Decolonising the curriculum: Southern interrogations of time, place and knowledge

Catherine Manathunga   School of Education,   cmanathu@usc.edu.au
                            University of Sunshine Coast,
                            Australia

ABSTRACT

Despite decades of postcolonial, Indigenous and feminist research, dominant Northern knowledge continues to claim universality across time and space in many academic disciplines and continues to ignore geopolitical power struggles over knowledge. This has taken on a particular urgency in South Africa since the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall student campaigns beginning in 2015. The international Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL) field has only begun to grapple with the implications of Southern theory for teaching and learning. In this article, I focus on Southern interrogations about time, place and knowledge and what they offer us in terms of decolonising the curriculum and southernising SOTL. I apply these theoretical resources to the need to trouble taken-for-granted knowledge hierarchies between Northern and Southern knowledge and argue for a truly dialogic knowledge exchange and redistribution of epistemological privilege. I illustrate how these theoretical resources can be applied to the site of intercultural postgraduate supervision and conclude by extrapolating the implications of this theoretical work to efforts to decolonise the undergraduate and postgraduate university curriculum.

Introduction

Scholars such as Connell (2007), Chen (2010) and Alatas (2006) have provided ample evidence of the ways in which epistemologies, knowledge systems, theories, research and publication practices continue to be controlled by Northern, Western and neoliberal capitalism. As Southern scholars, we are familiar with the myriad ways in which Northern knowledge and the English language continue to dominate many of the means of knowledge production globally. This has taken on a particular urgency in South Africa since the #RhodesMustFall (#RMF) and #FeesMustFall (#FMF) student campaigns beginning in 2015. As a Southern, white settler/invader scholar in the postcolonial country of Australia still dominated by Northern knowledge systems, I also have to acknowledge the ways in which I am

implicated in this inequitable apparatus (Manathunga 2014). One domain of research that is beginning to grapple with the implications of these geopolitical inequities for university teaching and learning is the international field of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL).

Building upon these arguments about the need for Southern theory and a dramatic decolonisation of the curriculum, this article seeks to explore, from an outsider's perspective, the implications of the Southern African #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall student campaigns for encouraging the field of SOTL to work towards the deconstruction of knowledge binaries and hierarchies between Northern and Southern knowledge. I will do this from the pedagogical site of intercultural doctoral education. The intercultural postgraduate supervision contact zone is a key pedagogical site heavily implicated in these struggles over contested histories, geographies and epistemologies. Drawing from earlier research (Manathunga 2014) and recent research collaborations with Indigenous, Punjabi-Australian and Chinese colleagues (Singh, Manathunga, Bunda & Qi 2016), I will outline how I have drawn upon a range of 'Southern' theories to reimagine time, place and knowledge in intercultural supervision. I also draw upon my recent, nascent forays into Colombian and African theories about knowledge and epistemology.

When engaging in research that wrestles with the complexities of culture, ethnicity and identity, it is important to firstly establish the standpoint from which I approach this work (Harding 1991; Nakata 2006). It is also important to acknowledge the problems of language in adequately capturing the complexities of culture, identity and geography in postcolonial settings. Therefore, I will firstly outline the ways in which my Irish-Australian feminist standpoint and the cultural complexities of my own family impact upon my positioning and arguments. I explain the fraught terms that I have used to capture, however inadequately, the subject positions and categories that are relevant in exploring the need to Southernise and decolonise the curriculum.

Irish-Australian feminist standpoint

Figure 1 illustrates three cultural symbols that I use to locate my Irish-Australian feminist standpoint. I am an Irish-Australian woman (as symbolised by the Celtic knot). My ancestors came by boat to Melbourne and Sydney in 1834 and 1858. I am proud to say my ancestors were boat people. Although I am fifth-generation Australian, I grew up in Brisbane in a family that had retained a very strong sense of its Irishness. This included a vivid folk memory of colonisation and dispossession. As an Irish-Australian I would like to draw on the meaning of this Celtic knot which symbolises the interconnectedness of human experience. I have characterised myself

Figure 1. Cultural symbols illustrating my culture, history and geography

as a settler/invader scholar to acknowledge my complex positioning in relation to colonisation (Manathunga 2011). I am both colonised and colonising as an Irish-Australian. Recently, I have begun a project of decolonisation by attempting to recover my Irish language which has not been spoken in

my family for five generations. As a woman who is proud to call herself a feminist and has struggled with ongoing marginalisation as a woman academic, my standpoint is also intrinsically feminist.

I am a Pākehā (Māori word for European New Zealander) born in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I draw on the Māori metaphor of the knowledge stones (the second cultural symbol in Figure 1) which we each collect from people we meet on our life's journey to think about how in our intellectual and social work as academics we give and receive knowledge and ideas. As an Australian with a deep respect for Australia's Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples I draw on the word Yärï or speak (the third cultural symbol in Figure 1), which comes with permission from the Turrbal people one of the Murri (Indigenous) clan groups from Brisbane which is my home town. This acknowledges my geographical heartland and its multiple and complex histories.

The cultural complexities of my own family illustrate the ways in which labels such as 'black', 'white' and 'Australian' break down because of postcolonial hybridities. My first marriage was to a Sri Lankan-Australian man which is why my family name is Manathunga. I have since learned that Manathunga is originally an African name that must have travelled across the seas to Sri Lanka several centuries ago. I have two Sri Lankan-Irish-Australian sons. I have learnt a great deal about intercultural experiences and identities by watching them grow up. I am a proud bearer of a Sri Lankan family name and a proud intercultural mother. My sons' partners are English-Australian with some Chippewa First Nations American and Colombian heritage. Therefore, my standpoint is now influenced by the multiple, entangled cultural identities of my sons and daughters-in-law and their families who are now part of my family.

Postcolonial cultures and identities: the problem with language

Before outlining the significance of 'Southern' theories about time, place and knowledge for the project of SOTL in the South, I need to explain why I have chosen to rely on quite problematic language like Northern/Southern, Western/Eastern, Indigenous/non-Indigenous and black/white. I fully appreciate the work of postcolonial and other theories in re-presenting identity as a hybrid, fluid notion especially in terms of the multiple migrations and roots and routes that we travel – just as they are reflected in my own family. I also recognise how we need to deconstruct these overdetermined categories. However, I have chosen to use these broad terms for culture and identity because I am trying to foreground the colonial relations of power that continue to shape the geo-political realities of our contemporary world. I am drawing upon our imagined constructs of categories like 'Northern', 'Southern', 'Western', 'Eastern' and 'Indigenous' in the way that Chakrabarty (2007) draws upon the ways we imagine and position the idea of 'Europe'. I am seeking to investigate how these relations of power condition the political, historical, social and cultural context within which we enact our pedagogies. In this way I am following the lead of Connell (2007) and postcolonial scholars like Chakrabarty (2007), Al-e Ahmad (1984) and Chen (2010).

For the purposes of this article, I am also drawing upon the highly problematic categories of black and white. I recognise that these labels are hugely overdetermined and have problematic histories, especially in contexts like South Africa. They also make no sense in my own family. Terms that represent the 'Other' to the normative white, Western self remain particularly troublesome. My colleagues and I have experimented with terms like 'non-Western' to include African, Asian, Middle

Eastern and South American peoples. We have also found we need to also include the category 'Indigenous' to fully capture the meaning of the category (Singh *et al.* 2016). The Colombian scholar, Arturo Escobar (2007), whose work I draw upon in this article, uses terms like 'non-Eurocentric'. In referring to the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall campaigns in South Africa and to the theories of African scholars like Francis Nyamnjoh (2016), Harry Garuba (2010) and Abena Busia (2006), the category used is 'black'. These theorists also use this term to demonstrate commitments to black empowerment and pride. This is the sense in which I use the term black in this article. I use the term 'white' in the sense used in Critical Whiteness Studies. This is particularly because white people, as the normative category, have often shown a great reluctance to own their own privilege and positioning as white.

Geopolitical struggles over knowledge: South Africa and #RMF, #FMF campaigns

Geopolitical struggles over knowledge and calls to decolonise the curriculum have taken on particular urgency in South Africa especially during the #RhodesMustFall (#RMF), #FeesMustFall (#FMF) and other recent campaigns by South African university students beginning in 2015. I am very conscious of the difficulties involved in an outsider such as myself discussing an issue as complex and entangled as this, however respectful my intentions. Nevertheless, I think it is important for me to emphasise how the urgent issues raised by these student protests relate to the Southern theories about time, place and knowledge that I have been grappling with in the postcolonial contexts of Australia and, to a lesser extent, Aotearoa/New Zealand. Like Luckett and Naicker (2016), I would never presume to critique South African student politics. My intention here, like Luckett and Naicker (2016), is to try to understand the anger and pain of these students from my distant and privileged position as a white Irish-Australian settler/invader scholar. I would also like to reflect on the implications of the South African students' demands to decolonise the university curriculum because this relates very strongly to my Southern theoretical research on intercultural postgraduate supervision and to the themes that scholars in this journal, *SOTL in the South*, are investigating.

As Nyamnjoh (2016) argues, "Black pain does matter" and must be heard, recognised and acknowledged. This is true in postcolonial contexts like Australia and Aotearoa/New Zealand as well. Australia has a very long way to go in terms of understanding and acknowledging the intergenerational trauma and pain experienced by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. I agree with Luckett and Naicker's (2016) position that the first step in decolonising the university curriculum is for members of the dominant community to listen carefully to the pain and anger of black students. Western cultures do not privilege listening like some Asian and Indigenous cultures do. For example, in my research, a Thai student explained that in her culture there is a saying that emphasises the importance of listening – "we have two ears but only one mouth" (Asian social science student 5). In Australian Aboriginal languages, there is a helpful term for this called '*Dadirri*' which is a form of deep listening and reflection where you seek to build community by listening carefully to others and to build peace and silent awareness by listening to nature (Ungunmerr-Baumann 2002). The other reason that people in dominant cultures are not able to truly hear the pain of marginalised groups is that they are unconscious of their own privileges and unable to recognise the unconscious ways in which they marginalise others. As one student at the University of Cape Town responded to a survey in 2012-2014, "I do not think anyone here can understand where they have never been" (quoted in Luckett & Naicker 2016:11).

SOTL in the South as a site of contested histories, geographies and epistemologies

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South is a key site where contested postcolonial histories, geographies and epistemologies play out. The field of SOTL itself is highly contested (Kreber 2013). It draws upon Boyer's seminal work on the four scholarships involved in academic work, which suggested that the scholarship of teaching was one of four interrelated scholarships (Kreber 2013). At its deepest level, SOTL aims to develop a more nuanced understanding of teaching and is a central part of academic professionalism (Kreber 2013). SOTL is not synonymous with educational research but instead focuses its attention on improving student learning (usually in a higher education context) and is a scholarly form of investigation because it involves "a systematic, peer-supported, research-like scholarly process" (Trigwell 2012:254). Ashwin and Trigwell (2004:121) argue that there are three levels of SOTL which develop 'personal', 'local' and 'public' knowledge. For the purposes of this paper, I am referring principally to the creation of public and international knowledge about improving university teaching and learning. We need to draw upon a robust array of theoretical resources if we are to follow up on the students' demands in the #RMF and #FMF campaigns to decolonise the curriculum. In this section, I outline the postcolonial/decolonial theoretical framework I draw upon and incorporate theories from some Colombian and African theorists to construct this array of theoretical tools. Decolonising the curriculum is made especially difficult in present times because of the domination of university cultures by neoliberal and globalising capitalism. Peters (2015:10) argues that universities in the twenty-first century have become captive sites of "cybernetic capitalism" that focus on producing consumable knowledge for transnational corporations and flexible, knowledge worker-entrepreneurs. In this game, students become customers, universities are recast as corporations and academics are reduced to service provision. Yet again we see the erasure of time, place and knowledge and the victory of universalising, colonial-style discourses designed to support the ongoing privileging of Northern universities and Northern knowledge.

However, if universities do not engage urgently with the contested histories, geographies and epistemologies evident in Southern postcolonial societies, they face drastic consequences. I have argued in my research (Manathunga 2014) and in more recent collaborations (Singh *et al.* 2016) that we need to deploy a range of what I have called 'Southern' theories – that is theories that are drawn from non-dominant perspectives such as postcolonial, Indigenous, feminist, social and cultural geography theories – to decolonise the university curriculum. Since I wrote my book in 2014, my thinking about the assemblage of postcolonial and other theories I used has shifted thanks to the opportunity to work with my Indigenous colleague, Tracey Bunda, a senior Ngugi/Wakka Wakka woman from Southeast Queensland. She has challenged me to think about the ways in which postcolonial theories can be problematic from Indigenous perspectives. Indigenous scholars point out that colonisation continues to the present in most countries despite attempts to move beyond racism and the privileging of Northern knowledge systems. Decolonial theories are "a family of diverse positions that share a view of coloniality as a fundamental problem in the modern (as well as postmodern and information) age, and of decolonisation or decoloniality as a necessary task that remains unfinished" (Maldonado-Torres 2011:2). We have adopted a *postcolonial/decolonial* theoretical positioning that encompasses *all* the important foundations contributed by postcolonial theorists and subaltern studies *as well as* the empowering theories proposed by Indigenous and Southern theorists engaged in decolonial theory.

In this article, I have also drawn upon the work of Colombian theorist, Escobar (2007) and of African theorists, Nyamnjoh, Garuba and Busia. I researched and wrote this manuscript while I was in Bogota, Colombia, working with colleagues at the University of La Sabana. I had many postcolonial moments when I was reading and writing about South Africa, while sitting in a shared office with my Colombian colleagues quietly talking around me in Spanish and getting updates from my Irish *Gaeilge* language app urging me to learn some new Irish words. As Ruitenberg (2005:214-215) argues, "I am undeniably influenced by my geographic location as well as by the traces of the geographic locations in which I have found myself in the past". I share Nyamnjoh's (2016:16) sentiment where he responds to the question "Are you from x?" with the cryptic response "Not yet"! While these theorists have not explicitly engaged in the SOTL, their theories enable us to work towards the undoing of knowledge hierarchies that privilege Northern knowledge.

Arturo Escobar is an interdisciplinary Colombian scholar and activist who initially trained in science and engineering and later moved into social sciences and anthropology. He is a Professor at the University of North Carolina in the US and has "conducted or participated in workshops on development and ecology in Colombia, Mali, Denmark, England, and Mexico" (Arturo Escobar n.d). As he indicates on his website, "the work with activists of the Proceso de Comunidades Negras (PCN), a network of Afro-Colombian organizations, has been since 1993 one of my most important sources of inspiration on questions of activism, environment, culture and development". Drawing on "European and North American critical theories of modernity and postmodernity to South Asian Subaltern Studies, Chicana feminist theory, postcolonial theory, African philosophy … and reflecting on Latin American cultural and political reality", he argues for a *transmodern* approach that "locates its own inquiry in the very borders of systems of thought and reaches towards the possibility of non-eurocentric modes of thought" (Escobar 2007:180). He proposes a "non-eurocentric and critical dialogue" with difference (Escobar 2007:187).

African theorist Francis Nyamnjoh is a Professor of Anthropology at the University of Cape Town who has written about "democratization, ethnicity and regionalism in Africa, globalization, and the role and place of the media in Africa" (Nyamnjoh n.d). Writing about the #RMF campaign and its ability to "generate critical questions about belonging and citizenship", Nyamnjoh (2016:14) argues that contemporary South Africa is characterised by "visible and invisible mobilities". Arguing against essentialism and highlighting the issues with "whitening up" or when "the outsider becomes the pace setter worthy of mimicry", he recommends that all "identity claims and counter claims" need to be put into "historical perspective". He suggests that we need to "bring the parochial and the cosmopolitan into conversation" in questions about citizenship and to "negotiate and navigate conviviality from the intersections of myriad identity margins" (Nyamnjoh 2016:16). He also advocates that all South Africans adopt the position of *amakwerekwere*, which was a derogatory word for 'undeserving outsiders' or strangers in South Africa. Instead of being a negative positioning, Nyamnjoh (2016) argues that acknowledging our own *amakwerekwere* positioning which takes account of the multiple mobilities that make up our identities could release creative energies and create new possibilities for black and white conviviality.

African theorist Harry Garuba is an Associate Professor at the University of Cape Town who has written extensively about "issues of mapping, space and subjectivity within an [African] colonial and postcolonial context and issues of modernity and local agency" (Centre for African Studies n.d).

Garuba (2010) also emphasises the importance of moving on from essentialist and ontological arguments about origins and identities and instead suggests the need to "recognise the trajectories and transformations of history". Exploring the writings of the African diaspora, he critiques the false binary between positioning Africa as origin or denying the role of Africa with an over-emphasis on hybridity and creolisation. Instead he suggests that genre theory and Foucauldian discourse analysis assist us to "re-theorise Africa in a non-essentialising way" (Garuba 2010:245).

Feminist African theorist, Abena Busia, is the Chair of the Department of Women's and Gender Studies at Rutgers University in New Jersey. She is also co-editor of the groundbreaking *Women Writing Africa Project*, a multi-volume anthology published by the Feminist Press at the City University of New York. This anthology is designed to recognise the complex cultural legacy and "cultural production" of African women. In a piece about funerals and exile, Busia (2006) argues that 'traditions' need to be regarded as dynamic and ever-changing rather than as static. She emphasises how, each time a ritual is performed, it is changed slightly depending on "its own time, space and ritual acts and immediate needs" (Busia 2006:23). She cautions us that, while "it would be comforting to have a vision of Africa to go back to to explain our new world agonies in terms of old world certainties", those worlds "if they ever existed, … certainly are not there now" (Busia 2006:19). All of this work exemplifies postcolonial/decolonial ways of grappling with knowledge and helps us imagine approaches that may move us towards a dialogical exchange of knowledge and a redistribution of privilege.

'Southern' theories about time, place and knowledge

Drawing upon this postcolonial/decolonial theoretical positioning and my recent thinking about the work of these Colombian and African theorists, this next section outlines the 'Southern' theories about time, place and knowledge that I have found helpful in understanding how contested histories, geographies and epistemologies shape our encounters with SOTL in the South, particularly focusing on the site of intercultural doctoral education.

Time and supervision

Southern theories allow us to think critically about the sense of multiple and contested histories that we bring into supervision. In the case of supervision, there is a multi-layered operation of history present which includes our own personal intellectual histories, the cultural histories of the many different cultural groups and sub-groups that supervisors and students each belong to, and the histories of the country in which the field work and the supervision takes place. I believe it makes a difference when I, as an Irish-Australian woman working a few years ago in Aotearoa/New Zealand, supervised a woman student from Tanzania at that particular moment and in that particular place.

'Southern' theories also challenge Western chronologies which are linear, measured units of time and Eurocentric ideas of history, time and space, where space is a surface to be journeyed across and conquered (Adam 2004; Chakrabarty 2007; Massey 2005). Coevalness is an important concept that recurs throughout these theorists' discussions of time and place. Coeval means "one of the same era or period; a contemporary" (Coeval n.d). Applying this term to notions of history, Fabian (1983) was one of the first to emphasise that different societies around the globe each have their own unique past, present and future trajectories and grapple with each other at precisely the same time. As

Massey (2005) powerfully outlines, Indigenous people around the world were not simply sitting around waiting for the arrival of European 'discoverers'. They were immersed in their own historical trajectories, their own pasts, presents and futures that may have been interrupted by Europeans but have continued on despite these ruptures. Therefore, these theories challenge historicist readings of history that construct time as "single, homogeneous and secular" (Chakrabarty 2007:15) inexorably leading to 'development' or European modernisation over time. Instead they show how time is not a series of linear events, but as a "contemporaneity between the nonmodern and the modern, a shared constant now" (Chakrabarty 2007:240). Chakrabarty (2002:22) investigates the ways in which Indian political action involves the "agency of gods and spirits". In these ways, these theorists suggest we need to rethink time as secular *and* religious, rational *and* mythical; as a kind of a meeting-up of multiple histories; "a constellation of social relations" (Massey 1997:322).

Social and feminist theorists like Adam and Groves (2007) and Clegg (2010) have also grappled with temporality in useful ways. Adam and Groves (2007) have written about contemporary notions of 'present future' time, where instant digital communication gives us a sense of timelessness as if time floats freely without being connected to the past or the future. This suggests little respect for multiple historical and future trajectories beyond the West (Adam & Groves 2007). Clegg (2010:346) applied these ideas to higher education pedagogy, arguing that they focus problematically only on the "future life of the individual" and goals such as "social mobility" and "employability" (Clegg 2010:346).

In re-reading these 'Southern' theories about time pedagogically in the context of doctoral supervision, I argued that we need to broaden legitimate forms of evidence that can be used in research (Manathunga 2014). This would involve including myths, literary and visual representations, proverbs and oral histories as well as documentary and 'scientific' evidence. This is an argument for transgressive and messy research that moves beyond Western/Northern Enlightenment notions of knowledge as universal, rational, secular and homogenous to include forms of knowing, being and doing that are evident in Southern/Eastern and Indigenous cultures.

This already occurs in intriguing examples of Indigenous supervision (McKinley, Grant, Middleton, Irwin & Williams 2011; Ford 2012) and Cambodian supervision (Devos & Somerville 2012). It would involve encouraging our students to investigate the multiple histories of the phenomenon being studied and the histories of our disciplines. It would also include interrogating how key theorists' work has been shaped by their own histories, geographies and gender (e.g. Connell 2007; Singh & Huang 2013). This would not only apply to the humanities and social sciences but also to the sciences as recent postcolonial, Indigenous and feminist challenges to Western science's claims of universality have argued (Sillitoe 2007; Nakata 2006; Harding 1991).

Reimagining history in intercultural doctoral education

In recent years, I have been extending this work in collaboration with Michael Singh, Tracey Bunda and Qi Jing. We represent an intercultural team of people – a Ngugi/Wakka Wakka Aboriginal Senior Woman, an Punjabi-Australian man, a Chinese woman and an Irish-Australian woman. We call ourselves the Deadly team – 'deadly' is an Aboriginal English expression for awesome. It is also used in Irish English. We are seeking to model "transcultural co-research approaches where we consciously strive to nurture a dynamic of meaning making through self-reflexive learning, based on each author's

intellectual contributions and (trans)cultural dispositions" (Singh *et al.* 2016:61). Together we have been arguing for the use of 'life history' methodologies in intercultural supervision especially in the supervision of Indigenous, migrant, refugee and international students. Using a postcolonial or decolonial historical methodology (Chakrabarty 2007; Battiste 2008), this research positions life histories as critical tools for reflexivity in intercultural education. This project investigates how doctoral education can be critically reimagined by tracing intersections between four core themes:

- personal and cultural histories;
- histories of colonialism and decolonisation;
- histories of place (geography) and
- histories of disciplinary knowledge production.

The project also draws upon Rancière's (2011; 2012) ideas of intellectual equality and interactive and communal theorising, which we seek to enact as a research team.

Time mapping: a new Southern methodology?

We are also developing a new Southern methodology building upon the work of Zerubavel (2003) on 'time maps'. Zerubavel's (2003) time-maps seek to trace collective historical memories of both individuals and cultural groups. Time maps allow us to depict the ebbs, flows, ruptures and varied intensity of historical narratives. His work also acknowledges how different cultural groups' time-maps may be contradictory and need to be overlaid to gain a more complex picture of the shape of the past (Zerubavel 2003). Participants will be asked to time-map their life histories and geographies using a range of textual, visual and creative forms including narratives, yarns, parables, poetry, art work, dance and performance. This time-mapping methodology can be used in supervision as a starting point to locate and share students' and supervisors' intellectual and cultural histories and geographies.

Place and supervision

I have also argued that we need to locate place and geography at the heart of intercultural supervision and challenge the absence or universality of place in Northern knowledge construction (Manathunga 2014). We also need to challenge recent arguments about time-space compression for, as Massey (2005) argues, contemporary experiences of time and space are very diverse depending upon gender, ethnicity and class. As 'Southern' theorists grappling with place-based pedagogies have suggested, places are multiply constructed and contested; social and relational and entangled with time (Massey 2005; Somerville 2010; Rose 1996; Pratt 2008; Ruitenberg 2005; Penetito 2009). If we recognise place as a productive space of difference, we have an opportunity to foreground hospitality and generosity rather than engaging in assimilation and suppression (Martin 2000; Somerville, Davies, Power, Gannon & de Carteret 2011).

These conceptualisations of place provide transgressive ways of understanding the role of place in supervision. Somerville (2010) suggests a conceptual framework for place-based pedagogies that includes a focus on dominant and alternative storylines, on the body and body/place learning and on

place as a contact zone where difference is entered deeply. Ruitenberg (2005:214-215) argues that "*where* we learn becomes part of *what* we learn … [because] I am undeniably influenced by my geographic location as well as by the traces of the geographic locations in which I have found myself in the past". I also find Rose's (1996:7) description of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples' notions of country evocative:

> People talk about country in the same way they would talk about a person: they speak to country, sing to country, visit country, worry about country, feel for country, and long for country. Country is not a generalised or undifferentiated type of place … country is a living entity with a yesterday, today and tomorrow, with a consciousness, and a will toward life.

Māori scholar Penetito (2009:20) also argues that Indigenous place-based education acknowledges that a sense of place is fundamental to being truly human; that there is a formal relationship between people and their environments, and that this pedagogy needs to embody ways of being that provide for the "conscious union of mind and spirit" or *wānanga*. If we apply these 'Southern' theorists' perspectives about place to intercultural supervision, I argue that this means we need to locate place at the centre of intercultural supervision and explore with our students how our multiple geographies shaped our thinking and our supervision interactions (Manathunga 2014).

Cultural knowledge and supervision

In reimagining epistemology, it is important to remember the history of the creation of Northern knowledge and its intimate connection with colonisation. Colonisation involved physical, military and economic invasion and was justified by attempt to export Western knowledge, technologies and cultural beliefs to the world. Writing from a Māori perspective, Smith (1999) argues that the key features of Western knowledge include a focus on the individual; racial and gender hierarchies; rationality and 'hard' work; privileging written over oral texts; linear constructions of time and space and a binary either/or logic. In the process of knowledge production, the North was the location of knowledge and theory, whereas the South functioned as a giant laboratory (Smith 1999). As several authors have argued, these patterns continue into the present through globalisation (Connell 2007; Al-e Ahmad 1984) despite decades of postcolonial, Indigenous and feminist research. An important consequence of this Northern dominance of knowledge production is what Al-e Ahmad (1984) describes as '*gharbzadegi'* which has been variously translated as 'Westoxication' or 'Occidentosis'. Ngugi Wa Thiong'o (1986) calls this the 'colonisation of the mind'. Essentially each of these terms seeks to capture the self-doubt and dependency on the North produced by such one-way, powerful and ongoing practices of epistemological hegemony. As Al-e Ahmad (1984:43) argues, there has always been historic rivalry of East and West but with age of Enlightenment/Imperialism there was a change from competition to a "spirit of helplessness" (Al-e Ahmad 1984:43).

If we apply these ideas to supervision then firstly, we would need to acknowledge colonial legacies inherent in Western knowledge and work with our students to position Western theorists in terms of culture, gender, time, location and so on (Chakrabarty 2007; Connell 2007). This would also mean learning *from* our culturally diverse co-researchers and students and learning from the theorists from their contexts and regions. It would also involve a both-ways transculturation where Southern and Northern theory are brought into dialogue and where Northern theorists (including ourselves and our

Western students) engage respectfully with Southern knowledges (Manathunga 2014). As a Western scholar located in the South, thinking through these theoretical resources about knowledge means that we have a particular responsibility to facilitate South-South dialogue and to decolonise knowledge, theory and education. There would also be times where we need to encourage our students to respect rather than integrate knowledge systems. Pākehā academic Jones (1999:315-316) reminds us that we must at times "embrace positively a 'politics of disappointment' that includes a productive acceptance of the ignorance of the other" and a "gracious acceptance of not having to know the other". Finally, we would need to encourage our students to engage in respectful and rigorous critique of Southern Knowledge and Theory (Hountondji 1996; Nakata 2007). Some of these practices are already evident in Indigenous and Māori supervision (for example Ford 2012; McKinley *et al.* 2011), in Devos and Somerville's (2012) insightful article on the doctoral examination of a Cambodian student and in the empirical research I conducted for my book (Manathunga 2014).

Conclusions: Decolonising the curriculum

To conclude, I would like to extrapolate from the site of intercultural supervision to make some broader recommendations about what these theoretical resources offer us as we seek to decolonise the undergraduate and postgraduate curriculum. These theories about the contested nature of time, place and knowledge have significant implications for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the South. They offer us ways to engage in what Escobar (2007:187) calls "non-eurocentric and critical dialogue" with difference to decolonise the curriculum. The first lesson all of these theoretical resources teach us is about the importance of listening to and acknowledging black and non-Western pain and anger, not only in South Africa but also throughout the postcolonial world. I believe that white people, including myself, need to learn about truly effective deep listening techniques from Asian and Indigenous cultures. Developing these careful and considered listening techniques will assist white people to move beyond our unconscious experience of privilege so that we can come to understand more about the impact of centuries of oppression on black and non-Western people throughout the world.

Secondly, these theoretical resources emphasise the importance of avoiding essentialism and engage meaningfully with what Nakata (2007) calls the multiple "cultural interfaces" that each of us represent. This means moving on from essentialised positions in ways that acknowledge and appreciate difference but also seek to build commonality and trust. This is where we can learn from Nyamnjoh's (2016) call to embrace our identities as '*amakwerekwere*' or as outsiders with mobile, hybrid identities that shift and change across time and space. These fluid mobile identities offer creative possibilities for new alliances and ways of being. As Nyamnjoh (2015:257) argues, "the challenge of being or becoming African or anything else, is not so much identifying with people, places and spaces one is familiar with, but especially with spaces, places and people one is yet to encounter or become familiar with". As Garuba (2010) argues in the African context, and Bell (2014) argues in the postcolonial Aotearoa/New Zealand context, we need to develop carefully historised ideas about our origins and identities that are not essentialised or ontological. This also involves not harking back to a static imagined past or tradition, as Busia (2006) argues, but recognising how cultural rituals and ceremonies change and grow each time they are performed according to the historical moment and geographical space they are performed in.

Thirdly, I believe that developing a decolonised curriculum would involve three parallel and equally important curriculum processes:

1. The systematic deconstruction of Northern knowledge;
2. Critical Whiteness Studies;
3. The systematic reconstruction of Southern knowledge.

This curriculum would not throw out Western/Northern theory and knowledge systems but rather seek to critically re-read the canon and the archive against the grain to highlight exactly *how* black, cultural minority, Eastern, Middle Eastern, Latin and South American, Indigenous peoples, and indeed women have been and continue to be systematically "misrecognised" (Luckett & Naicker 2016) and marginalised in universities. As Chakrabarty (2007) has argued, Western theory is both necessary *and* insufficient in postcolonial contexts. Reading the canon against the grain involves both discursive and non-discursive or material critical deconstruction of Northern/Western texts. If the Western canon was simply removed, it would not be possible to identify, analyse and critique the *colonial* and *neoliberal* operations of power that have caused and continue to cause black and non-Western pain and anger. This history and these texts matter precisely because they have created and perpetuated the unjust conditions of the present. Unless these histories and texts are systematically critiqued and deconstructed, their effects will continue to remain unresolved in the future.

Fourthly, an important part of this process is to incorporate Critical Whiteness Studies in the curriculum to assist white students to begin to appreciate the privileges they have been accorded simply because of the colour of their skin. Critical Whiteness Studies emerged as part of Critical Race Studies in the early 1990s. It aims to "render whiteness visible" to "subvert the power of whiteness" (Steyn 2005:122,120). As Steyn (2005:120) argues, whiteness is "an ideologically supported social positionality that has accrued to people of European descent as a consequence of economic and political privilege gained during and subsequent to European colonial expansion". The aim of Critical Whiteness Studies is to illustrate how "the psychological, cultural, political and economic dimensions of this privileged positionality are normalised and rendered unremarkable" (Steyn 2005:121). This curriculum would investigate how "whiteness is brought into being as a normative structure, a discourse of power and a form of identity" (Ware & Back 2002:13). It would also problematise "identities and cultures … to investigate … their polyglot registers and cosmopolitan potential" (Ware & Back 2002:14). As McLaughlin and Whatman (2011:365) argue in the Australian context, "the success of decolonisation of education depends upon the efforts of non-Indigenous peoples to re-examine their positions and the control they exert over curriculum decision-making and reform". As Luckett and Naicker (2016) argue in the South African context and Mitchell and Edwards (2013) suggest in the African American context, it is important that black students do not have to carry all of the emotional load of this deconstructive, decolonial work.

Fifthly, in parallel with this deconstructive process, is the equally important mission to reconstruct Southern, Eastern, African, Latin and South American, Middle Eastern and Indigenous cultural histories, languages, knowledge systems and theories, which would become core components of the university curriculum. In my work I have called this "both-ways transculturation" (Manathunga 2014:61). This involves learning *from* our culturally diverse co-researchers and students and learning from the theorists about their Southern contexts and regions. It also involves bringing Southern and

Northern theory into dialogue in supervision and ensuring that Northern theorists (including ourselves and our Western students) engage respectfully with Southern knowledges. It would also involve seeking to go beyond simplistic dualities and cultural essentialism, as Nakata's work (2006:9) does in 'The cultural interface', and as Hountondji (1996), Nyamnjoh (2016), Garuba (2010) and Busia (2006) do in relation to African diversity.

Sixthly, as a Western scholar located in the South, thinking through these theoretical resources about knowledge means that we have a particular responsibility to facilitate South-South dialogue and to decolonise knowledge, theory and education. As a settler/invader scholar, I feel I have a particular responsibility as a member of the global South but as a privileged Irish-Australian to invest my energies and resources in working with colleagues in Indigenous, migrant and refugee communities in Australia, in South Africa, in Latin America, in the Pacific and in Asia.

Finally, all of these strategies would rely on the development of what Nyamnjoh (2015) calls "conviviality". This idea of conviviality takes us beyond notions of collegiality. Jackson (2016:5) argues that Nyamnjoh's call for conviviality is "more contentious but no less respectful" than the term 'collegiality'. It probably also takes us beyond some of the elitist exclusions lurking beneath the traditional university concept of collegiality which really meant collegiality only for white male middle-class professors. Conviviality involves emphasising our relationality and interdependence and the need for a dialogue between knowledge systems (Nyamnjoh 2015). It also focuses on "conversation [which] is privileged over conversion, and ritual influences [which] are more amenable to the logic of conviviality than is coercive [or indeed symbolic] violence" (Nyamnjoh 2015:146-147).

I would like to end with an invitation rather than a conclusion. I would like to echo Jackson's (2016:9) call to form "global solidarities of scholar-activists within and outside of the academy" to decolonise the curriculum. In summary this would involve:

- Listening and hearing the pain and anger of black and non-Western voices globally
- Avoiding essentialism by historically situating identity claims and counter claims
- Deconstructing the operations of power and privilege in Northern knowledge
- Introducing Critical Whiteness Studies for all university students (especially white students)
- Systematically reconstructing and revaluing Southern knowledge
- Engaging in South-South and South-North dialogue
- Operating from a space of conviviality.

There are many challenging impediments to making these changes. In South Africa, Luckett and Naicker (2016) identify these obstacles as including a breakdown in communication; fatigue; inadequate public funding and state interference. However, the time for empty rhetoric is over. The #RMF and #FMF campaigns in South Africa make it abundantly clear that we must act now to Southernise SOTL and decolonise the curriculum or we will face serious and dire consequences. I invite you to think about how this is possible.

References

Adam, B. 2004. *Time*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Adam, B & Groves, C. 2007. *Future matters: action, knowledge, ethics*. Leiden: Brill.

Alatas, SF. 2006. *Alternative discourses in Asian social science: responses to Eurocentrism.* New Delhi: Sage.

Al-e Ahmad, J. 1984. *Occidentosis: a plague from the West.* Translated by R Campbell & H Algar. Berkeley: Mizan Press.

Arturo Escobar. n.d. Available:
    http://aescobar.web.unc.edu/biography/
    Accessed 20 July 2017.

Ashwin, P & Trigwell, K. 2004. Investigating staff and educational development, in D Baume & P Kahn (eds.). *Enhancing staff and educational development.* London: Taylor & Francis, 117-131.

Battiste, M. 2008. Research ethics for protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and research responsibilities, in N Denzin, Y Lincoln & LT Smith (eds.). *Handbook of critical and Indigenous methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage, 497-510.

Bell, A. 2014. *Relating Indigenous and settler identities: beyond domination*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Busia, A. 2006. What is Africa to me? Knowledge possession, knowledge production and the health of our bodies politic. *African studies review* 49(1), 15-30.

Centre for African Studies. n.d. Available:
    http://www.africanstudies.uct.ac.za/cas/staff/garuba
    Accessed 20 July 2017

Chakrabarty, D. 2002. *Habitations of modernity: essays in the wake of Subaltern Studies*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Chakrabarty, D. 2007. *Provincializing Europe*. 2nd edition. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Chen, KH. 2010. *Asia as method*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Clegg, S. 2010. Time future: the dominant discourse of higher education pedagogy. *Time & Society* 19(3), 345-364.

Coeval. n.d. Available:
    http://www.thefreedictionary.com/coeval
    Accessed 31 January 2013.

Connell, R. 2007. *Southern theory.* Cambridge: Polity.

Devos, A & Somerville, M. 2012. What constitutes doctoral knowledge? *Australian Universities Review* 54(1), 47-54.

Escobar, A. 2007. Worlds and knowledges otherwise. *Cultural studies* 21(2), 179-210.

Fabian, J. 1983. *Time and the Other: how anthropology makes its object*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Ford, L. 2012. Reflecting on doctoral candidature experiences as an Indigenous Australian, in C Denholm& T Evans (eds.). *Doctorates downunder*. Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press, 145-152.

Garuba, H. 2010. Roots and routes: tracking form and history in African diasporic narratives and performances. *Social dynamics* 36(2), 239-255.

Harding, S. 1991. *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Hountondji, P. 1996. *African philosophy: myth and reality*. 2nd edition. Translated by H Evans. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Jackson, N. 2016. Review of Francis B Nyamnjoh, *#RhodesMustFall: nibbling at resilient colonialism in South Africa*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa, 2016, in *Antipode: a radical journal of geography* 8, 1-11.

Jones, A. 1999. The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: pedagogy, desire and absolution in the classroom. *Educational theory* 49(3), 299-316.

Luckett, K & Naicker, V. 2016. Responding to misrecognition from a (post)/colonial university. *Critical studies in education* DOI: 10.1080/17508487.2016.1234495

McKinley, E, Grant, B, Middleton, S, Irwin, K & Williams, L. 2011. Working at the interface: indigenous candidates' experience of undertaking doctoral studies in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Equity & excellence in education* 44(1), 115-132.

McLaughlin, J & Whatman, S. 2011. The potential of critical race theory in decolonizing university curricula. *Asia Pacific journal of education* 31(4), 365-377.

Maldonado-Torres, N. 2011. Thinking through the decolonial turn: post-continental interventions in theory, philosophy and critique – an introduction. *Transmodernity* 1(2), 1-15.

Manathunga, C. 2011. Moments of transculturation and assimilation: post-colonial explorations of supervision and culture. *Innovations in education & teaching international* 48(4), 367-376.

Manathunga, C. 2014. *Intercultural Postgraduate Supervision: reimagining time, place and knowledge*. London: Routledge.

109

Martin, B. 2000. Place: an ethics of cultural difference and location. *Educational philosophy and theory* 32(1), 81-91.

Massey, D. 1997. A global sense of place, in T Barnes & D Gregory (eds.). *Reading human geography*. London: Arnold, 315-323.

Massey, D. 2005. *For space*. London: Sage Publications.

Mitchell, R & Edwards, K. 2013. The colour of thought: advising ethic minority candidates through a radical ethic of pedagogical love, in T Engels-Schwarzpaul & M Peters (eds.). *Of other thoughts: non-traditional approaches to the doctorate.* Rotterdam: Sense publishers, 101-144.

Nakata, M. 2006. Australian Indigenous Studies: a question of discipline. *Australian journal of anthropology* 17(3), 265-275.

Nakata, M. 2007. The cultural interface. *Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* 36 (Supplement), 7-14.

Ngugi Wa Thiong'o. 1986. *Decolonising the mind: the politics of language in African literature*. London: James Currey.

Nyamnjoh, F. n.d. Available:
http://www.nyamnjoh.com/2004/11/nyamnjoh_a_sele.html#more
Accessed 20 July 2017.

Nyamnjoh, F. 2015. Incompleteness: frontier Africa and the currency of conviviality. *Journal of Asian and African studies* 52(3), 253-270.

Nyamnjoh, F. 2016. *#RhodesMustFall: nibbling at resilient colonialism in South Africa*. Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa.

Penetito, W. 2009. Place-based education: catering for curriculum, culture and community. *New Zealand annual review of education* 18, 5-29.

Peters, M. 2015. The university in the digital epoch: fast knowledge in the circuits of cybernetic capitalism, in P Gibbs, OH Ylijoki, C Guzmán-Valenzuela & R Barnett (eds.). *Universities in the flux of time*. London: Routledge, 9-31.

Pratt, M. 2008. *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. 2nd edition. London & New York: Routledge.

Rancière, J. 2011. *Mute speech: literature, critical theory and politics*. New York: Continuum.

Rancière, J. 2012. *Proletarian nights: the workers' dream in nineteenth-century France.* London: Verso Books.

Rose, D. 1996. *Nourishing terrains: Australian aboriginal views of landscape and wilderness*. Canberra: Australian Heritage Commission.

Ruitenberg, C. 2005. Deconstructing the experience of the local: toward a radical pedagogy of place, in K Howe (ed.). *Philosophy of education yearbook*. Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society, 212-220.

Sillitoe, P. (ed.). 2007. *Local science vs global science: approaches to Indigenous knowledge in international development*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Singh, M & Huang, X. 2013. Bourdieu's lessons for internationalising Anglophone education: de-classifying Sino-Anglo divisions over critical theorising. *Compare* 43(2), 203-223.

Singh, M, Manathunga, C, Bunda, T & Qi, J. 2016. Mobilising Indigenous and non-Western theoretic-linguistic knowledge in doctoral education. *Knowledge cultures* 4(1), 56-70.

Smith, LT. 1999. *Decolonising methodologies: research and Indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books.

Somerville, M. 2010. A place pedagogy for 'global contemporaneity'. *Education philosophy & theory* 42(3), 326-344.

Somerville, M, Davies, B, Power, K, Gannon, S & de Carteret, P. 2011. Introduction, in M Somerville, B Davies, K Power, S Gannon & P de Carteret (eds.). *Place pedagogy change*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers, 1-12.

Steyn, M. 2005. "White talk": white South Africans and the management of diasporic whiteness, in A López (ed.). *Postcolonial whiteness: a critical reader on race and empire* Albany: State University of New York Press, 119-136.

Trigwell, K. 2012. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, in L Hunt and D Chalmers (eds.). *University teaching in focus: a learning-centred approach.* Camberwell, Victoria: ACER Press, 253-267.

Ungunner-Baumann, MR. 2002. Dadirri: inner deep listening and quiet still awareness. Available: http://nextwave.org.au/wp-content/uploads/Dadirri-Inner-Deep-Listening-M-R-Ungunmerr-Bauman-Refl.pdf
Accessed 23 July 2017.

Ware, V & Back, L. 2002. *Out of whiteness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zerubavel, E. 2003. *Time maps: collective memory and the social shape of the past*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.