

THINK PIECE: Cognitive justice and integration without duress

The future of development education – perspectives from the South

Catherine A. Odora Hoppers

Research Chair in Development Education at the University of
South Africa

Abstract

In a time of unacceptable global injustice, growing inequalities in the distribution of power, accelerating climate change, and unwavering racism and social exclusion, we are today facing the biggest challenges of human history' (European Conference on Intercultural Dialogue in Development Education, 2008: 1). A favourable wind is blowing slowly and steadfastly from the South. No longer is the South an 'object' of inquiry (Bhaba, 1995; De Silva *et al.*, 1988; Prakash, 1995). The transition from bandit colonialism through the intricate systems of the modern triage society (Nandy, 1997; 2000) that is wired for Western cultural compliance is being challenged. We have to start 'rethinking thinking' itself from the constitutive rules: how paradigms are made; how rules are policed; how the architecture of modern institutions is fashioned to make them behave the way they do (Odora Hoppers, 2009b; Odora Hoppers and Richards, 2012). We have to raise the issue of the fate of the grass roots into the global arena, where ways of knowing and the issue of indigenous knowledge systems (IKS) can be given higher priority. By doing this, we join hands in articulating the defences of the mind and conceptual categories that the grass roots use to organize their thoughts and keep their actions alive, not just in the villages, but also in the public sphere. Turning the previously colonized into participants in a new moral and cognitive venture against oppression requires more than just periodic elections. The atrophy of human capabilities that has characterized human development in the context of

both bandit colonialism and the modern triage society demands the development of a plurality of insights, of critical traditions, and a deepening of the tools for diagnosis, and hence the quality of prognosis.

Introduction: the problem at hand

Education is sometimes associated with theory, and in other instances with practice. The field of educational sciences as a whole may be viewed as a double-faced area of intellectual and political endeavours. It involves the generation of new knowledge of what the world of education is: inside the classroom, as well as in the socio-economic and political setting to which education belongs. Yet, education policy research and discourses, both antecedent and contemporary, remain mired within the limiting framework of the education discipline alone. Education is continually conceived of as a social policy instrument *in vacuo* (Motala, 1998). They also mask the important questions about the location of education itself as a subsystem in other systems such as politics, economy, culture and, as globalization increasingly brings to bear, international relations. Therefore a question needs to be asked: where is the critically informed 'agential citizenry' (Kenway 1996: 217) in development education to be found?

Moreover, it was a contrived nation-state endowed with power that was unaccompanied by the three other key and strategic actors: the market (denoting property), science (denoting modern knowledge) and, at the base, the knowledge holders (in this case, the informal sector). So we have the modern economy, the markets, and science in tow, attuned to the formal economy; while the obverse that was despised, downgraded, and actually insulted was the informal economy consisting of 'the common man/woman' holding their knowledge no matter what pilfering took place in the modern sector.

The disintegration of the African 'space', very much taken for granted in development discourse and practice, is what makes development structurally impossible. Two decades ago, a study of the United Nations concluded that the 'economic and social advancement of all peoples' is not just *not happening*, but that the world is really mired in a grim and dangerous impasse. More precisely, the 20 per cent Northern minority of humankind has 82.7 per cent of the world gross national product; 81.2 per cent of world trade; 94.6 per cent of all commercial lending; 80.6 per cent of all domestic savings; 80.5 per cent of all domestic investment; and 94.0 per cent of all research and development (Childers and Urquhart, 1994: 53).

Three and a half billion people, accounting for more than two-thirds of the Earth's land surface area, and comprising three-quarters of all humanity commonly referred to as 'the Third World', or the 'South', continue to exist on the periphery of the developed countries of the North:

... Were all humanity a single nation-state, the present North–South divide would make it an unviable, semi-feudal entity, split by internal conflict. Its small part is advanced, prosperous, powerful; its much bigger part is underdeveloped, poor, powerless. A nation so divided within itself would be recognized as unstable. A world so divided should likewise be recognized as being inherently unstable.

(South Commission, 1990: 1–2)

With sovereignty and long-term nationalistic development thinking totally derailed, the main preoccupation of most African policymakers since the 1990s has become crisis management for economic survival. The focus of economic policies shifted dramatically to short-term concerns resulting mainly from external shocks. Long-term development objectives were put on hold. In their place structural adjustment programmes (SAPs) were devised by the Bretton Woods institutions supported by the donor community, which these poor countries were required to adopt if they were to qualify for external support, and, in particular, have access to desperately needed foreign exchange. This reality has effectively shackled African countries to these programmes (Adedeji, 1995), nose-deep in a choice-less democracy (Mkandawire, 1996).

Knowledges, like categories, are contingent social derivations and instruments of symbolic power possessing a constitutive efficacy. The structures of discourse on the social world are often politically charged social pre-constructions (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). At the same time, actors in the geopolitical arena act out discourses that are strongly geographical in nature, making geographical discourse itself a form of power. The link between geopolitical knowledge, power, and hegemony, however, can be best captured by an understanding of the meaning of ‘discourse’. According to Giles Mohan, discourse is a set of capabilities and socio-cultural resources used by people in the construction of meaning about their world and their activities. It is not simply about speech or written statements, but the rules by which verbal speech and written statements are made meaningful (Mohan, 1994: 529).

The power to pre-empt the construction of meanings and to determine and control the rules governing speech and practice draws our attention to the non-neutrality of knowledge. It also enables us to discern the actors in the knowledge dissemination field, and to identify who controls the direction and quality in the knowledge traffic, who controls the traffic light, and most of all, to what extent the technologies layer new inequalities upon the old (Kenway, 1996).

Enough is enough!

We are today facing some of the greatest challenges in human history: growing inequalities in the distribution of wealth, unwavering racism and social exclusion,

and the consequences of accelerating climate change (European Conference on Intercultural Dialogue in Development Education, 2008: 1). A favourable wind is blowing slowly and steadfastly from the South.

No longer is the South an 'object' of inquiry. The transition from bandit colonialism through the intricate systems of the modern triage society that is wired for Western cultural compliance is being challenged. The Third World is not just mired in critique, or a prayer for the 'meek' to inherit the Earth as Ashis Nandy has forewarned us! For us to have reached this point, it required a decisive consensus that the meek do not inherit the Earth by their meekness alone (Odora Hoppers, 2009c; Nandy, 1997; Rahnema, 1997). Selected scholars had to start from the constitutive rules: how paradigms are made; how rules are policed; how the architecture of modern institutions is fashioned to make them behave the way they do (Odora Hoppers, 2009b; Odora Hoppers and Richards, 2012).

These transformative scholars turned to the global system and what it has scattered in many places of the world. The most pernicious of its effects is felt among the culturally despised indigenous knowledge system (IKS) holders (Hountondji, 1997). Here, to raise the pertinent issue of the fate of the grass roots in the global arena, the IKS issue had to take priority. In South Africa, to have the policy passed by Parliament in 2004 meant official recognition had to be afforded. This meant that the defences of the mind and conceptual categories, around which the grass roots could organize to keep their thoughts and actions alive and in public, was at last in place.

Turning the previously colonized into participants in a new moral and cognitive venture against oppression requires more than just periodic elections. The atrophy of human capabilities that has characterized human development in the context of both bandit colonialism and the modern triage society demands the development of a plurality of insights, of critical traditions, and a deepening of the tools for diagnosis and hence the quality of prognosis. It may, in certain instances, demand a cognitive indifference to the Western model, and a robust engagement with the methods of science and in particular their impact on sustainable livelihoods when acting in consort with economics. But most of all it calls for a vigorous engagement with conceptual categories and the theoretical and cultural underpinnings from which they have descended, with the clear intention of dismantling them (Nandy, 1997, 2000; Rahnema, 1997; Bhaba, 1995; Prakash, 1995).

We are beginning to think of the beginnings: that is, about education itself and its links with development. The natural sciences are complemented by other kinds of knowledge that can deal more adequately with wholes, with living organisms, and the inter-relatedness of human consciousness in particular. The salient point in development education is that it sees the pitfalls of development as lying not only in encouraging the world to take on consumption and accumulation, but also in its

unquestioned link with colonialism and the reductionist ethos in science, which has made it next to impossible to study the intersubjective grounds of human action: the socially shared and instituted meanings through which people live (Latouche, 1993; Odora Hoppers, 2008a).

Following the spread of Western hierarchization, the word 'development' pre-empted the acceptance of pluralities of insights, approaches, and world views, and thus of the consideration of the *polysemy* of history, including its many meanings, possibilities, and ambiguities (Latouche, 1993); because when masses of people are blocked out, erased, blacked-out, or whited-out from a lived space, whether cognitive or physical, the basis for the recognition of diversity is destroyed.

What then?

What then we need to share, echo, assert, and implement are deep visions of education that are capable of interrogating development, rather than being its drowsy bedfellow. Attempts at introducing the idea of education for sustainable development have so far ended up focusing on environmental degradation and climate change with little reference to diverse traditions that are ecologically coded and are paradigmatically more congruent with the reality of sustainable living.

Could we perhaps add to the efforts at redeeming development from itself by positing notions such as education for constructive development, or education as cultural action that changes cultural structures? Such conceptions redeem 'development' in that they remind us that as humans, we can create and recreate multiple social worlds that are constructed and that can be deconstructed; but also that to the extent that certain fundamental non-functionality can be demonstrated, the actual field of education should be reconstructed (Odora Hoppers, 1998; Richards, 1995).

In South Africa, the Department of Science and Technology has funded chairs to bring authentic sharing of the practice of alternatives that should create new synergies, but we do not know why this is so important. It recognizes that when we celebrate the knowledge and wisdom of common people, and begin to view their knowledge as a cultural resource valuable and valid in its own way, what we are saying is that a truly sustainable project of human-centred development can only begin when we start with what people already *have*, or already know.

From this foundation their knowledge can, of course, be extended and enriched by the scientific and other insights from experts of all stripes, but it will only remain effective as long as it is rooted in the culture and experience of those who are developing it. It is clear that it is impossible to create a well-functioning society and a way of approaching livelihoods and human security from a knowledge base that excludes the knowledge-holders in real time. It is what has made 'development' as

we have known it fundamentally inadequate, seriously incomplete, and in many instances mistaken in its basic assumptions (Ekin, 1992).

Democratization of knowledge and a moment of renegotiation of agency

The democratization of knowledge and the democratization of development are intrinsically linked with the democratization of the state (Odora Hoppers, 2010; Visvanathan, 2000). It is a democratization based on a new articulation of people-to-people and people-to-nature relations that provides for, and promotes, cultural diversity in a global perspective rather than Western industrial hegemony. It is an eco-centric perception that places humanity within and as part of nature, rather than as superior to it. It is a democratization that sees the development of people in the round as wholes, both as individuals and as members of social communities, a development that caters for their needs of being, of doing, and of relating, as well as of course the now dominant need of having. Finally, it is a democratization that promotes autonomy, initiative, and capability based on a commitment to social justice.

It is a democratization that rejects the idea that the 30 per cent of the world's population that have sustained their livelihoods on 'other' formulas elliptical to the Western model are now 'disposable' as far as the modern project is concerned. The organization, and support, for a new kind of people's power that can both resist the untrammelled onslaught of modern development and at the same time further the common good is a formidable and uncertain task, but it is not impossible (Ekin, 1992).

It is a moment when individual memory meets social memory in a contemporary space. A moment of harrowing ethical repositioning that provides an impetus for ethical judgement to undergo purposive, radical revision (Bhaba, 1994: 23). It is a moment when public memory accepts responsibility for the past and commits to restoring agency (Cleary and Connolly, 2004).

European development education

Europeans have both the responsibility and the moral and material capacity to face these challenges and to engage in the important and exciting fight for global justice, solidarity, human dignity, and sustainable ways of living. Development and global education in Europe are fundamental in this process, by enabling every European to become an active, responsible global citizen, living up to our shared values of humanity, and by contributing to overcome European policies that perpetuate the mentioned problems (Van der Merwe, 2008). The multi-agency report *The European*

Consensus on Development: The contribution of development education and awareness raising (DEEEP, 2007) points to this.

It is a new vision that calls on all actors in and across Europe to commit to building diversity, to support the emerging national strategies, to ensure coherence, and to move the process forward in a transparent and open way. It calls for development education actors at national and local levels (ministries of foreign affairs, development, education, and others; local and regional authorities; civil society organizations; schools and universities; the media, etc.) to elaborate their own coherent national development education strategies in a multi-stakeholder process, and to link them to the European Development Education Consensus.

It encourages members of parliaments to participate proactively in the implementation of the European Development Education Consensus at European and national levels, recalling previous commitments to provide adequate funding for development education, and recognizes the efforts made by some governments in this respect. Increased effectiveness, quality, and impact in development education are also required. This requires improvement and increased resource provisions for teacher training – both pre-service and in-service, and in the education and training of trainers in both formal and non-formal education, and informal learning. This also necessitates greater clarity regarding the differences along the continuum from development education to awareness raising to information and campaigning, and coherence between development cooperation and education. Appropriate mechanisms of evaluation in these related, complementary but differing spheres are essential.

More importantly the conference encourages all actors in European development education to contribute, in their activities, to intercultural dialogue, taking into account the complex character of the cultural identities of each person. Culture is multifaceted and should not be reduced to geographic origins. In order not to be culturally biased, development education should integrate the perspectives of disadvantaged groups whose views are often not represented.

NGOs, academics, and other stakeholders in research related to development education should cooperate more, sharing and learning from each other to develop best practices. The process of collaboration should recognize the strengths and limitations of all stakeholders, with the aim of capacity building in North and South. Research must be grounded in participatory methodology and a full understanding of the context (for example, gender or culture). We should promote more open, flexible, and collaborative approaches, including those that challenge our usual ways of thinking and working.

Working groups 3, 4, and 5 especially focused on the importance of embedding the Southern perspective into organizational life and elaborated on possibilities of creating North–South development education networks, encouraging methodologies in the field of development education and intercultural dialogue. These working groups also emphasized the possibilities of creating development education research partnerships, and linking the concepts of development education and intercultural dialogue, focusing on integrating aspects in different cultures and close interlinking with different networks, actors, and processes (e.g. the North–South Centre recommendation process, the Council of Europe, GENE, CONCORD, Global Education Week network, non-EU states, and other actors from non-development fields). These should be strengthened in order to create synergies and to avoid parallel and possibly competing processes.

Authentic Southern voices should be seen as partners in the work and not as guests of honour. The creation of North–South networks, the inclusion of accountability measures and procedures in these partnerships, and the inclusion of North–South partnerships in development education actions should be the basis for meaningful participation of Southern partners in events referring to realities from the South. Consultations with both Northern and Southern partners on the need, effectiveness, and the amount of funding needed for development education should be organized.

Southern perspectives should be embedded into organizational life. In projects, clear references to culture, values, attitudes, structures, ideas, relationships, and practices from both North and South – and how interventions maintain or change these – should be included. New and different thinking on methodologies and research to reflect our common humanity should be developed (Van der Merwe, 2008).

Points of departure for development education from the South

Development education as a new area in academic, research, and citizenship education takes ‘development’ as a pedagogic field, and human development as the goal. From here, it explores epistemological and methodological questions around human development and asks the questions: What kind of transformative actions must be brought to bear to enable both restorative action and sustainable human development to occur in Africa? How can key areas of disciplinary knowledge production (such as science, economics, and education) be reconstituted in order to bring about a just and human-centred development on our continent?

Given the unprecedented evacuation of millions of Africa’s population (mostly in rural areas) from the arena of knowledge production, what are the terms and conditions under which their fullest integration as knowledge producers into the formal and public arena – including their recognition in the National System of Innovation – should occur? Given the ambivalent and often problematic ‘distance’

between universities and society in Africa, what kind of realignment is essential to turn universities from a closed-loop culture of expertise to one that sees itself as part of the 'commons', a civic space with a capability to develop horizontal relationships, especially with its rural base?

Capacity building for moral and ethical reasoning must be taken very seriously, especially in these times when the skills to accumulate money and wealth are exalted, but those required to cope cumulatively with the imperatives of co-existence, solidarity, and human dignity are in such short supply. The stakes for humanity are therefore high.

Ashis Nandy observes that every generation is confronted with a prototypical violence to which it must respond with the fullest capacity possible. Therefore the task for this generation is that of a renegotiation of human agency, in which social justice is seen as that condition in which all members of a society have the same basic rights, security, opportunities, obligations, and social benefits. In other words, social justice cannot be defined by whatever the strong decide any more (Nandy, 1997).

From the perspective of colonialism, development education takes it as the task of this generation to corrode and exhaust the narrative of colonialism in its numerous guises and technologies and ruses, including those alibis that are couched in the recesses of the academy, and to affirm that the history that is taking place on the outer limits of the subject/object, is now giving rise to new moments of defiance that rip through the sly civility of that grand old narrative, exposing its violence (Prakash, 1995; Bhaba, 1995).

Subaltern agency now emerges as a process of reversing, displacing, and seizing the apparatus of value coding, which had been monopolized by the colonial default drive. It is the contestation of the 'given' symbols of authority that systematically shifts the terrain of antagonism. Bhaba agrees that this is the moment of renegotiation of agency. It is the voice of an interrogative, calculative agency, the moment when we lose resemblance with the colonizer, the moment (in Toni Morrison's words) of 'rememoration' that turns the narrative of enunciation into a haunting memorial of what has been excluded, excised, evicted (Bhaba, 1995).

This is no longer about documenting the histories of resistance of the colonized to colonialism. It is rather about turning those accounts into theoretical events that make those struggles relevant not only for their moment in time, but also relevant for other moments in times to come. The 'people without history' not only then get back their central place in history, finally away from the dingy 'ethnography corner' to which colonial discourse would want them confined for eternity, but also become full agents and makers of history, current and future.

It is about changing the very direction of the citizen's gaze, directly on to the naked emperor. Hence the light that began by being cast on colonialism and the legacy of domination and abuse is changed to vigilant analysis of its failures, silences, and a systematic spotting of transformative nodes that were not recognizable before, but which are now released into public spaces. This casting of generative light at last on to subjugated peoples, knowledges, histories, and ways of living unsettles the toxic pond and transforms passive analysis into a generative force that valorizes and recreates life for those previously museumized (Visvanathan, 1997; Odora Hoppers, 2008b; Prakash, 1995), throwing open for realignment the conflictual, discrepant, and even violent processes that formed the precipitous basis of colonialism.

In other words, it is a process of engaging with colonialism in a manner that produces a programme for its dislocation (Prakash, 1995: 6) – a dislocation that is made possible not only by permitting subalterns direct space for engaging with the structures and manifestations of colonialism, but also by inserting into the discourse arena totally different meanings and registers from other traditions. It is here that subaltern and heterogeneous forms of knowledge such as indigenous knowledge systems and related forms of agency that had no place in the fields of knowledge that grew in compact with colonialism and science at last have a place, and by their stirring presence they become revolutionary heuristics in a post-colonial transformation agenda (Rahnema, 1997).

Cognitive justice and cultural injustice

When we spell out concepts such as cognitive justice, for instance, it is no longer about the pros and cons of debating whether the colonized peoples have a history, or a philosophy, but it is directly about the right of different forms of knowledge to survive – and survive creatively and sustainably, turning the toxic hierarchy left behind by colonialism into a circle (Visvanathan, 1997; 2000), in which the inner cry for self-determination meets the outer voice of co-determination. Out of this is born a method for exploring difference that rejects hierarchization and the attendant humiliation, and provides for reciprocity and empathy (Odora Hoppers, 2009a; Lindner, 2006).

If culture is the precipitate, the default drive, the taken-for-granted of a people, then when African or indigenous people, for instance, cry out that the education system throughout the continent lacks familiarity with the context and culture of its learners: what they are saying is that it is carrying another default drive altogether, a process that disenfranchises and disadvantages the children epistemologically. In fact it can be said that in Africa, social cohesion does not depend on state sovereignty, liberal democracy, the advance of modernity, or the global economy, but upon the millions of African people willing to sacrifice what they 'take for granted' – their cultural script

and default drive – by bearing the uncomfortable burden of speaking and acting in unfamiliar cultural idioms within all areas of everyday life.

Here, then, we see that Africans are not passive victims of cultural imperialism, though they have been subject to coercive interventions, but active agents in negotiating unfamiliar, strange, and alien cultural terrain. Social cohesion especially in the southern part of Africa would easily collapse if Africans as the natural majority were not willing to suspend ‘that which is taken for granted’ and bear the burden of unfamiliar cultural transformations. Cultural justice therefore requires, at minimum, that this burden of the unfamiliar needs to be shared more equitably by people from different cultural backgrounds across society (Kwenda, 2003).

In other words, cultural justice takes us from tolerance to respect in cultural politics, arguing that what is needed is functional respectful co-existence. By ‘respectful’ is meant mutuality in paying attention, according regard and recognition as well as taking seriously what the other regards as important. By ‘functional’ is meant that co-existence is predicated on a degree of interaction that invokes the cultural worlds of the players: in essence, what they, in their distinctive ways, take for granted. In other words, cultural injustice occurs when people are forced by coercion or persuasion to submit to the burdensome condition of suspending – or permanently surrendering – what they naturally take for granted. This means that, in reality, the subjugated person has no linguistic or cultural ‘default drive’ – that critical minimum of ways, customs, manners, gestures, and postures that facilitate uninhibited, unselfconscious action (Kwenda, 2003: 70).

By its converse, ‘cultural justice’ is meant that the burden of constant self-consciousness is shared or at the very least recognized, and where possible rewarded. The sharing part is very important because it is only in the mutual vulnerability that this entails that the meaning of intimacy and reciprocity in community can be discovered. It is in this sharing that, on the one hand, cultural difference is transcended, and, on the other, cultural arrogance, by which is meant that disposition to see in other cultures not simply difference but deficiency, is overcome. The cultural work that is entailed in constructing functional tolerance therefore goes beyond providing equal opportunities in, say, education, to the unclogging of hearts filled with resentment (Odora Hoppers, 2005; 2007).

Investing in building trust as bridging social capital

Development education recognizes that we seem to be living in a world that appears to be caught in a ‘social trap’, i.e. a negative cycle of distrust and negative cooperation owing to mutual distrust and lack of social capital, even where cooperation would benefit all – reflecting a real tragedy of the commons. In fact, it is not that there is no trust at all: the problem is that the trust and loyalty extend only to fellow members

of the particular grouping; and distrust and hostility mark our relations with non-members. We therefore need to draw a distinction between bridging social capital and bonding social capital, in which 'bridging social capital' is a broader concept and encompasses people across diverse social cleavages, whereas 'bonding social capital' is more restrictive and tends to reinforce exclusive identities within homogeneous groups and to exclude people from other groups (Gunnarson, 2008).

Since the existing education system and processes have made it a prime goal to fragment, individualize, and valorize competitiveness as supreme ideals, the education of the future needs to invest in the building of bridging, or generalized trust that can enable us to embrace the 'stranger' and people who are not personally known to us in the first instance (Warren, 1998).

It was this that the Delors focus on learning to live together in his seminal report on education implied (Delors *et al.*, 1996). Because trust is infectious, a person with generalized trust believes that most people can be trusted, and is therefore an asset to the sustenance of democracy, and of the futures we are seeking.

Development education's critical engagement with 'culture'

Today, we stand forewarned by Hélé Béji that our resort to the vague idea of culture as the response to this problem may not be that adequate. Béji warned us that the real hazard with using culture as the point of ultimate respite is that culture, 'having supplanted race ... is today an apology for itself that is not amenable to rational criticism since each culture invokes its own rationality' (Béji, 2004: 27), fixing its own rules of the game and asserting rights in line with its own convictions, irrespective of what others think, or feel, undermining completely the possibility of neutral arbitration (*ibid.*). It becomes clear that belonging to the same culture or religion is no longer a guarantee of tolerance or political contentment. Therefore, in calling culture, democracy, human rights, etc. into the picture, we need to be very alert to instrumentalist and self-serving potentialities of these concepts (De Silva *et al.*, 1988; Benhabib, 1996).

A similar kind of vigilance needs to be applied in several other areas. To illustrate, we are today quite lost as we see human rights for all are turned into inhuman codes; sovereignty is replaced by supremacy; tolerance, which in the first place is the rejection of the intolerable, becomes the right to practise the intolerable. Democracy becomes a slogan in support of hegemony. Cultural difference, which was supposed to diversify peacefully, converges instead into a practice of violence; while anti-racism becomes as intolerant as racism. In the end the rights of the weakest are modelled on the abuses of the rights of the strongest, with the result that victims are turning into a new force of cruelty in their own right (Béji, 2001; 2004). These realities impose upon us an obligation to rethink the content and paradigm of learning itself.

Development education and the second-generation indigenization

In this second-generation indigenization (Odora Hoppers, 2009a), the errors of the past are taken as starting points for new directions. For instance it is recognized that there has been the usual period in a lot of social change where, to establish recognition and strength prerequisite to an effective presence in dialogue and discourse, there is a polarization or over-reaction against the incumbent (i.e. defining oneself as 'different from' as being important in the process of claiming space to define oneself through self-reference).

The force it takes against established and resistant hegemony to create this space is reflected in an exaggerated and confrontational antithesis, such as radical feminism; the anti-development lobby of the green movement; and in the white settler colonies, the anti-white elements of the black power movement – each spawning an equally distorted backlash (Fatnowna and Pickett, 2002; Odora Hoppers, 2002; 2009a).

With this new stream, the integrative paradigm shift recognizes that there is a growing maturity of dialogue that is not the result of a paradigm shift, but is the shift itself. Thus, in the area of knowledge, we move from the ignorance and depreciating ideology along with social theories that claimed *terra nullius* as a convenient rationalization for colonization and ill treatment, to a need for honest recognition of the existence of indigenous knowledge systems; of indigenous cultures, civilizations, and cosmologies. In fact it quickly becomes clear, in the light of disappearing landraces, biodiversity, and the depleting reservoirs of peace cultures, that there is a need for those knowledge systems themselves, not just the recognition that they exist (Fatnowna and Pickett, 2002).

As has been stated in the *UNESCO World Report on Knowledge Societies*, to remain human and liveable, knowledge societies will have to be societies of shared knowledge (Béji, 2001, 2004; Bindé, 2001). Today, we can say that the knowledge paradigms of the future are beginning by reaching out to those who are excluded and epistemologically disenfranchized, to move together towards a new synthesis. It is about equal access as citizens of a nation and of the world into the mainstream society, with an emphasis on equality without duress, i.e. the right to participate on an equal footing in a negotiating partnership. This includes identifying and deconstructing the mechanisms of any form of assimilation or imposition of other cultures on others (Fatnowna and Pickett, 2002).

Where appropriate, it is about indigenous peoples reclaiming the custodianship over their knowledge in public spaces, along with the right to speak and be determining agents of cooperative contemporary change and creative knowledge sharing of these knowledge systems.

Conclusion

Development education must be seen as a transformative pedagogy in our times. It draws ethical benchmarks for norm change. It addresses cognitive reversals and searches for new theories of freedom, knowing that an atrocity cannot be understood in the usual opposition of academic sociology between functional and conflict theory (Visvanathan, 2000).

To understand an atrocity we should not merely study the sociology of conflict, but attempt to understand evil and a phenomenology of humiliation, which standard sociology has not so far captured. An atrocity as a victim's narrative often falls afoul of the expert because the victim's testimony is often in discordance with the expert's assessment. Calibrating an atrocity with standard sociological tools, Visvanathan argues, often leads to surreal results. In other words, an atrocity cannot be domesticated as a mere human rights violation. It has to be a theory of freedom where literature and political theory combine in a new way (Visvanathan, 1997; 2000) or as Seyla Benhabib has well put, it is the challenge to democracy of difference (Benhabib, 1996).

A knowledge society with 'equity' is a society where all forms of knowledge get recognized and valued especially from where they originate, and also end up benefiting that society. It is a kind of dynamic process where it is not only the people who access information and knowledge, but also how knowledge and information find their way to the probable users (Odora Hoppers, 2006).

In other words, the challenge confronting us in the academy as we begin to realize how straitjacketed we have been for so long is that of opening the minds, and ultimately opening our hearts and wills. The path forward out of this situation is about becoming more human, not just 'more clever'. It is about transcending our fears of vulnerability, not finding new ways of protecting ourselves. It is about how to act in the service of the whole, not just in the service of our own interests. If we cannot see how what we are doing or not doing is contributing to things being the way they are, then logically we have no basis at all – zero leverage – for changing the way things are, except from the outside, by persuasion or force. We can no longer address this sedimented problem and the problem situation from a comfortable position of uninvolved innocence. In order to solve tough problems, we need more than shared ideas. We also need shared commitment. We need a sense of the whole and what it demands of us (Kahane, 2004).

As global educators, we must understand that the generative adult or adults of the future are seen as standing between the past and the future to be built, and therefore we have to make up our minds looking into the future, make that crucial distinction between producing more offspring, and producing offspring that are not crippled.

Lawrence Blum has warned us that an agent may reason well in moral situations, uphold the strictest standards of impartiality for testing maxims and principles, and even be adept at deliberation. Yet, unless he/she perceives moral situations as moral situations and unless he/she perceives their moral character accurately, their skills at deliberation will be for nought, and may even lead them astray. One of the most important moral differences between people is between those who miss, and those who see, various moral features of situations confronting them. Perception is the setting for action and salience: the adequacy of an agent's consciousness concerning a situation, or ability to grasp the contours of a problem prior to being called upon to exercise that agency, is key in this (Blum, 1991).

Professor Catherine A. Odora Hoppers is a scholar and policy specialist on international development, education, North–South questions, disarmament, peace, and human security. She is a UNESCO expert in basic education, lifelong learning, information systems, and on science in society. Her expertise extends to disarmament at the UN Department of Disarmament Affairs; benefit sharing and value addition protocols at the World Economic Forum; and traditional knowledge and community intellectual property rights at the World Intellectual Property Organization. In South Africa, Professor Hoppers holds a South African Research Chair in Development Education at the University of South Africa. Prior to that, she was a technical adviser on indigenous knowledge systems to the Parliamentary Portfolio Committee on Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (South Africa) and led the Task Team to draft the national policy on indigenous knowledge systems. She was the Scientific Coordinator and Campus Director for the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA) Annual Social Science Campus (2006); and a recipient of an Honorary Doctorate in Philosophy from Örebro University, Sweden, and an Honorary Doctorate in Education from Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in South Africa.

Contact: hoppeco@unisa.ac.za

References

- Adedeji, A. (1995) 'Economic progress: What Africa needs'. In Mengisteb K., and Logan B.I. (eds) *Beyond Economic Liberalization in Africa: Structural adjustment and the alternatives*. London: Zed Books.
- Béji, H. (2001) 'Tomorrow. Women'. In Bindé, J. (ed.) *Keys to the Twenty-first Century*. Paris: UNESCO, 286–8.
- (2004) 'The culture of the inhuman'. In Bindé, J. (ed.) *The Future of Values: 21st-century talks*. Paris: UNESCO, 27–33.
- Benhabib, S. (1996) *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bhaba, H.K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
- (1995) 'In the Spirit of Calm Violence'. In Prakash, G. (ed.) *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Post-Colonial Displacements*. Princeton: Princeton University Press (326–46).

- Bindé, J. (ed.) (2001) *Keys to the Twenty-first Century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Blum, L. (1991) 'Moral perception and particularity' *Ethics*, 101 (4), 701–25.
- Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J.-C. (1977) *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage Publications.
- Bourdieu, P., and Wacquant, L.D. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Childers, E., and Urquhart, B. (1994) *Renewing the United Nations System: Development dialogue*. Uppsala: Dag Hammarskjöld Foundation.
- Cleary, J. and Connolly C. (2004) *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Irish Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- De Silva, G., Hague, W., Mehta, N., Rahman, A., and Wignaraja, P. (1988) *Towards a Theory of Rural Development*. Lahore: Progressive Publishers.
- DEEEP (Development Education Exchange in Europe Project) (2007) *The European Consensus on Development: The contribution of development education and awareness raising*. Brussels: DEEEP. Online. <http://library.deeep.org/record/681/files/DEEEP-BOOK-2014-379.pdf> (accessed 30 September 2015).
- Delors, J., Al Mufti, I., Amagi, I., Carneiro, R., Chung, F., Geremek, B., Gorham, W., Kornhauser, A., Manley, M., Padrón Quero, M., Savané, M-A., Singh, K., Stavenhagen, R., Suhr, M.W., and Nanzhao, Z. (1996) *Learning: The treasure within. Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Ekin, P. (1992) *A New World Order: Grassroots movements for global change*. London: Routledge.
- European Conference on Intercultural Dialogue in Development Education (2008) 'Final Recommendations: Summary communiqué released by the convenors of the conference held in Ljubljana, 9–10 June. Online. <http://tinyurl.com/pd449oq>
- Fatnowna, S., and Pickett, H. (2002) 'The place of indigenous knowledge systems in the post-postmodern integrative paradigm shift'. In Odora Hoppers, C. (ed.) *Indigenous Knowledge and the Integration of Knowledge Systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation*. Claremont, Cape Town: New Africa Books.
- Gunnarson, C. (2008) *Cultural Warfare and Trust: Fighting the mafia in Palermo*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hountondji, P. (1997) 'Introduction'. In Hountondji, P. (ed.) *Endogenous Knowledge: Research trails*. Dakar: CODESRIA.
- Kahane, A. (2004) *Solving Tough Problems: An open way of talking, listening, and creating new realities*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Kenway, J. (1996) 'The information superhighway and postmodernity: The social promise and the social price' *Comparative Education*, 32 (2), 217–31.
- Kwenda, C.V. (2003) 'Cultural justice: The pathway to reconciliation and social cohesion'. In Chidester, D., Dexter, P., and James, W. (eds) *What Holds Us Together: Social cohesion in South Africa*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council, 67–80.
- Latouche, S. (1993) *In the Wake of the Affluent Society: An exploration of post-development*. Trans. O'Connor, M., and Arnoux, R. London: Zed Books.
- Lindner, E. (2006) *Making Enemies: Humiliation and international conflict*. Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.
- Mkandawire, T. (1996) 'Economic policy-making and the consolidation of democratic institutions in Africa'. In Havnevik, K. and Van Arkadie, B. (eds) *Domination or Dialogue? Experiences and prospects for African development cooperation*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Mohan, G. (1994) 'Manufacturing consensus: (Geo)political knowledge and policy based lending' *Review of African Political Economy*, 62 (21), 525–38.
- Morrison, T. (1973) *Sula*. New York: Knopf.

- Motala, E. (1998) 'The weaknesses of our analytical framework for education policy.' MS. Johannesburg: CSE/Centre for Education Policy Development.
- Nandy, A. (1997) 'Colonization of the mind.' In Rahnema, M., and Bawtree, V. (eds) *The Post-Development Reader*. London: Zed Books, 168–77.
- (2000) 'What does it mean to be human?' In Franck, F., Roze, J., and Connolly, R. (eds) *What Does It Mean to Be Human? Reverence for life reaffirmed by responses from around the world*. New York: St Martin's Press, 131–9.
- Odora Hoppers, C.A. (1998) *Structural Violence as a Constraint to African Policy Formation in the 1990s: Repositioning education in international relations*. Stockholm: Institute of International Education.
- (2001a) 'Towards a common understanding of IKS'. Submission to COHORT IKS-Champions Group, 16 March.
- (2001b) 'IKS and its implications for research and curriculum transformation in tertiary institutions.' Keynote address to the University of Venda conference on IKS: An African Perspective, September 2001.
- (2002) 'Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a conceptual and methodological framework.' In Odora Hoppers, C.A. (ed.) *Indigenous Knowledge and the Integration of Knowledge Systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation*. Claremont, Cape Town: New Africa Books, 2–22.
- (2005) *Culture, Indigenous Knowledge and Development: The role of universities*. Occasional Paper No. 5. Johannesburg: Centre for Education Policy Development.
- (2006) 'Centre for African Renaissance Studies (CARS), the Academy, the State, and Civil Society: Methodological implications of transdisciplinarity and the African perspective'. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies*, 1 (1), 33–52.
- (2007) 'Cultural diversity, traditions and modernities: Complexities and opportunities in the 21st century'. In *World Report on Cultural Diversity*. Paris: UNESCO.
- (2008a) 'In the service of humanity ... mapping an agenda for development education.' Keynote address at the official launch of the DST/NRF South African Research Chair in Development Education, 7 May, University of South Africa.
- (2008b) 'Lifelong learning in Africa: Lessons, experiences and opportunities from cultural and cognitive justice'. Speech given at the UNESCO 21st Century Talks on the theme 'Lifelong learning for all: how long to get there?', 29 October, Paris. Online. <http://to.ly/U7j9> (accessed 10 August 2015).
- (2009a) 'Lifelong learning and accelerated national development: Speaking truth to African society, and truth to humanity'. Keynote address at the University of Ghana, Institute of Adult Education, 60th Annual Year School, Legon Hill, Accra, 3 January.
- (2009b) 'SARChI framework and strategy document'. MS. The South African Observatory on Human Development, University of South Africa.
- (2009c) 'From bandit colonialism to the modern triage society: Towards a moral and cognitive reconstruction of knowledge and citizenship'. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies – Multi-, Inter- and Transdisciplinarity*, 4 (2), 168–80. Online. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/18186870903481210> (accessed 21 September 2015).
- (2010) 'Renegotiating agency in knowledge production, innovation and Africa's development in the context of the triage society'. *Critical Literacy: Theories and Practices*, 4 (1). Online. <http://to.ly/U7ji> (accessed 10 August 2015).
- Odora Hoppers, C. and Richards, H. (2012) *Rethinking Thinking: Modernity's 'other' and the transformation of the university*. Pretoria: University of South Africa Press.
- Prakash, G. (1995) 'Introduction: After colonialism.' In Prakash G. (ed.) *After Colonialism: Imperial histories and postcolonial displacements*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 3–20.
- Rahnema, M. (1997) 'Introduction.' In Rahnema, M., and Bawtree, V. (eds) *The Post-Development Reader*. London: Zed Books, ix–xix.

Richards, H. (1995) 'Education for constructive development'. The Nehru Lectures given at the University of Baroda, Gujarat State, India, August–September.

South Commission (1990) *The Challenge to the South: The report of the South Commission*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Merwe, S. (2008) 'Global players in development education: A view from the South'. Paper presented at the European Conference on Intercultural Dialogue in Development Education, Ljubljana, 9–10 June.

Visvanathan, S. (1997) *A Carnival for Science: Essays on science, technology, and development*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

— (2000) 'Democracy, plurality and the Indian university'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35 (40), 30 September, 3597-606. Online. <http://to.ly/U7I7> (accessed 10 August 2015).

Warren, C. (1998) *Democracy is Born in Conversations. Recreating N.F.S. Gruntvig for lifelong learners around the world*. New York: Circumstantial Productions.