



## 14th National Design Education Conference 2017

Hosted by Tshwane University of Technology & Inscape Education Group

### #Decolonise!

Design educators reflecting on the call for the decolonisation of education

#### Doing Research to Decolonise Research: to Start at the very Beginning.

Allan Munro

*Vaal University of Technology*

#### Abstract

The paper proceeds from the perspective that to decolonise education one needs to start from the position of decolonising research as practice. It proceeds to argue that to attempt to enter the halls of research to decolonise it, one needs, indeed, to decolonise the pursuits of research which are the pursuits of knowledge. A central domain of this pursuit lies in the notion of Africa-centred knowledges. The paper concludes by arguing that designers sit in the cusp or at the forefront of decolonised research endeavours, as they pursue human flourishing (instead of 'research') and the search for practical wisdom (or phronesis) instead of knowledge.

To make this argument the paper follows this pathway: it sets out to note that the current research state of affairs has come about by universities attempting to make research legible (following Scott's definition and tracing his arguments around "seeing like a state" – the title of his book) and therefore measurable. This is compounded by the necessity (it seems) to make the very practice of "doing research" legible, measurable, quantifiable and 'generalisable'. To open up potential alternatives, the paper then moves to an understanding of Africa-centred knowledges (Cooper & Morrell, 2014) in the pursuit not of what the world is but what the world needs. Having established this, the paper then suggests that research assumed the role primarily of problem definition (a pursuit of accurately describing and explaining the "isness" of the world), leaving solving of the problem to so-called lesser domains of the "applied sciences." Yet, the paper argues, the point of research should perhaps be, as it originally was, to solve practical problems to the advancement of community (and not the advancement of knowledge, directly). To do this it posits the notion of collaborations and strategic alliances. This is connected to abductive reasoning, which leads, the paper argues, to practical wisdom, and through this, to the pursuit of human flourishing.

Having made this argument, the paper considers avenues that such a conclusion might take, and engages in 'designed' speculations that move beyond description and explanation, to product, process, making and, therefore, potentially flourishing. It draws on Kasulis (Integrity and Intimacy) and then on Gardner's notion of Multiple Intelligences and Herrmann's Whole-brain learning. In short, the design disciplines gear their research around producing that which can solve problems. This comes about through exploring the territory, and not fixating on the map.

**Keywords:** *decolonisation; legibility, measurability; Africa-centred knowledges; strategic alliances; problem-solving.*

## Doing research to decolonise research: to start at the very beginning

“Who knows the river better ... the hydrologist or the swimmer? Put that way, it clearly depends on what you mean by ‘knows’, and ... what it is you wish to accomplish.” (Clifford Geertz).

“AR vs ARVs (African Renaissance vs Anti-retrovirals)” (Green 2014, p. 45)

“If you ask a mathematician what is two plus two they will say ‘four.’ If you ask an engineer what is two plus two, they will say: ‘it depends on how accurately you measured the first two and how accurately you measured the second two and the answer would be somewhere between 3.83 and 4.18.’” (Fred Munro, Engineer, personal correspondence)

## The colonising agenda: legibility and measurability

The colonisation agenda was driven by a supreme faith (indeed, a belief in the truth of the matter) in a modernist or high modernist agenda. James C Scott, in his provocative book *Seeing like a State* (1998) connects (and therefore critiques) such an agenda to a “muscle-bound version of the self-confidence about scientific and technical progress, the expansion of production, the growing satisfaction of human needs, the mastery of nature (including human nature) and, above all, the rational design of social order commensurate with the scientific understanding of natural laws” (1998, p. 4). I return to its application shortly, but a number of these concepts resonate in the education system in South Africa. There is an assumption that scientific progress (whatever that is) will be the panacea for all ills, and that technical and technology progress ‘carries’ such a panacea. Furthermore, progress and development is determined by the “expansion of production” and will lead, inevitably, to the satisfaction of needs, and finally, that the task is to master nature and human nature and then all will follow. Scott emphasises that social order can therefore be rationally designed (and thereby controlled), and that such rationalisation is, of course, the same as science. The implication is that all educational endeavours need to be geared towards achieving such rational mastery.

Given this, it is difficult not to determine that such education is part of a colonisation process, embedded in rationality, cognitive engagement, manipulation and control. Indeed, following this argument it would appear that the purpose of education is to tame the wild (we know how to do this because we have mastered the natural laws), focus on development (meaning production and productive development) and increase satisfaction (which means ‘personal satisfaction’). To do this, and to know we have succeeded, we need (following Scott) to determine two major concerns. Firstly, we need to be able to make whatever it is we wish to determine *legible*. By this he means that we need to be able to convert whatever it is we are wanting to control into some form of readability – a map, a definition, a diagram – so that what we observe here can be seen to be the same as what we see over there. We set up a classification system (Cooper, 2014), a series of check lists, a memorandum or two. If the matter cannot be made legible it cannot be controlled and therefore cannot contribute – indeed, it may be considered ‘aberrant.’ Once it is *legible*, matter will then be able to fulfil the second concern, namely its *measurability* (and with this, quantification).

Scott speaks here of social engineering (and we might parallel this with ‘research engineering’). Four dynamics are at play for problematic social engineering.

## The social/research engineering dynamics

“The first element is the administrative ordering of nature and society” (Scott, 1998 p. 4). The need for bureaucracy is to make things “legible”, measurable, conveniently formatted and thus controllable. In short, research is replete once the ideal map is delivered, the article

is published, that which is at play in the world is reduced to words that can be defined by a dictionary or by scientific jargon. But, as Scott points out, this ignores the territory or, as I shall argue below, the notion of embodied knowledge. In short, the “knowledge economy” has the potential to reduce the world to words, maps and money.

Scott’s second element refers to a “high modernist ideology” (1998, p. 4). Modernism reflects the notion of control over the world, natural or otherwise, placing humanity as masters of all that they survey. Modernism cements the belief in objectivity, the rational, and the exploitation of the natural world for the benefit of humanity. It is perhaps best illustrated in Descartes’ maxim “*Cogito; ergo sum*” – “I think; therefore, I am” – separating out the rational from the embodied, and presenting them as a hierarchy, with the rational in control. This clinging to the rational and to the hierarchy has led, amongst other things, to a justification of colonialism as a rational engagement with development. To decolonise, therefore, will mean to challenge the rational in the form that it is currently at play. Critically, from the point of view of the argument that I wish to make, this will also need to challenge the knowledge economy, as well as the imperative to make things legible and measurable.

“The third element is an authoritarian state that is willing and able to use the full weight of its coercive power to bring those high-modernist designs into being” (1998, p. 5). From a research point of view there are abundant examples of this at play, ranging from the insistence on publishing in accredited (‘high impact’) journals, to foregrounding research practices as the ultimate aim of a university. Within the educational environment the pursuit of pass-rates, FTEs, memoranda to emphasise information-memory equivalencies, even the underpinning of Outcomes Based Education is premised on “designing learning.”<sup>1</sup> Within this domain one might also address the plethora of concepts around KPA’s, PMS’s and the like. (One wonders what Plato, Mudimbe, Newton or even Bach would have thought of these high modernist tools of measuring productivity).

The fourth element is, controversially for now, “a prostrate civil service that lacks the capacity to resist plans” (1998, p. 5). I shall return to this concern as a central matter, below, but it is worth considering that attempting to change the educational landscape in South Africa has been a long and arduous process. Perhaps this is because the modernist ideology throughout the world is so deeply engrained that, to dismantle such an ideology is difficult, but perhaps even more difficult is *conceptualising what will or could take its place*. Here we discover one of the primary tensions in the decolonisation agenda. It is perhaps not enough to claim ‘freedom,’ when what is actually meant is ‘freedom *from* the colonial, oppression and discrimination’ – one should also pose the concern of ‘freedom *to* . . .’ Freedom to do what, one might ask? What replaces the colonised educational state?

Scott concludes: “In sum, the legibility of a society provides the capacity for large-scale social engineering, high-modernist ideology provides the desire, the authoritarian state provides the determination to act on the desire, and an incapacitated civil society provides the levelled social terrain on which to build” (1998, p. 5). Scott proceeds in his book to document and analyse a number of situations throughout the world that have engineered this position, and points to the catastrophic consequences in each. For my argument I do not wish to engage with catastrophe, but to suggest ways to escape this seemingly iron grip in the pursuit of decolonisation.

If one attempts to undo the impact of colonialism in the South African context one is inevitably plunged into the socio-economic domain. Colonialism has led to vast levels of inequality and discrimination, resulting in poverty and, inevitably and correctly, rebellion.

---

<sup>1</sup> The potential to remove the embodied from education by emphasising ‘blended’ learning, and the use of so-called ‘technology’ is particularly problematic as a hallmark of modernism. Within the South African context, for example, one wonders how *Sangomas* might be trained through the internet.

The causes of this need to be identified, described, understood and addressed. The processes of decolonisation, therefore, need to start with such an agenda. However, my concern is with what will be put in place in the new, decolonised, dispensation? Within the South African context it would make sense to move away from the western, globalised, metropole as the seat of the original colonial endeavour, and turn to what is African. However, this leads one to the tensions between modernity and indigeneity and along this binary path lies danger, one could argue. In simplistic terms, decolonising by removing modernity and replacing it, uncritically, with indigeneity is to pose the question: 'If one is freed from the colonial, freed from modernity's vice, and one turns to indigeneity, what is one free to do?' Can one conceptualise this 'freedom to do' around actions, events, conclusions, goals and the future? Put another way, and following Cooper and Morrell, and others in their edited book (2014) setting up modernity and indigeneity as a binary leads to debates "between a bad place and an immovable rock" (2014, p. 2).

## Introducing Africa-centred knowledge

I offer, drawing from two major sources, potential ways out of this conundrum. Firstly, I turn to the debates offered in various forms and engagements in the Cooper and Morrell book entitled *Africa-centred knowledges: crossing fields and worlds* (2014). Here I argue not for an African (decolonised) approach to education and knowledge, but for an *Africa-centred* approach, which focuses less on what Africa *is* and more on what Africa *knows and needs*. In this I follow the argument against 'cultural identity' as a retro-concept, and replace it with 'subject formation' as posited by Kaiser (2012). Subject formation allows one to posit a pragmatic, in-the-moment engagement with the situations, drawing on the past where necessary, but acknowledging that culture is emergent, generative, relational, temporal and creative (Hallam & Ingold 2007, pp. 1-24). I then proceed to Kasulis' (2002) work on *Integrity* as a modernist, westernised concept in understanding (with its emphasis on objective, dispassionate knowledges) (I acknowledge that I have extrapolated his views), and *Intimacy* as a non-western approach to human understanding, relationships and being in the world. I conclude by pointing to some educational models that might assist in the process of decolonising education, and therefore, research.

Cooper and Morrel argue cogently, that "Africa-centred knowledges are entangled, contextual and contingent" (2014, p. 3). Historically, for example, it is a seemingly impossible task to untangle the influences, sources, needs and dreams of the African continent from the past. Indeed, working through all of the current media practices in South Africa, for example, content and form of presentation shape-shift continuously, resonating with the past, the perceived future (the millennial or conceptualised Utopia) and the influences from Africa and beyond. To attempt, therefore, to untangle these, and place each strand into one or other 'box of influences', and then to determine what is 'colonised' and what has been 'decolonised' raises massive problems. The reasons for this, as Cooper and Morrel point out, is that all stimuli are by their very nature contingent upon what has gone before, and therefore the responses to such stimuli are inevitably dependent upon such triggers or stimuli. Furthermore, the shaping of such responses (and, dare one say, the expectations of such shaping) are embedded in the context of the moment of shaping. To draw, thus, on Hallam and Ingold (2007), responses arise out of the relationships with context, in the moment of shaping, emerging, thus, as a network of creative endeavours, entangled in webs of contextual stimuli. This is what the response *is*. Perhaps, therefore, it is more useful to ask what the response *does*, thus acknowledging the epistemological entanglement but moving toward a teleological engagement.

Inevitably, therefore, I would argue, following Cooper and Morrell (2014, p. 15) "Africa-centre knowledges are made and situated in the creative space ... and are open to *collaborations* and strategic alliances across the divide." The word 'collaboration' is,

etymologically, potentially the key, for two reasons. Firstly, the Latin words *'cum labora'* that form the basis of the word imply 'working together' or 'to work together'. Secondly, a collaboration is a state of existence that is constructed deliberately to do something that has not yet been done. Cooper and Morrell, however, stipulate that such collaboration should not fall into the domain of giving in to the power position (collaborating with the enemy, or the boss, for example) but should form "strategic alliances". Again, the notion of forming an alliance implies both enhancing the strength of the position, but also suggests that the alliance is set up to do something. Being established "strategically" poses the potential aim of the alliance – to achieve something<sup>2</sup>. Here, when Cooper and Morrell speak of "the great divide" they are referring to the "the bad place and the immovable rock" – the modernist and the indigenous. Inferentially they are suggesting that the strategic alliance between the two will develop an Africa-centred knowledge.

What might this Africa-centred knowledge draw on? Cooper and Morrell offer five areas of engagement, and all seem valid in the pursuit of a decolonised education. The first one I have dealt with, above, in the form of collaborations. Secondly, they suggest that such knowledge will arise from current embodied knowledges. Such embodied knowledges are embedded in context and in exigencies, suggesting that the knowledge has arisen from 'problem-solving'. Thus an education and a research culture that foregrounds problem-solving, as opposed to problem finding will move Africa-centred knowledge forward. Yet it is inevitable that such solutions need to be interrogated by the third area of engagement namely gatekeeping mechanisms of some sort. However, such gatekeeping needs in and of itself to interrogate "the great divide" and not cling to either the rock or the hard place. Indeed, as Cooper (2014, pp. 78-92) argues, one of the critical domains of gatekeeping will be the pursuit of the classification of an Africa-centred knowledge, and, by extension, all aspects of such decolonised knowledge domains. It is here that the fourth area is conceptualised, namely that the very language of negotiation (and classification) needs to be placed under the spotlight, for it is through language that Africa-centred gatekeeping/classification needs to arise. Languages, are, inevitably, bound to local knowledges (a fifth area of engagement) for context, connotation, implication and meaning. Language cannot be objective (language is a map to meaning and not the territory of meaning, where such a territory is experienced or embodied) and therefore it becomes by its very nature a site of strategic alliance building.

### Sites/themes of/for collaboration/strategic alliances

Lesley Green (2014, pp. 43-48) posits three sites where such collaboration/strategic alliances might arise. She posits these as "non-canonical ways of knowing" (and she acknowledges that the canon, in this case, can refer to that which arises from either the rock or the hard place), and she clusters them in themes. Her argument is not based on the binaries suggested by the dyad, but by suggesting a continuum between the two terms, and also by acknowledging the tensions between the understanding of the dyad as seen through the eyes of modernity and indigeneity.

The first theme that she suggests draws on the tensions in the Nature/Culture dyad, specifically engaging with the seeming hierarchical, placing nature 'beneath' culture (by some). Simplistically argued, a culture can be seen as a community that is bounded by its members practising life in the same ways, by understanding life in the same ways, and by sharing value systems. Yet it can be argued that such doing, understanding and valuing arises from and engages with that which is deemed 'natural' or 'from nature'. Culture presupposes a particular 'web of control' over nature, but is, in itself, determined by the 'nature of that

---

<sup>2</sup> Tellingly, perhaps, the difference may lie between the role of 'stakeholders' as opposed to 'role-players.' As I shall argue, below, it can be suggested that a stakeholder enters the fray to take something out of it, whereas the role-player has a vested interest and therefore is critically engaged in making the strategic alliance a success. As I shall show, this resonates with Kasuli's tension between the Integrity model and the Intimacy model.

nature.’ When two (different) cultures have two different ‘webs of control’ over the same matter, a site for negotiation is opened up, and strategic alliances between such differing cultures present themselves. (This potential decolonised dynamics of such strategic alliances will be attended to in the section on Kasulis’ notion of integrity and intimacy, below). It is conceivable, given this set of definitions that one can draw on a culture of science as opposed to a culture of experience. This would open out the tensions, offered in the third of the quotes at the top of the article, between the mathematician who has a culture of exactness, and the engineer who has to deal with the exigencies of measurement ‘in nature’.

The second theme Green raises speaks to the Mind/Body dyad (or bodymind whole, which in turn resonates with the embodied knowledge). Current understanding in education is that the mind is divorced from the body and education engages the mind. This is the duality captured in Descartes notion of “I think; therefore I am.” However, it is also caught up in the tensions where the map is not the territory. The map is a cognitive product of reduction, whereas the territory is embedded in the lived experience. It can be argued that the article, or the dissertation is a cognitive reduction (or distillation if one must) of the being in the world. But furthermore, it can be suggested that, in terms of Africa-centred knowledges, the knowledges are lived and not written. Geertz’s quotation at the start of this article also speaks to this – the hydrologist ‘can write about’ the river; the swimmer ‘lives it.’

The tension (perceived or otherwise) between the Traditional and the Modernist is her third theme. She opens this up with two telling examples, the one quoted in the beginning of the article where the modernist approach to the HIV/AIDS pandemic (the use of ARVs, or Anti-Retrovirals) was placed in tension (at the time) with the notion of the African Renaissance. The second example is the way in which Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) may be seen to potentially become commodified by a modernist approach (IKS becomes trademarked as IKS™). Her argument is that neither approach is particularly productive. Yet the fisherman knows the river, and the marketer knows the market and it would make sense that local, indigenous knowledge and modernist knowledge seek “strategic alliances.”

I would argue that all three themes highlight the potential dangers of clinging to a monolithic (and, perhaps, hegemonic) perception of identity. At this juncture of the argument I would suggest that the decolonisation endeavour cannot be hardened around already existing identity formations, where such identity formations might be seen to be embedded in the coloniser/colonised dyad. Kaiser’s (2012) notion of subject formation allows for the exigencies of the moment, the memories of the past, and the search for the future to coalesce around ‘strategic alliances’ between mind and body, between nature and culture, and between the traditional and the modern. Is there a way that this might come about?

## Kasulis on Integrity and Intimacy

I turn now to Kasulis’ notion of Integrity and Intimacy in attempting to provide a strategy. His project is to attempt to suggest a model to explain the differences between a Western ontological approach to the world and an Eastern one. I have appropriated his argument to speak of a modernist approach and then to intimate an alternative. Kasulis argues that the west understands the world in compartments, in integers, in discrete elements. Thus, in a process of negotiation, for example, each side would be seen to enter the negotiation with a clear understanding of the integrity of their positions, and an accepted understanding that the field or domain about which the negotiation is being undertaken can be demarcated and has an integrity of its own. Once the negotiations are completed, the parties withdraw, and return to their own integrity position, and the demarcated field is left as it was, its integrity intact. Units are discrete, have boundaries, can be defined and analysed, using discrete models that have their own integrity. Taken to its logical conclusion, such fields and models, because they are discrete, named, bounded, made legible (I return to Scott here) and

therefore measurable, they can seem to become agents on their own (I have extrapolated Kasulis somewhat here, to make my argument). This is the domain of the stakeholder. Thus one argues that “the economy” is in decline, the university is flourishing, research needs support and so on. In actual fact, it is not “the economy” that is in decline, it is a case of less people are spending less money (another discrete unit) where money is seen as a reward for working hard at making things, and so more people are making less money. It is not the “university” that is flourishing, but the people in the university who are working harder and smarter and are contributing to make a name for themselves, and it is not research that needs support, it is the researchers who are attempting to solve problems that need financial, emotional, and psychological, and so on, support.<sup>3</sup>

Given this, rather simplistic, presentation of one side of Kasulis’ argument one can see how the integrity model plays out in Green’s themes: the body is a discrete unit, as is the mind; the modernist approach is discrete, as is the traditional and so on. The development of “strategic alliances” seems a somewhat forlorn hope, given this Integrity state of affairs.

As opposed to this Kasulis notes the Intimacy paradigm, where engagement<sup>4</sup> with the ‘other’ (in the dyads, for example) inevitably influences both sides of the dyad. Thus, as the mind engages with the body, for example, so the mind changes, as does the body, given the engagement. The relationship is an intimate one, in that withdrawal from the engagement means that a part of each is presented to or left with the other, and withdrawal suggests loss. Furthermore, the relationship in the context of problem-solving is an empathic one. What is traditional can only be defined as being traditional if it is placed in empathic relationship to the modernist. And the modernist can only be seen as being modernist because the traditional is ever (empathically) present. Perhaps the most intimate moment is the moment of collaboration, and thus the collaborative interweave (or entanglement) of tradition and modernity in Africa produces, potentially, Africa-centred knowledge, solutions, insights and wisdom. Tentatively I propose, then, that this approach brings one closer to *Ubuntu*, and when *Ubuntu* is in the service of education and research one encounters Africa-centredness.

Collaboration and strategic alliances reveal human endeavour but are only constructed in the pursuit of something. If “colonised” research has pursued making things legible, measurable and predictable (or problem finding), what might “decolonised” research pursue? Given my argument to this point I would suggest a utilitarian pursuit – collaboratively using legibility, measurability and predictability in pursuit of problem-solving, practical wisdom (*phronesis*) and empathic development. As such, decolonised research (and education) is not about legibility, measurability and predictability, but lies in the empathic and intimate engagement through collaboration and strategic alliances with the future – in the pursuit of making a better life, for example. It is a field for role-players, and not for stakeholders.

The field of design is ideally placed to foster this decolonised approach. Whereas Human Centred Design or HCD has attempted to formalise this (and is not without its difficulties) it has provided a parallel framework, as it were, to *Ubuntu*.<sup>5</sup> I offer here an extended quote from a paper I presented at the University of Johannesburg’s FADA campus in April, 2016.

---

<sup>3</sup> A classic example of this at work is in the use in academic language of the passive voice where the agent of the action seems to disappear. For example “research was undertaken” actually should read “a bunch of people got together to attempt to solve problems,” and “state-capture was punished” where the people doing the punishing have not been named (by the language), nor have the people who are involved in state capture been revealed (by whom?)

<sup>4</sup> It is perhaps useful to interrogate the concept of an engagement here. In the marriage sense, an engagement is where two disparate people commit to a relationship that will lead to something productive. The breaking of an engagement leads to loss.

<sup>5</sup> I am indebted to my colleague, Kate Chmela-Jones, for this insight, and await the completion of her study with keen interest.



Consider an artist working at a painting. In the integrity model, one has the artist, with her paints, easel, even idea. Then there is the canvas, ready to receive, as it were, the paint. And then there is the notion of making a painting. In the integrity model, the one applies her tools to the other. And in the end, the painter stands back and returns to her reality, and the painting is complete, or now has its own integrity. In the intimacy model (and now I have to appear to wax lyrical, but if you are a painter you will know what I am talking about) the painter and the canvas stand ready to be changed, to engage, to be in an intimate relation to each other, to be open to what the canvas can give and receive and what the painter can give and receive. In the act of painting, the painter is often not cognitively (dare one say 'rationally') deliberate, but in communion with the canvas, her and its reality, the world. The reaction to each other is one of frustration, so to speak, if matters are not 'working' (whatever that 'not working' might be). At the end of the process it appears as if both artist and canvas 'step back from' the relationship moment, in many ways fulfilled, and definitely changed. Critically, there has not been an exchange (that would be an explanation from the integrity model) but a mutually creative act. The canvas and the artist will never be the same again.

The argument thus far suggests that to move into a decolonised education approach one needs to counter the modernist necessity to make new knowledge measurable and legible, and that such an approach needs to pursue not 'new knowledge' that takes these forms, but to pursue an Africa-centred knowledge, which pursues not what is, but what could be or could become. Constraints include multilingualism, competing world views, a potential clinging to a hegemonic view of identity, and the like. Are there models that might address these issues? I am fully aware that what follows is conceptualised from research that has taken place potentially from the modernist view of matters, but offer them for consideration/engagement and trust that they may form new collaborations and strategic alliances on various levels.

### Gardner and Herrmann

Thus I close this paper with some speculations on how one could overcome these barriers and to do so I draw on Gardner's model of multiple intelligences (1983) and on Hermann's view of whole-brain learning (1988/1995). I engage with Gardner in so far as I adopt the notion of "intelligences" to mean 'abilities to cope with, operate in and develop the world' and I do not consider the innateness of such intelligences, but posit them as 'domains of engagement.' Gardner's original model contains seven intelligences/domains of engagement, namely the verbal-linguistic, the logical-mathematical, the visual-spatial, the bodily-kinesthetic, the musical-rhythmic and harmonic, the interpersonal, and the intrapersonal<sup>6</sup>. It is common cause that most universities almost exclusively embed their understanding and pursuit of new knowledge through the domains of the logical-mathematical and the verbal-linguistic<sup>7</sup>.

This resonates with Scott's concern around the pursuit of the measurable and the legible. It can be argued that the *Policy on the Evaluation of Creative Outputs and Innovations Produced by South African Public Higher Education Institutions* (2017) goes some way towards opening up the potential for developments around the other five intelligences and fosters the notion that development and new knowledges can arise from activities in these domains, opening

---

<sup>6</sup> It can be argued that the domains of the interpersonal and the intrapersonal resonate with the field of Emotional Intelligence/Competence as well.

<sup>7</sup> Indeed, most current debates around the seeming problems in pre-tertiary education in democratic South Africa circulate around the mathematical and the multilingual concerns/shortfalls for the generation of new insight and knowledge.



up the presentation of such new knowledges in other, non-mathematical and linguistic ways. This is a development to be applauded in the decolonisation domain, I would argue. I do not advocate for the discontinuing of the mathematical and linguistic, but advocate for the rightful place of the other domains of enquiry and sharing in tertiary education, and, by extension, tertiary research. (I am also fully aware that, if tertiary education pursues the notion of making such research outputs legible and measurable, an immediate potential stumbling block will occur. How does one make legible and measurable the seeming ephemeral that benefits community and society at least on a local level? Could it be that impact factors for journal articles are replaced by the impact on local communities in the pursuit of development and ‘a better life?’ Is impact to be ‘measured’ by ‘human flourishing’ and not ‘citation numbers’?)

The second approach (running somewhat parallel to Gardner) is the notion of Whole-brain learning developed by Ned Herrmann (1988/1995; see also especially Ann-Louise De Boer, Pieter du Toit, Detken Scheepers & Theo J D Bothma, 2013). In simplistic terms brain preferences occur for learning purposes and can be clustered around the notion of learning through employing Form, Fact, Feeling or Fantasy (or combinations thereof). Traditional research work has dominated expectations through Form and Fact applications (which resonate with the logical-mathematical, and the linguistic when coupled with the logical). Nevertheless creative work often materialises through Feeling and Fantasy (although it can manifest in other domain combinations). Current pedagogy requires application (seemingly) of all four metaphorical quadrants yet measurability and legibility are only ‘allowed’ to manifest drawing on the Form and Fact Quadrants. I argue that this approach needs a form of decolonisation, as it will thus foreground doing and making, local knowledge and practical wisdom. In short, new insights from the swimmer and the engineer are as valuable and contributory as the hydrologist and the use of ARVs in the pursuit of human flourishing.

## Conclusion

I have argued that to decolonise education and research one needs to understand that ‘the map is not the territory.’ To move forward one needs to navigate the territory. Having a map is a huge advantage, but without the Africa-centred knowledges of the territory, and the necessity to traverse the territory that is embedded in the needs of Africa, the map is rather pointless.

## References:

- Geertz, C 2000, *Available light: anthropological reflections on philosophical issues*, Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Cooper, B 2014, 'Black Boxes and Glass Jars: classification in the hunt for Africa-centred knowledge', In B Cooper & R Morell (eds), *Africa-centred knowledges: crossing fields and worlds*, Woodridge, Suffolk, James Currey, pp 78-92.
- Cooper, B & Morell R (eds) 2014, *Africa-centred knowledges: crossing fields and worlds*. Woodridge, Suffolk, James Currey.
- Cooper, B & Morell R 2014, 'Introduction: the possibility of Africa Centred Knowledges', In B Cooper, Brenda & Morell R (eds), *Africa-centred knowledges: crossing fields and worlds*. Woodridge, Suffolk: James Currey, pp 1-20.
- De Boer, A-L, Pieter du Toit P, Scheepers D & Theo J D Bothma, TJD 2013, *Whole Brain (R) Learning in Higher Education - Evidence-Based Practice*, Oxford, Chandros Publishing.
- Gardner, H 1983, *Frames of mind: the theory of multiple intelligences*, New York, Basic Books.
- Green, L 2014, 'Re-theorizing the Indigenous Knowledge debate,' In B Cooper & Morell R (eds), *Africa-centred knowledges: crossing fields and worlds*, Woodridge, Suffolk, James Currey, pp 36-50.
- Hallam, E & Ingold T (eds) 2007, *Creativity and cultural improvisation*, Oxford and New York, Berg.
- Herrmann, N 1988/1995, *The creative brain*, Minnesota, University of Minnesota Press.
- Kaiser, SB 2012, *Fashion and cultural studies*, United Kingdom, Berg.
- Kasulis, TP 2002, *Intimacy or Integrity: philosophy and cultural difference*, Honolulu, University of Hawai'i Press.
- Scott, JC 1998, *Seeing like a state: how certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press