DECOLONISATION AND A THIRD POSSIBILITY FOR THE UNIVERSITY

L. Le Grange
Department of Curriculum Studies
Stellenbosch University
Stellenbosch, South Africa
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7096-3609

ABSTRACT

Decolonisation has recently captured the attention of those who inhabit South African universities, mainly sparked by student protests of 2015 and 2016. In this article writing is used as a mode of inquiry to explore what it means to decolonise the university in a contemporary world that is confronted with crises of all kinds; political, economic, environmental, health, education, and so forth. A third world university is pitted against a first world university (the neoliberal university that accumulates) and a second world university (the university that critiques), not as a new utopian idea but as a university that scavenges on the scrap material of the first and second world universities to retool them for decolonial purposes. In doing so the article changes the angle of vision on decolonising the university in South Africa and elsewhere. The author thinks with la paperson's ideas including hir notion of scyborg, which refers to people who use their agency to retool material of the first and second world universities to garner decolonial desires. A third possibility for the university jettisons the idea of a totalizing, utopian, decolonised university. What is possible is that the university can operate like a decolonised university, without being disengaged from the first and second world universities, signifying new ways of thinking/doing research, teaching, learning and community engagement.

Keywords: critique, decolonial desires, decolonization, neoliberal university, third possibility, scyborg

INTRODUCTION

Crisis is an apposite term for depicting the times we live in. As I write this article, we still find ourselves in a COVID-19 pandemic. Although COVID-19 restrictions have been removed in many parts of the world[1], the virus has not disappeared and continues to mutate. In 2022, people have died of COVID-19, although less than in 2020 and 2021[2], but there are still fatalities, and the effects of long COVID are not fully known. In the Anthropocene[3] or Capitalocene[4] crises such as global pandemics, global financial meltdowns, environmental catastrophes will likely be prevalent. These crises are moments of intensity in a more profound and sustained crisis that could be given different names: crisis of modernity, crisis of Enlightenment Humanism,

(neo)colonialism, coloniality, and so forth.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed gross inequalities in the world (and in South Africa), and made visible racism, the digital divide, inadequate provision of health care, increased incidences of gender-based violence, religious-based violence, and so on. Not only did the COVID-19 pandemic bring existing societal problems into sharper focus, but it also intersects with (or is part of) other crises. For example, there is growing social awareness that environmental problems have reached unparalleled levels and that the planet we inhabit (or that inhabits us) is on the precipice of ecological catastrophe. The effects of human-induced climate change are being felt in many parts of the world. In South Africa, Day Zero[5] is imminent in the City of Gqeberha, and devastating floods recently wreaked havoc in KwaZulu-Natal province, resulting in loss of lives and property and municipal infrastructure destruction. Human-induced climate change is caused by releasing greenhouse gases from combusting fossil fuels, biodiversity loss, and monocultural agricultural practices. We now also know that the occurrence of more virulent viruses such as *SARS-CoV-2* results from biodiversity loss[6] and related neoliberal capitalist agricultural practices (Le Grange 2020a). What is evident here is that climate change and the COVID-19 pandemic have some common causes or might be manifestations of a more significant crisis, as noted earlier. Transversal thinking is required at this time we live in – we need to invigorate lines of connection between/among crises.

Levinas (in Biesta 2006) referred to several of the atrocities (world wars, Nazism, genocides) committed in the 20th century as manifestations of the crisis of humanism. To Levinas' examples, we may add xenophobia, apartheid, and environmental destruction. Humanism, as invoked here, does not refer to its usage in the Anglo-Saxon world as a secular idea of privileging humans over other species and defending the rights of humans to freedom so as to realise their individual potential. It refers to the concept of human produced by the European Enlightenment depicted in Leonardo De Vinci's Vitruvian Man, whereby man was represented as the ideal of bodily perfection and later as a rational, autonomous being. European man became the molar entity – the screen against which others (humans and non-humans) were declared different and inferior – declared non-human or sub-human (Le Grange 2022). This molar entity became the basis for exploiting other humans and non-humans during colonial rule and has continued in postcolonial times. Braidotti (2013) points out, in the past two centuries, Europe heralded itself as both the origin and site of critical reason as well as self-reflexivity constructed on the Humanistic ideal. This ideal is based on the conviction that Europe was the place of universal consciousness that superseded its locatedness. In other words, humanistic universalism was Europe's particularity. Le Grange (2018) avers that humanism was the stimulus for European imperialism, colonialism and resultant modernity, bolstered by the use

of military power. Moreover, Mignolo (2011) reminds us that coloniality is the darker side of modernity. Put differently, modernity was not possible without coloniality. The darker side of modernity comprises the slave trade, imperialisms, violent genocides, racism, sexism, and the many cruelties experienced by colonised peoples, including in the current neoliberal imperative. To fully appreciate links between European Enlightenment Humanism and colonialism requires a more detailed historical account (see Mignolo 2011 for one such account). Suffice it to say, links between humanism and colonialism could be made. And so too, the links between decolonisation and posthumanism, which have been explored elsewhere (see Zembylas 2018; Du Preez 2018; Le Grange 2020b).

Another challenge in contemporary times is human entanglement with advanced technology making it difficult to delineate what human now means. Moreover, although technologisation has promises, it also holds dangers because it could exacerbate inequalities (or result in new forms of inequalities)[7], and give rise to increased surveillance. Drones have been used in wars that have resulted in several civilian fatalities (Cole 2019), technologies used in the biomedical sciences have resulted in the genetic code becoming capital (Braidotti 2013), and so forth. The critical question is, how do we resist the harmful uses and effects of advanced technologies without becoming technophobic? (Braidotti 2013).

In this introduction, I raise these matters associated with challenges of contemporary times because we can't have a productive conversation about decolonisation if it is not concerned with what is immanently present – with the matters or issues of current times. We cannot have a discussion on decolonisation during the COVID-19 pandemic without some reference to the pandemic. Nor can we have a conversation about decolonisation without accepting what new technologies will advance and that the world will increasingly become digitally mediated. Although the past is essential in informing the present and shaping the future, we cannot return to a less densely populated, less technologically advanced world where kinship networks are more robust. So, when Haraway (2015) correctly says in response to the Anthropocene/Capitalocene that we should make kin, she means making kin in a contemporary world – making kin with both humans and non-humans in the post-Anthropocene. Therefore, if we are to speak of any productive form of community engagement in the post-Anthropocene it must involve intra-actions of humans and the more/other-than-human world.

More specifically, we cannot simply wish away the neoliberal university and therefore have to work in and through it to invigorate decolonial desires. Those who inhabit the neoliberal university cannot stand outside the neoliberal university – we are both victims of neoliberal forces in the contemporary university and perpetrators in producing it. If we are to invigorate decolonial desires in the contemporary university, then we need to be competent in navigating

the neoliberal university – we need to understand its machinery (machinic assemblages)[8] so that we can retool them to invigorate decolonial desires. In presenting the case of a third possibility for the university, the article is divided into the following four sections: methodological (dis)position; the (re)ascendency of neoliberalism, its grammar and the neoliberal university; a third possibility for the university; some parting thoughts.

METHODOLOGICAL (DIS)POSITION

In this article, I investigate possibilities for decolonising the western university, particularly its contemporary incarnation, the neoliberal university. I do so at a time when people and the planet are faced with multiple crises. Although there may be cracks in its pillars and the walls of the neoliberal university are beginning to crumble, neoliberal desires continue to proliferate, and its regulatory mechanisms remain entrenched. My exploration is performed through the exercise of writing because it is a form of inquiry. So, I write to find out, not to represent research findings. As Richardson (2001, 35) so cogently puts it: "I write because I want to find something out. I write in order to learn something that I did not know before I wrote it."

I write to think with others in the process of experimentation that has no fixed essence or predetermined end. Braidotti (2005, 306) points out that philosophical monism implies that there is no categorical distinction between "thinking and creating, painting and writing, concept and percept."

THE (RE)ASCENDENCY OF NEOLIBERALISM, ITS GRAMMAR, AND THE NEOLIBERAL UNIVERSITY

The origin of neoliberalism is liberal perspectives of the 17th century, which were curtailed because of the rise of welfare state liberalism of the late 19th century and Keynesian economics of the twentieth century (Le Grange 2006). The re-ascendency of neoliberal politics resulted in the erosion of the welfare state, the privatisation of state assets and a return to neo-classical economics. Although, neoliberalism is a controversial term (both among its protagonists and detractors), there are generic principles shared by all neoliberals, such as: a commitment to individual liberty and a reduced state; a shift in policy and ideology against government intervention; and a belief that market forces should be allowed to be self-regulating (see Olssen, Codd, and O'Neill 2004 for a detailed discussion on the revival of neoliberalism). Le Grange (2006) points out that the resurgence of neoliberal politics has resulted in a change in the state's role from that of provider (of citizens' basic needs) to that of monitor and regulator. This changing role is inscribed in all spheres of society, particularly in areas such as education and health. Noys (2013) provides a more nuanced perspective on the state's role and argues that it

is a mistake to think that neoliberalism is as statist as other governmental forms. He avers that neoliberalism creates a new form of government in which the state plays a different role by permeating society to subject it to the economy. For Foucault (2008), the aim of neoliberalism is for the market to supervise the state rather than the state the market.

Despite the failures of neoliberalism, as laid bare during the global financial crisis of 2008/2009 and the COVID-19 pandemic, neoliberalism has not disappeared. Crises such as those mentioned have resulted in the morphing of neoliberalism into other forms. For example, Uber and Airbnb were created during the financial crisis of 2008 and 2009 and almost took neoliberalism to an ideal state (see Hall 2016). These for-profit sharing economy businesses bring conveniences to customers and perhaps greater affordability but have negative consequences for the on-demand worker (such as the uber driver), whose family life is disrupted and who is unprotected by the state and therefore vulnerable to exploitation. Le Grange (2020a) points out that in the wake of the financial crisis, we saw the reinforcing of neoliberalism through intensified privatisation, deregulation, the reduction of the state and further erosion of welfare systems. Moreover, we have seen new forms of platform capitalism grow during the COVID-19 pandemic and morphing into multipurpose platforms for connecting people socially, meetings of all kinds, and business and education. It is worth noting that Zoom founder Eric Yuan became a USD billionaire during the COVID-19 pandemic.

But why is neoliberalism so pervasive despite its failures? Noys (2013) argues that although neoliberalism has failed, we still have faith in its grammar. Therefore, even those antagonistic towards neoliberalism might be reinscribing neoliberalism because its grammar is not understood. Noys (2013, 40) draws on Foucault's notion of neoliberal governmentality and argues that its grammar is a "common phobia of the state that leaves us vulnerable to historical re-inscription under the terms of neoliberalism". Historically, the violence (in all forms) meted out by the apartheid state against most of South Africa's people would have resulted in state phobia. Moreover, state capture[9] in South Africa's recent past would likely (and understandably so) exacerbate state phobia. But there is a danger here, as Foucault (2008, 191–192) reminds us: "All those who share in the great state phobia should know that they are following the direction of the wind ...".

Foucault's caution remains apposite to present times. In South Africa, state phobia in the wake of state capture could leave South Africans vulnerable to the vicissitudes of neoliberalism, exacerbating inequality, ecological destruction, and the domestication of self. Guattari (2001) reminds us that the effects of integrated world capitalism (IWC) should be transversally understood – that devastation caused by IWC will be observed in three interlocking ecological registers: the social, self and environment (more-than-human world).

The revival of neoliberalism noted above has given rise to the neoliberal university. The neoliberal university functions within a knowledge-driven economy, where the university's role is not only concerned about relegating the frontiers of knowledge to the periphery but exploiting all types of knowledge in the interest of wealth creation (Peters 2002). As is the case elsewhere, in South Africa, public universities have become state-aided universities as subsidy income has declined over the years relative to the consolidated budgets of universities (Le Grange 2019). Public universities charge fees and engage in revenue-generating enterprises through the third- and fourth-income streams.[10] Although enrolments are relatively small, private higher education provision is expanding in South Africa.[11] In a knowledge-driven economy, we have witnessed the transformation of higher education research systems so that knowledge production is not simply regulated by academic peers but by an amalgam of private companies (such as Thomas Reuters and Elsevier Reeds), global publishing houses, governments, and universities (Le Grange 2014). Jacob and Hellström (2000) observed the following transformations in university research systems vis-à-vis the knowledge economy: the move from science systems to global science networks; knowledge capitalisation; integrating of academic labour into the industrial economy – the coming of the knowledge economy. Moreover, learning has become an economic transaction where students are consumers, and lecturers morph into on-demand workers in what Hall (2016) has referred to as the uberfication of the university. Le Grange (2020a) signals a cautionary note that the pivot to online learning in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic could hasten the uberfication of the university. In the neoliberal university, engagement with local communities becomes a performance indicator that gets measured. For example, Stellenbosch University, which first named engagement with communities as "social interaction" (implying reciprocity), changed the name to "social impact", which means a unidirectional process focused on the university's performance against measurable goals.

Neoliberal governmentality is also evident in the contemporary western(ised) university through performativity regimes, audit cultures, ethical regulation, and so forth. In the neoliberal university, the pursuit of truth no longer takes primacy but performativity, which Lyotard (1984, 46) described as the "best input/output equation". Ball (2003) argued that performativity is a technology that employs judgements and comparisons based on systems of rewards and sanctions. In such a culture, all activities undertaken are validated based on increased productivity measured in terms of efficiency (Barnett and Standish 2003). Metric adequacy has become the name of the game as those inhabiting the university are subjected to performance appraisal reviews. As entities, universities compete by participating in world ranking systems based on performance criteria. Regarding ethics, Sutherland-Smith and Saltmarsh (2011) point

out that present-day universities have become redesigned as engines of economic growth, resulting in the dilution of ethical principles and conduct because universities are now steered by increasing audit and surveillance regimes, the agendas of the corporate world, and competition amongst individuals. Consequently, the term "ethics creep" was coined by Haggerty (2004) to depict the biomedicalisation of the humanities and social sciences. In other words, the enlargement of ethical regulation from the biomedical sciences to the humanities and social sciences. Guta, Nixon and Wilson (2013) suggest that in the neoliberal university we are observing a move from professional ethics that are rooted in academic conventions to codifying ethics by means of ethical regulation by external review bodies.

The contemporary university regulated by neoliberal governmentality is named by paperson[12] (2017) the first world university. For hir, it collects fees and confers degrees. Moreover, it is a machine that accumulates and expands progressively using neoliberal mechanisms of seeking additional income streams through revenue-generating enterprises. Table 1 represents the first world (neoliberal university) in terms of what characterises it and what it engages with.

Table 1: The first world university (neoliberal university)

The first world (neoliberal) university (that accumulates)	
What characterises it?	**It engages**
• Charges fees and awards degrees • Celebrates diversity • Rewards excellence • Invests in advanced technologies (embraces 4IR) • Participates in the university rankings • Engages in for-profit initiatives and partnerships • Biomedicalises ethics	• with the high-tech economy • in partnership with for-profit private companies • in global science networks • with corporate and donor funders • with local communities but in colonising ways – community engagement becomes a performance indicator

Source: Adapted from paperson (2017), Le Grange (2020a)

Just as we have witnessed the failures of neoliberalism (most recently during the COVID-19 pandemic), the neoliberal university has cracks, which have been laid bare at moments of intense resistance, such as during the #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall campaigns. According to Disemelo (2015, n.p.), the issues which characterized these campaigns included: access to equal and quality education; deciphering the complexities of class relations in post-apartheid South Africa; effacing the hurtful exclusion and daily micro aggressions associated with institutional racism; exposing the failures of the heterosexual, patriarchal, neoliberal capitalist values which have become endemic to the country's universities.

Moreover, although the neoliberal university dominates the contemporary university, it is not a monolithic entity impervious to change. It has the potential to become another, to be a carrier of alternative constellations of the university. Therefore, I now turn to a discussion on a third possibility for the university.

A THIRD UNIVERSITY IS POSSIBLE

Before discussing a third possibility for the university, a discussion on the second world university is necessary. Co-existing with the first world university is paperson's (2017) second world university. The second world university draws on the diverse work of Critical Theory produced in the post-World War II era. It includes neo-Marxist work, critical feminist work, work informed by the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory, literary criticism that focuses on deconstruction, and so forth. paperson (2017) argues that there are two strands of critical theory visible in the arts, humanities and social sciences: social theory (which focuses on the hegemony of social systems and is usually neo-Marxist); and literary critical theory (which entails the deconstruction of texts to ascertain their hidden meaning). One or both strands are visible in work performed in several disciplines such as philosophy, sociology, history, geography, political science, language studies, education, etc. In education, for example, critical theory has given rise to a sub-field of education called "critical pedagogy", exemplified in the work of scholars such as Paulo Freire (1972), Henry Giroux (1988), bell hooks (1994) and Michael Apple (2019). Broadly, the second world university focuses on critique that has largely remained ensconced in the academe and has had little effect on society.[13] Moreover, Johnson (2013) argues that several decades of critical theory had failed to present a significant challenge to the dogmas of neoliberalism. Furthermore, that the naturalisation of capitalism has revealed the epistemic limits of critical theory. paperson (2017) offers an essential two-fold criticism of the second world university. First, the second world university critiques the material conditions of higher education, such as degrees, fees, expertise, regulations systems and the emancipatory possibilities about these. In doing so, it reinscribes the neoliberal university. Secondly, its pedagogic utopia, based on the idea of liberal expansion (education for all), rests on the ongoing accumulation of debt, fees and land – the second world university's hidden curriculum, therefore, is problematic. Table 2 summarises the second world university and what it engages with.

Table 2: The second world university (emancipatory university)

The second world (emancipatory) university (that critiques)	
What characterises it?	**It engages**
• Critiques dominant ideologies • Committed to transforming society • Its agenda is social justice (anti-racist, feminist, inclusive in relation to the LGBTQ+ community, disabled, etc. • Teaches critical theory and deconstruction in the humanities and elsewhere • Utopian	• with other radicals in the university • with the public through the media • in global science networks • with local communities to bring about change • with marginalised groups to empower them

Source: Adapted from paperson (2017) and Le Grange (2020a)

However, paperson (2017) points outs that the critique of the second world university informs a third world university's engagements and that we should work through critique so that we can get to the job. Through critique and the messy labour that follows, machinery that is useful could be found. This brings me to discuss the possibility of a third world university.

paperson (2017) argues that a third world university pits itself against the first and the second but functions strategically in furthering its aim by using the scrap material of the first and second world universities. Its aim is decolonisation but may incorporate the invigoration of a range of decolonial desires. It includes the decolonial desires of indigenous peoples: to discover and recover their identities, cultures and histories; mourn the loss of their knowledge (epistemicide), cultures (culturecide) and languages (linguicide); correct the deficit ways in which they have come to be defined and theorised by western(ised) scholars; invoke their histories, indigenous knowledge and worldviews to imagine alternative futures; seek self-determination; internationalise their shared experiences, struggles and hopes of all colonised people to build solidarities; protect the knowledge of colonised peoples; etc. (for more detail, see Smith 1999; Chilisa 2012). It may also include decolonial desires to repatriate indigenous peoples' land in settler colonial contexts. Tuck and Yang (2012) contend that decolonisation is not a metaphor, that it is not an empty signifier to be permeated by myriads of pathways to liberation. For them, central to decolonisation is the return of Indigenous land and the restoration of Indigenous peoples' relationship with the land. They aver that decolonisation is disparate from other social justice projects, including anti-racism.

Latin American scholars (Quijano 2007; Grosfoguel 2007; Maldonado-Torres 2007; Mignolo 2007) distinguish between colonisation and coloniality (legacy of colonisation) and, therefore, between decolonisation and decoloniality. Decoloniality may thus characterise work done in a third world university. Le Grange (2020b) points out that decoloniality is analytic of coloniality that involves developing a critical awareness of the logic of coloniality, resisting manifestations of coloniality, and taking actions to overcome coloniality. Moreover, given the pervasiveness of coloniality and the dominance of western knowledge in the western(ised) world, there may be a decolonial desire to learn to unlearn and relearn (see Omanga 2022 in conversation with Ndlovu-Gatsheni). Another decolonial desire could be to challenge and transcend what Grosfoguel (2016, 29) calls the "global epistemic hierarchy of the world system". He refers to the global racial/ethnic hierarchy and the global Judeo-Christian gender/sexual hierarchy of the world systems that privilege Western male knowledge and inferiorises the knowledge produced by women and non-Western knowledge workers. Decolonial desires might include what Grosfoguel (2016) calls "transmodernity", which

concerns the university opening itself up to epistemic diversity of the world, where scholars think from and with those that have been subalternised and inferiorised by the Eurocentric modernity. Of course, other decolonial desires could have been mentioned, but the point to note is that there is a diverse range of such desires.

A third world university is strategic because it invigorates decolonial desires using the scrap material of the first and second world universities. In other words, it scavenges for the scrap material of the first and second world universities and reassembles them for decolonial purposes. paperson (2017) importantly reminds us that, unlike the second world university, a third world university is not utopian – it is not interested in decolonising the (western) neoliberal university but more in operating as a decolonising university within the first and second world universities – the distinction is essential. Efforts to invigorate decolonial desires could include individuals, small groups of like-minded people, centres or departments. It is not a totalising project. In a third world university, the first world university curricula are taught, including in the fields of medicine, agriculture, law (as site of decolonial struggle), agriculture and economics (paperson 2017). paperson is hinting that first world university curricula need to be taught out of necessity in a third world university. However, learning first world university curriculum content[14] does not mean uncritically embracing it but instead learning to unlearn and relearn. In other words, the first world university curriculum becomes the starting place for invigorating decolonial desires through critique and repurposing the aims of such a curriculum. Hir also importantly notes that the analysis of the second world university is needed because it is only through critique that the colonial code can be cracked. This does not mean simply embracing and slavishly quoting what is produced in the second world university but reworking ideas and invigorating lines of connection among ideas/theories to garner decolonial purposes.

From the discussion, it should be evident that a third world university is not only possible but already exists and is becoming. It reminds me of Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) concept, "people-yet-o-come". When they invoked the concept, they were not referring to a future people, but a people-now-here that is becoming. Similarly, a third world university is not a future (utopian) university but a university that already exists that is becoming. Evidence of this is the proliferation of articles and books published on decolonisation/decoloniality, new journals on decolonisation have been established, and centres, hubs and institutes focusing on decolonisation have been established in South Africa and internationally in the past decade. I summarise paperson's (2017, 52–53) axioms on a third world university below:

- It already exists. It is assembling and assembles with the first and second world universities.

- Its undertaking is decolonisation.

- It is strategic – its possibilities are created in the first and third world universities.

- It is timely, whilst its usefulness constantly expires.

- It is vocational, similarly to the first world university.

- It is unromantic and not worthy of romance.

- It likely, though problematically, still collects fees and confers degrees

- It is anti-utopian in the sense that it is not interested in decolonising the university but in operating as one.

- It is a machine that proliferates machines.

- It constructs students into scyborgs.

The last axiom references scyborgs, so it is fitting to turn some attention to the concept of scyborg in my parting thoughts.

SOME PARTING THOUGHTS: BECOMING SCYBORG

paperson (2017) invokes the term scyborg to denote the agency of people effected/affected to repurpose the university for decolonial aims. It is a distinct concept from the cyborg used by femtech scholars, first by Donna Haraway (1991)[15] in her seminal work, Cyborg Manifesto. Cyborg refers to how the human body has become entangled with technology so that it is an assemblage of both human and technological components in such a manner that one can no longer think of the human as a discrete corporeal entity. However, the scyborg is not concerned with the body but how agency is extended by the circuitry of the systems meant to colonise (paperson 2017). Scyborg is, therefore, not ontological. In other words, it has no identity. paperson (2017, 62) argues that it is more like an adjective and "describes a technological condition of being embedded in an assemblage of machines".

A third world university depends on scyborgs, and if a third world university is to be expanded from current efforts, then more scyborgs are needed. A scyborg knows the neoliberal university well, understands the grammar of neoliberalism and is part of its machinery. It understands the contemporary world and all its crises and understands the integration of physical, digital and biological spheres in what has been called Internet 4.0 (The Fourth Industrial Revolution) and accumulates technological and pedagogical know-how in machinic assemblages related to 4IR. It also has a meaningful understanding of the language of critique that the second world university produces and can use it to crack colonial codes. However, scyborgs are not assimilated into the first and second world universities but use components of

the gigantic machinic assemblage that is the university. It unplugs components and plugs them in different places to invigorate decolonial desires.

I shall not sum up for the reader what I have said but point out that there is a third possibility (a third way) of thinking about the university in neoliberal times, a university that operates as a decolonial university, harnessing the scrap materials of the first and second world university and retooling them in a decolonial desiring-production, opening new ways of thinking/doing community engagement. To expand this possibility requires scyborgs, and so, along with paperson (2017), I invite the reader to become a scyborg and to invigorate those desires in intra-actions with humans and the more/other-than-human world.

NOTES

1. In South Africa, on 23 June 2022, the Minister of Health Dr Joe Phaahla announced the lifting of restrictions on gathering and the mandatory wearing of masks in indoor public spaces (https://www.wionews.com/world/south-africa-lifts-covid-19-rules-on-mask-wearing-gatherings-entry-491071).

2. According to the World Health Organisation, there has been a weekly decrease in cases and deaths since numbers reached its peak in January 2022. In the last week of May 2022, 9600 fatalities were reported (https://www.who.int/publications/m/item/weekly-epidemiological-update-on-covid-19---1-june-2022).

3. More than two decades ago Crutzen and Stoermer (2000) coined "The Anthropocene", positing a new geological epoch which depicts human's involvement in the Earth's systems. Initially these authors suggested that the new epoch started in the late 18th century after the invention of the steam engine. However, Morton (2014) points out that Crutzen and Stoemer has since reversed his initial dating of 1784 as the beginning of the Anthropocene and now proposes 1945 as the date that is indicative of the huge data spike in human involvement in Earth systems called "The Great Acceleration".

4. In his book *Capitalism in the Web of Life*, Jason Moore (2015) argued that the term Anthropocene needed to be replaced by Capitalocene. Moore (2015) averred that the rise of Capitalism in the period after 1450 resulted in a turning in human's relationship with non-human nature that was more significant than that of the ascendency of agriculture.

5. Day Zero was first used in 2018 when Cape Town experienced extreme drought. Day Zero would have been the day when the City would have run out of water. Thankfully it did not.

6. Scientists have documented the role of biodiversity loss in accelerating the transmission of infectious diseases (see Keesing et al. 2010).

7. In higher education we witnessed how the migration towards online teaching and learning during the COVID-19 pandemic, laid bear inequalities due to a digital divide and disparities in living conditions when students had to return home during lockdown periods (Du Preez and Le Grange 2020).

8. In this article I make reference to machines, machinery and machinic assemblage. Machine used here does not simply mean technical machines created by humans to perform work but relates to anything that connects organisms (humans and non-humans) into flows in "networks of desiring-production" (Bonta and Protevi 2006, 197). Desire, in desiring machines are not based on lack but desire is a productive force that connects with bodies (human and non-humans) to advance life through a process of experimenting with the real.

9. See Martin and Hussein (2016) for a description of this phenomenon.

10. In South Africa, first stream income is what is received from the state. Second stream income is

what is generated through student fees. Third stream income is that which is generated from industry, the corporate world and funding agencies including research foundations/agencies. Fourth stream income is funding elicited from donors including donor foundations.

11. Private higher education comprises about 15 per cent of total enrolments in the South African higher education sector but actual numbers are growing (Tankou epse Nakunah, Bezuidenhout, and Furtak (2019).

12. la paperson is the avatar name that K. Wayne Yang sometimes write under. Both name and surname is in lower case. To indicate paperson's non-binary orientation, I shall use "hir" and "s-he" when referring to paperson's work.

13. There are of course always exceptions and in the context of education Giroux (1988) has argued for moving beyond a language of critique to a language of possibility and Deever (1996) has argued for a language of probability.

14. By curriculum content I do not only mean subject matter knowledge but also skills and implicit/explicit values.

15. Original version was published in 1985.

REFERENCES

Apple, Michael. 2019. *Ideology and curriculum.* New York: Routledge.

Ball, Stephen. 2003. "The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity." *Journal of Education Policy* 18(2): 215–228.

Barnett, Ronald, and Paul Standish. 2003. "Higher education and the university." In *The Blackwell guide to the philosophy of education*, by N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith, and P. Standish. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

hooks, bell. 1994. Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York: Routledge.

Biesta, Gert. 2006. *Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future.* London: Paradigm Publishers.

Bonta, Mark and John Protevi. 2006. *Deleuze and geophilosophy: A guide and glossary.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2005. "Writing." In *The Deleuze dictionary*, by A. Parr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Braidotti, Rosi. 2013. *The posthuman.* Malden, MA: The Polity Press.

Chilisa, Bagele. 2012. *Indigenous research methodologies.* Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Cole, Chris. 2019. *A bloody month in the drone wars: 7 separate drone stiles kill dozen of civilians across four 4 war zones.* December 3. https://dronewars.net/2019/12/03/a-bloody-month-in-the-drone-wars-7-separate-drone-strikes-kill-dozens-of-civilians-across-4-war-zones/. (Accessed 9 July 2022).

Crutzen, Paul J. and Eugene F. Stoermer. 2000. "The Anthropocene." *Global Change Newsletter* 41(1): 17–18.

Deever, Brian. 1996. "If Not Now, When? Radical Theory and Systematic Curriculum Reform." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 28(2): 171–191. https://doi.org/10.1080/0022027980280204.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari. 1987. *Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* Translated by B. Massumi. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Disemelo, K. 2015. Student protests are about much more than just #FeesMustFall. *Mail&Guardian.* http://mg.co.za/author/katlego-disemelo. (Accessed 28 April 2016).

Du Preez, Petro. 2018. "On decolonisation and internationalsation of university curricula: What can we learn from Rosi Braidotti?" *Journal of Education* 74(1): 19–31. https://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i74a02.

Du Preez, Petro and Lesley Le Grange. 2020. "The COVID-19 pandemic, online teaching/learning, the digital divide and epistemological access." In *Re-thinking the Humanities curriculum within the time of COVID-19*, by L. Ramrathan, J. A. Smit, N. Hlongwe, and N. Mkhize. Pietermaritzburg: CSSALL Publishers.

Foucault, Michel. 2008. *The birth biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France.* Translated by G. Burchell. Basingstoke: PalgraveMacMillan.

Freire, Paulo. 1972. *The pedagogy of the oppressed.* London: Penguin.

Giroux, Henry A. 1988. *Schooling and the struggle for public life.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2007. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 211–223.

Grosfoguel, Ramón. 2016. "The dilemmas of ethnic studies in the United States: Between liberal multiculturalism, identity politics, disciplinary colonization, and decolonial epistemologies." In *Ecolonising the Westernised university: Interventions in Philosophy of Education within and without*, by Ramón Grosfoguel, Roberto Hernández, and Ernesto R. Velásquez. New York: Lexington Book.

Guattari, Felix. 2001. *The three ecologies.* Translated by Ian. Pindar and Paul. Sutton. London: Athlone Press.

Guta, Adrian, Stephanie A. Nixon, and Michael G. Wilson. 2013. "Resisting the seduction of 'ethics creep': Using Foucault to surface complicity and contradiction in research ethics review." *Social Science & Medicine* 98: 1–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. socscimed.2012.09.019.

Haggerty, Kevin D. 2004. "Ethics creep: Governing social science research in the name of ethics." *Qualitative Sociology* 27: 391–414. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:QUAS.0000 049239.15922.a3.

Hall, Gary. 2016. *The uberfication of the university.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Haraway, Donna. 1991. "A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century." In *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, 149–181. New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. 2015. "Anthropocene, capitalocene, plantationocene, chthulucene: Making kin." *Environmental Humanities* 6: 159–165.

Jacob, Merle and Tomas T. Hellström. 2000. *The future of knowledge production in the academy.* Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Johnson, Joshua. 2013. *Dark trajectories: Politics of the outside.* Hong Kong: [NAME] Publications.

Keesing, Felicia, Lisa K. Belden, Peter Daszak, and Andrew Dobson. 2010. "Impacts of biodiversity on the emergence and transmission of infectious diseases." *Nature* 468(2): 647–652. doi:10.1038/nature09575.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2006. "Quality assurance in South Africa: A reply to John Mammen." *South African Journal of Higher Education* 20(6): 903–909.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2014. "Currere's active force and the Africanisation of the university curriculum." *South African Journal of Higher Education* 28(4): 1283–1294.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2018. "The notion of Ubuntu and the (post)humanist condition." In *Indigenous philosophies of education around the world*, by J. Petrovic and R. Mitchell, 40–60. New York: Routledge.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2019. "The curriculum case for decolonization." In *The politics of curriculum: Making sense of decolonization in universities*, by J. D. Jansen, 17–35. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2020a. "Could the COVID-19 pandemic accelerate the uberfication of the university?" *South African Journal of Higher Education* 34(4): 1–10. https://dx.doi.org/10.20853/34-4-4071.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2020b. "The (post)human condition and decoloniality: Rethinking and doing curriculum." *Alternation* 31: 119–142. https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2020/sp31a7.

Le Grange, Lesley. 2022. "Global citizenship education and the (post)human condition." In *Ubuntu and Comparative Education and International Education for Peace*, by N. T. Assié-Lumumba, K. Bedi, M. Cross and Y. Ekanayake, 28–41. Leiden: Brill I Sense.

Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge.* Translated by G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2007. "On Coloniality of Being: Contributions to the development of a concept." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 240–270.

Martin, Michaela E. and Solomon Hussein. 2016. "Understanding the phenomenon of 'State Capture' in South Africa." *Southern African Journal of Peace and Security Studies* 5(1): 21–34.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2007. "Delinking: The rhetoric of modernity, the logic of coloniality and the grammar of coloniality." *Cultural Studies* 21(2–3): 449–514.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2011. *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options.* Durrham & London: Duke University Press.

Moore, Jason D. 2015. *Capitalism in the web of life: Ecology and the accumulation of capital.* London: Verso.

Morton, Timothy. 2014. "How I learned to stop worrying and love the term Anthropocene." *Cambridge Journal of Postcolonial Literacy Inquiry* 1(2): 257–264. https://doi.org/10.1017/pli.2014.15.

Noys, Benjamin. 2013. "The grammar of neoliberalism." In *Dark trajectories: Politics of the outside,* by J. Johnson. Hong Kong: [Name] Publications.

Olssen, Mark, John Codd, and Ann-Marie O'Neill. 2004. *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship & democracy.* London: Sage publications.

Omanga, Duncan. 2020. *Ecolonization, decoloniality, and the future of African Studies: A conversation with Dr. Sabelo Ndlovu-Gatsheni.* https://items.ssrc.org/from-our- programs/decolonization-decoloniality-and-the-future-of-african-studies-a-conversation-with-dr- sabelo-ndlovu-gatsheni/. (Accessed 10 June 2020).

paperson, la. 2017. *A third university is possible .* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Peters, Michael A. 2002. "The university in the knowledge economy." In *Scholars and entrepreneurs: The universities in crisis*, by S. Cooper, J. Hinkson, and G. Sharp. Melbourne: Arena Publications Association.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2007. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." *Cultural Studies* 21(2/3): 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1080/09502380601164353gg.

Richardson, Lauren. 2001. "Getting Personal: Writing-stories." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies* 14(1): 33–38.

Smith, Linda T. 1999. *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* London, UK: Zed Books.

Sutherland-Smith, Wendy and Sue Saltmarsh. 2011. "Guest editorial: In search of the ethical university." *Ethics and Education* 6(3): 213–215. https://doi.org/10.1080/1744964 2.2011.632713.

Tankou epse, Nakunah, N. Chimene, Adele Bezuidenhout, and Aleksandra Furtak. 2019. "The contribution of a private higher education institution to the South African higher education landscape." *South African Journal of Higher Education* 33(1): 283–300. http://dx.doi.org/10.20853/33-1-2689.

Tuck, Eve and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. "Decolonisation is not a metaphor." *Decolonisation: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1(1): 1–40.

Zembylas, Michalinos. 2018. "The Entanglement of Decolonial and Posthuman Perspectives: Tensions and Implications for Curriculum and Pedagogy in Higher Education." *Parallax* 24(3): 254–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/13534645.2018.1496577.