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Abstract

It is arguable that the Kibaki state which routed the Moi one in Kenya in the early 2000s has relatively seen to the opening up of academic interactive spaces in the country. The Moi state sought the erasure of sustained and critically disinterested scholarly engagement by Kenyan academics. Subsequently, it incarcerated, detained or rendered them meek ‘official narrative’ scholars. The Kenyan university then operated under academically underprivileging surveillance by state security apparatus. However, despite the relative opening up of academic and research spaces by the Kibaki state, there has been lack in responsible and meaningful intellectual inhabitation of these spaces. A major problematic is that of ethnic nationalism that has led to worrying ethnicisation of the institution of the university in Kenya. Paradoxically, the Kibaki state seems to be ‘authorising’ this trend, as is glaringly evident in the establishment of new universities, both public and private, that emerge as exclusivist dominions for ethnic communities in which they are based; and are thus potential centres of ethnic otherisation. The academic in Kenya is gradually degenerating into an ‘ethnic scholar’ on the narrow pilgrimage of ‘going home’ (to the university in their home enclaves).

The trend to ethnicise the university academic space in Kenya poses a major challenge to the much desired idea of an inclusivist Kenyan nation state. We posit that because ideally the university is a key institution in the imagining of the postcolony, the ongoing project in Kenya to desecularise scholarship is insidious especially considering the 2007 post election violence occurrence that has left the country ethnically polarised. In conclusion, we argue for the agency of the Kenyan intellectuals in imagining and mapping out philosophies for an inclusivist Kenyan narrative through the internalisation of the principle of epistemic responsibility and the Saidian concept of secularised scholarship.

Introduction: Situating the Problematic of Academic Space(s) in Kenya

The Kenya postcolony that emerged out of the British colonial rule in 1963 was a problematised one in terms of ethnic politics from the very beginning. For the reason that the British colonial system thrived on and sustained ethnic binaries in order to consolidate their rule, independence did very little in collapsing ethnic stereotypes as well
as mistrust among the forty-two Kenyan ethnic communities/nations. In a sense then, ethnic nationalisms have often situated most of Kenyan people’s actions, beliefs and thoughts. Hence the country is ever confronted by the suspect epistemology of the Kikuyu who ‘bravely’ fought in the Mau Mau ‘war of liberation’, or who belong to an amorphous entity called the ‘Mount Kenya Mafia’; or perpetual oppositionist Luo, who resist Kikuyu; or the ambiguous and unreliable others, habitually de-centred by the above two dominant ethnic entities, but who have to be accommodated variously for their swing-vote/view political value.

Kenya’s leading writer, Ngugi wa Thiong’o has argued that because the Gikuyu and the Luo never traditionally shared boundaries, ‘the claim that they could have been traditional enemies defeats reason and common sense’ (2009:3 a). It is important to note that narratives of otherisation (ingrained and thus made part of the ‘culture’ of a people) can just prove to be more insidious than even the actual concept of common boundaries. Not that the boundaries do not matter (in Kenya, for instance, the boundary has become a dangerous mark of making the autochthonous/alien distinction), for as Achille Mbembe notes:

Almost everywhere, the redefinition of internal boundaries was carried out under cover of creating new administrative districts, provinces, and municipalities. These administrative divisions had both political and economic goals. But they also contributed to the crystallization of ethnic identities – in fact, whereas under colonization itself, the attribution of space sometimes preceded the organization of states or went hand in hand with it, since the beginning of the 1980s the reverse has been happening. (2000: 267)

The conundrum of ethnocentricism (the viewing of one’s ethnic group’s perspective as universally legitimate and appropriate for all) thus, hydra-like, inhabits the Kenyan postcolony to deleterious effects.
And yet this is not unusual in the postcolony, for itself, right from its very formative beginnings, manifested as a site of the enactment of the absurd (Mbembe 1992; 2001). Issues of identity and belonging, especially bordering on the ethnic have been, haply, the most contested and lethal in the postcolony, here seen as that socio-cultural and geographical entity that emerges from colonialism, and drawing heavily on the colonial socio-political drama, and even injecting in a raw, insane nakedness and violence. In Kenya, this insane nakedness and violence was witnessed after the December 2007 bungled election that witnessed the degeneration of the country into serious socio-political and ethnic strife whose ramifications are still visible to date – in terms of internal displacements, and the continued ethnic community distrust.

Kenya, like other postcolonies, especially the African ones, has had a problematised conception of identity and belonging among its ethnic ‘nations’ since the end of official colonisation by the British. With the end of the official British colonisation in, privileged and (counter) oppositional ethnic nationalisms emerged with their respective Otherising, in the sense of occlusion on the grounds of the bifurcation of us/them narratives.

A space that has unfortunately not been spared by this problematic of ethnic nationalisms has been the Kenyan university. It is a very sorry affair that the university in Kenya has become the centre to ‘authorise’ ethnically otherising discourse. Granted, the Kibaki state which routed the Moi dictatorship in 2002 has relatively seen to the opening up of academic interactive spaces in the country. It is the case that the Moi authoritarian state actively and violently sought the erasure of sustained and critically disinterested
scholarly engagement by Kenyan academics. To make the point clear, it incarcerated, detained (as the writer-scholar, Ngugi wa Thiong’o aptly puts it in his prison memoirs, *Detained: A Writer’s Prison Diary*, 1981), exiled, or alternatively rendered them meek ‘official narrative’ scholars. The Kenyan university then operated under academically underprivileging surveillance by state security apparatus.

Moi declares in his *Kenya African Nationalism: Nyayo Philosophy and Principles* (1986), “an intellectual is a resource, and intellectualism is a force. However, like all other resources and forces, without proper control and management, intellectuals and intellectualism can take the country astray” (128, emphasis added). Informed by this academic erasure ‘philosophy’, Moi utilised all state resources in the fight against what he called “intellectual existentialism” and “Ostrichism” (ibid.). And, in a way, managed to lay control over the academic community in Kenya. Ngugi again captures this well in his novel *Matigari* (1987):

This Karl Marx has really made these students and teachers crazy … Their case will be heard and settled just now … The Permanent Professor of the History of Parrotology, the Ph.D in parrotology and the Editor of the Daily Parrotology will give evidence to show that, historically, philosophically and journalistically speaking, it is those who teach Marxism – in other words, communism – who spoil our students and our workers. That is why they should be detained without trial. Isn’t that so, Professor? …The permanent Professor, the Ph.D holder and the newspaper editor stood up and sang three verses from *Songs of a Parrot*. After they had finished they sat down, still holding the song-book very tightly. (106)

We quote Ngugi at length because in this fictionalised rendition, he happens to poignantly capture the devoicing and emasculation of the Kenyan intellectual and the attendant configuration into an ‘official narrative’ scholar, thus unable to articulate the demands of genuine scholarship to himself as a scholar and to the society that looks upon him to provide salvational guidance for its socio-cultural and scientific undertakings.
Paul Tiyambe Zeleza provides a vital background reading of the postcolonial university when he argues that:

[the liberatory mission of the postcolonial university gave way to the imperatives of survival, as middle-class comforts slipped from the lives of academics in many countries. Diminishing resources, combined with mounting state tyranny, led to the deterioration of research, teaching and physical infrastructures; the demoralisation of faculty and students; and a social devaluation of the status of academics and the scholarly enterprise … Many academics became consultancy hustlers and informal sector hawkers and hacks. (2009: 117)

The first Kibaki political formation came to power during the 2002 Kenyan general election, in which it was popularly elected. In a definitive statement Moi’s twenty-four year long rule was called to a ‘closure’. In the academic arena, there was witnessed a relative opening up of scholarly research spaces by the new state. Still, there has continued to be lack in responsible and meaningful inhabitation of these spaces by intellectuals. The university space, considering the university to be “the place designated for the training in deep objective change” (Spivak, 2004: 107), has been worryingly ethnicised. This has been compounded by the fact that the Kibaki state seems to be latently ‘authorising’ this trend; as is glaringly evident in the establishment of new universities, both public and private, that emerge as exclusivist dominions for ethnic communities in which they are based. These institutions are thus potential centres of ethnic otherisation presided over by ‘ethnic scholars’. This development poses a major gauntlet to the much-desired idea of an inclusivist Kenyan nation state. It also collapses the notion of academic responsibility of the Kenyan scholar.

In this paper, we proceed to posit that because ideally the university is a key institution in the imagining of the postcolony, the ongoing project in Kenya to desecularise scholarship is insidious especially considering the 2007 post election
violence that saw to the death of hundreds of Kenyans, and displacement of thousands, leaving the country, up to date, dangerously ethnically polarised. In the conclusion, we argue for the agency of the Kenyan intellectuals in imagining and mapping out philosophies for an inclusivist Kenyan narrative through the internalisation of the principle of epistemic responsibility and Edward Said’s notion of secularised scholarship.

**Narratives of Ethnicised Academic Space(s) in Kenya**

The lack of serious archeologically-motivated (in the Foucauldian conceptualisation of research) search for scholarly scientific and philosophical ideas in the Kenya postcolony dominates many narratives about the making of the Kenyan nation. The collapse of intellectual discourses into tribal/ethnic contests manifests severally and structures the being of the Kenyan nation since its attainment of independence in 1963.

At the University of Nairobi’s History Department, for example, and to an extent in the various Historical Association of Kenya conferences of the seventies and eighties, the overwhelming idea was that of contesting the authenticity of ethnic nationalisms: the Mau Mau nationalism, the Nandi resistance nationalism, Dedan Kimathi versus Koitalel arap Samoei, Thomas Mboya versus Harry Thuku in the pre-independence trade unionism, among other narratives. The famous of these contests, perhaps, has been that between the writer-scholar Ngugi wa Thiong’o and the historian William Ochieng, in which even intellectual decency was in most cases dropped, and bare knuckles let loose. Hence the Kenyan scholar-historian and victim of the Moi state’s detention, Maina wa Kinyatti, bemoans in the poem “Kenyan Historians”:
Your silence after my arrest means
You have made an agreement with the dictator
You have betrayed those ideas our people
Cherish

One day
Our people will rise
And with anger and bitterness
Ask you
Where were you
When national independence was betrayed

In here, there is space for the Kenyan intellectuals to ask themselves serious questions concerning academic freedom and responsibility. The betraying of national independence of course takes several actors, and wa Kinyatti’s cry is that of anger at the intellectual who was complicitous in the process of the destruction of the independent Kenyan national narrative, and subsequently betraying the trust the people bestowed in him/her.

In the betrayal of the dreams of national independence, the Kenyan masses have become impoverished because of, inter alia, political and economic irresponsibility of the political elite. Of course, again, this is no new trend in the politics of the postcolony, in which the amassing of wealth and consolidation of power in the family or the clan or the tribe is cultivated and cherished as a norm. Unfortunately though, the occurrences take a cyclic nature, as has happened in Kenya, so that with the ascendancy of a new dispensation to power, the dominant view becomes that of and so his/her community has got the chance. The chance to dominate, to loot, to pillage … the grand opportunity to eat. And in all these dispensations, there are intellectuals and other “authorities” to provide the authentic narrative of justification.

Besides Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s Matigari, as we have noted above, the representation of the Kenyan intellectual as lacking in moral and intellectual/academic
responsibility is also aptly portrayed in two other literary creative texts: *The Cannibals* (1995) by Okoth Okombo and *The Drums of Death* (2005) by Chris Wanjala. These texts are immediate in our argument in this paper, because they insightfully burrow into the recent Kenyan politics and discourses; and also have been written by two practicing older Kenyan intellectuals, both teaching at Kenya’s premier university, the University of Nairobi.

In *The Cannibals*, Okoth Okombo vividly captures Kenya’s patrimonial and corrupt political culture very well known to the average Kenyan. In it there are politicians whose interests range only between their own bellies and their immediate families and mistresses; only recouring to their clans and “tribes” when they feel threatened by opponents and the Other. But in the text, also, Okombo brings out an intellectual, a university professor who is a Kenyan by “birth and commitment” (101), and Chair of the Department of National Morality, Dedan Kimathi Institute of Advanced Humanities. He is referred to as Professor Mlinzi Wa-Utu (Custodian of Humanity). The Professor’s public lecture to the community is titled “On the Present Evolutionary Stage of Cannibals”, in which he concludes:

The only solution is for us to realise the fact that by eating one another, we are bound to eat the whole of our nation; and that realisation alone should be enough to show us that we can live a long and harmonious life only if we do one thing. And that thing is: we have to change our eating habits – to make sure that every one of us has a fair access to what we collectively decide to be our food. That way, we shall eat and live together without any threat of self-destruction and consequent extinction. (108)

Earlier on in the text, Okombo satirically refers to other African ‘scholars’ involved in the theorisation of the conundrums of tribe and tribalism:

The demon became so strong that some so-called realistic scholars in African universities even argued that it was futile and unrealistic to fight against it. The
fact that Africa had tribes was a reality…. It was therefore, in their opinion, utterly unrealistic for anyone to think that Africans could live without tribalism. (53)

To these scholars, therefore, the issue is not the awareness that ‘tribalism consisted not in the existence of tribes, but in the subordination of national interests to tribal ones’ (54). To them what was of immediate interest was that “they [scholars] too had gizzards, and would support and defend any belief which kept those gizzards turgid with grain. The key word was opportunity: Nation? Nonsense! Reason? Rubbish! Shame? Shut up! Opportunity? Yea! That’s it … gr-rab it!” (ibid.).

From the reading of the representation of the Kenyan/African intellectual in Okombo’s *The Cannibals*, we agree with Toyin Falola that “[u]niversities are sometimes the creation of ethnic forces, with scholars championing the causes of particular ethnic groups, even using scholarship to promote ethnic interests in ways that may undermine the national” (2006: 178). Unfortunately in Kenya, the ‘undermining of the national’ has become a daunting reality.

In Wanjala’s *Drums of Death*, the major area of critique is the place of the intellectual in the “de-otherisation” process. The protagonist Mothendu, “a politician, a philosopher, a poet, a memoirist, a literary critic and an editor” (2), leaves the university to vie for an elective post in a forthcoming general election. With all these accolades, one would expect him to transcend the ersatz and superficial conceptualisation of politics and leadership. Not at all, the narrative goes, “Mothendu depended on his high education and the support of the people. His re-entry into parliament would ensure his clan’s supremacy in the Nambayi politics (2).
The intellectual, thus, as portrayed in *The Cannibals* and *Drums of Death* present us with two consanguineous individuals that clearly read the Kenyan situation. Only that the ideal intellectual, Prof. Mlinzi Wa-Utu, the individual who wants to focus more on the narrative of the Kanyan nation-state, and who recognises that “[w]riters, artists, musicians, intellectuals and workers in ideas are the *keepers of memory of a community*” (Ngugi, 2009: 87, emphasis added), is a rather rare one in Kenya. Further, for an individual like Prof. Mlinzi Wa-Utu, the postcolonial state easily incarcerates him in a bid to ‘silence’. Ebrima Sall captures it well when he writes that, “[c]ritical views were most unwelcome. The arrest and detention of scholars and students suspected of being critical of official views or policies, or simply for daring to struggle for better salaries, stipends or working conditions became a frequent occurrence” (2010).

As the historian Joseph Ki-Zerbo propounds, “[i]n the face of the exploitation of real or artificial ethnic identities, we have to foster a new African, nay – an African neo-personality that espouses the ethnic group and jettisons ethnicism” (2005: 89).

In the essay, “The Kenya General Elections: Troubling Political Propaganda in an Intellectual Garb” (2009), the Kenyan historian Godwin Murunga re-reads the historian-cum Kibaki presidency advisor, Peter Mwangi Kagwanga’s Policy Brief, “Breaking Kenya’s Impasse: Chaos or Courts”, in which he sees the latter as invoking silences and half-truths. Murunga contends:

> It would have been expected that as a director of a democracy and governance programme, he would have made greater effort to see beyond the ethnic blinkers that cloud him from taking a panoramic view, if for no other reason, then for the sake of maintaining the integrity of the research programme and the domain he then directed. (17)
We conceive Murunga’s argument to be about the location of the intellectuals in the Kenyan ethnic nations’ narratives and the Kenyan nation-state’s Narrative. Murunga holds, “[i]t should be clear that it is no longer acceptable to get away with deliberately skewed research especially when the issues involved are literally a matter of life and death” (16). The argument about the location of the Kenyan intellectual becomes vital if we are to consider that the intellectual should manufacture a liberational episteme for the society in which he/she lives.

The Narrative of “Going Home” in the Kenyan Scholarly Community

With the mushrooming of various ‘universities’, both public (especially in their unchecked establishment of campuses), and private ones, in the country, the academic in Kenya is gradually degenerating into an ‘ethnic scholar’, on the narrow and epistemically vacuous pilgrimage of ‘going home’, that is, becoming lecturer/professor at the university/campus in their home areas. Indeed, there is talk in the country of situations where in some universities, university senate deliberations are conducted in respective ethnic languages.

In a rather disturbing case, a principal of a university college of Egerton University (the university space in which the two of us inhabit) had to be re-called and offered another vacancy after the community and staff of the university college rejected him on the grounds of his being an ‘outsider’. This is despite the fact that he is a respected professor of philosophy and has vast experience and knowledge in university administrative work.
In the recent past, Kenya has witnessed creation of over 15 university colleges affiliated to the country’s seven public universities in various ‘ethnic nations’ for the reason that the communities want university institutions of ‘their own’. The political elite in the Kibaki state, led by the president himself, have used this as reason to gain political mileage as defenders of intellectual development in their various ethnic communities. And the communities in their struggle for full ‘ownership’ of the institutions have laid claim to overseeing who is appointed to which senior positions, academic and administrative.

This clamour for the ‘university of our own’ has subsequently built a culture of little regard to the basic tenets that ought to inform the space of the institution of the university. The quality of education, scholarly ethical principles, among such ideal university-related issues have thus been collapsed and flouted in the bid to please the local/ethnic power barons. Thus in issues of governance, “some of the universities [both public and private] are run like ethnic enclaves. Yet, institutions of higher learning should promote diversity” (*Saturday Nation*, 2010: 12). It is even more problematic with the private universities, which go much unchecked because the body responsible for the authorisation and establishment of institutions of higher learning in the country, the Commission for Higher Education, “has little capacity to superintend over these institutions. Once it has given a charter or letter of interim authority, seldom does it monitor to check quality and standards” (ibid.).

In as much as most Kenyan universities declare their visions as aiming at being first-rate global institutions in the advancement of scholarship and research, this can only be said to be on paper. The reality on the ground depicts institutions lacking in basic
principles that should inform the university as it seeks to engage, to use Jacques Derrida’s formulation, the various frontiers, be they external (relation with the world, the state, civil society and fields of power) or internal frontiers (disciplines, hierarchies and fields of knowledge) (Derrida, 2002: 115-6).

The Kenyan university remains hostage to narrow philosophies that do not create grounds for serious reflection on the state of the country and its diverse peoples and heritages. bell hooks’ call, “[a]ll of us in the academy and in the culture as a whole are called to renew our minds if we are to transform educational institutions – and society – so that the way we live, teach, and work can reflect our joy in cultural diversity, our passion for justice, and our love for freedom”, (1994: 34), thus issues with an urgency for the Kenyan academician.

**Epistemic Responsibility and Secularised Scholarship**

In a very defining way, the Palestinian scholar and activist, Edward W. Said lived and practiced the ideal of intellectualism. Said internalised the views of the philosophy of humanism and had it as a lifelong preoccupation the idea of making the world a more humane space taking into consideration the contradictions fraught in the notions of identity and representation. Said conceptualised humanism as being “centred upon the agency of human individuality and subjective intuition, rather than on received ideas and approved authority” (2003: xxii). And in this humanistic spirit, “texts [and narratives] have to be read as texts that were produced and live on in the historical realm in all sorts of … worldly ways” (ibid.)
It is in this worldliness, a realistic manner of presentation cognisant of the real world of power, authority and struggle, that Said sees the intellectual not losing touch with the ordinary populace. He holds that humanistic study seeks “ideally to go beyond coercive limitations on thought towards a non-dominative and non-essentialist type of learning” (2003: 337).

In Said’s contention that “texts are worldly” that they are to some degree events, “a part of the social world, human life, and … the historical moments in which they are located and interpreted” (Said qtd. in Saunders, 2005: 24), we are urged into the process of caution in our reading and interpretation of texts, of narratives, into secular criticism. Secular criticism according to Said is an,

[i]nvitation to the crossing of boundaries – boundaries of nation, tradition, religion, race, [tribe], and language – and carries the implication that the world as a whole can be the only authentic horizon of critical practice. In other words, it conceives of communities of interpretation as inhabiting not self-enclosed life-worlds but rather the world itself, or rather some identifiable but never entirely closed-off corner of the world. (Mufti, 2004: 4)

We are all readers, and ‘the narratives of otherisation’ are all over and with us. As intellectuals, people deemed to possess authority and knowledge, the Kenyan academic would do his society good service in secularising, not letting unnecessary inhibitions cloud him/her in thought and action, in his/her engagement with the world, the immediate and the distant. In his Representations of the Intellectual (1994), Said defines the intellectual as “an individual endowed with a faculty of representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for, a public” (11); and the “universal principles” that should guide the intellectual are that “all human beings are entitled to expect decent standards of behaviour concerning freedom
and justice from worldly powers or nations, and that deliberate or inadvertent violations of these standards need to be testified and fought against courageously” (12).

Thus, intellectuals as “individuals with a vocation for the art of representing” (ibid.), have the responsibility, as in the Kenyan case, of intelligibly reading each and every narrative that they encounter and endeavouring to make necessary sense out of them.

Lorraine Code advances the notion of ‘epistemic responsibility’ which is essential in developing and harnessing “an intellectual virtue [itself]… a kind of orientation to the world and to one’s knowledge-seeking self as part of the world” (1999: 160). Code goes on to argue that:

An intellectually virtuous person would value knowing and understanding how things ‘really’ are, to the extent that this is possible, renouncing both the temptation to live with partial explanations when fuller ones are attainable, and the temptation to live in fantasy or illusion. Such a person would consider it better to know, despite the comfortable complacency that a life indiscriminately governed by fantasy and illusion might offer. (ibid.)

Indeed, as we think of “academic freedom and the social responsibility of academics and researchers in Africa”, we are called upon to reflect with Thandika Mkandawire that:

[†]he fate of Africa lies in a collective rethinking of that continent’s unfulfilled humanistic tasks in light of what has transpired, and the concrete situation today; so as to recast them into cornerstones of social justice, solidarity and equality and enable the continent to reconnect with the rest of the world in a mutually beneficial way (2001: 30).

We believe that this task can only be usefully engaged in when the African scholar internalises a high degree of intellectual virtue and epistemic responsibility. And this is urgent especially from those of us from the social sciences and humanities, because as Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has rightly argued, “[i]f the university is to be secular, it
requires a sustained epistemic effort that can only come from the humanities” (2004: 109). This ‘sustained epistemic effort’ cannot be harnessed if the intellectuals of a society remain insulate by limiting thought systems that fail to see scholarship as a practice in responsibility.

**Conclusion: Rethinking Epistemic Responsibility in the Kenyan Academy**

In the foregoing reading, our contention has been that the Kenyan intellectual person is inhabited by a narrow conceptualisation of academic responsibility, or in some cases even lacking in it completely. That he/she inhabits and valorises, consciously or unconsciously, ethnicised narratives of otherisation. He/she has failed to locate the university classroom as a field of possibility in which there is the “opportunity to labour for freedom, to demand of ourselves and comrades, an openness of mind and heart that allows us to face reality as we collectively imagine ways to move beyond boundaries, to transgress … [to see] education as practice of freedom” (hooks, 1994: 207). We have argued that the various Kenyan states have fostered and thrived on narratives of otherisation, and in the quest to legitimise these narratives and their structuring ersatz ideologies, they have either made the academic space in Kenya very unviable to responsible Kenyan scholars; or actively encouraged scholars to participate in the official narrative that is controlled by the state and its functionaries; and thus, in our view, collapsing any attempts in founding an authentic narrative of the Kenyan nation-state.

We hold that it is imperative to engage in scrupulous examination of these narratives/metaphors of otherisation by being secular critics and scholars in the most refined sense possible, in the Socratic submission that the unexamined life is not worth
living. Paul Tiyambe Zeleza’s view, “to ensure that we continue to struggle for the production, organisation, dissemination, and consumption of knowledge that enhance, rather than undermine, Africa’s possibilities” (2006: 29), is equally an urgent submission. In essence, we advocate for an engagement in the project of “detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social, economic, and cultural, within which it operates at the present time” (Foucault, 1984: 75). As intellectuals, we have to be courageous and worldly scholars who are consciously sensitive to the notion of epistemic responsibility to ourselves, our students, the other, and that responsible Kenyan/African community that looks upon the university as a space for deep practical and theoretical reflection on its prevailing human condition.
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