PART 8

A CALL TO ACTION

25 *A forward-looking ethics of transformative leadership: Rebuilding societies in the 21st century*

Catherine A. Odora Hoppers and Crain Soudien

Overview

The 20th century witnessed unprecedented developments in technology and also created powerful new international norms around war. Many crises remain unresolved, and of these, many centre on the postcolonial state in Africa and in much of the non-Western world. These precepts, the consequence of the displacement and abnegation of indigenous knowledges, practices, and wisdoms, have led to the alienation and objectification of nature, a de-spiritualisation of human development, and an extractive and exploitative relationship with the natural world. They have stunted the development path that systems of knowledge would have undergone. Because of the universalisation of dominance, the world lost its opportunity to learn the lessons of sustainable development from those it defines as 'other'. The challenge for us is how to recover from the hurts inflicted by domination. The question is how to imagine new models of leadership that address these resentments. Education is needed that will embrace the 'other' and encourage leaders to question and transform the rules of the game both at the institutional level and at societal and systemic levels.

Introduction: The challenge of transformative leadership

> *Wanderer, there is no path, you lay down the path in walking. And where you look behind, you see the path that will not be trod again. Wanderer, there is no path, but the ripples on the waters.*
> *(A poem by Antonio Machado, cited in Conn, 1991, p. 74)*

By transformative leadership is meant leadership that directs change in systems, as opposed to transactional leadership – leadership that directs people. This latter definition of leadership focuses on the styles and traits of leaders, and engagement between leaders and followers. According to Swartz, transformative leadership is 'intent on attaining systemic and social justice outcomes for societies and employing ethical and people-centred processes…in order to achieve these ends' (Chapter 1, this volume, p. 5). These are profound words that challenge us to view anew, to come to a sense of the preconditions that must exist to allow transformative leaders to emerge in Africa. What is the level of diagnosis that can allow a person to develop insights into a situation, such as in Africa, as we emerge

from the ravages of decolonisation, epistemological disenfranchisement, and, worse still, our stuckness in academic systems that cry out for transformation, so that a new future can be born in our time?

We look left and we see the dominant norms of modern culture that make us suspicious of our own cultures. All of us have legitimate access to our own humanity! But Hélé Béji (2004), in a landmark publication by Unesco, *The Future of Values*, forewarns us that modern culture no longer offers us access to our humanity. She says that we should be aware that the culture that surrounds us today is characterised by the distortion of human rights into inhuman codes:

- where sovereignty is replaced by supremacy;
- where tolerance, which in the first place is the rejection of the intolerable, becomes the right to practise the intolerable;
- where democracy becomes a slogan in support of hegemony, or cultural difference, which was supposed to diversify peacefully, converges instead into a practice of violence;
- where anti-racism becomes as intolerant as racism; and
- where the rights of the weakest are modelled on the abuses of the rights of the strongest. (Béji, 2004, pp. 30–32)

The result is that victims are turning into a new force of cruelty in their own right. These realities impose upon us an obligation to rethink the content and paradigm of learning itself.

We look right, and see our indigenous knowledge subjugated almost to a point of no return. But Foucault, a French philosopher, expressed a powerful articulation of the state of indigenous knowledge which gives remote hope. Subjugated knowledges, he argued, are whole sets of knowledges that are either hidden behind more dominant knowledges but can be revealed by critique, or those knowledges that have been explicitly disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated: naive knowledges, located low down on the hierarchy, beneath the required level of cognition or scientificity. They are historical forms of wisdom that have been buried or masked in functional coherences or formal systematisations (Foucault, 1980). These articulations embody a call for strategic transactional leadership within the academy, leading to a transformative leadership model that surpasses the debate between the leadership models that Swartz elicits in this volume. The understanding of the monumental efforts being undertaken worldwide to recognise, promote, develop, and protect these knowledges is key to illustrating the adage that the true path to emancipation lies beyond critique, in transformative action.

For this we make three proposals – one, general, for the world; another, specific to us here in Africa; and a third, addressed to our young leaders. The first, a call for transformative action 1: *the moment of renegotiation of agency,* as we put it later, is for the preparation of young and able youth who are well versed in the

long and continuous history of human development and the contributions of all people, everywhere, to the development of our capacities as morally sentient beings. Human development, we must teach all the world's young people, and, perhaps more importantly, their elders, is not the invention or the product of what we have come to describe as European civilisation. The development of all of our capabilities, scientific, cultural, and spiritual, in all of their moral expressions, both good and bad, could never have taken place without the great contributions of the people of Africa (Kies, 1953). Our second proposal, a call for transformative action 2: *the integrative paradigm shift,* builds on the first. It proceeds on the basis that inclusive and respectful approaches to development will work with all our knowledge resources, not only, in any sense of deference and obligation, with those that come from our European experience of the last five hundred years. Our third proposal, a call for transformative action 3: *making generative leaders,* in acknowledgement of the specific situation of the youth of our continent, calls for the development of an educational process that taps into and nurtures their cognitive and affective capabilities and empowers them to confront any and all forms of subjection and objectification.

Our hope is for an education that works with our young people's diverse capabilities and so enriches them as individualised human subjects. Each of them has potential. That potential lies in reserve in infinitely different forms. There, among them, as in the past, are great astronomers, physicists, mathematicians, craftspeople, agriculturalists, adventurers, engineers, storytellers, spiritualists, linguists, philosophers, artists, and musicians. The educational experience, however, must never detach them from their social and ecological contexts – their connectedness to their pasts and their responsibilities for their and their descendants' sustained and sustainable futures. The future depends on living in a relationship of boundless respect with our natural world – a world which we share as equals with other life and inanimate forms (Latour, 2013).

A note on leadership

A cursory reference to any source on leadership will generate many wise insights into what the term can mean. Doug Firebaugh (n.d., p. 3), for example, tells us that '[l]eadership is the art of seeing the invisible…then touching it'. The task of a leader, say Whitney and Trosten-Bloom (2010), is to create an alignment of strength that makes people's weaknesses irrelevant. Leadership is a matter of how to be, not how to do. How to do is the task of a manager. From Kouzes and Posner (2011) comes the timeless insight that the most effective leaders are living demonstrations of how values and character, when combined in action, carry the day. They pay attention to their inner growth, knowing they must fully develop themselves as human beings if they are to develop as leaders. The inner journey is a prerequisite to authentic leadership. Inherent to these insights, everyday as

they may seem, are two constants: a good leader, firstly, is by their example a natural educator and, secondly, an ethical warrior.

We know that contemporary culture determines our understanding of reality and how power works. In these understandings we have a heightened sense of external attributes such as territory, property, academic success, wealth, and political access. But we also know that this external world is in a serious state of depletion and distortion as a result of our manipulations. What then is our task? What do we need to do to develop a sense of how we might think and act in contemporary times? How can we execute leadership for a humane and democratic world at such a time as this? When we say humane, we mean conduct that is marked or motivated by concern with the alleviation of suffering for all life forms and a desire for the moral and intellectual advancement of all human beings. We seek, hereby, to recover an ontology of self that works with a sense of our human differences, and which is not encoded in hierarchy and in narrow and essentialised understandings of our complex and multifarious identities, but which looks, always, for the new and wondrous.

We consider the challenge of leadership from the vantage point of the privileged space of the university. We begin with a discussion of ethics in the context of the postcolonial African continent and what this means for leadership. We then proceed to a consideration of ethical leadership in the contemporary African university.

Ethical African leadership: A challenge

A fresh start in diagnosing leading to prognosis needs to be made urgently. Ethical African leadership needs to pay attention to what we call second-level indigenisation (Odora Hoppers, 2009, 2012). What do we mean by this? Béji (2001) states that if the 20th century was the century of Africa's political independence, the 21st century will be the century of Africa's reclaiming of human agency, and of its status in world citizenship as a subject, not object. The 21st century will be one in which the political freeing of the continent from various strands of colonial control as an act linked with the attainment of political sovereignty transforms and metamorphoses into Africans freeing themselves as a creative act of the spirit. If by attaining political freedom and sovereignty the continent attained the right to act politically, awareness of freedom in the 21st century, however, brings with it what Béji (2001, p. 286) calls 'a greater consciousness of our duties'.

Yet, awareness of spirit in our times, and of being free as a creative act of the spirit, takes us far beyond the cries of reparation and claims of injustice against a historical experience that was cruel and, in some instances, actually evil. It goes beyond the dictates of modernity and enlightenment in which all nations

of the world are locked into the grids of the European experience. It takes us to quite a different place, a place in which the idea of freedom in the 21st century is held up against the great demand of unconditional human recognition: of its offering to every single human being an unqualified common good in a world of undifferentiated common well-being – a new future.

A key question for the task of creating new futures for Africa is how we in Africa cultivate in ourselves the capacity for being active and fully knowing human agents in an ethically cognisant dispensation. The question is about us as human subjects, in the first instance, but also about the institutions and structures we bring into being, nurture, and sustain. We come to this point with the awareness and acknowledgement that, ontologically, given our colonial history of mental subjugation, political, cultural, and psychological freedom creates for many of us a strange aporia or contradiction. Inherent to the moment is a sense of handicap and incoherence.

This comes to us in intensely intimate and personal ways. We have in these the psychosocial juxtaposition of the past, the present, and the future in all its tumultuous and discordant complexity. We are, as a consequence, stretched, distorted, compressed, and manipulated all at once. Paralyse us as this aporia may, it is also a moment of immense possibility. We are positioned, uniquely almost in the world – *almost* because there exist, always, analogues of our experience elsewhere that we do not yet see clearly – to imagine the world beyond its dominant ontological templates. From the aporia we have a view of human history, of its racialised, gendered, and spatialised sequestration of subjectivity, and a yearning for an alternative which stimulates imaginations of possible new dispensations with new social and ecological compacts of respect.

To ground all this, where Europe destroyed and dehumanised with apparent elation, then got the Rostovian illusion and curse combined fully ingrained into development thinking, which told Africans: 'You see, just do as we did, and you will get there', we see only plunder, desolation, and collapse. To attain what the West has attained using the formula it espouses, one would need a lot of other countries and lands to conquer, subjugate, dehumanise, and thereafter, 'develop'. Africa must therefore carefully weigh its methods of transcending the realms of that bondage – in other words, it must go beyond naming what it is fighting against, to courageously naming what it is fighting for.

Where Europe needed to destroy and subjugate so many, Africa must define new formulas for its reconstruction (in relation to the historical destruction), name the new icons symbolising its points of departure, and articulate the kind of energy it will bring to bear in the building of its future in the new, more humane dispensation.

We have to tighten and deepen our diagnosis in the following ways.

1. As Africa confronts the malfunctions of modernity and, behind it, European-programmed notions of progress and their offsprings of development, progress, rationality, and so forth, we take as a founding premise of our agency the need to recuperate the definition of 'time' with which we operate. Such a recuperation involves a *lived time* that needs to be humanised, beyond the rhythms of capitalist accumulation. It is therefore Africa that, in transforming the contours of its struggles from archaic resistance to domination, holds the key to the world's future – hence the call to foster a cohort of astute young Africans to take on the leadership role and take us forward.

2. But to do this, a lot depends on how Africa reconfigures and refashions the temporal narrative in which it is locked: its past (one which is still painful) and the kind of future it would like to see unfold, not just for itself, but also for humanity at large. Much will depend on how Africa articulates itself out of the experience of historic humiliation, suffered at the hands of colonialism, and avoids adding to self-perpetuating cultural cycles of violation and vindication which would seem to say, 'I have the right to be angry and make others suffer forever because someone hurt me in the past.' The question then for the future – towards a new time – becomes this: How can Africa generate fewer humiliation entrepreneurs, such as Hitler, Mussolini, and, latterly, Idi Amin, and more Nelson Mandelas who interrupt the cycle of humiliation by triggering new cycles of dignity? How can we cultivate together enduring instruments and practices that can disarm this singular weapon of mass destruction – humiliated hearts and minds – and turn them into weapons of mass creativity and solidarity (Lindner, 2006)? How can we move, using the existing resources already at our disposal, to free the many hearts clogged with resentment?

3. Clearly, we need new concepts to guide our thinking and action in this generation. Here, we draw from Nandy (1983, 1997), who argues that 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 defences of the mind and conceptual categories around which they can organise their thoughts and actions. Turning the previously colonised 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 characterised 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 (Nandy, 1983, 1997). It may, in certain instances, demand a cognitive indifference to the Western model and a robust

engagement with the basic foundations of modernity's knowledge production systems themselves – the disciplines.

4. We also draw from Blum (1991), who argues 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, and yet, unless they perceive situations as *moral* situations, and unless they perceive their moral character accurately, not succeed. 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 – that is, the adequacy of an 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 (Blum, 1991; Odora Hoppers, 2012).

What is education's response to this? How do we go beyond critique to transformative action? How do we build an 'ethics' on the ruins of modernity? How can actual citizenship be built and how can we carve out a pathway towards a planet-centred paradigm in which we hold a sense of respect and dignity for all of life? How might we acknowledge our special potentialities as human beings to think critically, to reason, and to dream, but also, simultaneously, our symbiotic dependence on our organic and physical environment? How do we conceptualise a future that accords radical equality to all inside our ecological universe, with which we are in relationship – our fellow human beings, however they may wish to describe themselves? How do we consider our extraordinarily varied relatives in the biological world and, last but by no means least, our physical environment, the air we breathe, the water we drink and are composed of, our soils, rocks, mountains, forests, and deserts? How can we rethink the ethics of education, the questions of development, progress, sustainable human development, and the making of livelihoods in ways that are more conscious, more self-aware, and more alert to the conveniences and seductions of knowledges and practices that portend the end of humanity?

Our response to these questions is that we have a global responsibility to 'up our game' and nurture future leaders who know the contours of the terrain of struggle precisely, in order to take whatever action they deem necessary.

Tightening the diagnosis: From transactional to transformative leadership and back

Modernity was consolidated in the 20th century: its laws undergirded by retributive justice; its linear ways of thinking and its exclusionary and detached science wedded to the applications of technology, not to expanding the philosophical base of science; its economics closely tied to scarcity; its puritan

model of governance distinctively un-nuanced about the suffering it creates. In the words of Indian scholar Visvanathan (2002, cited in Odora Hoppers, 2002b, p. viii), the science discipline in particular turns the 'self' into an ultimate manipulator,

> a spectator, a recorder of events, an act of alienation…Over time, the gaze of science over the so-called 'non-scientific' for instance became a gaze of surveillance, preventing the entry of pain and compassion, leaving the "I" of science an impoverished self without a backstage. He argues that science is not only political, but goes beyond politics to create its own 'micro-physics of power, with its own capillaries by pre-empting and terminally judging the way one thinks'.

While the sage in the African and Indian indigenous forests was not interested in acquiring and dominating, but in realising and enlarging their consciousness by growing with and into their surroundings, the West took pride in subduing nature (Merchant, 1980). Visvanathan (2000, 2001) argues that the American wilderness, unlike the Indian or African forest, lacked cosmic power. For the West, nature belonged to the category of the inanimate, and Western thought posited a disjunction between nature and human nature.

Suzuki and McConnel (2006) state that the way we see the world shapes the way we treat it. If a mountain is a deity, not a pile of ore; if a forest is a sacred grove, not timber; if other species are biological kin, not resources; or if the planet is our mother, not an opportunity, then we will treat each other with greater respect. Thus, the challenge is to look at the world from a different perspective.

The dialogue between Western and African universities should, in terms of epistemology, therefore, be between a city science and a forest science, between a mode of being that sought harmony with nature, and a way of doing that sought possession of it. While we cannot deny the power of Western science or the dynamism of the Western university, the dialogue of knowledges can only begin when the differences are understood and recognised (Visvanathan, 2000). It is on the recognition of this epistemological tenet of the university's agenda for reconnection with the context, therefore, that an ethics for transformation is likely to be built.

In tightening the diagnosis, we have to move beyond the appraisals of the work of individual scientists, beyond the assessment of the output of particular research teams, beyond the competitive acumen of research centres, to the question of what type of knowledge is being generated, what type of research questions are being asked, and what is not being asked (Hountondji, 1997). We have to realise quite rapidly that part of the economic and epistemological dependency of the South on the North lies in the problematic belief that in Northern or Western ways of knowing are guarantees of certainty – scientific and epistemological

validations of knowability and comprehensibility – and in the South, only the resources or raw materials – objects – of curiosity. It is a relationship of superiority and inferiority sanctioned by the present intellectual property rights system, which necessitates a whole systems approach.

To change this system of dominance we need to make profound changes in existing rules and regulations governing scientific activities, and look closely at, and where appropriate interrogate, progressive but still exclusionary knowledge-production practices currently taking place in universities. To contemplate including non-Western conceptions of knowledge and systems into the mainstream of university life, we need to acknowledge, is extremely challenging. The challenge begins in understanding the normative culture of the 'scientific method'. This scientific method, with its formulaic rules of observation, hypothesis-making, and testing, presents itself as the only methodology for arriving at the 'truth'. Seeking to challenge it is to court academic suicide, because the burden of proof, of credibility, lies exclusively in the scientific method, in written text, in regulations, and in sacrosanct evidential routines.

How do we generate transformative leaders out of this morass? How we permit the possibility for alternative orders of validation, claim-making, and truth-assertion is an important task for knowing in the university. Thus, we need to develop a notion of equity that goes beyond making concessions to marginal groups, or allowing them access to goods that mainstream dominant groups enjoy, or being 'nice' to those less fortunate than ourselves, to one which works reciprocally in all directions. A truly equitable society is one in which the mainstream groups see it as essential to have access to the linguistic and cultural resources of marginalised groups, and demand such access as a matter of equity. Equity cannot be left as a matter of making concessions. It has to be seen as a matter of equality of cultural trade, where each social group is seen as having contributions of equal value to make to all other social groups in the larger social unit (Kress, 1996). Even 'international' as a qualifier, we suggest, ends up denoting a form of diversity that is cohered and brought together in terms of a Western perspective.

A call to transformative action 1:
The moment of renegotiation of agency

In our minds, the postcolonial theorists offer important insights as to how young leaders and postcolonial scholars-in-action should position themselves for deep change. They take cultural difference as an important heuristic and argue that in the process of respectfully working with our differences lies the opportunity for constructively working with all of our knowledge affordances. In embracing difference, we open ourselves to managing ourselves and our relationships in truly critical ways, ways that recognise value wherever it arises, but which

also have built into them a curiosity for explanation and a suspicion of dogma. Through this we nurture our human capability for working critically with all our grand narratives, old and new. We, in this mindful of processes of subjugation, approach science and the scientific method with cautious respect. We take from its workings the extraordinary wonders of technological discovery, but we pause, repeatedly, over its sense of itself, of itself as whole, wholesome, and essentially worthy. According to Bhabha (1994/2004), history is now taking place on the outer limits of the subject/object, giving rise to new moments of defiance that rip through the sly civility of those grand narratives, exposing their violence.

Subaltern agency emerges as a process of reversing, displacing, and seizing the apparatus of value coding which had been monopolised by the colonial 'default drive'. Bhabha states that it is the contestation of the 'given' symbols of authority that shifts the terrain of antagonism. *This* is the moment of renegotiation of agency. It is the voice of an interrogative, calculative agency, the moment when we give up the desire of close resemblance with the coloniser, the moment of (in the term used by Toni Morrison) 'rememoration' (cited in Bhabha, 1994/2004, p. 284) that turns the narrative of enunciation into a haunting memorial of what has been 'excluded, excised, and evicted' (Bhabha, 1994/2004, p. 284).

What is unfolding in important regions of the academy is a growing demand that scholarship should not be content with documenting the histories of resistance of the colonised to colonialism. Scholarship should turn those accounts into theoretical events that make those struggles not only relevant for their moment in time, but also relevant for other moments in times to come. The 'people without history' then not only regain their central place in history and finally move away from the dingy ethnography corner to which colonial discourse would have them cast for eternity, but also become full agents and makers of history current and future.

In this way, the light that began by being cast on colonialism and the legacy of domination and abuse is changed to vigilant analysis of its failures and silences, and a systematic spotting of transformative nodes that were not recognisable before, but are now released into public spaces. The casting of light at last onto subjugated peoples, knowledges, histories, and ways of living unsettles the toxic pond and transforms passive analysis into a generative force that valorises and recreates life for those previously museumised (Odora Hoppers, 2008; Prakash, 1995). In Prakash's (1995, p. 6) words, it 'throws open for realignment the conflictual, discrepant and even violent processes that formed the precipitous basis of colonialism'. It is a process of engaging with colonialism in a manner that produces a programme for its dislocation. This dislocation 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 postcolonial transformation agenda. Of significance here, then, is how the victims of unjust and dehumanising systems go about exercising their power. The immediate task, according to Rahnema (1997), is that of deciphering the hidden transcript of the subordinate group's resistance.

A call to transformative action 2: The integrative paradigm shift

A second call for preparedness comes through naming the conditions for dialogue. Second-level indigenisation differs from post-independence indigenisation, which focused on the inclusion of Black people into the game. It questions the rules of the game, engages the paradigmatic frames, and engages the constitutive rules of systems (Odora Hoppers, 2009).

In this second-generation indigenisation, the errors of the past are taken as starting points for new directions. For instance, it is recognised that during a lot of social change there is a period when, to establish the recognition and strength prerequisite to an effective presence in dialogue and discourse, there is a polarisation or over-reaction against the incumbent (in other words, defining oneself as being 'different from', as being important in the process of claiming space to define oneself through self-referencing). The force it takes against established and resistant hegemony to create this space is reflective of 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 & Pickett, 2002; Odora Hoppers, 2002a).

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* (nobody's land) as a convenient rationalisation for colonisation 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 (Knudtson & Suzuki, 1992). The knowledge paradigms of the future are beginning by reaching out to those excluded and epistemologically disenfranchised, to move together towards a new synthesis.

In this synthesis, while 'empowerment' is usually more about resuming power (because power is never voluntarily relinquished), it is recognised 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 (Venter, 1997). Co-optation without a shift in authority, power, and control is empty. Transfer of symbolic power has usually been about a change of actors without changes in the structures of privilege, power, and oppression or 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 sociocultural justice. In this new stream, modernisation proceeds without following Western values (Huntington, 1996), time, or sequences, but rather with a restrengthening of core values from different traditions of knowledge and living. It is about equal access as citizens of a nation and of the world to the mainstream society, with an emphasis on equality – 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 & Pickett, 2002; Knudtson & Suzuki, 1992). It is about indigenous and marginalised peoples reclaiming the custodianship over their knowledge in public spaces along with the right to speak and to be determining agents of cooperative contemporary change and creative knowledge sharing of these knowledge systems.

The assumption of superiority of the West and its patronising obsession with facilitating the entry of traditional societies into the 'developed' world is hereby brought under sharp scrutiny. Western modernisation, progress, and thought are seen as a temporary epoch in human history, with both advantages and disadvantages, and one which must re-engage with the rest of the world. They must enter a mode of discourse and valorise modes of engagement – in deliberately more holistic and integrated conceptualisations of our ontologies and epistemologies – with cultures that have, fortunately, not been down the path of 'Westernisation'. 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 more viable future for humankind (Fatnowna & Pickett, 2002; Huntington, 1996; Knudtson & Suzuki, 1992.

A call to transformative action 3: Making generative leaders

The intended meaning of generative is 'making a difference', 'giving back', 'taking care' of your community and your planet. When society has been stable and predictable – that is, when one's community has been doing the same things the same way for generations – identity, intimacy, and generativity come easily, almost innocently. A person knows their place, the place of contemporaries, and the place of successors, for these were carefully taught to them (Kotre, 1975). 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 plates are more than evident, then identity and choice of direction become matters of conscious deliberation. The generative adult stands between the past and the future to be built, and, looking into the future, makes that crucial distinction between merely producing more offspring or producing offspring that are not crippled. The generative adult not only welcomes change, but brings something into it, creating socially valuable work.

Today, out there in the margins, demands for new theories of freedom, expanded definitions of knowledge, sharpened understandings of the notion and practice of justice, as well as understandings of context, diversity, difference, and culture are emerging from the very coffins that had been custom built for them by modernisation, with the burial area policed in advance by the Western paradigm. And it is precisely here that Kwenda's (2003) notion of 'cultural justice' becomes both pertinent and instructive. He takes for his analogy the situation of Africa, which is very instructive for deepening 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.

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 a minimum, that this burden of the unfamiliar is 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 coexistence. Respectful implies mutuality in paying attention, according regard and recognition, as well as taking seriously what the other regards as important. By functional, the intention is 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.

Cultural injustice occurs when 'people are coerced or persuaded 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, p. 70).

Cultural justice denotes that 'the burden of constant self-consciousness is shared or at the very least recognised, 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 the disposition to see in other cultures not simply difference, but deficiency, is overcome (Kwenda, 2003, p. 70–71).

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 (Kwenda, 2003; Odora Hoppers, 2007, 2009).

Conclusion

Howard Richards (15 November, 2009), in a personal conversation with the author, Odora Hoppers, states that sometimes the entities that perform the functions and wield the authority are actually *not* persons, like pilots and doctors, but *words*. How can our thoughts and words be condensed into a point that can be turned into an arrow? How can we go beyond postcolonial theorisations to transformative interventions in knowledge production in the academy? In this chapter we have sought to deconstruct the issues of leadership, decolonisation, epistemological disenfranchisement, transformation of the academy, ethical identity reconstruction, and societal transformation as a methodology to turn the words into an energy needed for the building of a new human future. Beyond the natural resources of gold and silver in Africa, there is a motherlode of joy to be recognised. It is only blocked. Remove the block, and it will be a free-flowing source of energy. And that is the task we have taken on: to remove the blocks.

#AfricaGenuineFreedomLeadership
A call for leadership to lead Africa out of the morass of colonisation, decolonisation, and epistemological disenfranchisement to a state of genuine freedom is a monumental task. We must find complementarities to tackle the depth of change necessary.

Questions for discussion

1. How might we go beyond critique to transformative action?

2. How can we rethink questions of development, progress, sustainable human development, and the making of livelihoods in ways that are more conscious, more self-aware, and more alert to the conveniences and seductions of knowledges and practices which portend the end of humanity?

3. The authors call for us all to 'up our game' in terms of transformative leadership. How could you up your game as an individual and as part of a collective (whatever that collective may be)?

References

Béji, H. (2001). Tomorrow, women. Learning to live together: Towards a new social contract. In J. Bindé (Ed.). *Keys to the 21st century* (pp. 286–288). Paris, France: Unesco.

Béji, H. (2004). The culture of the inhuman. In J. Bindé (Ed.). *The future of values: 21st-century talks* (pp. 27–33). Paris, France: Unesco.

Bhabha, H. K. (1994/2004). By bread alone: Signs of violence in the mid-nineteenth century. In H. K. Bhabha (Ed.). *The location of culture* (pp. 284–302). London, United Kingdom: Routledge Classics.

Blum, L. (1991). Moral perception and particularity. *Ethics*, *101*(4), 701–725.

Conn, S. A. (1991). The self-world connection: Implications for mental health and psychotherapy. *Woman of Power: A Magazine of Feminism, Spirituality, and Politics*, 20, 71–77.

Fatnowna, S. & Pickett, H. (2002). The place of indigenous knowledge systems in the post-postmodern integrative paradigm shift. In C. A. Odora Hoppers (Ed.). *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation* (pp. 257–288). Cape Town, South Africa: New Africa Books.

Firebaugh, D. (n.d.). *Leadership*. Retrieved from http://passionfire.com/Doug_Firebaugh_QuoteFire.pdf (no longer accessible).

Foucault, M. (1980). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse of language*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Hountondji, P. (Ed.). (1997). *Endogenous knowledge: Research trails*. Dakar, Senegal: Codesria.

Huntington, S. P. (1996). *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Kies, B. M. (1953). *The contribution of the non-European peoples to civilisation*. Cape Town, South Africa: The Teachers' League of South Africa.

Knudtson, P. & Suzuki, D. (1992). *Wisdom of the elders*. Sydney, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

Kotre, J. N. (1975, 20 December). Generative humanity. *America*. Retrieved from https://www.johnkotre.com/images/generative_humanity.pdf.

Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (2011). Leadership begins with an inner journey. *Leader to Leader*, *2011*(60), 22–27.

Kress, G. (1996). Representational resources and the production of subjectivity: Questions for the theoretical development of critical discourse analysis in a multi-cultural society. In C. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds). *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 15–31). London, United Kingdom: Routledge.

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* (pp. 67–82). Cape Town, South Africa: HSRC Press.

Latour, B. (2013). *An enquiry into modes of existence: An anthropology of the moderns.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lindner, E. (2006). *Making enemies: Humiliation and international conflict.* Westport, CT: Praeger Security International.

Merchant, C. (1980). *The death of nature: Women, ecology and the scientific revolution.* New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Nandy, A. (1983). *The intimate enemy: Loss and recovery of self under colonialism.* Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Nandy, A. (1997). Colonization of the mind. In M. Rahnema & V. Bawtree (Eds). *The post development reader* (pp. 168–177). London, United Kingdom: Zed Press.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2002a). Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a conceptual and methodological framework. In C. A. Odora Hoppers (Ed.). *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation* (pp. 2–22). Cape Town, South Africa: New Africa Books.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2002b). Introduction. In C. A. Odora Hoppers (Ed.). *Indigenous knowledge and the integration of knowledge systems: Towards a philosophy of articulation* (pp. vii–xiv). Cape Town, South Africa: New Africa Books.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2007). Knowledge, democracy and justice in a globalizing world. *Nordisk Pedagogik*, *27*(1), 38–53.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2008, 29 October). *Lifelong learning in Africa: Lessons, experiences and opportunities from cultural and cognitive justice.* Speech at the Unesco 21st Century Talks, Unesco, Paris, France. Retrieved from https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000163618.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2009, January). *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, Accra, Ghana.

Odora Hoppers, C. A. (2012, March). *Ethical African leadership: We know the theories, but what is the task?* Presentation to the Unisa Pre-Senate Executive Committee, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Prakash, G. (1995). Introduction: After colonialism. In G. Prakash (Ed.). *After colonialism: Imperial histories and post-colonial displacements* (pp. 3–20). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rahnema, M. (1997). Introduction. In M. Rahnema & V. Bawtree (Eds). *The post development reader* (pp. ix–xix). London, United Kingdom: Zed Press.

Suzuki, D. & McConnel, A. (2006). *The sacred balance: Rediscovering our place in nature.* Vancouver, Canada: Greystone Books.

Venter, L. (1997). *When Mandela goes: The coming of South Africa's second revolution.* London, United Kingdom: Transworld Publishers.

Visvanathan, S. (2000). Democracy, plurality and the Indian university. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *35*(40), 3597–3606.

Visvanathan, S. (2001). *Culture, culture on the wall.* India Seminar. Retrieved from https://www.india-seminar.com/2001/501/501%20shiv%20visvanathan.htm.

Whitney, D. & Trosten-Bloom, A. (2010). *The power of appreciative inquiry: A practical guide to positive change.* Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.