedly that in the attempt to analyze the concept of modernity and the implicit comparison and contrasting of the historical realities of societies, there has been an unfounded assumption that all societies share inevitable natural historical laws and evolutionary/chronological trajectories. According to them, this hypothesis at universality does not conform to reality. This is aptly supported by M. Y. Mudimbe's argument that "evolutionism, functionalism, diffusionism – whatever the method, all repress otherness in the name of sameness, and thus fundamentally escape the task of making sense of other worlds."¹⁰ The externalist/foreign interventionist perspective to development thus seems untenable.

Modernity is both a historical phenomenon and a conceptual framework.¹¹ In the first sense, the word ‘modernus,’ from which the word “modernity” was coined is explainable in English as indicating the present in contrast to the past, and thus suggestive of a transition beyond something that is historically surpassed. It was first used in the fifth century A.D in post-medieval Europe. It was during the time of the collapse of the Roman Empire when the cyclical opposition of ‘old” and “new” characteristic of pagan antiquity was replaced with the sense of an irreversible break with the past.¹² In the second sense, modernity bifurcates between tradition and change on the one hand, and arguably converses against tradition³ and folk lifestyle¹⁴ on the other hand. This resulted in exclusive dichotomies of societies with respective categorizations such as modern/traditional, West/rest, global/local, developed/underdeveloped¹⁵. The theory of social relations comes to the fore as central to any discourse on modernity, and different scholars have employed the typology of their various societies to capture the idea of modernity. However, despite their different socio-theoretical approaches, they all hold the view that the changes in social structures, which laid the template for modernity, occurred in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The concept of modernity is also indicative of a transition. It is in this sense that modernity correlates with modernization, connoting a societal transitional process from simplistic “primitive, subsistence economies to (Western/European) technology-intensive and industrialized economies; from subject to participant political cultures; from closed, ascriptive status system to open, achievement-oriented systems; from extended to nuclear kinship units; from religious to secular ideologies.”¹⁶ Of note in any modernization process is the role played by industrialization and the attendant socio-economic indices of modernity by which it upturned the paradigms of social relations. Such indices include a notion of scientific objectivity, instrumental rationality, (Western) education, capitalist economy, urbanization, atomistic individualism, liberal democracy, transport and communication infrastructure, social services, literacy, secularism and humanism as against superstitions, myths, irrationalities, endemic religiosity, entrenched (institutional) authoritarianism, constricting trado-religious or cultural morality and overwhelming collectivism¹⁷ embedded in traditional societies.

This explains the affinity of modernity with colonialism, especially in Africa, as the twentieth century featured the colonization of many countries in Africa, including the attendant economic exploitation and political domination. Therefore, as modernity smacks of transition from crudity to civility and colonization was portrayed as a process of modernization which portends transition into civilization, colonialism, in the guise of modernity, took on the garb of a civilizing mission. From the foregoing, it can be said that modernity

construes tradition or traditionalism as non-forward looking¹⁸ and, as such, problematic for civilization and development. It emphasizes, contrary to tradition or traditionalism, the present in contradistinction to the past but in relation to the future, and views (Western) science and technology which makes the past irreversible as central to the modernization process and development agenda.¹⁹

Culture as Existential and Developmental

The idea of culture that plays out in this discourse is the societal culture. In every society, there exists some form of interaction, communication and cooperation which gradually evolved and comprising common thinking patterns and lifestyles.²⁰ So, culture can be defined, according to Orlando Patterson, as “a repertoire of socially transmitted and inter-generationally generated ideas about how to live and make judgments, both in general terms and in regard to specific domains of life.”²¹ Scholars, especially anthropologists, have also conceived of culture, albeit differently. For instance, some construe it from a particularistic²² perspective, and others from a universalist perspective. Among the former, we find Roger Martin Keesing, Ralph Linton, Marvin Harris and Kwame Gyekye. For Keesing, culture refers to learned, accumulated experience.²³ He posited further that it is expedient to taper the concept of culture in such a way that “it includes less and reveals more.”²⁴ In this instance, culture implies learned ways of behaviour which represent socially transmitted behavioural patterns characteristic of a particular social group. For Harris, culture is socially acquired and consists of “the patterned, repetitive ways of thinking, feeling, and acting”²⁵ that are typical and distinguishing of a particular society. For Gyekye, cultural patterns encapsulating thoughts, actions and behaviours have been “created, fostered and nurtured by a people over a period of time.”²⁶ By these, we see that people are not born with culture but learn its rudiments from others in the society through social interaction, usually from the older to the younger generation, or through domestication within a process called enculturation.

Tylor’s definition of culture reflects a universalist undertone. According to him, culture is “that complex whole which includes knowledge, beliefs, arts, morals, law, custom, and many other capabilities and habits required by man as a member of society.”²⁷ This conception of culture indicates that culture, broadly speaking, is the possession of humankind, a behavioural pattern peculiar to *homo sapiens* alone, resulting from their rationality, intellection and abstraction. The universality of culture also plays out in Clifford Geertz’s theorization on culture. Geertz posited that:

The concept of culture is semiotic and instrumental to how people communicate with each other about life. Culture is an ordered system of

symbols and meanings in terms of which people define their world and express themselves. ... Meanings are rooted in social structures. Cultural and social aspects are mutually interdependent factors. ... The analysis of culture is the art of interpreting the meaning of symbols.²⁸

From the above, another characteristic of culture becomes apparent – culture is a social heritage involving “group universal behavioural practices, beliefs, ideational systems, systems of significant symbols, or informational substance of some kind.”²⁹ As such, culture is shared. It is not an ascription upon an individual but something believed, adopted and possessed, and operational within a group of people. Culture as a shared heritage also implies that culture has its historicity immersed in a system of implicit and explicit designs for the existential beingness of a designated collectivity, creating explanatory models for intra-group similarities and inter-group differences, thus distinguishing a group of people from another group. As a heritage, the failure of a generation to transmit the indices of its culture to succeeding generations may result in the complete disappearance or loss of those cultural indices, or the culture itself. Cultures are therefore valuable existential frameworks because it is only through having access to them that people attain existential meaningfulness predicated upon common existential frameworks which have historical, social, ethico-moral, spiritual, political and educational undertones and implications.

It is in the process of inter-generational transmission, or the case of intercultural relationship, that a culture attains its dynamic characteristic and development structures. These involve, according to Bewaji, “the various accumulations of experiences and creativities which are inherited from previous generations of members of the society, even while selectively discarding or acquiring aspects of these inheritances.”³⁰ As such, historically, culture has helped shape the educational development of members of the society. The educational theories, systems, processes, contents and practices have afforded the culture means of transmitting and propagating these cultural components and ensuring their dynamism, towards modifying or perpetuating the culture. In the process of transmission or infusion of cultures, cultural contents or practices gradually change; hence the notion that culture is not rigid.³¹

Instructive to note is that cultures equivocate around materiality and immateriality. The first encapsulates the tangible, obviously manifest and conspicuous components of culture, indicating the visible, measurable and describable, empirical objects.³² These empirical objects include meaningful signs and symbols, housing architectural designs, artworks, dressing patterns, hair-dos, artefacts and so on. Immaterial aspects of culture entail the norms, mores, ideas, beliefs, folklore, myths, legends, and other ideational or abstract properties of the culture with deep and pervasive influence on the people.³³

Immaterial aspects of culture serve as the ideational guidelines or normative principles which enshrine societal values³⁴ and as such, undergird socio-cultural organizations.³⁵

A characteristic of culture indicating its uneven distribution depicts, on the one hand, that people incorporate cultural practices differently and, on the other hand, those cultural practices are themselves not uniform. These explain the concept of cultural diversity as a reflection of the complexity and dynamism of the modern society featuring human communities with a wide range of options, perceptions, objectives and ideals. The diversity of human beliefs and practices is rooted in several variables, varieties, and alternatives that exist from culture to culture. (36) A critical insight into societal structures in history would reveal the difficulty and almost impossibility of finding absolute standards for human actions. 37

Cultural relativism underscores the notion of cultural diversity. It implies that the elements of a culture are to be evaluated and examined in terms of their normative and psychological function in the particular culture to which they belong. Basically, it connotes that a cultural system is always distinguished as being an autonomous group or society of human beings' set of particular and unique expressions of their perception of the world and its inherent realities. Thus, cultural diversity explains the evident differences among cultures. These evident differences serve as indicators and indices of the development-status of respective cultures.

Cultural Dislocation and the Crisis of Development in Africa

The Europe-Africa inter-cultural exchanges have, historically, been foregrounded within the social evolutionist constructs, with the presupposition that the underlying western-European cultural accretions as embedded in the notion of modernity being prodded by Western Europe embodies, sufficiently, indices for sustainable development in Africa. This Europe-Africa historicity is thematic with Europe's negative conception of Africa as a backward and primitive part of the world, necessarily requiring external intervention³⁸ and, thus, was conceived as a rationale for the imminent European cultural imperialism. Deriving impetus from Charles Darwin's polygenetic theory³⁹ towards satisfying her expansionist agenda, vigorous ideologies were espoused by Europe towards an incessant construction of "the logic of difference"⁴⁰ which ultimately culminated in the European domination and expropriation of Africa.

One area which depicts the forceful incursion of Europe into Africa is colonialism. Starting with the Atlantic slave trade and the attendant forceful migration of Africans, colonialism firmly established the historical background from which Africa advanced to modernity, albeit under the rubrics of European rule and cultural indices underpinned throughout the continent by coercion and racism and characterized by violence, exploitation and trauma. Due to superior weaponry, the higher military prowess of the colonialists shook the native's confidence in native gods and local practices. Foreign religions came with exclusivist ideologies, monopolization of the divine and very aggressive proselytism aimed not only at converting the African but also eliminating heathenism among Africans. Christianity became particularly associated with modernity and availed for new opportunities and greater freedom, especially literacy and western education.⁴¹ Western education and its accruals – access to non-physically laborious, easier and better-paying jobs in government agencies or business firms, social mobility, assumption of western cultural accretions such as dress style, language and monogamy - enhanced the emergence of a new sense of identity,⁴² and this is to the disparagement of traditional forms of education. The adverse effect of this is urbanization or metropolitanism - the centralization in the urban areas or metropolis where accruals of western education were available, to the effect of the continuous abandonment and increasing underdevelopment of the rural areas, and ultimately, Africans' massive migration to the West and the uncritical, dogmatic acceptance of the superiority of Western accretions.⁴³

In all these, the colonialist language attained a prominent position in the sense that it became the official, interactive language between the colonialists and the colonized. It also became the religious language as it is the linguistic construct within which the foreign religions are practised and as well the language of instruction in the educational centres. An immediate implication of this is that the bridge between the Africans and their world which contained the holistic meaning-making process that communication entails, and within which are embedded the conceptual realities with which the Africans construct and deconstruct the representations of their world, is broken.⁴⁴ Worst still is the problem of translation due to differentials in the conceptual realities of the different cultural systems, and the loss of the knowledge of many concepts within the African conceptual realities.

The communalist socio-cultural bonding that underlies social and economic coherence in Africa's societies was displaced by western individualism, with a multiplier effect on Africa's economy. The entrenchment of capitalism – the economic ideology of the industrial West with its attendant exploration and exploitation of natural and human resources for the objective of profit creation and capital assets - gradually weakened Africa's trade-social and people-oriented

economy. This was made possible by the trumping of western economic operatives such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund and their normative frameworks which are inimical to Africa's economic development.

These Western cultural accretions became frontline civilization models, entrenched by the emergence of a forceful and pervasive techno-scientific civilization, Western-driven globalization sloganeering, and a new crop of (African) "intellectuals...whose only mantra is cloning Africa in the image of Europe or the United States of America,"⁴⁵ underlined with their inherent values. All these distort the tempo of cultural growth and autochthonous development of Africa's civilization.

As such, the arrogant notion of supposed European superiority in contradistinction to the African in cultural, intellectual, spiritual, political, moral, epistemologico-psychological accretions became prevalent and effectively played out in the objectification of the African towards the actualization of slavery, colonialism, and imperialism in Africa. All these had great underdevelopment effects on Africa. Although they instilled some centripetal tendencies and consciousness among Africans such as the consciousness of common ancestry, cultural nationalism, ethnocentric values and political harmony;⁴⁶ these historical realities of slavery, colonialism and western imperialism and the underlying cultural implications, largely shaped Africa's developmental trajectory and the attendant crisis.

This crisis of development in Africa is very much nuanced. Generally speaking, development suggests "a change from a less desirable to a more desirable condition"⁴⁷ or the fortifying of collective and fiscal progress by varying the settings and structuring developmental attempts through systematized and deliberate efforts intended towards controlling the spread of poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, economic and industrial underdevelopment. The development has also been defined as positive and sustained growth in at least four aspects of human existence namely the individual,⁴⁸ the social, the political and the economic.⁴⁹ Walter Rodney explains the first category as implying "increased skill and capacity, greater freedom, creativity, self-discipline, responsibility, and material well-being."⁵⁰ Etuk clarifies the remaining three more explicitly as characteristic of a people or a nation, having several different indices, including the per capita income of the population; the economic growth rate; the level of life expectancy; the level of school enrolment; the level of industrial production measured against primary production; the range of commodities produced by a people both for internal consumption and for export, and so on.⁵¹

A lot of theoretical frameworks have been proffered in the discourse on development. They include the human,⁵² technological,⁵³ economic,⁵⁴ the capitalist,⁵⁵ the Marxist/socialist,⁵⁶ the dependency theorists,⁵⁷ the social/democratic,⁵⁸ the liberalist, and the sustainable development⁵⁹ theories of development. These different theoretical perspectives share evolutionist presuppositions about historical progress, indicating “steps or levels through which . . . people must have passed in the process of evolution: most usually savagery, barbarism, and civilization, the latter being considered a ‘higher’ stage,”⁶⁰ with their respective demonstrations of extremely schematic pictures of the chains of exploitations between the central and the marginal, and a clear delineation between development and underdevelopment. This idea of evolutionism was reiterated by Peter Amato as representative of logically necessary stages in history which “rigidly determines the development of cultures and the direction of their development.”⁶¹

The modernization perspective to development appears, more than any of the theories highlighted above, to exploit the evolutionist presuppositions. This perspective employs development and modernization interchangeably, albeit with a western, ethnocentric, cultural prejudice.⁶² implying not just a transition from traditionalism to modernity in a restless march to material progress as irreversible and inevitable,⁶³ but also an exclusivist approach and complete breakaway trade-cultural accretions.⁶⁴ The intent is towards the crafting of what Richard Sklar has described as “universal civilization – *homo Universalis*,”⁶⁵ which Samuel Huntington defined as “the cultural coming together of humanity and the increasing acceptance of common values, beliefs, orientations, practices, and institutions by peoples throughout the world.”⁶⁶ This notion of universal civilization rests on three assumptions. First, the collapse of Soviet Communism implies the end of history and the universal victory of liberal democracy. Second, increased interactions amongst peoples generate a common world culture. Here, the notion of universal civilization shifts the notion of civilization off its geographical and cultural frameworks, with far-reaching implications for the dynamic interplays between globalization and localization, and the attempt to homogenize humanity.⁶⁷ The third assumption condenses the earlier two. It reasons that homogenous humanity ought to adopt a single style of civilization, and that style must be Western, indicating that modern civilization equates to Western civilization and vice versa.⁶⁸ Noting that the West antedates its civilization, this position argues that the cardinal characteristics⁶⁹ of the West, which distinguish it from other civilizations, presupposes social evolution and thus indicate modernity and development more than any other. This notion of universal civilization, thus, has externalist undertones of western projections, forerunning the modernization of non-Western societies in a Westernized manner, being a derivative of the *scientistic orientation*⁷⁰ and portraying a linear

notion of developmental pattern highlighted by materialist, acquisitive and consumerist ideas, and social scientific parlance with indices such as measurability, quantifiability, visibility, physicality and objectivity. The accoutrements of such developmental patterns are exemplified within urbane infrastructures undergirded with techno-scientific innovations and advancement, a booming, capital-driven and highly industrialized economy, intensification of globalization indices, nuclear capacity, highly dollarized per-capita income, individualism, high capacity for debt (credit rating), financial-policy compliance with Bretton Woods' institutions.

However expedient the above might be for Africa's development, its forceful incursion into Africa aptly explains the development crisis in Africa, as it runs contrary to Africa's internalist paradigms which espouses "the humanistic and spiritual components of development such as humaneness, integrity, justice, freedom of the individual, harmony, community, self-fulfilment, contentment, etc."⁷¹ This notion of development is implicative of the simplistically unilinear and inherently ethnocentric concept of development by the colonialist West which has a social evolutionist undertone to the effect that replicating the advanced industrial countries is the only pathway to development. The attendant crises for Africa's development here lies in the fact that this notion of development is not sustainable because it commits fundamental mistakes by discountenancing the salient cultural norms of Africans as indices for Africa's sustainable development. Its inherent ethnocentricism is not only misleading but also invalid for Africa.

Conclusion

This paper has focused on some underlying problematic and limitations confronting Africa's development resultant from the incursion of the western notion of modernity and the attendant cultural dislocation. No doubt, there have been some impressive examples of developmental contributions from the western modernity accretions such as western education, stoppage of some inhumane cultural practices such as human sacrifice and killing of twins, urbanization of African cities, telecommunication, technological innovations and advancements. Nevertheless, the dangers of cultural dislocation are real with the conspicuous absence of value-laden African culturality in the continent's quest for development. Therefore, not only has the trajectory of development in Africa been misguided and the quality of development in Africa been seriously hampered, but also the quality of new developmental efforts would be seriously compromised without factoring in the roles of salient African cultural values in the quest for Africa's development. This is because

culture is all-encompassing, and a people's culture and its inherent values inform their practical philosophy and worldviews. Whatever developmental model to adopt must, as such, project their cultural values and norms.

The above underscores the prematurity of assuming, too readily, a developmental model for postcolonial Africa, as latent in the presuppositions underlying Europe-Africa historicity. The limits to which development agenda and models of African nations can be constructively engineered by external agencies must be recognized. This is because there is an endemic danger in imposing expectations from a monistic and exclusivist developmental model of Western modernity that does not take into cognizance African's cultural and existential peculiarities. This kind of developmental model will not sustain as it is insufficient for an African holistic cultural perspective with a fundamental belief that cognitive, psychological, spiritual, ethical, social, economic, political and material progress must effect simultaneously within the same web of cultural normativity.

The thrust of the argument, therefore, is the necessity of a revisionist detour in Africa's developmental construct or model, which, granting the irreversibility and expediencies of Western modernity indices for development, would as well take cognizance of the imperativeness of salient African cultural norms and practices and accommodate such in Africa's bid for sustainable development. This is hinged on the notion that each society ought to choose for itself its model of development structured upon its underlying socio-cultural values. Based on this is the exigency of a sort of conceptual decolonization in Africa which would examine the possibility of a nexus and utilization (through logical and hermeneutical interpretations) of salient normative paradigms embedded in the languages, religions, traditions and folk philosophies of Africa with the indices of western modernity to effect a holistic and autochthonous African development

References.

¹ Social evolutionist theories attempt a universal, a historical and rational foundation for its analysis and appraisal of the society by averring that society evolves like a living organism and changes over time. See Herbert Spencer, 1873. *The Study of Sociology*. London: Henry S. King and Co. and George Ritzer, 1996. *Sociological Theory*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., p.229. It encompasses technical evolution, suggesting "an apparently neutral, scientific process" and money economics as "a key variable in measuring people's quality of life," with an underlying notion that all humans are (or at least should be if 'modern') motivated by rational, self-interested acquisitiveness." See Emma Crewe and

Elizabeth Harrison, 2000. *Whose Development: An Ethnography of Aid*. London: Zed Books, p.25

² Shlomo Avineri, 1972. *Hegel's Theory of the Modern State*. London: Cambridge University Press, p.222

³ See Frank Lechner, 1984. "Parsons' Action Theory and the Common Culture Thesis." *SAGE: Theory, Culture and Society*, Vol. 2, Issue 2, pp.71-83.

⁴ See David Morgan, 1996. "The Gender of Bureaucracy." In D. Collinson and J. Hearn (eds.) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men: Critical Perspectives on Men, Masculinities, and Management*. London: Sage Publishers.

⁵ For instance, Rustov's theory of stages appropriately explains this phenomenon. Ifechukwu Ndiانefoo elucidates on Rustov's theory as construing development "to be spatially diffused, a process by which more and more countries evolve from the state of backwardness, capitalizing on the experience of those that developed before them. The spatial distribution of progress, however skewed at any time, is not static but dynamic. By proximity and interaction, progress is diffused through space. Progress or modernity, by its very nature, is apt to stream beyond its locus, overflowing into the adjacent space and transforming it. Thus ... uneven development is a transition phenomenon that can be removed sooner or later by creating certain favorable conditions within the underdeveloped regions and by ensuring the appropriate interaction between them and the developed regions." See Ifechukwu J. Ndiانefoo, 2013. "Philosophical Perspectives in Nigeria's Economic Development: Insights from Popper's Critical Model." In Kolawole A. Olu-Owolabi and Adebola B. Ekanola (eds.) *A Holistic Approach to Human Existence and Development*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, p.357

⁶ Karl Marx, 1976. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. 1. Harmondsworth: Penguin

⁷ John Ayotunde Isola Bewaji construes imperialism to indicate external racist, racialist, imperialist, colonialist and capitalistic domination interests – including external educational agendas, funds, curricular needs, economic goals, epistemologies, ontologies, validation and certification processes, etc. See John Ayotunde Isola Bewaji, 2012. *Narratives of Struggle: The Philosophy and Politics of Development*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, p.23

⁸ Omotade Adegbindin, 2014. *Ifa in Yoruba Thought System*. Durham: Caroline Academic Press, p. 198. Kwame Gyekye seems to suggest this when he said that "The problems confronting the African people and their societies in the

modern world are legion. To the extent that some of the problems are cultural--in the sense that they are causally related to cherished practices, habits, attitudes, and outlooks that derive from the inherited indigenous cultures--it can be said that such problems predate, and can hardly be said to have resulted from, the imposition of European colonial rule with its concomitant introduction of European cultural values and institutions. But it can also be said that some of the problems derive from attempts to grapple with, and adjust to, the aftermath of colonial rule and its institutions. Perhaps it is the complex sources of the problems that have made them more intricate, daunting, and resilient.” See Kwame Gyekye, 1997. *Tradition and Modernity: Philosophical Reflections on the African Experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. viii

⁹ See S.K. Sanderson, 1990. *Social Evolutionism: A Critical History*. London: Blackwell Publishers, p. 36.

¹⁰ V.Y. Mudimbe, 1998. *The Invention of Africa*. London: James Currey Press, p.72

¹¹ Tu Wei-Ming, 2000. “Multiple Modernities: A Preliminary Inquiry into the Implications of East Asian Modernity.” In Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (eds.) *Culture Matters: How Values shape Human Progress*. New York: Perseus Books Group, p.256

¹² According to Jurgen Habermas and Seyla Ben-Habib, “the word “modern” in its Latin form “modernus” was used for the first time in the late 5th century in order to distinguish the present, which had become officially Christian, from the Roman and pagan past. With varying contents, the term “modern” again and again expresses the consciousness of an epoch that relates itself to the past of antiquity, in order to view itself as the result of a transition from the old to the new. See Jurgen Habermas and Seyla Ben-Habib, 1981. “Modernity versus Postmodernity.” *New German Critique*, No.22. Also, see Peter Osborne, 1995. *The Politics of Time: Modernity and Avant-Garde*. London, New York: Verso, pp. 9-12.

¹⁴ By tradition we mean a product of a group of people’s engagement with nature from which they have evolved “a set of enduring or recurring beliefs, values, linguistic and other symbolic usages and social practices which define” their ways of life and ascribe unto them some sort of socio-cultural and intellectual identity and validation; or, in the words of Lawrence Harrison, an entrenchment of “traditional cultural values and attitudes.” See Olusegun Oladipo, 2002. “Introduction: The Third Way in African Philosophy.” In Olusegun Oladipo (ed.) *The Third Way in African Philosophy: Essays in Honour of Kwasi Wiredu*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, p.12. See also Lawrence E. Harrison, 2000. “Promoting Progressive Cultural Change.” In Lawrence E. Harrison and

Samuel P. Huntington (eds.) *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books, p.303.

¹⁵ See Joseph R. Strayer, Hans W. Gatzke and E. Harris Harbison, 1961. *The Course of Civilization*. San Diego, California: Harcourt, Brace and World Inc.

¹⁵ Underdeveloped societies or countries are, in the words of Rodee, Anderson, Christol and Greene, those societies or countries “which are largely agricultural and rural; more formally....those countries where the largest occupational category consists of those who are employed in agriculture.” See Carlton C. Rodee, Totton J. Anderson, Carl Q. Christol and Thomas H. Greene, 1983. *Introduction to Political Science*. 4th Edition. Auckland: McGraw-Hill International Book Company, p.77

¹⁶ Dean Tipps, 1973. “Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective.” *Journal of Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 15, No. 2. pp. 199-226.

¹⁷ See Samuel P. Huntington, 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, p.95 and Chris Okechukwu Uroh, (ed.) 1998. *Africa and the Challenge of Development*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, p.24

¹⁸ Mourad Wahba, 2006. “Philosophy in North Africa.” In Kwasi Wiredu (ed.) *A Companion to African Philosophy*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, p.163

¹⁹ Godwin E. Azenabor, 1998. *Understanding the Problems of African Philosophy*. Lagos: First Academic Publishers, p.2

²⁰ See Kola Abimbola, 2006. *Yoruba Culture: A Philosophical Account*. Birmingham: Iroko Academic Publishers, p. xvii. Abraham Kardiner defines culture as the “totality of activities, the conceived and actual values, commonly accepted in a given society.” See Abraham Kardiner, 1939. *The Individual and his Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, p.7

²¹ Orlando Patterson, 2000. “Taking Culture Seriously: A Framework and an Afro-American Illustration.” In Lawrence E. Harrison and Samuel P. Huntington (eds.) *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books, p.208

²² Roy D’Andrade professes a “particulate theory of culture’ implying “the ‘pieces’ of culture, their composition and relation to other things.” See Roy D’Andrade, 1995. *The Development of Cognitive Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.247

²³ Roger Keesing, 1974. "Theories of Culture." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, Vol. 3, pp.73-97.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Marvin Harris, 1975. *Culture, People, Nature: An Introduction to General Anthropology*. New York: Harper and Row, p. 144.

²⁶ Kwame Gyekye, 1994. "Afrocentricity and African Philosophy: Issues and Concerns." Lecture given at the Department of African American Studies, Temple University, Philadelphia (April 14).

²⁷ Edward B. Tylor, quoted in Robert Bierstedt, 1970. *The Social Order*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Ltd., p.123

²⁸ See Hans Schoenmakers, 2012. *The Power of Culture: A Short History of Anthropological Theory about Culture and Power*. Groningen: Globalization Studies, p.68

²⁹ Toyin Falola, 2018. *The Toyin Falola Reader on African Culture, Nationalism, Development and Epistemologies*. Austin, Texas: Pan-African University Press, pp. 206-208

³⁰ J.A.I. Bewaji, 2012. *Narratives of struggle: the Philosophy and Politics of Development*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, p. 102.

³¹ Ibid

³² Antonio Gallo, 2003. "Culture as a Phenomenon: The Basis of Self-Identity." In George F. McLean et. al (eds.) *Hermeneutics and Inculturation*. U.S.A: Library of Congress Cataloguing in- Publication, pp. 201-202.

³³ Gabriel Idang, 2015. "African Culture and Values." *Phronimon*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 97-111.

³⁴ Anthony Giddens, 2004. *Sociology*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., p.22

³⁵ Bierstedt, *The Social Order*, p. 154

³⁶ Robin Ely and David Thomas highlight the variables to include "race, ethnicity, sex, social class, religion, nationality, and sexual identity, all of which contribute to cultural identity." See Robin Ely and Thomas, D. 2001. "Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group

Processes and Outcomes.” *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 2. pp. 229-273

³⁷ Ibid., p. 173.

³⁸ Isaac James Mowoe and Richard Bjornson, 1986. *Africa and the West*. New York: Greenwood Press, p. 3. See also Aime Cesaire, 1955. *Discours Sur Le Colonialisme*. Paris: Presence Africaine.

³⁹ Charles Darwin indicated different species evolved in relation to biology and environment, reflecting a hierarchy of human species which situates the whites on top of others, and through which Europeans justified colonialism and their evolutionist concept of progress and civilization. See Charles Darwin, 1859. *The Origin of Species*. London: John Murray and Omotade Adegbindin, *Ifa*, p. 201

⁴⁰ Bewaji, *Narratives of Struggle*, p.90

⁴¹ John Parker and Richard Rathbone, 2007. *African History: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 53

⁴² This sense of identity results from a cultural divide between the minority who became skilled at and operated within the European models and the majority who were not educated in the western style.

⁴³ Abosede Ipadeola, 2017. “The Imperative of Epistemic Decolonization in Contemporary Africa.” In Isaac Ukpokolo (ed.) *Themes, Issues and Problems in African Philosophy*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 149-150

⁴⁴ Ngugi Wa Thiong’O, 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: the Politics of Language in African Literature*. London: James Currey, p. 11.

⁴⁵ Bewaji, *Narratives of struggle*, p. 6.

⁴⁶ See Ali A. Mazrui, 1963. “On the Concept of ‘We are all Africans.’” *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. LVII, No. 1, pp. 88-97 and Toyin Falola, 2018. *The Toyin Falola Reader on African Culture, Nationalism, Development and Epistemologies*. Austin: Pan-African University Press, p. 451.

⁴⁷ See Udo Etuk, 1998. “Ethical Conditions of Human Development in Twenty-First Century Africa.” In Olusegun Oladipo ed. *Remaking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*. Ibadan: Hope Publications. p. 276; Maduabuchi Dukor, 2007. “Globalization and Development.” *Essence: Interdisciplinary International Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 4, p. viii, and Ulf Himmelstrand, Kabiru Kinyanjui and Edward K. Mburugu, “Introduction: In

Search of New Paradigms?” in Ulf Himmelstrand, Kabiru Kinyanjui and Edward K. Mburugu (eds.) *African Perspectives on Development*. 1994. London: James Currey Ltd., p. 17

⁴⁸ Walter Rodney, 1973. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications, p. 6.

⁴⁹ Segun Gbadegesin, 1991. *African Philosophy: Traditional Yoruba Philosophy and Contemporary African Realities*. New York: Peter Lang, p. 255.

⁵⁰ Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*, p. 6

⁵¹ Etuk, “Ethical Conditions of Human Development in Twenty-First Century Africa,” pp. 278-279

⁵² *Ibid.*, pp. 278-279.

⁵³ Kwasi Wiredu, “Our Problem of Knowledge: Brief Reflections on Knowledge and Development in Africa.” In Olusegun Oladipo (ed.) *Remaking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, pp. 18-19

⁵⁴ James Smoot Coleman, 1994. *Nationalism and Development in Africa: Selected Essays*. Richard L. Sklar (ed.). Los Angeles: University of California Press, pp. 167-170

⁵⁵ Jimi Adesina, 2006. “Development and the Challenge of Poverty: NEPAD, post-Washington and Beyond.” In J. O. Adesina, Yao Graham and A. Olukoshi (eds.) *Africa and Development: Challenges in the New Millennium*. Dakar: CODESRIA, p. 38

⁵⁶ This notion of development allies with the Soviet model – a model of accumulation close to that of historical capitalism, nonetheless completely delinked from the constraints of the world system and administered at the level of the nation (or plurination) state by means of state ownership and the centralization of economic and political powers concentrated in the hands of the new rising bourgeoisie.

⁵⁷ Ian Taylor, 2006. “NEPAD and the Global Political Economy: Towards the African Century or Another False Start?” In J. O. Adesina, Yao Graham and A. Olukoshi (eds.) *Africa and Development: Challenges in the New Millennium*. Dakar: CODESRIA, p. 66.

⁵⁸ This notion of development affirms the regulation of national policies, which are certainly open but nonetheless assuring the coherence between the

expansion of capital and the historical capital/labour compromise in the framework of the nation-state.

⁵⁹ The concept of sustainable development can be defined as a distillation of interactive dependencies such as “policies, institutions and mechanisms which are relevant to the achievement of a wider diffusion of material and social well-being and the conservation of the ecological and environmental fragility of the planet.” See Anya O. Anya, 1998. “Knowledge and Experience: Biology and the Evolution of a New Paradigm for Africa’s Sustainable Development,” in Olusegun Oladipo (ed.) *Remaking Africa: Challenges of the Twenty-First Century*. Ibadan: Hope Publications, p. 25

⁶⁰ L. L. Langness, 1987. *The Study of Culture*. California: Chandler and Sharp, p. 14

⁶¹ Peter Amato, 1997. “African Philosophy and Modernity.” In Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze ed. *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., p. 77

⁶² Polycarp Ikuenobe, 2016. “Tradition, Modernity and Social Development.” In Olatunji Oyeshile and Francis Offor (eds.) *Ethics, Governance and Social Order in Africa: Essays in Honour of Godwin S. Sogolo*. Ibadan: Zenith Book House Ltd., p. 54.

⁶³ Samuel Huntington, 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster. p. 56.

⁶⁴ Richard L. Sklar, 1994. “Introduction.” In James Smoot Coleman and R. L. Sklar (eds.) *Nationalism and Development in Africa: Selected Essays*. Berkeley: University of California Press, p. 4.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 1

⁶⁶ Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations*, p. 69.

⁶⁷ Globalization has been described by Ayotunde Bewaji as a necessary consequence of the industrial and technological age, depicting the Western “system of utilization and appropriation of natural and human resources by the powerful of the world at the expense of the poor, dispossessed and victims of “development,” “civilization,” and “advancement.” J.A.I. Bewaji, .2012. *Narratives of struggle: the Philosophy and Politics of Development*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, p. 283.

⁶⁸ Ibid. See also Samuel Huntington, 1996. "The West: Unique, not Universal." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 6, pp. 28-46.

⁶⁹ Such characteristics include the following: the classical heritage drawing from Greek philosophy and rationalism, Roman law, Latin and Christianity; Western Christendom deeply steeped in Catholicism and Protestantism; European languages grouped loosely within the general categories of Romance and Germanic; separation of spiritual and temporal authorities; the rule of law and the consequential constitutionalism and the protection of human rights; social pluralism; liberal democracy, representationalism, autonomy and nationalism; and individualism, among others. Ibid, pp. 69–72. Emmanuel Levinas also holds a purely Eurocentric view by positing the Greek *logos* "as the standard conceptual framework for any encounter between Greek (the West generally) and its "others" (the non-white) thereby making a reassertion of the supremacy and hegemony of Greek or Western reason." See Omotade Adegbindin, 2014. *Ifa in Yoruba Thought System*. Durham: Carolina Academic Press, p. 28 and Robert Bernasconi, 1997. "African Philosophy's Challenge to Continental Philosophy." In Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze (ed.) *Postcolonial African Philosophy: A Critical Reader*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd., p. 185

⁷⁰ Kolawole A. Owolabi, 2000. "African Philosophy: Retrospect and Prospect." In Kolawole A. Olu-Owolabi (ed.) *Issues and Problems in Philosophy*. Ibadan: GROVACS Network, p. 27

⁷¹ J. N. Kudadjie, 1992. "Towards Moral and Social Development in Africa: Insights from Dangme Traditional Moral Experience." In Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye (eds.) *Person and Community: Ghanaian Philosophical Studies*. Vol. 1. Washington D.C: The Council for Research in Values and Philosophy, p. 208.