

**NELSON MANDELA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY**  
LAUNCH OF THE  
CENTRE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF NON-RACIALISM AND DEMOCRACY

Port Elizabeth, 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2010  
Goldfields Auditorium, North Campus

Keynote Address

**Transformative Leadership and the Humanization of the Academy:  
Towards the Integrative Paradigm Shift**

**Professor Catherine A. Odora Hoppers**

DST/NRF South African Research Chair in Development Education  
University of South Africa

**The Search for a Paradigm of Transformative Human Development**

Let me open this address by sharing with you some operational insights from my on-going work in the SARCHI Chair in Development Education I am currently holding. The insights below will form part of the core of a new book I have co-authored with Howard Richards that will be released later this year on **Rethinking Thinking: Modernity's 'Other' and the Transformation of Universities**.

As you probably know, the South African Research Chairs Initiative (SARChI) is a strategically focused knowledge and human resource intervention into the South African Higher Education system that was established through a parliamentary dispensation and is funded by the South African Department of Science and Technology.

Its core mandate is to advance the frontiers of knowledge through focused research in identified fields or problem areas, and create new research career pathways for highly skilled, high quality young and mid-career researchers, as well as stimulate strategic research across the knowledge spectrum.

This particular South African Research Chair in Development Education hosted by the University of South Africa in Pretoria was established to provide a forum for contemporary social science research that examines its own origins in order to review current practice.

Development Education is a new area in academic research and citizenship education which **reframes human development** in an **epistemology of hope**, within a **paradigm of restorative action**.

It takes development as a pedagogic field and human development as the goal, and posits the questions:

1. What kind of transformative actions must be brought to bear to enable both restorative action and sustainable human development to occur in Africa and elsewhere? and,
2. How can key areas of disciplinary knowledge production (such as science, economics, education and law) be reconstituted in order to bring about a just and human-centered development on the continent?

Let me say right from the beginning that in order to contribute to a methodology of transformative human development, we need not just new policies, but a new paradigm. If today, we know that there is no peace without justice; that there is there is no justice without an end to poverty; then it is only logical to state fairly emphatically, that there can be no end to poverty without restoration of community.

To begin with, let's take a long and sharp look at the narrative in economics. Economic reality in the way we see it today implies that investment for profit is the motor that moves the economy. Therefore, governments must encourage investment, or at least not discourage investment. Economic reality also tells us that some people have access to money and other resources, while others do not. The have-nots are the poor. It might seem logical, therefore, to end poverty by increasing the access of the poor to resources.

From here, increasing access of the poor to resources means at least the following:

1. Raising wages
2. Paying for health care, education, and parks with money raised by taxes
3. Establishing democratic control of natural resources
4. Subsidizing home ownership and affordable rental units

Unfortunately, investors (who we call owners of the motor of the economy –i.e. people with huge amounts of accumulated wealth) to whom we are to look, tend to respond to measures like these by doing what is called **“losing confidence.”**

In other words, they find it more profitable to run away from the places where the have-nots need to increase access to resources, and invest somewhere else. This is called **“the exit power of capital,”** or **CAPITAL FLIGHT**.

Similarly, there is a **CAPITAL STRIKE** when investors decide not to invest at all.

Another economic reality goes something like this: when investment for profit is the motor that moves society, when that motor stops, society stops.

- capital flees
- production declines
- unemployment increases
- governments lose elections –or are ousted by force
- the IMF comes “to the rescue”

An “obvious” economic reality soon dawns on us in a weird vicious-seeming cycle – implying that creating investor confidence is a SYSTEMIC IMPERATIVE. Yet, even the World Bank once upon a time had the following to say:

“We [The World Bank] must strive to eliminate absolute poverty by the end of this century. This means in practice the elimination of malnutrition and illiteracy, the reduction of infant mortality, and the increase of life expectancy to the levels of the developed countries.” (Robert McNamara, President of the World Bank, Nairobi, 1973)

### **What then is the paradigmatic issue here?**

For those who have read many scientific references to this concept (Kuhn 1962), a paradigm:

- Defines normal science
- Defines the context of mathematical calculations
- Determines the “rules of the game.”
- Is a socially legitimated way of seeing<sup>1</sup>.

The first thing to recognize is that the global economy operates in a global legal framework. Its paradigm defining human relationships is derived from Roman commercial law. **It has been updated, but not transformed.**

The Four Basic Principles of the Roman “Law of [all] Nations”;

- Honeste vivere (“**Respect Persons**”);
- Suum cuique (“**Property**”);
- Alterum non Laedare (“**Do not harm others**”);

- Pacta sunt servandum (“**Contracts**”)<sup>2</sup>

But all of this good sounding precepts and principles have at their core, the interest of the private propertied, and **those who already have resources!!!!**

The disadvantaged members of democratic societies on the other hand, find that it is clearly to their interest that that **general laws, administrative rules and collective bargaining agreements prevail over private contracts** (Gunnar Myrdal).

In other words, the basic cultural structures of a commercial society, freedom, contracts, non-injury and property, **limit what can be done within the confines of the dominant paradigm.**

So, when we say another world is possible, we are often told: “**That’s just the way things are!**”

“**The world has always been like this!**” and even “**It’s human nature!**”

**But THE WAY THINGS ARE IS NOT THE WAY THINGS HAVE TO BE.**

The systemic imperative that requires creating investor confidence in order to avoid capital flight or capital strike can be weakened and made less imperative.

**THE WORLD IS NOT. THE WORLD BECOMES** (Paulo Freire)<sup>3</sup>.

The analysis of the dominant paradigm, that is to say, of the legal and moral framework of commerce therefore, gives us a unique criterion for evaluating concrete steps toward its transformation.

Thus we can see that at a time when Keynesian macroeconomics has failed, and Neoliberalism has failed, around the world people are inventing or reinventing cooperative survival strategies. Some of these are evolving what some call “anarchist,” or “socialist,” while some call them “social economics” or “people’s capitalism”.

What they have in common is that they restore community.

The challenge -- humanity’s challenge -- is to restore and to build ecologically sustainable communities which are capable of putting into practice **ubuntu** and other ancient ideals of cooperation and sharing **under modern industrial conditions; with advanced appropriate technologies; and high population density.**

A methodology for change is therefore more a set of questions than a set of answers. Some good questions ask whether we are upgrading the minimal morality made for the propertied articulated in the Roman law roots of the dominant paradigm<sup>4</sup>.

For us and my collaborators in the SARCHI Chair, we ask:

1. Are we transforming the rules of the games that specify the rights and duties of property owners?
2. Are caring human relationships being sufficiently elaborated to temper the contractual relationships so embedded in the Roman law, and that so overwhelm the lived world today?
3. Is freedom more about being self-directed and less about being self-centered?
4. Are people being empowered to participate in the creation of culture?

Several criteria for evaluating transformative human development therefore follow from recognizing the main norms of the paradigm to be transformed:

1. **EQUITY IN THE DISTRIBUTION AND USE OF RESOURCES** (i.e. **transform property by reinforcing the social function of property equity**. This criterion **tracks bringing in first the excluded**, and then step by step **includes all human beings in the benefits that flow from mother earth, from capital investments, and from technologies**).
2. **SOLIDARITY** (i.e. **transform contracts** in that in a culture of solidarity, the object of production is **use**, that is to say, the **reproduction of life**. This object can be achieved many different ways, and profit plays a smaller role as a criterion defining and limiting what will be produced and for whom).
3. **RESPONSIBILITY** (i.e. **transform freedom and non-injury**). This criterion adopts Martin Luther King's principle that freedom should be defined as being **self-directed**, not as being **self-centered**. Modern law generally still follows the Roman principle that people **should not injure other people** (non fit injuria). The principle of **social responsibility** requires more. **It seeks the good of others and of the environment**.
4. The dominant paradigm is **NOT NATURE**, but a **cultural construction** that can be reconstructed.
5. Reinforce **PARTICIPATION** (i.e. the world **becomes** as people **join in dialogue and cooperative action**). Dialogue among knowledge and cultural systems; and a multi-disciplinary approach shows that **another** economic reality is possible, and also that there are **many possible economic realities**. Because culturally determined behavior is diverse, the systemic imperatives created by the currently dominant paradigm do not have to exist. In other words, the ecological imperative and the imperative to restore community come close to one another<sup>5</sup>.

## What does this imply for CANRAD and NMMU?

The framing document of CANRAD draws attention to the effects of colonial and apartheid rule on socio-economic and political landscape in South Africa. It calls for the opening up of intellectual space for enquiry into and debate on racism, non-racialism and their relationship with human rights and democracy.

It urges for the fostering of progressive policies and social interventions aimed at addressing social transformation of both the academy and broader South African society. Positioning NMMU as a public institution and thus serving the public good, one of the key goals is critical knowledge production and educational engagement towards a non-racial society.

This must be done in a proactive manner with a clear eye on the toxic default drives that would seek to trivialize or negate people's experiences of racism. Equality is a key goal, and interdependence between research, advocacy, education and intervention is emphasized.

Clearly, CANRAD stands out as a potential flagship node in NMMU as it envisions itself as a leader in optimizing the potential of our communities towards sustainable development in Africa. As such social responsiveness and critical theory driven advocacy leading to societal intervention will ensure that academic labor does not function in a vacuum.

It will also ensure that the centre will respond to the complexities in post apartheid South Africa in the spirit of healing, reconciliation and nation building, thereby transforming scholarship into practical initiatives that are relevant to socio-economic development.

My responses to this are as follows:

1. To lead this center and get it to gel in practice with not only NMMU, but also South African and African society at large, we need the concept of non-authoritarian authority to undergird every facet of its work. We justify **non-authoritarian authority by its ability to perform social functions**. Social functions are significant because they are, in the end, **physical functions**. In much the same way that Plato justified the **authority of pilots by their ability to steer ships safely to port**, and of **medical doctors by their ability to steer patients safely to health**, we need to understand that sometimes the entities that perform the functions and wield the authority **are actually NOT persons** like pilots and doctors, but **WORDS. IDEAS therefore HAVE a consequence**<sup>6</sup>. CANRAD must be clear about the concepts it uses and especially cross-check that the ones selected as guiding concepts possess the carrying capacity for the tasks expected of it.
2. Following from Ashis Nandy<sup>7</sup>, the transition from bandit colonialism through the intricate systems of the modern triage society that is **wired for western cultural compliance requires more than just critique, or a prayer for the meek to inherit the**

earth. It requires a decisive consensus that **the meek do not inherit the earth by their meekness alone. They need defenses of the mind and conceptual categories around which they can organize their thoughts and actions.** Turning the previously colonized into participants in a **new moral and cognitive venture** against oppression requires more than just periodic elections – significant though that process is. Addressing 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 deepening 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 tenets of the knowledge production systems themselves – the disciplines<sup>8</sup>!**

3. From Adam Kahane we get the insight that we need a deeper connectedness between our minds, hearts, spirit and actions. **Opening our minds ultimately means opening our hearts, and wills.** The path forward out of any situation is therefore 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<sup>9</sup>.**

Kahane cautioned that 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.** This is because we can never address a 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<sup>10</sup>.**

In other words, there is not **‘a’ problem out there** that we can react to, then dash and fix. Rather, there is a **“problem situation”** of which each of us is a part – **the way an organ is part of the body.** We **affect the situation, and it affects us.** The best we can do is to engage with it from **multiple perspectives,** and try, in action-learning mode, to improve it....more like **unfolding a marriage** than it is **fixing a car.**

4. A fourth point of departure has to do with moral perception. Lawrence Blum has argued 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 a 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** – i.e. the **adequacy of agent's consciousness** concerning the situation, or ability to **grasp the contours of a problem** prior to being called upon to exercise that agency -- is key in this<sup>11</sup>.

5. Finally, Theoretical Chemist Roy McWeeny, in his contribution to the conference on "Building the Scientific Mind" has argued that societal efforts focusing on human development, such as through the various school systems, have long been far too biased towards **merely making people more competent, allowing them to acquire all kinds of narrowly defined skills that can easily be measured on tests and exams**. Far less attention he argued has gone to ensuring that competent people **develop the disposition to use their competencies in ways that are mindful**. We thus see an increased risk that the ever greater ability of humans to intervene in their environment **is insufficiently guided by the more comprehensive frames of mind humanity developed while the species evolved culturally**<sup>12</sup>.

What do I mean by the above?

### **Human Rights revisited**

"Rights" is an especially valuable concept because it is more than a concept that almost everybody finds meaningful. It is a concept that almost everybody respects as having moral authority. It makes an inward appeal to conscience, in the respect that most people inwardly guide their own conduct to avoid infringing on other people's rights.

It has moral authority in the sense that one is considered justified while acting within one's rights, and also in the sense that one is considered to be justified in becoming indignant when one's rights are violated. The concept of "rights" thus complies with the **"internal aspect"** and **"socially obligatory"** (Hart<sup>13</sup>, Richards<sup>14</sup>).

A cultural context where it is acknowledged that the rights of others are supposed to be respected **provides a framework for meaningful dialogue**.

But the concept of rights still belongs within what can be called the "ideal culture" -- a set of meanings recognized as correct, but which may have little or no effect on actual conduct. There is therefore a need to deal with the larger, if not deeper leaks within this discourse if it is to have the carrying capacity for the tasks expected of it.

According to Richards, what we need is something more than respect for the rights of others for three reasons.

Firstly, citing Hegel Richards argues that there are too many rights. And **where there is a surplus of rights, force decides**.



Commonly in a war, or in a bar room brawl, both sides can paint with the language of rights to give their cause the colour of moral superiority, and to give themselves the colour of 'knights errant' fighting for a righteous cause.

And where culturally recognized precepts of right gives both sides good moral arguments, there is a moral stalemate in which both sides are rhetorically armed with good reasons for declaring the other evil.

**It is at this point that force becomes the final arbiter.**

The second argument he makes drawing from Karl Marx, is that **the stubborn persistence of poverty, the instability of capitalist systems, and the exploitation of labour are all consistent with recognizing the rights of humanity embodied in the laws of commerce.**

Where everything is sold at its market price, in a free market, with property rights respected, it is often the case that labour is sold for little or nothing. This is a NORM which is also endorsed by the very same societies that harp on human rights.

The third argument drawn from Solzhenitsyn and Mahatma Gandhi, is that in principle, **rights without duties are unworkable.** Emphasizing rights at the expense of duties is similar to adopting Denis Diderot's 18th century definition of liberty: 'whatever the law does not forbid is allowed'.

Like liberty, rights-talk can easily lend itself to an irresponsible ethic. It authorizes everyone to say what they are supposed to be ALLOWED TO DO, and ARE SUPPOSED TO HAVE and SUPPOSED TO GET.

**But it does not make anyone responsible for contributing to the welfare of others, or to the common good** (Richards<sup>15</sup>)

### **Democracy as a work-in-progress**

Democracy can be thought of as a system of government with four key elements. A political system for choosing and replacing governments through free and fair elections, the active participation of the people, as citizens, in politics and civic life; protection of the human rights of all citizens; and a rule of law, in which the laws and procedures apply equally to all citizens.

Democracy is a **key means by which people to choose their leaders** and to **hold them accountable for both their policies and their conduct** while in office.

It enables citizens to **choose between competing parties** in regular, free and fair elections.

Central to the idea of democracy is the aspiration that **government** is based on the **consent of those who are governed.** Sovereignty of the people is a precondition, in that the **real power flows from the people to the leaders who hold power only temporarily.**

The creation of laws and policies require majority support in parliament, but the rights of minorities are protected in various ways.

If one were to do a text analysis on a written piece on democracy, the registers that show up would consist of concepts like: **citizen, participation, choice, government, party or parties, rule of law, accountability, governance, majority, votes, right to vote, power, free and fair elections, consent, power etc.**

It is clear that the pillar in the thinking about democracy is the **citizen**, with the process being played out in a **nation state**.

The **non-citizen's presence is not a factor**, neither is democracy clear about events **outside of the nation-state** i.e. beyond the "familiar", the "community".

It does not have propositions as to **how citizens should relate to one another outside of electoral processes, or in the private spheres of lived world**<sup>16</sup>.

### **The problem of the "community" and the "nation state"**

In fact, the very arena within which democracy operates, i.e. the nation state, poses its own set of problems. As Sartwell has so well put, **communities** as a form of group identity, are not made from the **abstractions of shared beliefs**, but on something more difficult to articulate... **a deep level of communication** which Sartwell calls "**emitting noise in the right shape**"<sup>17</sup>.

To the extent that **conceptions of community miss the crucial formative role of exclusion**, they **misconstrue how and why they form and perpetuate themselves**, while remaining quite **unequipped to deal with this darker shadow... the inbuilt exclusion inherent in the DNA**.

**Communities** are formed by **exclusions and by violence**, and what constitutes 'normal' is articulated by a process of **scapegoating** – i.e. **creating and internalizing hallucinatory images that degrade the 'other'** as excuses to **dominate, abuse, murder, or exploit people while exalting the 'we' group**.

Thus, **exclusion is key in defining an identity** in a community<sup>18</sup>.

Democracy does not equip the citizen with tools to **reconstruct itself from an exclusion based identity to one that is embracing**.

Luckham et al (1998) go further and delineate some key points of tension located in the history of democracies. One of these historical factors is the tension between democracy as a **universal aspiration for popular self rule** and as a **historically bounded form of governance** in modern states (i.e. liberal democracy).

The other one is the tension between **democratic institutions** and the diverse forms and discourses of **democratic politics** in particular national and regional contexts.

A third set of tensions has to do with the models of democracy and the omissions in both. In the Athenian model of democracy practiced in early Greece, great emphasis was put on **maximizing active citizenship**. In the liberal representative model very strong in the US and England which emerged at the end of the C18th, a great emphasis was levied on **political contestation, on rational discussion and on avoiding tyranny**.

But both these models can be queried from the perspective of substantive exclusion in **that 'citizenship' excluded women and slaves**; while in England, **suffrage was based on property**<sup>19</sup>.

With **exclusion** identified as a natural, but central ghost in the historical practice of democracy, it can be said that in the West liberal states only became substantive democracies **after** the political mobilization of the broad mass of citizens, including urban working class and women behind demands which included the extension of the franchise to all adult citizens.

In the United States, it can be said that democracy began to move towards a semblance of "substantive" following the **gains from the civil rights movement**.

It is these "democratic revolutions" which **increased citizen involvement** in the affairs of government, that **expanded the concept of citizenship itself to cover economic, social, as well as political entitlements**<sup>20</sup>.

The solution to this is usually posited through greater democratic politics: i.e. the development of a culture of **informed participation**, which, in turn depends of the capacity of citizens to hold powerful private and state agents to account. It is hoped that by deepening the **politics of society** one can better influence the **high politics of the state**.

Thus, democratic politics would pay great attention to **democratic deficits** which can occur when democracy is:

- is narrowed down to **elections** as the arbiter of political succession,
- when **formal equality** does not say much about the social, cultural or economic structure within which this equality is embedded,
- when **running for office** at any level of government becomes a **very expensive affair**, which ends up leaving the masses with a **narrow pool of people** (elite of means) to choose from – **legitimizing perfectly the social and economic status quo**, and,
- when **popular sector challenge is repressed**, and **redistributive policies are blocked**<sup>21</sup>.

It is about **the citizen and their interaction with the state** within the framework of the nation state as the marker of identity.

## **The globalizing world filled with ambivalence**

Up to this point the only certainty we seem to have had is that the international community has entered a period of tremendous global transition that has brought **prosperity to some**, interwoven myriad others through the medium of technology and the internet, but **created more social problems than solutions for much of the world's population**.

The end of super-power rivalry and the growing North/South disparity in wealth and access to resources, **coincide with an alarming increase in violence, poverty and unemployment, homelessness, displaced persons and the erosion of environmental stability**.

At the same time, previously **isolated peoples are being brought together voluntarily and involuntarily into new and ever closer neighbourhoods by the increasing integration of markets, political instability, new regional political alliances, remarkable advances in telecommunications, and transportation that have prompted unprecedented demographic shifts**.

The resulting confluence of **peoples and cultures** is an increasingly global, multicultural world **brimming with tension, confusion and conflict in the process of its adjustment to pluralism<sup>22</sup>**.

As nations and communities big and small rummage about in this confusion, one detects various degrees of hankering for a **lost age of social harmony, cultural homogeneity and commonly-shared values** – occasionally **confusing the past state of things for a vision for the future**.

In the meantime, the **perceived fragmentation of society, concerns about crime, persistent undercurrents of racism, and growing distrust of neighbour and government**, have strengthened the attraction of many to the numerous affinity groups mushrooming everywhere<sup>23</sup>.

This climate of change and acute vulnerability therefore raises new challenges to our ongoing pursuit of universal human rights as we acknowledge that **cultural background, inter-cultural knowledge and inter-cultural education are the new essentials of existence in the globalizing world that is at once enriching, but also disorienting**.

## **From Diversity and Tolerance to Functional Respectful Co-existence**

If in a social context, the term **diversity** refers to the presence in one population of a wide variety of cultures, opinions, ethnic groups, socio-economic backgrounds, then **diversity should be manifested in the existence of many peoples contributing their unique experiences to humanity's culture**.

For its part, **tolerance** (somewhat akin to the idea of negative peace) is the **collective and individual practice of not persecuting those who may believe, behave or act in ways that one may not personally approve of.**

In the wider sociological sense, "tolerance" carries with it the understanding that "**intolerance**" **breeds violence and social instability**, and has therefore become the **social term of choice** to define the practical rationale of permitting uncommon social practice and diversity.

But oftentimes, **one only tolerates people who are disliked for their differences.** While people deemed undesirable may be disapproved of, "tolerance" would require that the party or group in question be **left undisturbed, physically or otherwise**, and that criticism directed toward them be free of inflammatory or inciteful efforts.

To tolerate something is to put up with it even though we might be tempted to suppress it.

The next step, then, is to **name which things it is that we are tempted to suppress?** Here, too, we know the answer: we are tempted to suppress those things that we **deem mistaken, painful, wrong, harmful, offensive, or in some other way unworthy of approval.**

Tolerance therefore cannot be neutral about what is good, for its very purpose is **to guard goods and avert evils.** The circumstantial element in the practice of tolerance is **right judgment in the protection of greater ends against lesser ends.**

Despite these shortcomings, the importance of tolerance for social cohesion and democratic political participation has been strongly emphasized by many analysts.

To Amanda Gouws (2003) tolerance is defined as the refusal to resort to violence, force or coercion in relation to **objectionable political alternatives**<sup>24</sup>.

But this simple requirement for democracy is difficult to sustain when opponents are perceived not only as different, but also when political alternatives are held by groups who are perceived of as threatening.

But in the intersection between the global and the local, it is important to emphasize that resources are at stake; not merely material resources but also the **human resources of imagination, creativity and identity.**

Globalization has accelerated the pace and scope of transnational movements of money, technology and people, but it has, by its very fluidity, also generated **new images of possibility and new ideals of human solidarity.**

By moving beyond the notion of human solidarity which is based on the assumption that all people share a common underlying humanity, we could look further and picture the symbolic **cultural and social resources for negotiating human identity.**

As we take this further, a more **profound form of tolerance** emerges which resides in the **capacity to develop respect, understanding and mutual recognition of others.**

Here, the ordeals of imagination undergone by those who have survived colonialism, genocide or slavery can also find space and inform our understanding of **human solidarity under impossible conditions**.

It is also here that Kwenda's notion of cultural justice takes us from **TOLERANCE** to **RESPECT in cultural politics**.

If culture is **that which is taken for granted** - a comfort zone of everyday, ordinary ways of living, then it is easy to recognize why a threat to a people's culture is perceived as a personal threat<sup>25</sup> (Kwenda 2003).

What Kwenda proposes is **functional respectful co-existence**. By *respectful* he means mutuality in paying attention, according regard and recognition, as well as taking seriously what the Other regards as important.

By *functional* is meant that coexistence 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.

He takes for his analogy; the situation of Africa which is very instructive for the deepening of our discussions here. In Africa he argues, 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', by **bearing the uncomfortable burden of speaking and acting in unfamiliar cultural idioms within all areas of everyday life**.

Africans are **not passive victims** of cultural imperialism although they have been subject to coercive interventions, but **active agents** in negotiating unfamiliar, strange and alien cultural terrain.

According to Kwenda, **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, un-self-conscious action.

By **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 also 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 both difference and 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**.

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.

Thus if we take European understandings of culture (as is the case with reading literature), as being morally edifying and spiritually enriching, for culture to function in this manner, it has to be experienced in a positive way.

It would follow then, that **if culture is experienced negatively, then it would have the opposite effect** (i.e. morally degrading and spiritually impoverishing).

To speak of **cultural justice** in this scenario, is to expect that **cultures are experienced positively so that their healing and enriching capacities may be released**.

This is a protest against conditions and circumstances that make negative experiences of cultures seem **inevitable, or even desirable**<sup>26</sup>.

In the context of Africa, the legacy of **colonialism and apartheid** has made culture become a serious bone of contention with **some cultures being regarded as superior to others**.

The ambivalence of education towards this unacceptable situation has made the field of education itself **resemble the emperor with no clothes on!**

### **What about the Integrative Paradigm Shift**

This paradigm shift addresses the challenge that lies before us who are managing the second generation indigenization process. In this **second generation indigenization**, 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 referencing)<sup>27</sup>.

The force it takes against established and resistant hegemony to create this space is reflective of **an exaggerated and confrontatory 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**<sup>28</sup>).

With this new stream, there is a growing **maturity of dialogue** that is not the result of a paradigm shift, but is the shift itself. Thus, from the ignorance and depreciating ideology along with social theories that claimed 'terra nullius' as a convenient rationalization for colonization and ill treatment, **there is a need for honest recognition of the existence of indigenous knowledge systems**. In fact there is a **need for those knowledge systems themselves, not just the recognition that they exist**<sup>29</sup>. The knowledge paradigms of the future are beginning by reaching out to **those excluded, epistemologically disenfranchised**, to move together towards a new synthesis.

In this synthesis, '**empowerment**', which is usually more about resuming power (because power is never voluntarily relinquished), it is recognized that **shifting of power without a clear shift of paradigms of understanding that makes new propositions about the use of that power in a new dispensation leads to vicarious abuse of power by whoever is holding it – old or new**<sup>30</sup>.

Cooptation without a **shift in authority, power and control** is **empty**. Transfer of symbolic power has usually been about **change of actors** without changes in the **structures of privilege**, power and oppression and an understanding of the attitudes that sustained those systems leaving new incumbents behaving '**just as the masters did**', with new tensions emerging as fellow members from the previously oppressed groups continue to hold expectations of change and socio-cultural justice.

In this new stream, **modernization proceeds, but without following Western values** (Huntington 1998) **or sequences**, but rather with a re-strengthening of core values **from different traditions of knowledge and living**. It is about **equal access as citizens** of a nation and of the world the mainstream society, with an emphasis on **equality** – 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**<sup>31</sup>.

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.

The assumption of **superiority of the west** and its patronizing obsession with **facilitating the entry of traditional societies into the 'developed' world** is brought under sharp scrutiny. Western modernization, progress and thought is seen as a **temporary epoch in human history with both advantages and disadvantages** which must, and is seeking to re-engage with the more holistic integrated conceptualizations of sustainable life held by cultures that have, fortunately, not been down the path of 'westernization'.

In other words, it is a **rapprochement of modern and older cultures**, including modern culture's older roots where each complementing the other opens up the possibility of a viable future for humankind<sup>32</sup>.



By generative is meant “making a difference”, “giving back”, “taking care” of your community and your planet. When society has been stable and predictable, i.e. when one’s community has been doing the same things the same way for generations, identity, intimacy, and generativity comes easily, almost innocently. One knows his/her place, the place of contemporaries, and the place of successors, for these were carefully taught to him/her<sup>33</sup>.

But when a society is in flux, when understandings of what ‘it is all about’, when descriptions of one’s role as a citizen, as a researcher, scientist, worker or friend turn over ever more rapidly, when major shifts in the continental plate are more than evident, then identity, or choice of direction become **matters of conscious deliberation**.

The generative adult or adults stand between the past and the future to be built, and, looking into the future, makes that crucial distinction between producing **more offspring**, and producing **offspring that are not crippled**. The generative adult not only welcomes change, but **brings something into it, creating socially valuable work**<sup>34</sup>.

### **Conclusion: Where am I going with all of this?**

Let me take the cue from peace work. I take peace because it is beyond anti-anything. It is FOR. In taking a stance against racism or a stand for non-racialism, it is important to spell out what the empirical task is, or constitutes of.

In the case of peace, from a peace action point of view, Peace, like war, is a disposition, or a set of dispositions and acts of human will – i.e. conscious activity. On the road to attaining moral change and cultural transformation, we need to study more closely intentionality in human conduct. We also need to pay attention to both aggressive impulses AND calculated self interest as both lead to violence.

The building of a culture of peace **begins with respect for the rights of persons because it is a cornerstone of the global civic culture that exists**.

But as leaders, we clearly **need to reach further than respect for the rights of others, or regular elections into concepts that have the power to employ and enhance other ethics**.

**Trust, solidarity, love, caring, respect for nature, integrity, honesty, character, forgiveness, non-violence, generosity, sacrifice for the common good** can all be found embedded in **cultural norms of one group of people or another**.

Peace building for instance, works to **draw from the diverse cultures these positive norms** and seeks to **develop ethical growth points above and beyond the ethic of respect for the rights of others**.

Education for a culture of peace would infuse the living and coming generations with a **profound aversion against violence.**

It also means **understanding conflict as part of human existence, and learning the skills for transformation of those conflicts without resorting to violence.**

It builds on the **good and the best from different cultures, traditions and faiths, to create a new ethics for human existence.**

This is both my bias, and my vocation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962)

<sup>2</sup> Richards H. SARCHI Chair in Development Education Notes 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Richards. SARCHI Chair in Development Education notes *ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Richards. SARCHI Chair in Development Education Notes *ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> SARCHI Chair in Development Education Notes

<sup>6</sup> Richards, personal communication 2009

<sup>7</sup> Nandy A. 1983. *The Intimate Enemy. Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism.* Delhi. Oxford University Press.; Nandy A. 1997. *Colonization of the mind.* In Rahnema M & Bawtree V. eds. 1997. *The Post Development Reader.* London, ZED (168-177).

<sup>8</sup> From bandit colonialism to the modern triage society: Towards a moral and cognitive reconstruction of knowledge and citizenship. *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies.* Vol. 4 (2) 2009.pp. 168–180

<sup>9</sup> Kahane A. 2004. *Solving Complex Problems. An Open Way Of Talking, Listening, And Creating New Realities.* San Francisco. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

<sup>10</sup> Kahane *ibid.*

<sup>11</sup> Blum L. 1991. *Moral Perception and Particularity.* In *Ethics.* Vol 101, No 4 (July 1991) 701-725.

<sup>12</sup> McWeeny.. in personal communication

<sup>13</sup> Hart, H.L.A. 1961. *The Concept of Law.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.

<sup>14</sup> Richards H. 2004. *On the Concept of Peacemaking.* The Danish Peace Academy. November 2004. <http://www.fredsakademiet.dk/library/peacemaking.htm> retrieved 26<sup>th</sup> January 2006.

<sup>15</sup> Richards 2004 *ibid*

- 
- <sup>16</sup> Odora Hoppers C.A. 2007. Knowledge, Democracy and Justice in a Globalizing World. Nordisk Pedagogik. Vol 27. pp: 38-53. Oslo
- <sup>17</sup> Sartwell C. 2002. Community at the Margins. In aPherson P. 2002. Diversity and Community: an interdisciplinary Reader. Oxford Publishers. Blackwell Publishers.
- <sup>18</sup> Sartwell *ibid* pp 47-49.
- <sup>19</sup> Luckham R; Goetz A.M.; Kaldor M. 1998. Democratic Institutions and Politics in the Contexts of Inequality, Poverty, and Conflict. A Conceptual framework. IDS Working paper 104. Sussex.
- <sup>20</sup> Luckham *ibid*: 6-9
- <sup>21</sup> Bello, W. 2005. The Tragedy of Contemporary Democracy in the South. Speech delivered at the World Meeting of Democracy Promoting Foundations, Swedish Parliament, Stockholm, 28-30 August 2005.
- <http://www.focusweb.org/the-tragedy-of-contemporary-democracy-in-the-south.html>. Retrieved 12-12-2005. See also [http://www.transcend.org/t\\_da\\_tabase/articles.php?id=574](http://www.transcend.org/t_da_tabase/articles.php?id=574)
- <sup>22</sup> Ayton-Shenker, D. (1995). The Challenge of Human Rights and Cultural Diversity. Background Note. United Nations Department of Public Information DPI/1627/HR--March 1995. Retrieved 02-06-2005. <http://www.un.org/rights/dpi6273.htm> 12th February 2006.
- <sup>23</sup> Odora Hoppers C.A. 2005. Managing Diversity: A Challenge for Europe keynote address to the Conference on "Managing Diversity: A Challenge For Global Participation". City Hall of The Hague 24 June 2005.
- <sup>24</sup> Gouws, A. (2003). The Importance of political tolerance in fostering social cohesion. In D. Chidester, P. Dexter & W. James (eds.): What Holds Us Together: Social Cohesion in South Africa. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.
- <sup>25</sup> Kwenda, C.V. (2003). Cultural Justice: the Pathway to Reconciliation and Social Cohesion. In D. Chidester, P. Dexter & W. James (eds.): What Holds Us Together: Social Cohesion in South Africa. Pretoria.
- <sup>26</sup> Kwenda *ibid*.67-68.
- <sup>27</sup> Odora Hoppers C.A. 2008. **Education, Culture and Society in a Globalizing World: Implications for Comparative and International Education**. Keynote address at the British Association of International and Comparative Education Societies. University of Glasgow.
- <sup>28</sup> Fatnowna, S & Pickett, H (2002). The Place of Indigenous Knowledge Systems in the Post-Postmodern Integrative Paradigm Shift. In Odora Hoppers, C [2002]: *Indigenous Knowledge and the Integration of Knowledge Systems: Towards a Philosophy of Articulation*. New African Books (Pvt) Ltd, Claremont, South Africa.; see also Odora Hoppers C.A. 2002. Indigenous Knowledge and the Integration of Knowledge Systems: Towards a Conceptual and Methodological Framework. In Odora Hoppers C.A. ed. 2002. *Indigenous Knowledge and the Integration of Knowledge Systems. Towards a Philosophy of Articulation*. Cape Town. New Africa Books. (pp:2-22)
- <sup>29</sup> Knudtson P. and Suzuki D. 1992. Wisdom of the Elders. Sydney. Allen & Unwin.
- <sup>30</sup> Venter 1997. When Mandela Goes. The Coming of South Africa's Second Revolution. London. Transworld

---

<sup>31</sup> Fatnowna & Pickett *ibid.*

<sup>32</sup> Fatnowna & Pickett *ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Kotre J. N. 1975. Generative Humanity. *America*. December 20. 1975.

<sup>34</sup> Odora Hoppers C.A. 2008. **Towards an Innovative and Sustainable R&D Environment and Practice.** Think Piece prepared for Skaraborgs Institute In The Twentyfirst Century. Skaraborg. Sweden