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Abstract

Canaan Sodindo Banana, a freedom fighter, statesman, academic and cleric, is arguably the most controversial clergyman from Zimbabwe. He was a polarising figure in both his personal life and academic writings. Much is known about his political legacy, but very little about his educational views. This essay appraises Banana's views on the content and purpose of education in a post-white settler society. The essay employs document analysis to review Banana’s views on education and concludes that his view was that education should liberate and empower the poor, particularly the previously disadvantaged.
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Introduction

On 17–20 August 2017, the Methodist Church in Zimbabwe celebrated 40 years of autonomous mission from the British Methodist Conference. Since it arrived in the country some 126 years ago, the Methodist Church has produced fine leaders for the church and the state. Among these leaders is the Rev Canaan Sodindo Banana, a freedom fighter and academic who became the first ceremonial President of independent Zimbabwe. He represents the second generation of African mission-school-educated elites who pioneered the African people’s struggle against ecclesial and political oppression by the whites in the church and society. Never shy to express his opinions, Banana alienated himself from his comrades-in-arms and his church. Both the church and the state shunned his legacy because of his critical political theology of these institutions and also because of his personal life drama. His political theology was viewed in church circles as too radical. He was convicted of sodomy and imprisoned. Banana became an outcast in the eyes of both the church and the state. He died on 10 November 2003, a disappointed man and a villain in their eyes. The government refused him national hero status and burial at the iconic National Heroes’ Acre, where most
liberation war heroes and heroines are buried. At the same time, the Methodist Church did not grant him an official funeral. In a largely conservative country, for many, his fall from grace was punishment for his “unconventional” theology (Gunda 2015, 57).

Banana’s most known contribution is in politics as a non-executive President of independent Zimbabwe. In academic circles, he is remembered for his call to re-write the bible. In church circles, he is known for his spats with his white-dominated church that made him, at one point, sever ties with the church that he so loved. However, Banana also contributed tremendously to his view and criticism of education. Unfortunately, this contribution is overshadowed by his political legacy. This article evaluates Banana’s views on the content and purpose of education, particularly in a post-colonial nation-state. Using document analysis of Banana’s various writings, the article will show that Banana consistently believed that all education must empower people, especially the poor, to be self-reliant. Through this critique, Banana was not merely highlighting his views on what he believed the content and purpose of education should be; rather, he was confronting the church and the state about the kind of education they were offering.

The Making of an Educator-President

Banana was born to Methodist parents at Esigodini, near Bulawayo in Zimbabwe, on 5 March 1936. His father was a local preacher and a herbalist. He did his primary and secondary education at Mzinyati Mission and Tegwani High School. He went to study for ministry at Epworth Theological College just outside Harare between 1960 and 1962 and was ordained minister in the United Methodist Church (UMC) in 1966. In 1973, Banana enrolled for a Master of Theological Studies degree at Wesley Theological Seminary in Washington DC, United States of America, graduating in 1975. 1979 he completed a Bachelor of Arts (Honours) degree from the University of South Africa. Later in life, he became actively involved in the struggle against the white minority settler rule for which he was detained, restricted and imprisoned. Gundani (2000:176) observes that Banana “consciously decided to join party politics and took a leadership position without renouncing his priestly collar.” With the coming of independence, he gladly accepted the non-executive presidency. A radical theologian, Banana published several books in which he articulated his political theology. Banana was an avid sportsman and a regular spectator at the country’s top-flight soccer league matches. Upon his retirement from the presidency with the constitutional change that abolished the non-executive presidency, he took up a lectureship position in political theology at the University of Zimbabwe. He also became an elder statesman mediating in conflicts on the continent. When Zimbabwe began to show signs of socio-economic collapse, he criticised President Robert Mugabe (Kumalo 2005, 158-159). Meldrum (2003) notes that Banana was earmarked to mediate between President Mugabe and opposition leader Morgan Tsvangirai to resolve the country’s socio-political and economic crisis in the early 2000s.
Banana is a towering, multi-faceted, hard-to-ignore figure in the history of Zimbabwe, not just because he was head of state and a clergyman who had a spectacular fall from grace but also because of his contribution to education. He is, thus, important as a subject of academic study. To begin with, he was Methodist for all his life. As Kumalo (2005, 158) observes, “The Church educated and gave him employment as a school teacher and clergyman. Methodist education shaped him and, in turn, he also played a role in shaping it. Second, he was involved in education in all the crucial periods of Zimbabwe, from the period of the struggle for liberation, as Head of State and as university professor.”

Third, “Banana was one of the vocal, prophetic liberation theological mouthpieces of the church during the liberation struggle in the 1970s” (Paradza 2019, 5). He remained a liberation theologian all his life, and his conviction on the need to empower the poor was not affected by the privileged life he lived as Head and later as former Head of State. Even after independence, he stood for the poor. He was very critical of the landlessness of the indigenous Zimbabweans due to colonial dispossession and the early post-independence land redistribution programme, which saw the elite enriching themselves. “At present, the landless seem to be the least beneficiaries of the resettlement programme. We need to continue to focus on the landless as a priority sector,” Banana (1996, 246) wrote. In his view, political freedom and independence are undoubtedly important, but unless they are accompanied by economic and social justice, they are meaningless.

Needless to say, this subsequently compromised the church’s prophetic role insofar as challenging the unjust land distribution is concerned. The war of liberation (1964–1980) was fought primarily, though not exclusively, on the basis of land re-acquisition. After the attainment of political independence in 1980, the land question had not been addressed in a comprehensive manner, even though after the collapse of the Geneva talks (1976), the Lancaster House agreement (1979) made basic provisions for land redistribution (Urbaniak and Manobo 2020, 226).

For Banana, total freedom and independence are achieved when people gain political and economic freedom. Like the Old Testament prophets like Amos, he condemned political injustices and economic inequalities. He agreed with Gustavo Gutierrez’s idea of a “theology from the underside of history”, saying:

In recent years it has seemed more and more clear to many Christians that if the Church wishes to be more faithful to the God of Jesus Christ, it must be aware of itself from underneath, from among the injustice, struggles and hopes of the wretched of the earth - for such is the Kingdom of God (Banana 1991, 3).

Banana continued to do theology from the underside and, even in the books that he wrote later in life, he still saw himself as “doing theology from his experience as an activist and educator in the liberation struggle” (Banana 1991, x). He argued that the church had a role to play in the struggle against colonialism, in reconstruction and
development after independence and a prophetic role in cases of abuse of power. He advocated for a complete transformation of society. “Revolutionary transformation is a thorough-going process. It entails a fundamental change in the structural basis of our entire system: economic, social, political or religious” (Banana 1985, 10). He was against all forms of oppression and corruption that dehumanised the poor majority in the world and Zimbabwe, in particular. “The Church stands challenged to mediate on behalf of the oppressed and underprivileged of our society” (Banana 1985, 10). Many times, he was scathing of the church for not taking a stance against injustice and for not coming on board aggressively to address the issues facing the nascent nation.

Banana focused on social and political education, emphasising the need for the Church’s involvement in education that leads to liberation and self-reliance (Banana 1987, 42). He acknowledged and praised the importance of missionary and church education in the struggle for independence. “By the accident of history, a good number of Africans acquired education and skills that were to prove useful in their bid to analyse colonial repression and articulate African aspirations” (Banana 1985, 11). It is also a common cause that missionary education groomed most of Zimbabwe’s political leaders.

A few examples are: Robert Mugabe who went to Kutama College, a Catholic Jesuit School; … Leopold Takawira who went to St Augustine Penhalonga and was a lawyer and a key figure of the liberation of Zimbabwe; and Samuel Mumbengegwi, a former student of Dadaya, former government minister and now lecturing at Great Zimbabwe University (Muzambi 2017, 92-93).

Banana was one of the leading liberation theologians in Zimbabwe, if not north of the Limpopo, at the time. His political theology raffled feathers. He advocated for socialism as the mode of production that promoted African communal values. He described socialism as “the legitimate child of Christianity” and urged the church to get over its “in-built antipathy towards socialism” (Gifford 1988, 425). The zenith of his theology was with his The Gospel According to the Ghetto (1990). Banana also re-wrote the Lord’s Prayer, including the lines “Teach us to demand our share of the gold/and forgive us our docility” (Meldrum 2003). He became a subject of criticism from many segments of the Christian community after suggesting that the Bible should be rewritten to be relevant to African experiences.

As signs of decay within Mugabe’s government began to manifest themselves, Banana became critical, and he and Mugabe seemed to have developed bad blood. He was convicted of sodomy and sentenced to prison. Some critics viewed the conviction and sentence as Mugabe’s political strategy to silence the influential cleric (Kumalo 2005, 159). Banana died in a London hospital and was not accorded a full state funeral befitting of a former Head of State. He was buried at his rural home of Esigodini, far from the National Heroes Acre, “his contribution and insights sadly lost to both the church in Zimbabwe and Southern Africa” (Kumalo 2005, 159).
Education as Liberation of Culture

Banana observed that education as liberation will lead to the liberation of culture. On the one hand, colonial education was meant to segregate and exclude African children from attaining education. On the other, the education system “bred black Europeans who debased their own culture and history” (Banana 1982, 53). The system did alienate a few privileged Africans from their own world. Banana also lamented the damage done by colonial education to African culture, suggesting that it focused on disempowering African people by destroying their culture. “Education meant the washing away of African culture and its total replacement by Western values founded on exploitative capitalism” (Banana 1987, 29). Banana also criticised the school system for being functional in supporting colonial regimes in eroding African culture. “Colonial education was part of the cultural arrogance of the Western tradition which identified human success and progress with itself and identified failure with non-western culture” (Banana 1982, 62). The system did not only undermine the African-based non-formal education but dismissed it as an irrelevant form of education (Banana 1982). This was a deliberate move to colonise the African minds. Soderstrom (1984, 92) argues that

The students were uprooted from their traditional environment. During school terms they lived in a Western culture and way of life. When they returned home for the holidays they were more or less alienated from their families and the African way of life.

Through this approach to education, Banana concurred with another educationist, Bongani Mazibuko (e.g. 2005, 2003), who viewed education as a tool of colonisation, arguing that through the mass media and school textbooks, the oppressor bombards the oppressed with images of their oppressors throughout their life, “until they adopt and internalise these images as their models” (Kumalo 2005, 167). Paulo Freire (2005) called this a “cultural invasion.”

Cultural invasion, which serves the ends of conquest and the preservation of oppression, always involves a parochial view of reality, a static perception of the world, and the imposition of one worldview upon another. It implies the “superiority” of the invader and the “inferiority” of those who are invaded, as well as the imposition of values by the former, who possess the latter and are afraid of losing them (Freire 2005, 160).

Banana and Mazibuko observed that daily, “the forces of oppression bombard Africans with oppressive educational content with little to no liberatory educational content to counter the oppressive one” (Kumalo 2005, 167). According to Banana, “An elite is created on the basis of education and economic considerations and used as a buffer between the oppressor and the oppressed. The legitimate aspirations of the poor remain unsatisfied” (Banana 1981, 327). Since the aspiration of the oppressed is liberation, education must not perpetuate their enslavement. He wrote:

Enslaving education arises from colonial models that continue to serve the dependency structures, promoting internalization of foreign values, re-enforcing class structures, and
creating producers of raw materials and consumers of manufactured goods. The colonially inherited educational system benefits a select few, who, through the hierarchical school structures learn to accept their positions in a stratified society (Banana 1990, 174).

Banana’s argument on inequalities created by the education system was connected to his liberation theology. He was completely against the system that divides people and creates socio-economic classes. Thomas (2005, 321) notes that “unlike among the black theologians in South Africa for whom colour was an issue, Banana’s analysis has always been in terms of class.” Thus, Banana writes:

We aim to form a society where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, neither rich nor poor, neither the downtrodden, nor the privileged. Christianity aims to create the Kingdom of God whose society is devoid of the iniquitous class system” (Banana 1991, 53).

In the same vein, Gunda (2015:141) argues that Banana’s motivation was social justice:

Banana sought the establishment of a justice, equality and equity driven society, a society that would protect all its citizens, a society that would uphold fairness as a virtue in human relationships and transactions.

Banana advocated for a “Combat Theology,” which he described as “a theology of actionable protest” (Thomas 2005, 326). His combat theology did not have a biblical or theoretical basis but used a poetic approach,

It believes in the right to self-expression;

It believes in the right to self-determination;

It believes in the right to self-reliance;

It believes in power, over weakness;

It believes in victory, over defeat;

It believes in pride over shame;

It believes in love over hatred;

It believes in anger over meek submission (Banana 1996, 364).

Education for Constructive Citizenship

For Banana, education should serve the goals of development, which can be understood as:
A process by which members of a society increase their personal and institutional capacities to mobilize and manage resources sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations (Mpumlwana, cited in Kumalo 2003, 12).

According to Banana, colonial education discouraged the marginalised from developing skills. He argued that colonial education “tended to wean the elite from the hoe, the pick, the shovel, and all other instruments of production” (Banana 1987, 30). In his view, colonial education discouraged a work ethic among Africans. Most mission schools emphasise academic education over practical training (Soderstrom 1984, 98). “It did this by stigmatising manual labour as a sign of backwardness and failure, an activity open to the dull ones while mental labour in offices or in the classroom was exalted as the acme of greatness” (Kumalo 2005, 169). To walk the talk, Banana kept poultry at the State House to demonstrate his belief in education for and with production (Banana 1987, 28).

For Banana, the solution was to approach education from a socialist perspective. Education aims to enable people with skills to produce resources essential for their livelihood (Kumalo 2005, 68). He averred:

> Education with production is the search and restorer of the natural unity and balance between the pursuit of knowledge and the acquisition of the practical skills for the production of the material means to life (Banana 1987, 28).

He saw education as needed for the production of resources and as the tool for empowering people with practical skills that enable them to participate in the production of material means for their wellbeing (Kumalo 2005, 170). By so doing, Banana is, in a way, affirming certain aspects of missionary education which sought to provide technical skills, such as carpentry, farming, poultry, sowing, etc., to Africans (Banana 1987, 27). Africans had been used to hunting and gathering, and by imparting technical skills to them, the missionaries were helping them adapt to an emerging industrial society (Kumalo 2005, 170). The Church of Scotland held a similar view in responding to the Bantu Education in South Africa in 1953:

> We believe that Christian education policy must seek to prepare members of every social group to assume their full share of adult responsibility in the service of the country (Christie 1991, 81).

The colonial government was not interested in an education that would make Africans independent by empowering them with skills. Rather, it wanted to keep Africans dependent. While introducing Bantu Education to Parliament, Hendrik Verwoerd, the architect of apartheid, said:

> I just want to remind the Honourable Members of Parliament that if the native in South Africa is being taught to expect that he will lead his adult life under the policy of equal
rights, he is making a big mistake. The native must not be subject to a school system, which draws him away from his own community, and misleads him by showing him the green pastures of European society in which he is not allowed to graze (Christie 1991, 93).

In a way, it can be observed that both colonial and missionary education had aspects of cultural invasion. However, the difference was that while missionary education sought to empower and liberate black people from illiteracy and domination by whites, state education sought to deny Africans the skills and knowledge to make meaningful participation in economic affairs (Kumalo 2000, 170).

Banana also observed that liberatory education is both intellectual and practical, adding:

> In this situation of struggle, education becomes an exercise of freedom; becomes self-realization, a conscious and productive involvement in history as opposed to education as high-handedness and reduction of man alienated, unconscious productive automaton (Banana 1987, 1).

Kumalo (2005, 171) observes that when he became State President, Banana’s understanding of the purpose of education changed from arming people for the struggle to equipping them for production. Banana (1987, 28) stressed production-oriented education if Zimbabwe was to avoid remaining a nation of international beggars. He emphasised that education should focus on “strategies and programmes that lead to self-reliance and self-sufficiency” (Banana 1987, 28).

Banana (1987, 29) argued that ideological and scholastic commitment ought to be combined with technical orientation, involvement, and efficiency if the much-needed economic development is to be achieved. This is because, at the end of the brutal war of liberation, the nation needed to grow the economy, reduce poverty levels, repair the damaged infrastructure and educate the African masses so that they could participate meaningfully in the economy. Banana did not, however, reduce education to equipping the previously disadvantaged with technical skills. He had a holistic conception of education, as seen in this passage:

> Education is a central element in our national development. In addition to increasing the number of skilled workers, and thus raising the political and social consciousness in our youth, we need education to acquire a broad base knowledge, attitudes, values and skills on which we can build in later life. Education should provide us with the potential to learn to respond and acquire the ability to participate meaningfully and constructively in the political, cultural and social life of our nation…. There is a need for our students to identify with the new changes in our society and to play a constructive role in these new circumstances (Banana 1987, 29).

This passage suggests that while Banana saw the importance of technical education, he also saw the importance of the humanities and social sciences, that is, learning that addresses the country’s social, political and cultural changes (Kumalo 2005, 171).
saw the need to raise the political and social consciousness of the nation, moving hand-in-hand with the need to provide practical technical skills. He was advocating for an education that provides holistic empowerment, and what he was critiquing is the narrow intellectualism that reduces education to an affair of the mind only (Kumalo 2005, 172). He believes transformative education must be abstract and provide practical and technical skills.

From the approaches of the three creative educators for social transformation – Banana, Mazibuko and Freire – one sees consistency in that the goal of education should be the transformation from disempowerment to empowerment. “Any meaningful national policies should find expression in the aspirations of the poor majority, who crave for social, cultural, educational, economic and political fulfilment, and oppose flaunting of wealth by the so-called elites in “parade culture” (Banana 1990, 175). It was a challenge for Christians to look at the goal of Christian education to shape it in a way that promotes liberation. Having seen that the goal of Christian education is liberation and transformation, there was now a need to shape the content of education to meet that goal. In Zimbabwe, colonial approaches that undermined Africans in education and workplaces were rejected. Anything that maintained disparity between the racial groups was rejected, giving more advantage to the whites. Economically, the “equal pay for equal work” principle could not be universally applied (Musendekwa 2018, 6-7). Banana equally contested inequality and injustice, hence his support for the liberation struggle meant to transform society.

The Quest for Education with Production

Education must be mass-oriented, scientific, and technologically biased to be more developmentally focused, promoting the rural population (Banana 1982, 55). “This technology bias will appear mainly in the science syllabus and as a result science has become an important and integral component of the curriculum in independent Zimbabwe from the first grade” (Banana 1982, 55). The science and technology-biased syllabus will form the basis for education with production. “Education with production is the cornerstone in the sphere of national development and through it an all-round education can once again be achieved, more especially because production involves complex mental activity and simultaneously enhances manual dexterity” (Banana 1990, 175). According to Banana (1982), “Education which is not closely related to production is barren.” Therefore, Zimbabwe was moving from colonial education that lacked production to one that would promote human self-reliance (Banana 1982). Education with production helps address local community and national needs. Schools are meant to develop a variety of talents and skills to help in developing communities. According to Banana (1990, 176), “All students need to be involved, as part of this learning, in every aspect of the process of production, development, or socially useful activity, from planning to delivery.” Education with production equips students with the skills and knowledge to create employment and manage their own enterprises. “Our political independence was never conceived to be an end in itself; it was merely an
enabling act to transform the whole gamut of our socio-economic, political, cultural and religious spheres” (Banana 1985, 12). Such focus created the desire to see education development with production to get economic independence among the African majority.

Education with production demanded cooperation between the church, education authorities and economic development structures. There was a need for strong permanent coordination of stakeholders. Educational institutions should have broader national and international networking of all kinds of production and sharing of the relevant technologies within a particular education system in the teaching and learning that will link the theory and practice of education with production. This kind of networking should bring together “the whole range of staff-training and recruitment, technical support such as accounting, planning and undertaking feasibility studies, application for funding and other professional services” (Banana 1990, 177). Networking promotes the sharing and use of new technology that is relevant to the church and education system.

Modern technology has given man the ability and means to create new possibilities – and with this goes the serious obligation for man to exercise extreme care and responsibility to ensure that our new knowledge is used as a positive force for good, and in the service of mankind (Banana 1985, 13).

Education with production has to do with providing solutions to local challenges. If education does not equip students with skills, a serious shortage of skills will be needed to solve people’s problems. With adequate training and skills, people will also increase productivity and be satisfied with their jobs (Banana 1982, 62).

Conclusion

This paper has noted that while Banana is widely known as a statesman, he also played a major role as a theorist of social education. A prophetic liberation theologian, Banana advocated for an education that promoted self-reliance of the previously marginalised and led to the transformation of society. In post-war Zimbabwe, Banana argued that education was critical to developing the nation, ending poverty and rebuilding the infrastructure. It has also been noted that for him, education was education for production. He critiqued colonial and church education for creating blacks who looked down on their own culture and history. For Banana, education was a liberation project. By devoting acres of space to the education theme, Banana was simultaneously critiquing the church and state responsible for educating the nation.
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