On decolonisation and internationalisation of university curricula: What can we learn from Rosi Braidotti?

Petro du Preez

School of Professional Studies in Education, North-West University, Potchefstroom, South Africa
petro.dupreez@nwu.ac.za
http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9100-6461

Abstract

In this article I explore the (non)constructive contestations between decolonisation and internationalisation and the extent to which this might inform the construction of undergraduate university curricula. To augment this exploration, I consider Rosi Braidotti's *The Posthuman* (2013) to ask what we can learn from Braidotti when it comes to the decolonisation and internationalisation of undergraduate university curricula. First, I discuss decolonisation and internationalisation and then argue that decolonisation and internationalisation are not opposites and that there are constructive contentions between the two once we think about the transformative potential of university curricula. In conclusion, I argue that in the light of debates about decolonisation and internationalisation, the ontology, epistemology and the ethics of undergraduate university curricula should be placed under the magnifying glass since such an endeavour has the potential to bring about deep transformation in higher education institutions.

Keywords: decolonisation, internationalisation, university curricula, Rosi Braidotti, posthumanism

Introduction

The #Fallism movements and protests that currently permeate the South African higher education landscape are a reflection of how students and academics are using their agency to think, reflect, and act on controversial matters and contradictory spaces encountered in higher education (du Preez, Simmonds, & Chetty, 2017). One common way in which the protesters have challenged the structure of higher education during the various #Fallism movements, as they have pointed out, is by asserting that nothing in higher education has changed since apartheid. The protesters questioned the Eurocentric nature of the curriculum and demanded free higher education for all. Despite interventions to decolonise curricula and thus provide greater epistemological access (CHE, 2016) and the response of government to the demands for free education in its announcement that there would be no fee increases for the 2016 academic year as Butler-Adam (2015) noted, it seems that there is a revolutionary regrouping in preparation for more sustained disruption by protesters (Seale, 2016). For the purpose of this article, I focus on the decolonisation debate since decolonisation would mean, quite

literally, the end of the colony in Africa. This debate is coupled with a global drive to strengthen the internationalisation of higher education to provide international access for students and academics to different institutions and to various ways of knowing (see Botha, 2009; Kehm & Teichler, 2007). As Altbach and Knight (2007) have made clear, this drive is, for the most part, propelled by the knowledge economy, increased mobility, and an integrated world economy and this is reflected in university policies.

My underlying assumption in this article is that decolonisation and internationalisation enable curriculum scholars to rethink curriculum studies and what it might mean for undergraduate university curricula; this assumption assists scholars to engage with the ever-changing nature of the discipline. Li (2009) has stated that such engagement, in paying heed to the movements and divergent forces that influence the discipline, moves scholars beyond simplistic dualities and as Carson (2009) has pointed out, allows for new ways of conceptualising the discipline—one that is forever in becoming. As le Grange (2016) put it, "A focus on the performative side of knowledge decentres (not destroys) dominant knowledge systems and produces third spaces (spaces in between) where seemingly disparate knowledges can be equitably compared and function to work together" (p. 10).

Scholars hold different views on what curriculum entails but for me curriculum is not limited to what is written on paper (the official or planned curriculum) but extends to what we teach and do not teach for whatever reason, how we teach, and why we teach in particular ways. For Jansen (2017) those in power select what to learn and how to teach and therefore curriculum is inherently a political act with symbolic value. I concur, too, with le Grange's (2016) description of curriculum that it is about the stories we tell students about the past, present, and future, about the lived experiences (and autobiographies) of students and teachers, about an understanding of curriculum as *currere*,[1] and an inquiry into what the curriculum does in its manifestation of being forever becoming. In addition, I see the curriculum as way of bringing policy imperatives (whether local or global) to life (Jansen, 2001) and as facilitating epistemic access that provides academic ways of knowing that sustain strategic imperatives on different levels (Morrow, 2007). It is also helpful to consider Pinar's (2007) theory of the horizontality and verticality of curriculum studies. For him, horizontality concerns researching curriculum studies from a global to a local level while verticality entails researching the past, present, and future of curriculum studies.

As mentioned above, here I look at what we can learn from Rosi Braidotti (2013) when it comes to the decolonisation and internationalisation of undergraduate university curricula. My aim is not to provide a simple answer to this complex question, but to open new ways of thinking about university curricula in relation to Braidotti's notion of posthuman subjectivity, posthuman ethics, and affirmative politics.

---

[1]   *Currere* for Pinar (2010a, p. 177) is not simplistically defined as "to run a course" but signifies "a complicated conversation among teachers and students focused on texts and the concepts they communicate in specific places at particular historical moments".

On decolonisation

Decolonisation, literally understood as signifying the end of the colony, has transformed in such a way that multiple meanings are attached to it (Jansen, 2017). Decolonisation is not a new phenomenon, but, arguably, as le Grange (2016) has made clear, did not receive adequate attention in South Africa until the student protests of 2015. It involves a process in which colonial ways of knowing and doing are deconstructed and then reconstructed to include the history, culture, language, and identity of colonised peoples. Decolonisation enables the colonised to explore alternative possibilities of conjuring up indigenous knowledge systems and becoming committed activists to give voice to the colonised and, in so doing, translate decolonial ideals into strategies for social transformation (le Grange, 2016). Decolonisation is thus a strategic response of higher education institutions to redress past inequalities and injustices, to challenge the dominance of Western knowledge, pedagogy, and research, as well as to question the colonial roots of university practices and curricula.

Drawing on the work of Odora-Hoppers and Richards (2011), le Grange (2016) differentiates between first- and second-generation colonialism in that the former refers to the physical colonisation and actual presence of the coloniser in the colonised community, and the latter to the colonisation of the mind through, for example, various disciplines, that happens without the actual presence of the coloniser. These generations of colonialism lead to the "denigration and decimation of indigenous knowledges" which gave rise to epistemic injustice. Another factor at play in colonisation for le Grange (2016) is neoliberalism and how it gives rise to a neocolonial reality that is "a more insidious form of colonialism because it is more difficult to detect [and that] also involves new-elites . . . trained by colonialists [who] take on the roles of colonialists in countries, post-independence" (p. 4). Nyerere (1967) was acutely apprehensive of recolonisation (neocolonisation through neoliberalism), in his argument that international gifts, loans, and investments cannot be refused, but might simultaneously endanger independence. Nkrumah (1974) described this endangerment as a pseudo-independence that opens the door for ex-colonial or newly developed superpowers to retain their power.

Jansen (2017) has identified six conceptions of decolonisation in relation to curriculum knowledge. These conceptions, for the most part, intersect with those of le Grange (2016) and other national and international scholars. One conception of the decolonisation of the university curriculum entails the process of decentring hegemonic Western knowledge and recentring African knowledge systems. Asante (1998) refers to this as Afrocentricity that "literally means placing African ideas at the centre of any analysis that involves African culture and behaviour" (p. 2). This appears to be the position for which le Grange (2016) argued as being most important vis-à-vis debates about the decolonisation of the university curriculum when he suggested that "it involves a process of change that does not necessarily involve destroying Western knowledge but in decentring it or perhaps deterritorialising it (making it something other than what it is)" (p. 6). Heleta (2016) agreed when he noted that decolonisation is not about removing both the foreign and local from the curriculum but is, rather, about decentring the hegemonic Western canon upon which human knowledge rests.

Jansen (2017) has reminded us that decolonisation of the curriculum is perceived of by some as the displacement of colonial knowledge with African knowledge. For le Grange (2016), too, this position is problematic insofar as it suggests that indigenous knowledges are not influenced by other knowledges. Jansen (2017) has made it clear that

> for the pan-Africanist, the call for Africanisation in the curriculum is a nationalist imperative that asserts African identity and rejects the imitation of Europe in the quest for African knowledge, culture, and aspiration in the substance of what we teach and learn. (p. 159)

He has argued that in some instances decolonisation is either perceived of as an additive or add-on module to existing curricula, or as an infused aspect of existing curricula, i.e. inclusive knowledge. An additive approach is problematic insofar as it artificially separates African knowledges from other knowledges. As an add-on module the infusion of different knowledges is not possible and might reinforce epistemic injustices that were central to colonial curricula. This position is often adopted by those who wish to maintain the hegemonic Western status quo (Heleta, 2016). When it is seen as inclusive knowledge, the decentring of dominant knowledge becomes possible and could enable students to see the relationships between different knowledge systems. This is what le Grange (2016) has described as relational accountability in that all parts of the curriculum should be connected. Garuba (2015) has argued that meaningful integration of different knowledge systems in curricula might bring about fundamental transformation.

Jansen (2017) has described a decolonised curriculum as a critical engagement of settled knowledge in which process new theories, perspectives, and methods are employed so as to see the same set of colonial problems differently. He stated that "this conception of decolonisation is less concerned with either repositioning or replacing the existing curriculum than with empowering students to engage that knowledge by asking critical questions" (p. 161). This empowerment could allow students to engage critically with the voices and knowledges of indigenous people to facilitate respectful representation in the curriculum (le Grange, 2016). Should this not be done, as Mbembe (2016) has reminded us, the Western way of knowing will remain hegemonic and the skills students need to move the African content forward will continue to be absent (Heleta, 2016). Jansen (2017) has argued that claims about decolonising the curriculum too often neglect the question of what knowledge is of most worth. In this regard, Heleta (2016) has claimed that universities have for the most part neglected to open themselves up to different knowledges in new and exploratory ways.

Decolonisation of the curriculum is about Africans seeing themselves in relationship with other selves (Ngugi, 1981). Such a curriculum encompasses complex encounters with entangled knowledges that are not separated superficially between *us* and *them* but are based on interwoven knowledges embedded in the entangled lives of all earth-dwellers (Jansen, 2017). Le Grange (2016) agreed with this approach when he stated that "a decolonised curriculum is evidenced by a shift in subjectivity from the arrogant 'I' . . . to the humble 'I', to the 'I' that is embedded, embodied, extended and enacted" (p. 9). In some circles the decolonisation of the curriculum is seen as a vehicle for the repatriation of occupied

knowledge and society. In this instance the power of the curriculum lies in its potential to disrupt settled knowledge that might, for example, lead to repatriating land to the colonised (Jansen, 2017).

Jansen (2017) has posed several critiques of how both students and scholars in South Africa have responded to these debates. He criticised some of those participating in this debate for their rhetorical engagement with the topic that distanced them from sincerely committing to transform the curriculum. He has expressed concern that there is a lack of focus in exactly what is meant by decolonisation of the curriculum; it appears to be everything. He has been troubled by those who argue that no efforts towards decolonisation have been launched since the end of apartheid. Indeed, universities have made some efforts (CHE, 2016), but, as Heleta (2016) has found, these have been directed mostly toward the development of new policies and not towards transforming institutional cultures and curricula.

On internationalisation

South African universities are faced not only with debates about decolonisation but also with debates about internationalisation. The steep increase of research into the internationalisation of higher education since the mid-1990s, as Kehm and Teichler (2007) have noted, is a direct result of the rising interest in international security, the maintenance of economic competitiveness, and the fostering of human understanding across nations (Qiang, 2003). Internationalisation of higher education refers to what might be called the border-crossing of universities to attain certain academic, economic, political, and cultural aims (Botha, 2009). As Qiang (2003) has said, it entails the process of integrating an international and intercultural dimension into the core activities of higher education—teaching-learning, research, and community engagement. The reasoning behind the internationalisation of higher education is, for the most part, guided by neoliberal ideals such as the knowledge economy, increased mobility, and an integrated world economy (Altbach & Knight, 2007). One could explain internationalisation as a strategic response of higher education institutions to address the reality of globalisation. In their overview of research on the internationalisation of higher education, Kehm and Teichler (2007) listed the main topics that researchers engage with in this field as "mobility, mutual influence of higher education systems, and internationalisation of the substance of teaching and learning [and] institutional strategies, knowledge transfer, cooperation and competition, and national and supranational policies" (p. 260).

Cooperation and competition are the corollaries of the performativity culture. This culture is not unique to South Africa but is part of a global phenomenon and stems from neoliberal discourses that have steadily infiltrated the higher education context. The rise of performativity discourses and elaborate mechanisms to monitor and appraise the work of academics, as well as the proliferation of university ranking protocols are clear signals that the work of the academic and the nature of the contemporary university are in a state of flux. University rankings in particular are evident in the manner in which universities brand themselves in their quest for international prestige. The internationalisation of higher

education in a neoliberal context is often used merely as a means to an end. Such instrumentalist ways of dealing with the internationalisation of higher education through, for example, its categorising of universities in relation to national and international rankings, undermines the transformatory potential of internationalisation (Teichler, 1996). In addition, fundamental assumptions underpinning the broader discourses (capitalism, neoliberalism, globalisation, knowledge economy, etc.) of the internationalisation of higher education are often made and, all too often, accepted uncritically.

The internationalisation of higher education directly influences how university curricula are shaped. It holds the promise of promoting global citizenship, fostering an increased understanding between and among cultures, and cultivating intellectual stewardship across borders to work collectively towards addressing shared societal issues. In this sense, the internationalisation of higher education and its manifestation in the curriculum have a potentially transformative agenda. For deep transformation to come about, however, more attention should be placed on the core business of higher education that includes knowledge exchange through research, teaching-learning and community engagement among other things.

There are several similarities between the internationalisation of higher education and the internationalisation of curriculum studies. The movement toward the internationalisation of curriculum studies is partly the result of globalisation and points directly to new developments in the discipline (Carson, 2009). Internationalisation of the curriculum does not refer only to comparative studies in curriculum but entails an inquiry into the value that cultural and cross-cultural perspectives could contribute to curriculum discourses (Lee, 2010). Pinar (2010b) has observed that the internationalisation of curriculum studies is not new, but that its institutionalisation and theorisation are a recent development. In its more recent form, internationalisation promises a critical, dialogic encounter among curriculum scholars who are not confined by national contexts but engage eagerly with international developments in the interest of advancing the discipline. For Pinar (2010b) the dilemma is about how to engage with international discourses while remaining aware of world history and injustices without re-enacting them. Schubert (2010) argued that

> internationalization promises deepened understanding of the local through encounter with the global and collective. Unlike globalization, internationalization promises to intensify the intellectual sophistication of . . . curriculum theory, especially that theory committed to multicultural, gendered, and political activism towards social justice. (p. 270)

Schubert also stated that "internationalization denotes the possibility of nationally distinctive fields in complicated conversation with each other" (as cited in Pinar 2010b, p. 3).

The (non)constructive contentions between decolonisation and internationalisation

There might well be tensions between decolonisation and internationalisation given that the former is perceived of as a local concern and the latter as a global one. Internationalisation is sometimes perceived as a threat to decolonisation since it might lead to recolonisation by cunning international forces. This is evident when it is argued that decolonisation is either a process of displacement or one of repatriation. In other instances, the tension between decolonisation and internationalisation lies in its underlying intentions. It might be argued that the purpose of decolonisation is to redress past inequalities and injustices and to challenge the hegemony of Western knowledge and pedagogy while internationalisation is concerned with participation in a global village (a village that might, at least potentially, overshadow national imperatives and localised knowledge). These lines of reasoning are inherently dualistic. In this regard, le Grange (2016) has argued that "decolonisation of the curriculum must involve liberating thought from the fetters of Cartesian duality" (p. 8).

Underpinning the different approaches taken to conceptualise decolonisation (i.e. decentring, displacement, additive/inclusive, critical engagement with knowledge, entangled knowledges, and repatriation) is the desire for the colonised to resuscitate their lost citizenship and construct a renewed understanding of their histories, cultures, languages, and identities. This is not a once-off event, but a process of forever becoming (le Grange, 2016). The question some might ask is how the colonised, who are in the process of reconstructing their histories, cultures, languages, and identities, could position themselves simultaneously as global citizens if they have not begun the process of repositioning themselves locally. Here the dilemma is that an engagement with the global without re-enacting the local might again lead to injustice done to the colonised (Pinar, 2010b).

The above two positions are to be seen as (non)constructive contentions since they have been steered by superficial dualisms and fear of engaging with and participating in the international realm. As Braidotti (2013) has made clear, the danger is that by channelling energy toward negativity, vulnerability, and fear we might fail to notice the unique opportunity to reinvent ourselves affirmatively, through creativity and empowering ethical relations.

There are constructive contentions between decolonisation and internationalisation and I argue here that an engagement between the local and global could benefit debates about the decolonisation and internationalisation of university curricula. The internationalisation of the university curriculum necessitates an increased understanding between and among cultures to address shared societal issues. This leads to a deepened understanding of the local through an engagement with the international. Decolonisation is not limited to the South African context but has been of social concern in countries like Australia, Canada, and New Zealand for example. Through an engagement with the international, the possibility exists that South Africans might gain a deeper understanding of their local concerns and struggles in the process of reconstructing their identities. Both decolonisation and internationalisation require

a critical, dialogical engagement with entangled knowledges (Jansen, 2017; le Grange, 2016) and, in this sense, could be mutually beneficial.

Although different in nature, both decolonisation and internationalisation have a transformative agenda. Decolonisation aims to transform the university curriculum to redress injustices and inequalities done to the colonised, whereas internationalisation aims to transform and promote peaceful global relations through cross-cultural engagements. I consider this transformative intent as constructive for both decolonisation and internationalisation.

Posthuman subjectivity, posthuman ethics, and affirmative politics

As I have made clear, the decentring of hegemonic Western knowledges, the development of an inclusive curriculum, and a critical engagement with entangled knowledges are pivotal in the pursuit of rethinking curriculum studies that informs how university curricula are constructed. I argue that principles such as posthuman subjectivity, posthuman ethics, and affirmative politics ought to be considered when we are thinking about the construction of university curricula. To guide this discussion, I have chosen to base my questions on Rosi Braidotti's *The Posthuman* (2013) because she concurs with the embedded, embodied, extended, and enacted nature of knowledge and believes in the potential of humanity to re-invent itself in relation to the world. For her, posthumanism is important because it leads to the production of socially relevant knowledge that is based on principles such as social justice, respect for human diversity, anti-racism, openness to others, and conviviality, all of which indicate the affirmation of the positivity of difference. In addition, she argues that should we aim to address epistemic injustices, we should think of the epistemic and the ethical as two sides of the same coin.

Braidotti (2013) has postulated that we need to rethink the status of humans and their inherent subjectivity to arrive at new forms of ethical relations, norms, and values that are worthy of the complexity of our times. I want to introduce Braidotti's work to frame the argument that her work could expand our thinking about the construction of undergraduate university curricula that pays heed to both decolonisation and internationalisation. She has argued that older conceptions of the university are currently destabilised as a result of the global economy and the decline of the nation-state. This, for her, necessitates that we think global and act local.

> I would rather start from the empirical imperative to think global, but act local, to develop an institutional frame that actualized a posthuman practice that is 'worthy of our times' . . . while resisting the violence, the injustice and the vulgarity of the times. (pp. 177–178)

Her vision is that of a university that is cognisant of localised knowledge and the global transmission of cognitive data. She has said that universities should represent, reflect, and

serve the globalised, technologically mediated, ethnically and linguistically diverse society based on the principles of social justice, respect for diversity, hospitality, and conviviality. Therefore, societal transformation and university transformation should happen concurrently and, in the light of this, academics need to be embedded in the urban and global environments. She has argued that a university worthy of its times should face up to permanent, on-going transformation. For her, universities are currently experiencing an identity crisis as a result of the displacement of Eurocentric curricula. To attend to this crisis the curriculum should become more representative. Curriculum developers should take note of epistemology and ethics and realise that new constructive pedagogy and critical thinking is required. Such a curriculum should take posthuman subjectivity, posthuman ethics, and affirmative politics into account.

Subjectivity is the process of self-styling and "involves complex and continuous negotiations with dominant norms and values and hence multiple forms of accountability" (Braidotti, 2013, p. 35). It aims to seek alternative ways to understand the human subject. Addressing the vision of what Braidotti thinks of as multi-versity calls for posthuman subjects who cherish and promote the radical ethics of transformation. The posthuman subject is nomadic and transversal, and acknowledges her or his multifaceted, embodied, and embedded nature. This subject is immersed in and immanent in a local and global network[2] that requires critical dialogic engagement on all its levels. She describes such engagement as intersubjective relationality. Subjectivity, therefore, needs to be understood as all-encompassing and requires a new understandable language and/or vocabulary to describe the embodied and embedded subject.

A new posthuman ethics cannot be characterised by individualism that privileges the self and disdains multiple others. What is needed is a break up of "the fantasy of unity, totality and one-ness, but also the master narratives of primordial loss, incommensurable lack and irreparable separation" (Braidotti, 2013, p. 100).

> It [a new posthuman ethics] expresses the affirmative, ethical dimension of becoming-posthuman as a gesture of collective self-styling. It actualizes a community that is not bound negatively by shared vulnerability, the guilt of unpayable ontological debts, but rather by the compassionate acknowledgment of their interdependence with multiple others. (pp. 100–101)

For Braidotti (2013), a posthuman subject's intersubjective relationality signifies an ethics based on interconnectivity between the self and others that is based on a collaborative morality. Posthuman ethics is characterised by its drive to transcend negativity and it aims to combine ethical values and the well-being of the larger community. Affirmative and innovative creativity is required to develop a radical epistemology that goes hand in hand with her understanding of ethics.

---

[2]   Braidotti (2013) does not see the local and global as two separate entities, i.e. in a dualistic manner, or as a power-related issue. For her, these power-relations are temporary and should be challenged through social action and interaction.

Hope, inspired by creativity, is one way in which visionary prophetic minds can dream and imagine alternative futures and invent new figurations of complex situations based on affectivity, memory, and imagination. Hope is both grounded in responsibility and inter-generational accountability. The affirmation of hope enables sustainable transformation. It is about an ethics of joy and affirmation that functions as a way of transforming negativity into positivity. This necessitates affirmative politics so that subjects become part of the world (national, regional and international), make a difference, and make sense of complex situations (Braidotti, 2013).

Undergraduate university curricula

Brann (cited in Dillon, 2009) states that in the process of curriculum development, we need to consider

> who should learn what so as to become what and do what, and how and by whom and with whom is it to be taught? – which question comprehends the learner, the object of learning, the transformation worked, the practical purpose, the plan of study, the teacher, and the community of learning. (p. 348)

With this in mind, I provide several suggestions to be considered when we are developing an undergraduate curriculum that is inclusive of decolonisation and internationalisation. These suggestions are by no means exhaustive but could be useful as we begin to think about university curricula that ought to be forever in becoming. As a starting point, it is important that we construct a curriculum that pays heed to the porous nature of ontology, epistemology, and ethics since these three elements are in constant intra-action with one another.

Those who develop undergraduate university curricula should be clear, at least theoretically, about how they define curricula. This is challenging since many academics are disciplinary experts who do not necessarily possess the knowledge and skills related to curriculum development. A distinction between a technical approach to curriculum development and a praxis approach is significant here. The former is procedural and might lead to an artificial add-on subject to attend to decolonisation and internationalisation. The latter approach is, among other things, committed to be inclusive. This approach acknowledges the entangled and embedded nature of different knowledge systems and aims to connect these as well as possible. Academics ought to tailor curricula to enable this embeddedness to emerge by bringing the local in meaningful intra-action with the global. This approach is relational and based on the ethics of epistemic justice and access, strong community bonds, and a critical disposition.

A curriculum as lived (and not just a document on paper) requires clarity concerning the nature of students and lecturers and their connectivity with one another and the broader community. Students and lecturers have the responsibility to participate in the complicated conversations about what they learn, why they learn, and what value this learning will have for the world of work and beyond. In this sense, being, knowing, and ethics cannot be separated. Complicated conversations necessitate an open-minded, creative, critical, and

dialogical disposition, on the part of both the student and the lecturer. Engaging in conversations facilitates the process of students and lecturers learning from one another's autobiographies and lived experiences, as well as from the past, present, and future. It is a collective self-styling activity that could empower both parties insofar as they negotiate and challenge dominant knowledges and values, seek alternative ways to understand themselves and others (all earth-dwellers), and position themselves locally and globally (think global, act local). As subjects who are part of this world, students and lecturers should aim toward making a difference locally, regionally, and globally and should be held accountable for doing so.

Curriculum development is not only about selecting knowledge but should take account of the learning milieu. For example, the 21st century and the Fourth Industrial Revolution pose new challenges to all earth-dwellers and require that we are in tune with the local context while paying heed to global developments since we are indeed world citizens, too. At the same time, we need to reconsider the ethical spaces of learning since these spaces might enable or discourage creativity and critical dialogue and might lead or not lead us into third spaces in which knowledges can be reconfigured continually. The milieu is important since it represents the ethical spaces in which we are embedded and that we eventually embody. These spaces, however diverse they might be, should be hospitable and just so as to ensure the well-being of all educational stakeholders.

By way of concluding

How we perceive decolonisation and internationalisation calls for deep transformation in terms of the why, what, and how of university curricula. Here I agree with Jansen (2017) who stated that "curriculum transformation strikes at the very identity of a higher education institution by asking troubling questions about how a university sees itself in relation to the nation and the world" (p. 154). How a university positions itself in the current era requires a new language based on a vocabulary that unites who we are, what we learn, and what we value collectively. Žižek (2012) has suggested that "it is the people who have the answers, they just do not know the questions to which they have (or, rather are) the answer" (p. 89), because they do not yet possess the language to express themselves in an alternative way. A new language based on the core principles of posthumanism could assist us in expressing ourselves in relation to the nation and the world through a critical, dialogic questioning of hegemonic and troubling values and knowledges. This language and process of positionality are not once-off events, but on-going and forever in becoming.

References

Altbach, P., & Knight, J. (2007). The internationalization of higher education: Motivations and realities. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3–4), 290–305.

Asante, M. K. (1998). *The Afrocentric Idea*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Botha, N. (2009). Some current curriculum issues in South African higher education. In E. Bitzer (Ed.), *Higher education in South Africa: A scholarly look behind the scenes* (pp. 155–182). Stellenbosch, RSA: SUN MeDIA.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Butler-Adam, J. (2015). Is the decline and fall of South African universities looming? *South African Journal of Science, 111*(11–12), 1–2.

Carson, T. (2009). Internationalizing curriculum: Globalization and the worldliness of curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry, 39*(1), 145–158.

Council of Higher Education (CHE). (2016). *South African higher education reviewed. Two decades of democracy*. Pretoria, RSA: Council of Higher Education.

Dillon, J. T. (2009). The questions of curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(3), 343–359.

du Preez, P., Simmonds, S. R., & Chetty, D. J. (2017). Critical transformation in higher education: Ethical reflections on #mustfall movements and concomitant gender-based violence. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 31*(6), 96–112.

Garuba, H. (2015, April 17). What is an African curriculum? *Mail & Guardian*. Retrieved from http://mg.co.za/article/2015-04-17-what-is-an-africancurriculum/

Heleta, S. (2016). Decolonisation of higher education: Dismantling epistemic violence and Eurocentrism in South Africa. *Transformation in Higher Education, 1*(1), 1–8.

Jansen, J. (2001). Rethinking education policy making in South Africa: Symbols of change, signals of conflict. In A. Kraak & M. Young (Eds.), *Education in retrospect: Policy and implementation since 1990* (pp. 41–59). Pretoria, RSA: Human Sciences Research Council, in association with the Institute of Education, University of London.

Jansen, J. (2017). As by fire: The end of the South African university. Cape Town, RSA: Tafelberg.

Kehm, B., & Teichler, U. (2007). Research on internationalisation in Higher Education. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 11*(3/4), 260–273.

le Grange, L. (2016). Decolonising the university curriculum. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 30*(2), 1–12.

Lee, J. (2010). International research. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 497–500). London, UK: Sage.

Li, X. (2009). A Daoist perspective on internationalizing the curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry, 39*(1), 179–192.

Mbembe, A. (2016). Decolonising the university: New directions. *Arts & Humanities in Higher Education*, *15*(1), 29–45.

Morrow, W. (2007). *Learning to teach in South Africa*. Cape Town, RSA: HSRC Press.

Nkrumah, K. (1974). *Consciencism: Philosophy and Ideology for Decolonisation*. London, UK: Heinemann.

Ngugi, W. T. O. (1981). *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Nairobi, Kenya: East African Educational Publishers Ltd.

Pinar, W. F. (2010b). Introduction. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *Curriculum studies in South Africa: Intellectual histories and present circumstances* (pp. 1–18). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Qiang, Z. (2003). Internationalization of higher education: Towards a conceptual framework. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*(2), 248–270.

Schubert, W. H. (2010). Categories of Curriculum Thought. In C. Kridel (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of curriculum studies* (pp. 270–272). London, UK: Sage.

Seale, W. (2016). Disruption as a continuous link between student protests. Retrieved from http://thinking-africa.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/TA2016-letter21.pdf.

Teichler, U. (1996). Research on academic mobility and international cooperation in higher education: An agenda for the future. In P. Blumenthal, C. Goodwin, A. Smith, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *Academic mobility in a changing world* (pp. 338–358). London, UK: Jessica Kingsley.

Žižek, S. (2012). *The year of dreaming dangerously*. London, UK: Verso.