

Knowledge Distortions in Tanzanian Secondary Schools: A Case of Kinondoni Municipality, Dar es Salaam Region, Tanzania

Armstrong C. Matogwa

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Dar es Salaam
armstrongmatogwa@gmail.com*

&

Richard F. Sambaiga

*Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Dar es Salaam
richsambaiga@gmail.com*

Abstract

Since the 1990s there have been serious concerns about the quality of formal knowledge¹ in Tanzania. The centre of the concerns has been the relationship between formal knowledge and development. Most of the studies agree that, under-development in Tanzania is highly influenced by the poor quality of formal knowledge. Though this has been the case, little is known about the distortions of knowledge in materialist terms. As it is argued by various scholars, poor quality of formal knowledge has been associated with a poor learning environment, lack of teaching staff and other basic equipment. While these are important, this study aimed at explaining how systems of knowledge production and dissemination distort the quality of knowledge in Tanzania. By situating Tanzania in the context of European imperialism, it was observed that knowledge production and dissemination systems have been destroyed since colonial times, and the content of knowledge has been sporadically distorted to respond to the needs of the world capitalist system. The paper explains these distortions in various historical periods with a focus on secondary schools in Tanzania.

¹ In this study the definition of formal knowledge falls under Dib (1988) and Smith (2001) conception. Thus, formal knowledge is defined on the bases of the legal and institutional frameworks. Generally, it is a systematic, organized education model, which is structured and administered by specified laws, regulations and curricula. This kind of knowledge is characterized by a contagious schooling process that involves regular interaction between teachers and students. It also provides a variety of specialized programs and institutions for full-time technical and professional training.

Introduction

In materialist terms, the development of any society is measured against the development of her productive forces. The latter reflects the advancement of knowledge and skills as reflected in the social process of production. The main role of knowledge, therefore, among other things, has been to advance the productive forces of a particular society. While this is happening in core capitalist nations (CCN), in the peripheral capitalist social formations (PCSFs) knowledge does not accomplish this role. In this paper, this situation is referred to as a *knowledge crisis*, which is a direct consequence of the process of knowledge distortions. In other words, knowledge distortion is a process of stagnating articulated/relevant knowledge and imparting disarticulated/irrelevant knowledge² to a particular society. In Tanzania for instance, there have been various efforts in disseminating knowledge, including preparation of the curricula, syllabi, text books, construction of schools, training of teachers, and many others. However, despite these efforts, no notable achievements have been observed in terms of development of productive the forces as to a large extent, the peasants who comprise about 70 per cent of the national population still depend on the imported hand hoes, tools they have used since pre-colonial period. The immediate question here is, “Why is this so?” Why it is that formal knowledge in Tanzania fails to develop productive forces?

Methodology and Conceptual Framework

This study used qualitative methodology which takes into consideration the social processes, forces and relations of a phenomenon. The methodology enabled us to collect thick descriptions concerning knowledge distortions in Kinondoni Municipality³ and Tanzania in general. This was done through qualitative methods of data generation namely in-depth interview, telephone interview, focus group discussion, observation, as well as documentary and visual methods. The study involved 68 informants obtained through purposive and snowball sampling procedures. These include students, parents, and experts of knowledge production and dissemination from various institutions such as the Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE), University of Dar es Salaam, Mbweni, Twiga, Canossa and Feza Boys

² Knowledge that is incompatible with the social/domain conditions of a certain society, and is produced by the controllers of the world economic system to serve the interest of the world system (global capitalism) while destroying the interests of the peripheral capitalist nations.

³ Kinondoni Municipality was selected because it provides the ‘best case’ among other Municipalities of the Dar es Salaam Region. She has higher literate population compared to others (URT, 2015); and frequently appears in the NECTA top ten lists due to good examination performance of its secondary schools.

Secondary schools. Data analysis was done manually, and guided by the logic of qualitative methodology and accumulation by disarticulation theoretical framework. Similarly, Marxian Critical Discourse Analysis was applied to all verbal, documentary and visual data.

The accumulation by disarticulation is a conceptual framework that falls under materialism. It was coined by Amin (1974), and then amplified by de Janvry and Sadoulet (1983) and Shivji (2009). This framework enabled the researchers to situate Kinondoni Municipality in the peripheral capitalist social formations. This framework falls under the assumption that, imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism, divides the world into two main poles, core and periphery. While core capitalist nations are the drivers of the world economic system, peripheral nations are the ones being oppressed and exploited in the system (Amin, 1974; Shivji, 2009; Oelofsen, 2015). Through this process comes out as a political and economic process, it is argued in this paper that the process goes together with distorting knowledge systems in the periphery. Since this is a social process, the nature and extent of knowledge distortion in Kinondoni and Tanzania in general have been changing to reflect the dynamics of the dominant social systems as dictated by European imperialism. Therefore, this paper argues that the distortions of knowledge in the periphery are historical and systemic; organized around the interests of imperialists.

This conclusion is based on two materialist assumptions; first, knowledge is an outcome of the material conditions prevailing in a certain society. In classical terms, Marx and Engels (1968) noted that, although men are producers of their knowledge, they do not do this as they please, but as conditioned by the material conditions of the epoch. The main argument here is that the production of knowledge is directly interwoven with the material conditions of a society. Second, all individuals in a society do produce knowledge; however, the dominant knowledge has always been produced by the ruling class which dominates and controls the means of both material and mental production. In this context, therefore, this dominant class exists as a thinker, producer and regulator of the production and dissemination of knowledge. This conception of knowledge then suggests that a study on knowledge should consider these dimensions; material conditions/social organization and the dominant class of the epoch as explained in the subsequent sections.

Knowledge Articulation in Pre-colonial Social Organisations

The eastern African coast is an area extending from Somalia in the North to Mozambique in the south. This area includes some areas of Tanzania such as Tanga, Bagamoyo, Mtwara, Lindi and Dar es Salaam. The area comprises people of different ethnic groups including Ndengereko, Shonvi, Zigua and Zaramo (Mapunda, 2002). As documented in Chami (2009) and Schmidt (1997), in the pre-colonial period people of this coastal strip managed to transform from the Stone Age to Iron Age, from hunting and gathering to domestication of animals and plants. This transformation suggests an articulated system of knowledge production, dissemination and consumption. Generally, during the pre-colonial period, knowledge was stable and articulated.

In Dar es Salaam (which by then comprised small villages such as Mzizima, Kuduchi, Mbweni etc.), up to 1500 AD, the Zaramo had managed to produce simple tools such as knives, hand hoes, animal traps, machetes etc. which were used as farm tools and weapons. This enabled them to settle as a community, to produce in surplus and to defend themselves against the Kamba, invaders from Kenya (Sutton, 1970; Swantz, 1970). All these things were internally organized, skills and knowledge were possessed by community members and inherited along their lineages. The process of production was also intertwined with this kind of social organization, whereby, the Zaramo chiefs and *wajumbe* played a decisive role. Long distance trade used to stabilise this articulation of the economy by complementing other important needs and wants produced from other communities in the hinterland.

Knowledge Distortions during Arab Colonisation (1500 – 1850)

In the eastern African coastal line, and Dar es Salaam in particular, knowledge distortions started during the Arab colonisation. These colonisers interfered with the political and economic organisation of the coastal communities, thus destroyed cultural, spiritual and knowledge systems of the coastal people (Chami, 2009). Since they were the dominant class, Arabs also dominated the sphere of knowledge production. On the Eastern African coast, Africans were then forced to imitate the culture and religion of the Arabs; such as dressing styles, naming, fasting, pilgrimage and many others (Sutton, 1970). The main economic activities of Arabs were trading and agriculture. They supplied luxurious goods from Asia and China while exporting ivory and slaves. This process destroyed the Africans social-economic system which existed before, and as such knowledge systems were bent towards Arabs' interests.

In relation to knowledge distortion, this process had three main impacts as follows: first, some of the community members abandoned other productive activities like farming and fishing and joined the slave trade as traders or hunters of slaves (Sutton, 1970; Swantz, 1970). This interfered with innovation and inventions of progressive technologies regarding their social conditions. Second, the trade disturbed their serenity as the slave traders and invaders such as Bushiri and Tippu Tip were around the coastal zone all the time (Sutton, 1970). This means that productive works, particularly those involving articulated thinking, new skills and technology ceased. Third, since the region enjoyed some good stuff from Asia and the Far East, Africans then specialized in products that were needed by these foreigners such as ivory, slaves and animal skins. Thus, up to the mid-1800s, people of the coast ended up benefiting the economies of other continents while their technologies remained stagnant. Consequently, knowledge on iron and productive forces, in general, did not advance beyond these contextual needs.

German and British Colonialism (1890s -1960s)

Much of knowledge distortions and technological backwardness are found during European colonialism. To facilitate the process of primitive accumulation of capital both German and British colonists distorted knowledge systems in various ways. Knowledge distortion during this period was done mainly through colonial formal education, Christian religion, colonial economy (trade) and the colonial state. These components were not isolated, all contributed towards colonizing the minds of Africans. This is not to suggest that the process was smoothly done, rather it involved a range of resistance from the African masses (Msellemu, 2013; Tussing, 2017).

Colonial Education

The main role of colonial education was to make Africans submissive to colonial rule (Carnoy, 1974). Thus, the training was based on Eurocentric values under the mission of civilising Africans (Mushi, 2009). To accomplish the goal, knowledge in both formal and non-formal channels was distorted (Dolan, 1969; Carnoy 1974; Buchert, 1994). In this way, colonial education disarticulated the students and the general public from their immediate environment (natural and social) as it lacked practical use in their communities (Mhina, 1970). This went together with disregarding their prior knowledge which was treated as superstition. By glorifying colonial education and undermining African knowledge, Africans were made a knowledge dependent society. They had to strive to internalise new

knowledge of which the experts were not only foreigners but also colonisers, and whose main interest was accumulation of capital rather than advancing useful knowledge for Africans. It is from this observation where Ngugi (1986) sees the education process as that of the *colonisation of mind* in Africa. Writing from the experience of colonial education, he shows how colonial curricula aimed at destroying African knowledge by glorifying European values.

The 1952 syllabus⁴ for middle schools, for instance, intended to mislead Africans in many aspects concerning their history, culture, relationships, geography and science. In the subject of Citizenship and Community Development, for instance, Africans were taught to accept colonialism. This means that they were educated to respect European knowledge while at the same time disregard their own. The content of the subject was set in a manner that influenced students to equate colonial domination with true democracy, and thinking of the developmental role of the colonial state. For instance, the syllabus insisted that students understand the advantages of colonial development projects in Tanganyika. This is what it said in that regard:

“Discuss any development project that is or should be going on your district... do the people truly understand the aims and the benefits that should result? Is there any part that the school can play in promoting plans? Have you heard of any other development projects in other areas of Tanganyika? E.g. what is happening in Sukumaland, the Mlalo area of Usambara, Rufiji basin, Newala?” (Tanganyika, 1952:33).

“The development of [colonial] government in Tanganyika, the advantage of living in a state of law and order, the true meaning of democracy, obligations of the citizen, The authority of the Governor and Legislative Council, the importance of taxes... and customs dues... Defence, police, armed forces, administrative courts and prisons” (Tanganyika, 1952:34).

The main concern here is to enable students to acknowledge the roles and importance of the colonial government then. The phrases, present colonial rule as *developmental* rather than retrogressive; *democratic* rather than authoritarian.

⁴ See Tanganyika Provisional Syllabus of Instruction for Middle Schools, produced by the Department of Education in 1952.

Conversely, Standard VI students were exposed to what was called World History (Tanganyika, 1952). This covered much of European history and other areas of colonial interests. Topics such as the history of Greece, Spain, Tigris and Euphrates, Sumerians, Babylonians and Assyrians, the second Babylon Empire, the rise of Macedonia and Alexander the Great as well as the rise and fall of the Roman Empire were emphasised without any discussion of the true history of Africa in general, and Tanganyika in particular. This kind of knowledge obscured antagonistic relations between the colonists and colonized; and thus, accentuated oppression and exploitation of the latter.

The *abolitionist syndrome* was much dominant in History subject. In Standard VIII, for instance, African students were trained to appreciate European colonialism and see the colonist as saviours. The content of the subject was dominated by the glorification of the Europeans role in Africa. Europeans were presented as abolitionists and missionaries; they abolished inhuman practice of Africans, which included the slave trade and witchcraft. Therefore, as indicated in this syllabus (Tanganyika 1952), the historical epoch followed after the slave trade in Africa is not identified as *colonialism* rather, a period of *civilisation*; a period where Europeans came to save and civilise the Africans. All this aimed at distorting the African knowledge, and then use formal education as a tool to facilitate colonial domination rather than developing the natives.

Religion

Since Christianity was part of the colonial project (Carnoy, 1974), though with a different approach, it ensured that Africans abided by the colonial tyranny. In relation to the knowledge distortion, Christianity contributed much to the dismantling of African knowledge. The religion did not allow converted Africans to proceed with iron working. Since missionaries, like many other Europeans, perceived African ways of life as primitive, they associated iron working with witchcraft. In this manner, most Africans discarded their traditional skills and knowledge of ironsmithery. The following was noted by Mapunda (2002) in this regard:

“...Unfortunately, ironworking as we have seen particularly in Chapter Six it was loaded by superstition and animal offering... thus due to these practices it was highly criticized by missionaries who claimed that traditional ironworking was dominated by witchcraft and was used to disseminate the practices (witchcraft)...” (Mapunda 2002:127)

This suggests that the missionaries negatively perceived African culture/knowledge. They considered the skill uncivilized and non-progressive. Then, missionaries saw themselves as educators and civilizers, while Africans were reduced to students and barbarians who are obliged to learn wisdom, and good knowledge from them (Europeans).

Colonial economy

This component had a decisive contribution towards distorting African knowledge. As argued by founders of disarticulated theories, 'the colonial economy' was organised in a manner that complemented the economies of the core capitalist countries. The production of iron tools from iron ore which was dominant in pre-colonial period was discouraged by the supply of iron products from Europe. Since the production of iron tools from iron ore was prohibited by Europeans, then the few ironsmiths continued with the activity by using iron remains. This simplified the process of ironworking, and minimised to the maximum the traditions which were associated with witchcraft. Regardless of this difficult situation, African ironsmiths produced some of the quality iron tools such as hand hoes. Mapunda (2012) shows how the *Fipa* hand hoe (*ise*) was good and durable compared to imported hoes from Europe.

The production of iron tools using African knowledge contradicted colonists' trade interests (Schmidt, 1997). The interest of the colonial economy was to open markets for European products. Thus, all the efforts of ironworking in Tanganyika were destroyed as they opposed the logic of colonialism. For instance, the said hand hoe technology (*ise*) was copied by Europeans and after a while, the *ise* was produced directly from Birmingham (Mapunda 2002). In the process, this produced *technologically dependent Africans* as they were prohibited to invent or innovate anything with technological value.

Besides, the colonial economy also destroyed African knowledge by making them concentrate on producing raw materials for European industries. Some of them concentrated on producing cash crops at home or in plantations and some supplied labour in mines. These circumstances were not conducive for ironsmith to concentrate in their fields. No meaningful technological innovation or invention was recorded during this period as most ironsmith lost their skills and knowledge and unfortunately, they did not have a chance to transfer their knowledge to the next generation (Mapunda, 2002; Chami, 2009).

The colonial state

The colonial state as an organised force with both repressive and ideological apparatus played a decisive role in destroying African knowledge. It coordinated all processes of knowledge and cultural destruction while preserving few elements which did not contradict the logic of colonial economy. The colonial state regulated all processes to ensure the process of accumulation of capital in the African periphery is realised. This process as argued earlier went together with the process of controlling Africans' minds and destroying African knowledge. The power of the state on knowledge distortion can be seen through several ordinances which were used to legalise or prohibit certain social practices in Tanganyika (Shivji, 1984; East, 2018). For instance, the state restricted Africans from ironworking by enacting several by-laws as explained in Mapunda:

“Studies show that missionaries’ arguments were fallacious. They claimed that Africans ironsmith were witches, and killed people for sacrifice... this affected the security of the communities, thus must be prohibited. The colonial state relied on such claims without doing further investigation since the claims came from their fellow Europeans. The state then enacted anti-ironwork by-laws to prohibit traditional blacksmith from such practices. Brutal punishment which included imprisonment, whipping and fine were applied to lawbreakers... Another fallacious argument was on environmental degradation. Europeans claimed that traditional ironworking caused deforestation and desertification. In many areas this argument was used to prohibit ironworking. However, detailed studies have proved this statement wrong.” (2002:130).

This quotation shows how the colonial state coordinated religious activities and linked them to the main objective of colonialism. On this background, the state enacted by-laws to stagnate African technology to conform to the goals of colonialism (Rodney, 2001; Mapunda, 2002). This was a deliberate process of disarticulating Africans from their immediate environment. The process also created a *knowledge dependent society* in Africa. A society which cannot make its own productive forces depends on external technology even in the production of gadgets.

Knowledge Distortions during the Ujamaa period

In Tanzania, the term ‘Ujamaa period’ is used to describe a period that started from 1961 to the early 1980s. This period has several names; some scholars describe it as after/post-independence (Mushi, 2009), or

neocolonial period (Nkrumah, 1966). The period is characterised by the great social process of *ujamaa*. It was a period when the state tried to build a kind of African socialism (Nyerere, 1968). By referring to it as the *ujamaa* era, we do not refute the *neocolonial* conditions that impinged African countries in this period. The term is used purposely to describe the main knowledge currents which dominated the era. For example, Kimambo et al. (2008) have referred to this as a period of *Africanisation of knowledge*, acknowledging the efforts made by the Tanzanian state to put things into her own perspective.

Revolutions in formal knowledge were done along with the *ujamaa* philosophy which discarded European values and at the same time recognised some of the African values. The philosophy also diminished religious, racial and class segregation in education provision by making education free for all Tanzanians. Through *education for self-reliance*, basic education was meant to enable students to live and transform their immediate environment. Thus, practical knowledge on agriculture and other vocational skills were emphasized. Thus, the education system was restructured to incorporate work (learning by doing) as part and parcel of the studies.

Similarly, the state of Tanzania and the University of Dar es Salaam as main agents of knowledge production those days played an important role in the *Africanisation of knowledge*. The University was made to be an investment of the poor, where students were enabled to think independently towards revolutionising their social conditions particularly those prevailing in the villages. According to Nyerere (1968), the universities in developing countries had the duty of making their contribution to the world of knowledge, i.e. promotion of thinking rather than being passive recipients of European knowledge. By this Nyerere meant that the university should be self-sufficient in knowledge production, it should discard the colonial legacy, and produce knowledge which is relevant to Tanzanians. In this respect Nyerere (1968) had this to say:

“Whether in a developing country or elsewhere, a university does not deserve the name if it does not promote thinking. But our particular and urgent problems must influence the subjects to which thought is given, and they must influence, too, the approach. Both in the university-promoted research, and in the content of degree syllabuses the need of our country should be the determining factor...And it is my conviction that, universities in a country like Tanzania have other urgent task to fulfil which will test their

resources-human and material- to the utmost. I do not believe that they can at this stage pursue pure research and knowledge for its own sake without neglecting other functions which are for the time being more important... ” (1968:181).

This shows how Nyerere was trying to contextualise knowledge production and dissemination at the university level. On the same wavelength, the University of Dar es Salaam started to produce knowledge relevant to the conditions of Tanzania. Most of the courses by then reflected the real conditions of Tanzania. For example, they tried to philosophise the needs of Tanzanians by using the *ujamaa* (*African socialism*) and anti-imperialist theoretical framework. Various departments elucidated their role in relation to this philosophy. The Department of Development Studies, for instance, put it clear that:

*“Development Studies offers a foundation course of study to all students in each of the Faculties. It seeks to provide a broad interdisciplinary perspective on the development problems of East Africa, and the potential for socialist transformation of the society.... The first section of the course offers an **historical survey of the process of technological and social change** as they have occurred in Africa and the developed world and of **the efforts of East African countries in their attempt to liberate themselves from the political, economic and cultural impacts of colonialism**. Building onto this base, the focus in the second section will shift to a more detailed analysis of the **development prospects of East African**, including the **international context** and the resource base within which they operate, as well as some of the major issues in defining **future development strategy** (UDSM undergraduate prospectus, 1972/1973: 9).*

The above quotation gives out a picture of the kind of knowledge the Department was strived to produce and impart to students. For example, the study on process of *technological and social change* in Africa and the developed world, and the efforts of the East African countries *to liberate themselves from the impacts of colonialism* highlight a sense of awareness of our society and directed towards liberating the society out of colonial legacy. It also highlights the nature of social relations faced by the East African countries in the *international context*, and the desire to understand, change and strategically plan for their future development.

Other courses relevant to the Tanzania social conditions which were offered at the University of Dar es Salaam include: *The bases of East Africa's present underdevelopment, The Legacy of pre-colonial African Society, Major Elements of Development in the modern world and its impact on developing countries, The rise of Capitalism and Imperialism, The Nationalist movements, Socialism and Development, experience in socialist countries, Self-reliance and socialism in Tanzania, The problem of Underdevelopment, and Development strategies in East Africa, Socialist change in the economic and social structure, The balance between agriculture and industry; prospects for industrialization, Rural development and ujamaa, Political economy of industrial states, Tanzania Socialism and African Political Thought, Imperialism and Liberation, Tanzania economic history, Political economy of industrial states.*

All these courses particularly in the 1970s were offered under the framework of *Ujamaa* philosophy. The philosophy was anti-imperialist and rested on African values and culture. This context necessitated the revival of local industries and the need to advance small industries in Tanzania. The establishment of UFI (Ubungo Farm Implements) and ZZK-Mbeya (*Zana za Kilimo*/Farm implements Mbeya) shed light on the matter.

Since the mid-1980s to date, things have changed for the worse. All the efforts above were destroyed during this period. The state and the university abandoned the *ujamaa* philosophy completely, and they all turned towards neoliberalism (Zezeza, 1997; Shivji, 2009; Patnaik and Moyo, 2011). Under this *new philosophy (neoliberalism)*, all efforts of *Africanising knowledge* were turned upside down. African culture, knowledge and ways of life were disregarded. It became fashionable then to embrace Eurocentric knowledge which was glorified as modern and developmental. The following section tries to elucidate the situation by focusing on knowledge production at the university and dissemination in secondary schools.

Knowledge Distortions in the Neoliberal Era; Secondary and University Education

Neoliberalism as a theory of political economy emerged in the late 1970s and produced a great programme which came to be known as Structural Adjustment Programs (SAPs). The programme was pioneered by core capitalist nations (CCN) particularly the USA and Britain, and was controlled by the International Financial Institutions (IFIs): The World Bank and the IMF in particular (Shivji, 2009; Williamson, 2009). It was said that the programme was intended to rescue developing countries from economic crises and great indebtedness experienced in the 1970s. Thus, to get

structural adjustment loans, developing countries had to comply with structural adjustment conditionality (Williamson, 1990, 1993, 2009).

In the *Washington consensus I*, the custodians of neoliberalism came out with Ten Commandments (conditions) which developing countries were obliged to implement. Among other things, the countries had to comply with free-market economy (reduction of the state role in the economy), liberalisation of the economy, devaluation of the national currency, reduction of public expenditure, promotion of exports (comparative advantage), increase in domestic savings, privatisation of the formerly state-owned companies, promotion of private property rights, and foreign private investment (Williamson, 1993; 2009; Bond, 2007). The list of SAPs was sporadically updated to incorporate other liberal values. In the *Washington consensus II*, for instance, several concerns were added. These included the promotion of human rights and democracy, labour market flexibility, institutional reforms, proper taxation, improving education, land titling (in Hernando de Soto's fashion), land reforms and accessibility of microcredit (Williamson, 2009).

As far as knowledge production is concerned, neoliberalism came to suppress the notion of *society* and social cohesion by advocating individualism, privatisation, class inequality, polarisation and other liberal values (Harvey, 2005; Shivji, 2009). The state and universities in the periphery were both transformed. Through the institutional transformation frameworks, they were all forced to discard *ujamaa* philosophy and embrace neoliberal thinking. They were forced to disseminate ideas from the IMF, the WB and other international organisations lumped together as the international community.

Under this context, while African states became 'toothless dogs' (Shivji, 2009), the universities were turned into 'vocational schools' (Mamdani, 2007; Chachage, 2016). This means that both the state and university lost their autonomy in determining what knowledge is relevant in their context. In Tanzania, for instance, the state started to neo-liberalise her policies, laws, institutions, development strategies and many other components. For example, Kweka (2012) shows how the NSGRP is lodged with neoliberal theorisation. The same is also observed in national documents such as Tanzania Development Vision 2025, secondary school curriculum, syllabi, and textbooks. The content of these documents shows how neoliberalism dominates the systems of knowledge production and dissemination in Tanzania as explained in the following sections.

Knowledge Distortions in Tanzania Development Vision and NSGRP

The dominance of neoliberal thinking is observed in these two documents. In addition to what Kweka (2012) observed (neoliberal thinking in NSGRP), this study shows a clear link between neoliberal thinking in MDGs, Tanzania Development Vision, and NSGRP. Reading these three documents together, they all fall under the neoliberal philosophy; the philosophy of the core capitalist nations, international financial institutions and the so-called international community. This philosophical dependency is openly declared in the documents (Tanzania Vision 2025 and NSGRP) credibly. For example, the Tanzania Vision 2025 says:

“The need to formulate a new economic and social development vision for Tanzania emanated from the outcomes of economic reforms - especially those which were pursued since 1986... Secondly, the government had realized that those earlier development policies and strategies were not in consonance with the principles of a market led economy and technological development occurring in the world. The government, therefore, started preparing three-year reform programmes with strategies, generally, focusing on only a few economic and social areas, and the areas of focus changing frequently. These structural adjustment programmes, have been followed for a long time, about fifteen years... The government and the society in general realized that the nation lacked direction and a philosophy for long-term development. The new Development Vision 2025 feels this vacuum” (Tanzania Vision, 2015).

Besides, the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) claims:

“The National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) is a second national organizing framework for putting the focus on poverty reduction high on the country’s development agenda. The NSGRP is informed by the aspirations of Tanzania’s Development Vision (Vision 2025) for high and shared growth, high quality livelihood, peace, stability and unity, good governance, high quality education and international competitiveness. It is committed to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as internationally agreed targets for reducing poverty, hunger, diseases, illiteracy, environmental degradation and discrimination against women by 2015. It strives to widen the space for country ownership and effective participation of civil society, private sector development and fruitful local and external partnerships in development and

commitment to regional and other international initiatives for social and economic development” (URT 2005:1)

The phrase *It is committed to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as internationally agreed targets* directly shows the philosophical link between these frameworks. The agenda of the World Bank and the IMF became the agenda of the Tanzanian government. Issues of private sector development and external partnership which were previously seen as retrogressive⁵ were prioritised during this era. Reading the objectives of National development vision and National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) together they clearly show how neoliberalism dominated the state and state actors, they all aiming at promoting neoliberal agendas. This includes promoting the private sector as the driving force of Tanzanian economy, to promote free-market economy, Human rights and Democracy, good governance and the rule of law, Gender equality and Women empowerment, capacity building, entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial mindset (Tanzania Development Vision, 2025; URT, 2005:28-29).

Knowledge Distortions at the Universities

With reference to the University of Dar es Salaam, we have observed that there was a shift from producing contextually relevant knowledge to the neoliberal one. This was guided by the grand process of change, namely the Institutional Transformation Programme (ITP). Under this programme, the University of Dar es Salaam was forced to re-arrange her administrative and academic programmes to suit the neoliberal framework. While in the political and economic arena this was described as a *lost decade* for Africa (Shivji, 2009), it was a *dark period* for the University of Dar es Salaam (Mukandala, 2012). Thus, many departments, by 1990s started to offer neoliberal courses. Neoliberal theorization became dominant in almost all courses and departments. Neoliberal discourses such as entrepreneurship, globalisation, human rights, democracy, gender and the like dominated academia (UDSM, 2013, 2017).

This means that in the neoliberal era, the university as a centre for knowledge production was thus dominated by neoliberal thinking. As opposed to courses provided during the *ujamaa* era, these courses/discourses were loaded with capitalist values of individualism and private property. As explained by informants, many courses are now theorised along with neoliberal framework; academia is biased towards

⁵ See Arusha Declaration 1967

micro-analysis, modernisation and post-modern theories. The *dark days* of the university are also characterised by a crisis in research funding. It was observed that from the 1990s the University of Dar es Salaam has been surviving through donor funds whose research agenda is pre-determined (Mukandala, 2012). Normally the research topics fall in the neoliberal pool, pushing the researchers away from the real conditions existing in Tanzania.

Knowledge Distortions in Secondary Schools

In Tanzania, the dissemination of formal knowledge is organized in five levels, namely pre-primary, primary, secondary, tertiary, and university education (URT, 2014). It is expected that the level of knowledge and skills of students should be increasing from one level to another. Each level is guided by a curriculum which determines the content and the extent of knowledge and skills to be disseminated. This paper explains how this content is distorted by focusing on the curriculum at the ordinary level of secondary education in Tanzania, citing examples from history and civics subjects.

Curriculum

A curriculum is a mirror which reflects the philosophy and culture of a particular society. It shows the nature and sources of knowledge, skills, attitudes and social values; pedagogical orientations, teaching and learning aids, teachers' competence, curriculum enabling infrastructure and methods of monitoring and evaluation (TET, 2013). In light of this study, the first four components need special attention since they determine the nature of knowledge in the society. These were captured by looking at the objectives of the curriculum and the resulting subject syllabi and textbooks.

The Tanzanian Secondary education curriculum has changed four times since independence. These changes were a response to the major changes that took place in Tanzania social organisation. It first changed in 1967 to replace the colonial curriculum and then changed in 1979 to incorporate *ujamaa and self-reliance* in the secondary schools (TET, 2013; Mushi, 2009). In 1997, the curriculum was again changed as a response to social and political changes that happened since the 1980s (TET, 2012, 2013). Lastly, the curriculum was changed in 2005 to respond to national and international development programmes such as NSGRP, Development vision 2025, Education Sector Development Programme (TET, 2012, 2013). The last two changes were done purposely to incorporate neoliberal thinking in secondary schools. According to TET (2012), these changes were done to enable students to be *employable* and cope with the *labour market*. Changes were also made to address issues of reproductive health and *gender equality*,

with emphasis on eradicating 'archaic thinking' on gender and *sexuality*. It is believed that these changes were *inevitable* and backed with the desire to cope with development of science and technology in the world (TET, 2012).

This paradigm shift is observed in the first part of the curriculum where the *Broad Learning Objectives and Competencies* are stated. Among other things, the curriculum insists on understanding, acknowledgement and respect for human rights, individual differentiations (social classes), self-employment and acquisition of *modern* values for development. All these are neoliberal discourses which were designed to suppress *Africanisation of knowledge* in Tanzania. What are called 'modern values of development' draw on Rostows' (1960) model of development which glorifies the European culture and knowledge while disregarding African knowledge as primitive and retrogressive. Knowledge distortions in the curriculum are well observed in the second part, where *Curriculum Content-Learning Areas and Subjects* are described. This paper presents the content of two selected subjects, history and civics, to reveal the distortions and the way they inhibit relevant understanding of social conditions prevailing in Tanzania.

History Subject and Knowledge Distortions

As noted in the syllabus of history, the subject intends to enable students to understand the organization and evolution of African societies, and their experiences, which include problems, struggles and success achieved over time to predict the future. It also intends to enable students to understand the relationship between Africa's developmental problems and foreign intrusion, colonial domination, cultural subjugation and economic exploitation at various stages in history. Additionally, it intends to enable students to understand and appreciate the efforts made and strategies used by African people to regain their independence and resist neocolonialism (URT, 2016: VI). Looking at this content and the conditions of Tanzania, this study has noted that, at this level the subject is well articulated. The philosophy behind this content is also relevant as it situates the history of Africa within the context of imperialism as TIE recommends:

The history of Africa from the second half of the nineteenth century to the present cannot be adequate[ly] understood without situating it within the context of imperialism. One very obvious expression of this imperialism was the European expansion into Africa which took place on a massive scale from about 1875. (2002:1)

To be able to situate Africa within the context of imperialism, the philosophy of Historical Materialism has been recommended (*Ibid.*). It is argued (by TIE 2002) that, *Historical Materialism* is a powerful philosophy of interpretation and analysis compared to other perspectives lumped together as *Idealism*. The latter have been discredited as superficial and inadequate towards understanding the true history of Africa in general and Tanzania in particular.

However, despite the usefulness of this philosophy as recommended by TET (2012), in the actual sense, it is not coherently applied in the syllabus and history textbooks. Our observations on the syllabus and history subject textbooks reveal that Historical Materialism as a theory of understanding societies is applied only at the early stages of evolution of African societies up to 'few years after independence'. Topic 3 of Form Four history syllabus/textbooks, for instance, explains the history of *African States after Independence*. In this topic the materialist approach is abandoned. The analysis of issues has been based on an empiricist (Eurocentric) direction contrary to the relevant philosophy recommended by TIE (*Ibid*) above.

Reading one of the famous⁶ history subject books, Kaloly and Kiruthu (2017) show clearly how the authors have moved towards a Eurocentric perspective. On explaining the reasons for independent, African nations to change ideologies and political systems, for example, the authors stress descriptive factors like *weak economies, searching for a new identity, the desire to establish good relations with friendly states, to eradicate racial discrimination, to reallocate land* and others of the same nature. This description is idealistic, and provides an incomplete analysis of the matter. The topic has not been situated in the context of imperialism, thus, it does not enable students to capture the essence of the topic in question.

Similar distortions are observed when the authors present the Arusha Declaration, and particularly the weakness of *ujamaa*. On this subtopic, the authors (Kaloly and Kiruthu) do not hide their intention to subvert Historical materialism. Since they list strengths and weaknesses in numbers, putting many weaknesses (11) than strengths (7) prepares the students/readers to give attention to the weaknesses. However, the listed weaknesses are backed with neoliberal philosophy (empiricist approach) of which, if interpreted using the Historical Materialism Theory they do not hold water. The weaknesses of *ujamaa* according to the authors include:

⁶ Famous in the selected/studied secondary schools

Foreign investors were discouraged from Tanzania and other countries that adopted socialism...Foreign investment in the country reduced drastically in numbers as many investors wanted to have freedom to operate capitalist enterprises with little interference from the state...The number of tourists especially from western Europe stagnated due to the socialist policies adopted by the government...There was more slow growth in economic development as there were few incentives for individual citizens... (Kaloly and Kiruthu, 2017:92).

On *Africa in International Affairs*, the fourth topic in Form Four history subject the same distortions are observed. The topic begins with the Materialist Perspective, addressing issues of imperialist domination on Africa since the 15th century to date. Issues of European exploitation and oppression as well as the Pan-Africans Movement are well explained using Historical materialism on the initial pages of the topic. However, the philosophy is discarded on the way; particularly the discussion on the *relationship between Africa and the International Organizations* such as UN, IGOS, NIGOs and UN agencies is presented. This part is dominated by a Eurocentric perspective which portrays a positive role and constructive contribution of these organizations in Africa. On the roles of UNESCO in Africa for example, the authors (*Ibid.*) say, UNESCO helps in providing free education, eradicating racial, social and international tension, promotes appreciation of cultures in the world and raises standards of living of the people. Similarly, the role of the UNHCR in Africa as described by the authors includes assisting African refugees with food and clothing, medical aid, education and other needs (Kaloly and Kiruthu, 2017)

The authors as well describe the roles of UNICEF in Africa as follows:

...UNICEF deals with welfare activities with respect to children all over the world. African states have worked closely with UNICEF to promote the welfare of children in the following ways; works towards promotion of material health in Africa and in other parts of the world... Sponsors programmes in the continent to promote the welfare of infants through breastfeeding and other forms of nutrition including multi-vitamins... Donate essential drugs to protect the lives of young children and mothers... assist refugees worldwide... (Kaloly and Kiruthu (2017:169-170)

Reading these roles as described in the history books it is clear that Africa is not situated in the context of imperialism. Historical materialism, the philosophy which provides adequate analysis of African history is replaced

by Eurocentric perspective. The authors have not critically theorised the roles and existence of these international organisations. In this manner then, the authors of the textbooks and the syllabus do not only bring *theoretical confusion* to students and readers of history but as well contribute to distorting the real African history.

When a critical analysis is done on the roles of these international organisations, it reveals their oppressive and exploitative agenda in Africa. It is from this angle Hancock (2009) lamented, by describing and portraying them as *lords of poverty*. For him, these organisations contribute to intensifying problems of Africa such as poverty and hunger rather than helping the continent. His analysis of UN programs through IGOS, NIGOs and UN agencies such as Red Cross, UNICEF, WHO, UNHCR, European Economic Community, USAID, UNDP, FAO, Oxfam, shows that most of activities and programs conducted by these organisations aim at benefiting European nations and the White workers while humiliating and retrograding Africans. These organisations use African problems to their own benefits while their governments gain political rights to oppress African states through their activities. In this sense, the organization becomes an *ideological UN apparatus*. Here Hancock laments:

One agency that has mastered the art of saying much and giving little is the Hunger Project, a massive international undertaking which raises fund in the United States, Britain and many other countries with the claim that it is dedicated to the eradication of persistence of hunger and starvation in the Third World; in fact, it sends almost no money to the starving at all... The hunger project received donations totaling \$6,981,005 ...out of this, 210,775 was passed on in the form of grant to other organizations involved in relief work in hungry countries. All the rest was spent in the US ... (2009:6)

He continues:

The real failure, however, is symbolised by the continued existence of the aid agencies themselves: if they were doing a proper job of promoting development in the third world, then, presumably, they should have put themselves out of business by now. Over almost fifty years they should have dealt systematically with the problems that they were established to solve closed up shop and stopped spending tax-payers money...They have done no such thing, however. On the contrary, they have managed to stay firmly on the scene despite the rapid changes that have taken place in the post war world. Neither

have they simply, doggedly persisted: the majority have grown from year to year with ever bigger budgets, ever more projects to administer and ever more staff on their ever-expanding payrolls...Employed to serve the poor, these staff rank ironically amongst the best-paid professionals on earth. Their mission is to work for the deprived-and yet they themselves enjoy an astonishingly rich and diverse range of perks and privileges... (2009:74)

Similar observations come from Bond (2007) and Green (2012) who observed that the main role of UN agencies is to destroy and loot African resources. While Hancock (2009) sees UN agencies providing *poisonous aid*, Green (2012) views them as sources of riots. All crises in Africa, they say (such as wars, rebellions, hunger, poverty, refugees, malnutrition, etc.), are created by core capitalist nations for their interests; thus, *aid* becomes deception and a palliative kind of activity, just to fool the poor. However, despite this relevant analysis of the relationship between international organisation and Africa, it is ignored in the history subject. The subject embraces a Eurocentric view in general and neoliberal theorisation in particular. This distorts the true knowledge of the African history as it can be viewed in the *big picture* of imperialism.

The same confusion seems to face the authors of the most recent history book in Tanzania titled *A New History of Tanzania* (Kimambo *et al.*, 2017). As in the history subject book, historical materialism is applied in some chapters and the others have been lodged with Eurocentric perspective. For example, chapters like *The Integration of the Tanzanian Interior in the Capitalist System* (Chapter 8) *Imperialism and Colonialism; The Scramble and Partition of Africa* (Chapter 11) and *The Colonial Economy* (Chapter 13) have widely applied Historical Materialism while the majority of the remaining chapters have been theorised along idealism. From Chapter 17 to 20 for example, the authors argue, after colonialism Tanzania has passed through two different historical epochs namely '*post-independence* and *globalization*'. Historical materialism is not applied in these last two phases; they are dominated by Eurocentric perspective instead. Paradoxically, what is called the Globalisation phase, the period in which Tanzania/Africa has experienced rampant destructions of people's lives (Bond, 2007; Shivji 2009; Green, 2012), is described in only two paragraphs, which conveys no useful knowledge. The chapters are too descriptive, vague and misleading⁷.

⁷ According to Kimambo I. N. *et al.* (2017:107) missionaries were not part of the colonialism project. Their aim was to spread Christianity and provide humanitarian help such as the suppression of slaves

Knowledge Distortions in the Civics Subject

Currently, civics subject is guided by the 2005 syllabus which is said to consider sufficiently the current social, cultural, global, technological, and cross cutting issues in Tanzania (TIE, 2017). Going through the syllabus and civics textbooks, this study observed that neoliberal thinking dominates the subject. The subject is occupied with neoliberal discourse, gives no room for students to think otherwise. Topics like *Human Rights* (Form I), *Democracy and Gender* (Form II), *Economic and Social Development* (Form III), *Culture and Globalisation* (form IV) are framed along the neoliberal philosophy which, according to this study function to distort proper knowledge concerning the matters. The books are too descriptive and cherishingly present neoliberal ideology as ultimate truth. No serious critiques have been raised against imperialism and neoliberal fetters. The following civics topics reveal these distortions.

Human Rights and Knowledge Distortions

In Tanzanian secondary schools, the topic of human rights is introduced in Form I. As indicated in the civics syllabus, the objective of this course is to enable students to demonstrate the ability to recognise and respect human rights and individual dignity (URT, 2017). In key civics textbooks human rights are defined as basic things that all human beings are entitled to and which nobody should interfere with (Abeid and Olotu, 2017a), or as principles of fairness, justice and benefits that all human beings are born with (Nyangwine, 2011). These include right to life, ownership of property, education, marriage, health care, privacy, housing, security, freedom of expression, freedom of association and freedom of worship (Ibid). All these rights are based on the Universal Declaration of Human Rights of 1948 and are categorised into three main groups namely, Civil and political rights, Economic, social and cultural rights, Environmental and developmental rights.

As taught in Form I, these rights are said to be very important as they are the foundation of justice, peace and freedom. They also promote democracy, equality and discourage any form of discrimination against colour, gender, religion or ethnic origin. Thus, in the long run, human rights promote the development of the people (Nyangwine, 2011; Abeid and Olotu, 2017a). However, the findings reveal that the knowledge of human rights in secondary schools is distorted as it is based on liberal theorisation while disregarding other non-liberal values. In a simple statement, the analysis

and local wars. However, this argument is contrary to the reality, that missionaries were part of the colonial project, the colonisers (See Shivji, 1989; 2009; Rodney, 2001; Depelchin, 2004).

shows *what is liberal is a human right and what is not liberal is not a human right*. Thus, in a general picture, knowledge of human rights in secondary schools contains the following distortions:

First, the disseminated knowledge does not disclose the philosophical and contextual roots of the human right discourse. From a Historical Materialism Perspective, it is well established that, the conception of conventional human rights is rooted in the European bourgeoisie philosophies of natural law and positivism all of which protects the bourgeoisie interests (Shivji, 1989). By then, the term *human* in these human rights did not include women, slaves or black people. Slaves, and black people in this context, were described as cargo, thus can be possessed or killed with no trouble (Lauren, 2011). Therefore, the term right in human rights says Shivji (1989) reflects a commodity producing society where the concept of *equality* is expressed in the equivalence of exchange in the sphere of commodity circulation. These liberal values are not questioned in the disseminated civics knowledge.

Second, the idea of human rights did not emerge so peacefully as the civics syllabus and textbooks try to suggest. Some scholars (Shivji, 1989; Lauren, 2011) explain how the idea emerged out of class struggles of the oppressors against the oppressed, slaves against slave masters, colonists against freedom fighters, property owners and paupers. Since the universal declaration of human rights was reached while all African countries were still dominated by colonialism, and the classes between colonist and freedom fighters persisted, it is clear that the declaration did not aim to protect the rights of the exploited majority of Africans. Until now, the knowledge of human rights as disseminated in secondary schools does not criticise the question of class divisions and imperialist oppression; instead, the rights stand as a legal and moral justification of these matters⁸.

Under the same framework, the effects of imperialism on Africa and elsewhere in the world are not seriously questioned in human rights knowledge. Though the custodians of human rights try to insist on the discourse, the experience reveals their pretense. They violate human rights but no one questions. On this Shivji explains,

“What western intellectuals say about violations in Uganda, Zaire, Equatorial Guinea etc... It reeks of ‘hypocrisy and opportunism’ when the role of Britain and Israel in installing Idi Amin, the role of

⁸ See, Abeid and Olotu (2017a) and Nyangwine, (2011)

CIA in identifying and installing Mobutu, the role of Spain, US and France and even the Soviet Union in Equatorial Guinea etc. is rarely mentioned or if mentioned is glossed over... even worse the hypocrisy and opportunism is reproduced within the African scholarship and activity on human rights, the few African NGOs funded as they are by their western counter-part or other western funding agencies, rarely touch on the role of imperialism. They do not even expose the crimes of their own states. Instead much time is spent on refining legal concepts of human rights and the machinery for implementation (1989:60-61).

In the same framework, Moyn asserts;

“The human rights have become prisoners of the contemporary age of inequality, rising with but not challenging neoliberal globalization” (2018:6).

These quotations try to highlight the imperialists’ practices against peripheral nations on the question of human rights. Though they are the main violators of human rights in the world, no sanctions were applied on their side. For instance, no action was taken against the US and NATO when they invaded Iraq and Libya (Sishuwa, 2011; Chipaike, 2012; Cadier, 2016). They all celebrated the killings of Gadhafi, Sadam Hussein and Osama Bin Laden (Ibid). What does *the right to life* mean in this context? Unfortunately, this kind of analysis (anti-imperialism) is lacking in the civics syllabus and textbooks in Tanzania secondary schools. The disseminated knowledge of human right is very descriptive, ahistorical and liberal.

Democracy and Knowledge Disarticulation

In Form II, secondary students are introduced to the concept of democracy. As explained in certified form two civics textbooks the concept is framed along the neoliberal philosophy. In these books, democracy has been explained monolithically; and refers only to capitalist/liberal democracy (presented as the only democracy in the world). In this regard, all other types of democracies (which favour historical materialism conceptual framework) are categorised as a dictatorship. In this study, we have observed that anything which contradicts capitalist values or refute the logic of capitalist accumulation is regarded as dictatorship (Zombwe, 2008; Abeid and Olutu, 2017b).

For both Civics textbooks above the meaning of the term democracy does not go beyond Abraham Lincoln's definition⁹. There are only two forms of democracy presented in these books namely direct and indirect. Both forms fall under neoliberal philosophy thus implicitly means other forms of democracy are dictatorial kind of ideas. They all see democracy as being built by the basic principles¹⁰; for instance, the principle of economic freedom and equality denotes;

*... **Economic freedom**; democratic societies allow people to have economic freedom, the government allow private ownership of goods and services... **equality**, democracy values all individuals' equality this means that people have equal opportunities and may not be discriminated because of their race, religion, ethnic group or gender. Democracy allows an individual or group the right to have different cultures, personalities, languages, and beliefs. (Abeid and Olutu 2017b: 50)*

This paragraph suggests two important things; first what is called the principle of *economic freedom* aims to promote privatization and fetishism of private property rights which is one of the pillars of neoliberal economics. This was also noted by Femia (1993), Amin (1994) and Chachage (2002) that, under imperialism *freedom* is only enjoyed by the owners of the capital while the rest remains exploited and oppressed. Second, the principle of *equality* intends to justify class inequalities. Though it seems to take care of various kinds of discrimination, *class* as a major component of discrimination and inequality is not mentioned. Since neoliberal democracy promotes private property rights, class inequality and the resulting forms of discrimination are regarded as normal, part of human nature.

Reflecting this in Kinondoni, this study has observed how class inequality is taken for granted. For instance, there is a big gap between public and private secondary schools in the area. While education is provided free in public secondary schools it costs 3 to 6 million Tanzanian shillings in selected private schools. While public secondary schools are deprived, lack important teaching and learning aids, the same cannot be said in selected private schools; they have all equipment needed for secondary school education thus teaching and learning environment is conducive. What kind

⁹ Democracy is a *government of the people, by the people, for the people*.

¹⁰ Principles of democracy include citizen participation, equality, transparency, accountability, regular free and fair election, political tolerance and consensus, economic freedom, Human rights, adherence/Bills of rights, Rule of law, Freedom of press, and Multi-partyism

of equality is this? Is this differentiation acceptable? Why do other parents afford to pay a tuition fee of 6 million Tanzanian shillings while others cannot afford even 20 thousand? Is this normal? Is this equal opportunity? These are some of the questions that neoliberal democracy cannot provide relevant answers to.

Conclusion

This study sought to explain knowledge distortions in Tanzania secondary schools. Reflecting this from Kinondoni Municipality, it was observed that, knowledge distortions in secondary schools have deeper roots. The phenomenon originates from the Arab colonisation through European imperialism to date. It is argued in this paper that, knowledge distortions in secondary schools stem from the destructions of knowledge production systems in Tanzania which have passed through several historical phases, namely colonialism, neocolonialism and neoliberalism. In the last phase, the study has shown how the State and the University of Dar es Salaam have bent towards neoliberalism. The process of producing relevant knowledge in the Tanzanian context was muted in the 1980s and completely destroyed since the 1990s. Currently, the role of both state and university is to rubber-stamp neoliberal knowledge from the custodians of neoliberalism.

In this regard, the disseminated knowledge in secondary schools contains this neoliberal character which functions to disarticulate Tanzanians from the conditions of life. This is revealed in the current curriculum, syllabus and textbooks for history and civics subjects. Though knowledge distortions in history subject are not rampant as in civics, they still bring confusion in understanding African societies in general and Tanzania in particular. The study also has shown how civics knowledge is distorted; the subject is widely affected by neoliberal thinking which functions to promote imperialism and coloniality in Tanzania and Africa in general. Thus, in the end, secondary schools disseminate disarticulated knowledge, which impinges on the development of productive forces and society in general. Finally, this study recommends, the state and universities as the main agents of knowledge production should redefine their role and turn towards producing relevant knowledge for Tanzanians. This includes radical curriculum change which will also affect secondary school syllabi and textbooks. The production and dissemination of knowledge should be framed along an anti-imperialism theoretical framework.

References

- Abeid, R., and Olutu, S. (2017a). *Civics for Secondary Schools: Form One*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Abeid, R., and Olutu, S. (2017b). *Civics for Secondary Schools: Form Two*. Dar es Salaam: Oxford University Press.
- Amin, S. (1974). The Disarticulation of Economy within Developing Societies. In C. Alavi and Shanin, Y. (Eds.), *Introduction to the Sociology of Developing Societies* (pp. 205-209). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Amin, S. (1976). *Unequal Development; An essay on the Social Formations of the Peripheral Capitalism*. Stanford: The Harvester Press.
- Amin, S. (1994). The Issue of Democracy in the Contemporary Third World. In U. Himmelstrand, Kinyanjui, K. and Mburugu, E. (Eds), *African Perspectives on Development* (pp. 320 – 335). Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota.
- Amin, S. (2009). *Eurocentrism, Modernity, Religion, and Democracy: A Critique of Eurocentrism and Culturalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bond, P. (2007). *Looting Africa: The Economics of Exploitation*. London: Zed Books.
- Cadier, M. (2016). World in Conflict: The Case of Libya, The United Nations & NATO. Bachelor Thesis, The University of Gothenburg, Institution of Global Studies.
- Carnoy, M. (1974). *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Chachage, S. (2002). National Building and Ethnicity: Towards a Reconceptualisation of Democracy in Africa. *Utafiti; Journal of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences*, 4: 151-178.
- Chachage, S. (2016). Ghettoisation of Basic Research in Higher Education. *Kavazi Occasional Papers, No.4*. Nyerere Resource Center.
- Chami, F. (2009). *Zanzibar and the Swahili Coast from C. 30, 000 Years Ago*. Dar es Salaam: E&D Limited.
- Chipaika, R. (2012). The Libya Crisis: The Militarization of the New Scramble and More. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 2(8): 43-48.

- de Janvry, A. and Sadoulet, E. (1983). Social Articulation as a continuation for Equitable Growth. *Journal of Development Economics*, 13(3): 275-303.
- Depelchin, J. (2004). *Silences in African History, Between the Syndrome of Discovery and Abolition*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Dib, C.Z. (1988). Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Education: Concepts/Applicability. *Cooperative Networks in Physics Education, Conference Proceedings 173* (1988) 300-315.
- East, J.W. (Transl.) (2018). *The labor question in German East Africa (Tanzania): A collection of Primary Historical Sources*. Retrieved from <https://www.academia.edu/37559841>.
- Femia J. V. (1993). *Marxism and Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Kimambo, I. K., Mapunda, B. B., and Lawi, Y. Q. (2008). *In Search of Relevance: A History of The University of Dar es Salaam*. Dar es Salaam: DUP.
- Kweka, O. (2009). Uliberali-Mamboleo Ndani ya MKUKUTA. *Chemichemi*, 2: 8-14
- Lauren, P.G. (2011). *The Evolution of International Human Rights* (3rd Ed). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mamdani, M. (2007). *Scholars in the Market Place: The Dilemmas of Neoliberal Reforms at Makerere University, 1989-2005*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Mapunda, B.B. (2002). *Ufundi Chuma Asilia Afrika Mashariki: Chimbuko, Kukua na Kukomaa Kwake*. Dar es Salaam: Peramiho Printing Press.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1968). *A critique of The German Ideology*. Moscow: Progress Publishers.
- Mhina, J.E. (1970). Education in and Around Dar es Salaam. *The Journal of the Tanzania Society, Tanzania Notes and Records*, 71: 175-180.
- Moyn, S. (2018). *Not Enough: Human Rights in an Unequal World*. Cambridge: the Belknap Press.

- Msellemu, S.A. (2013). Common Motives of Africa's Anti-colonial Resistance in 1890–1960. *Social Evolution & History*, 12(2): 143–155.
- Mukandala, R.S. (2012). Fifty Years of Generating and Advancing Knowledge: The University of Dar es Salaam's Experience and Outlook for the Years Ahead. *Papers in Education and Development*, 31: 1-20.
- Mushi, P.A. (2009). *History and Development of Education in Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: DUP.
- Ngugi wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Nairobi: Heinemann.
- Nkrumah, K. (1966). *Neocolonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*. New York: International Publishers.
- Nyangwine, N. (2011). *Civics for Secondary Schools: Book One*. Dar es Salaam: Nyambari Nyangwine Publishers.
- Nyerere, J. K. (1968). *Freedom and Socialism*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Oelofsen, R. (2015). Decolonisation of the African Mind and Intellectual Landscape. *Phronimon*, 16(2): 130-146.
- Patnaik, U. and Moyo S. (2011). *The Agrarian Question in the Neoliberal Era: Primitive Accumulation and the Peasantry*. Nairobi: Pambazuka Press.
- Rostows, W.W. (1960). *Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmidt, P.R. (1997). *Iron Technology in East Africa: Symbolism, Science and Archaeology*. Bloomington: Indian University Press.
- Shivji, I.G. (1984). Law in independent Africa: Some reflections of the Role of Legal Ideology. Edited Version of the Transcript of Speech Given to the College of Law, The Ohio State University, Columbus, U.S.A. on 1st October, 1984; Unpublished Paper.
- Shivji, I.G. (1989). *The Concept of Human Right in Africa*. London: CODESRIA Book Series.
- Shivji, I.G. (2009). *Accumulation in an African Periphery: A Theoretical Framework*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Shivji, I.G. (2013). Democracy and Democratization in Africa: Interrogating Paradigms and Practices. *The African Review: A Journal of*

African Politics, Development and International Affairs, 40(1): 43-57.

- Sishuwa, S. (2011). *Lessons from Libya: Who defines a dictator?* New African, December 2nd: 28-32. <https://newafricanmagazine.com/2703/>.
- Smith, M. K. (2001). What is non-formal education? *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education*. Retrieved from <http://infed.org/mobi/what-is-nonformal-education/>.
- Sutton, J. E. G. (1970). Dar es Salaam: A Sketch of a hundred Years. *The Journal of the Tanzania Society*, 71: 1-19.
- Swantz, J. (1970). The Zaramo of Dar es Salaam: A study of Continuity and Change. *The Journal of the Tanzania Society*, 71: 157-164.
- Tanganyika. (1952). Provisional Syllabus of Instruction for Middle Schools. Dar es Salaam: Department of Education.
- TIE. (2002). *History Teachers Handbook: Africa from the Nineteenth Century to the Present*. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education and Culture.
- TET. (2012). *Tafakuri ya Maboresho ya Mitaala na Mkakati wa Mafunzo kwa Wadau*. Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu na Utamaduni.
- TET. (2013). *Maboresho na Mabadiliko ya Mitaala toka Mwaka 1961 hadi 2010*. Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu, Sayansi na Teknolojia.
- Tussing, N. (2017). African Resistance to European Colonial Aggression: An Assessment, Africana Studies Student Research Conference. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.bgsu.edu/africanastudiesconf/2016/001/2>.
- United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2000). Tanzania Development Vision 2025. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of State, Planning Commission.
- United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2005). National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP). Dar es Salaam: Vice President's Office.
- United Republic of Tanzania (URT). (2014). National Education and Vocational Training Policy. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education and Vocational Training.
- TIE. (2016). History Syllabus for Ordinary Secondary Education: Form I-IV. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.

- TIE. (2017). *Civics Syllabus for Ordinary Secondary Education: Form I-IV*. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education, Science and Technology.
- University of Dar es Salaam. (2013). *Undergraduate Prospectus 2013/2014*. Dar es Salaam: DUP.
- Williamson, J. (1990). *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* Washington: Institute for International Economics.
- Williamson, J. (1993). Democracy and the Washington Consensus. *World Development*, 21(8): 1329-1336.
- Williamson, J. (2009). A Short History of the Washington Consensus. *Law and Business Review of the Americas*, 15: 7-23.
- Zezeza, P.T. (1997). *Manufacturing African Studies and Crises*. Darkar: CODESRIA.
- Zombwe, G. M. (2008). *Civics for Secondary Schools: Book Two*. Dar es Salaam: Nyambari Nyangwine Publishers.