BORDER CROSSINGS: INTRODUCTION

A.-CHR. ENGELS-SCHWARZPAUL
tina.engels@aut.ac.nz
School of Art and Design,
Auckland University of Technology

Students at Western universities were *traditionally* "disproportionately male, from high-status social-economic backgrounds, members of majority ethnic and/or racial groups, and without disability" (Taylor & Beasley, 2005, p. 141). In that sense, more and more *non-traditional* students enter academia today and, with them, *Other Thoughts* (Beck & Grande, 2010). Paradoxically, the cultures from which these non-traditional researchers hail are still called *traditional* societies in Western speech (by contrast with modern, dynamic, individualised and scientifically oriented societies), and it has long been alleged that the development of their knowledge is arrested or inadequate. While many Western institutions now assert their interest in diversity, Other Thoughts still remain underrepresented in the prevailing frameworks governing the production and distribution of knowledge (Olssen, 2003). Yet, Other Thoughts are attractive to research institutions when they can serve or even propel the perpetual quest for the new and original. As different kinds of intelligence appear in the preserves of academic knowledge production, candidates pursuing Other Thoughts are always in danger of being seen as exploitable resources, assimilated and institutionalised.

Countering the inward movement of Other Thoughts into the academy, *Renegade Knowledges* are produced by those who, dissatisfied by established academic contents, practices and procedures, turn away from the centre towards an outside that is, like Michel Foucault's *heterotopia*, still linked to the institution.[1] Amongst the renegades, gate crashers, *arrivés*, fence sitters and -crossers implicated in the border work are Indigenous, postcolonial, environmental, feminist and sexual minority scholars, educated within established canons. They stick their necks out, go out on a limb. Risk takers nourish dissenting views bound to meet with criticism, which frequently gets them into unpopular and sometimes vulnerable positions. These renegades cause productive friction: when negation interrupts traditional hierarchies of

values, conformism and consensus, it challenges the "self-aggrandising mythology used to buttress the timeless truths of the West," opening the latter "for an alternative set of futures" (Peters, 2016, p. 26). Renegade knowledges provide a "rough ground" (Wittgenstein), a friction for thought to gain traction. For Thierry de Baillon, renegade knowledge "goes against any conventions, rules, consensus or dominant thinking," epistemologically as much as socio-culturally, and is therefore widely dismissed. Often tacit, it not only measures the gap between *doxa* and action but is itself actionable (pers. comm. 5 June 2015).[2] Can renegade knowledges, then, "make facile gestures difficult" (Foucault & Kritzman, 1990, p. 154)?

Academic Border Traffic

Non-traditional candidates currently find new opportunities to confront the mainstream with un-subjugated knowledges and counter-memories. They can change the academic landscape through critical engagements with established bodies of knowledge, literatures and methods. Pacific researchers, for example, lean towards innovative strategies and transformation of genres precisely because they do not necessarily identify and align themselves with Western disciplinary areas and methods (Wood, 2003, p. 388). Their challenge is to resist co-optation and subjugation; to refrain from partaking in exclusionary practices by becoming part of, and partaking in, what Jacques Rancière calls the *count*, where only some are counted in and "the unaccounted-for … have no part" (2001, thesis 6).

This count is not fixed: previously unaccounted-for postgraduate candidates now negotiate academic boundaries, neither completely from inside the institution, nor completely from outside. Bringing with them Other Thoughts to inform their research, they turn the periodic paradigm shifts in knowledge production into a permanent condition. At the same time, Renegade Knowledges challenge the system from within. These inverse directions of border traffic (centripetally seeking closeness to a real or imagined centre and centrifugally straining away from the institutional core) can be complementary and mutually beneficial. Jointly, they undoubtedly bring new knowledges to the institution and contest and unsettle existing knowledge.

No less than major, clearly visible events, the small acts of resistance and compliance, rebellion and co-optation continually occurring in the border traffic of Other Thoughts and Renegade Knowledges in both directions contribute to generative oscillations. Preventing any form of knowledge from becoming too settled and obedient, "paradigmatic controversies are often taking place at the edges … the places that show the most promise for projecting" the trajectory of present and future research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 121).

Politics, Assimilation and Containment

The "distribution of the sensible," which determines what is intelligible, visible and audible (Rancière, 2004b, p. 1) and apportions ways of doing, being, and saying (1999, p. 29), is challenged by those who have no part when they confront the prevailing order.[3] In Eurocentric regimes based on self-universalising philosophies, for instance, other ways of seeing and naming the world remain largely invisible. Those without part are denied "the capacity to think critically or creatively by … enabling, authorising, and empowering themselves to think for the world" (Dabashi, 2011). Usually, their intelligibility and visibility are diminished until they present as a "problem" – but such conditions can be challenged through politics or dissensus. By showing the "presence of two worlds in one" (Rancière, 2010, p. 37) and the "equality between any and every speaking being" (1999, p. 30), dissensus makes place for heterogeneous processes.

At their moment of success, then, newcomers can visibly change the educational system: its orientations and goals, policies, curricula, roles and responsibilities, supplies, technologies and physical spaces. Once their heterogeneous agendas enter the system, though, the very forces that previously discounted their value will likely seek to assimilate their energies to their own purposes. Thus, many UK, Australian and New Zealand universities now seek to expand their "product range" in competitive, profit driven markets by offering creative practice-led research degrees in art and design. These were initially regarded with suspicion and made to conform to conventional science criteria, but this is changing. Now is, therefore, an exciting time for practice-led postgraduate research in this field and candidates can, to an extent, co-determine the criteria by which their work will be judged. Yet, formalisation and standardisation seem already under way as academic management is seeking control of processes and standards. To add another, specifically New Zealand example: for some years now, research degree completions by Māori and Pacific students have attracted twice the standard Government funding in order to boost their participation. This has created a new interest in their research, which can be seen as a positive development and an opening to cultural difference. However, the extra funding is paid to the institution, not the candidates, and does not necessarily improve research conditions for the latter. Nor do these candidates automatically enjoy the same quality standards and rigour in supervision: rather than securing Māori and Pacific researchers as supervisors (or at least experts in Māori and Pacific research approaches), institutions stand by as faculty who previously considered Māori and other Indigenous epistemologies trite and irrelevant try to secure supervisions, sometimes actively recruiting Māori and Pacific candidates in the expectation of career benefits. At the same time, better qualified Māori and Pacific scholars cannot find employment.[4]

In such constellations, assimilation imposes "a unidimensional, one-way process by which outsiders [relinquish] their own culture in favour of that of the dominant society" (Abercrombie, Hill, & Turner, 2006, p. 20); critical forces are dissipated, reinforcing an expectation that newcomers fully integrate into the mainstream. As new kinds of intelligence threaten to disrupt the prevailing institutional order, they are inevitably also met with co-optation by that very order (Chambers, 2010b, p. 68). Then, the modus operandi returns to statist practices that degrade, convert, and possibly eliminate the unsettling and creative potential of dissensus (2012, p. 73). The institution's capacity for self-understanding, which grows through the understanding of others (Ricoeur, 1974, p. 17), diminishes.

Institutions that are genuinely interested in inclusion and openness are likely to want to understand the disagreement and disruptions caused by those who have no part. They may then discover unexpected spaces of possibility, in which perceptual dispositions of what can be seen and heard are recon-figured. Thus, the tension between Pacific researchers' "receptivity to the new and loyalty to the known" (Hansen, 2010, p. 5) creates an "ever-shifting, ever-vibrant space" for "attachments to land and ancestors and … identities formed in experiences of travel, relocation, and dislocation" (Wood, 2003, p. 388). Stressing the need for critical dissent, innovation and creativity, Wood anticipates a decline in "innovation, transmixing, and subversions of conventional academic research reporting" where Pacific Island researchers become more "comfortable" with Continental disciplines (pp. 358–359).

There is another, less overt set of questions concerning identity and difference in knowledge construction that need to be addressed. In mainstream Western research, the knowing subject is imagined as individual and more or less autonomous. Non-Western candidates, by contrast, may start from a significantly different self-understanding (Anae & Mila-Schaaf, 2010, p. 10f), in which an ostensible "I" always involves a "we." How does this impact on the way they frame their research and understand knowledge? How does the relationship between individual and collective notions of self inform their choice of research paradigms and practices?[5] Collective researcher identities, parameters and procedures may currently not be easily accommodated (Bishop, 2011; Bishop, Berryman, & Wearmouth, 2008) because they include concerns that are foreign to the rhetorical figure of *community* in neo-liberal frameworks (see Edwards and Baszile, pp. 85–99, and Singh, Manathunga, Bunda and Qi, pp. 56–70, in this issue).[6] Further, collaboration is likely to take on a different character when research processes are perceived as collective pursuits, beyond individual or plural selves. If there are to be joint ventures between Western and non-Western scholars, as Ross Jenner narrates in this issue (pp. 25–42), such partnership could begin to build meeting grounds for knowledge production across cultures. Connections between postgraduate

researchers and their communities can then lead to mutually beneficial, creative collaborations. Before jumping off to post-human paradigms, there is still a lot to explore about differently lived human experience and understanding: comprehending a plural sense of self and a less segregated Indigenous conception of the world can ease the necessary transition into more inclusive and collective ways of thinking (which are, it may turn out, though not acknowledged, indebted to Indigenous thought already, see Todd, 2014). What "every experience of another culture offers us is an occasion to experiment with our own" (De Castro, 2014, p. 18), and from such acknowledgement and mutual interest, new academic traditions could be forged between those already established within the University and those currently excluded.

The *Back of Beyond* and the Function of Critical Distance

"Creative scholars," claims Welby Ings, "are, by nature, disobedient. To break ground, you have to disobey what exists to be able to step into what does not exist" (2014, at 14:34mins). The defiance of existing rules and habits relates to what Ings calls the *back of beyond* – something that lies beyond reach, and which people do not tend to discuss. The relationships between the remote back of beyond and society's normal sites are, like the relationships between Foucault's *heterotopia* and the social sites they simultaneously reflect and invert, marked by suspicion.

The back of beyond is the territory of centrifugal forces where doubt, unknowing and remoteness combine to create a distance, a space in which productive, unsanctioned thought can operate. Centripetal forces, allied to established research standards and practices, pull inwards, straining to establish certainty, to consolidate knowledge into a coherent body, and to stabilise and secure established boundaries. Centrifugal forces pull away from the stable core, destabilise secure boundaries, explore and expand possibilities beyond, and create deviations from the known and normal. Carl Mika's accounts of Indigenous Māori epistemologies, for example, regularly involve the exploration of unsettling and energetic aspects of appropriated Māori terms and concepts, like *ira* (life principle, gene, interjectory "look!," dot, mortality, see Mika, 2015) or *whakapapa* (genealogy, to layer, become (move towards) earth, see Mika, 2015). In this issue (pp. 43–55), Mika explores "Papatūānuku" as an active force evading strict definition, which impacts Māori supervisory teams.

Creative practice, if not research quite generally, depends on a delicate balance between opposing forces: the Dionysian ecstasy of centrifugal forces can explode into "pure and unmediated possibilities," while the Apollonian rigour of centripetal forces would, without counter-balance, implode and lead to the stasis of "hackneyed research" (see Rosenberg, 2000).[7] Not surprisingly,

several contributors to this issue address this tension between rigour and intensity (see Boberg & Devine, pp. 100–113, and Milech & McGann, pp. 114–127). The centripetal move towards the core of the Western educational system, even if critical and troubled, needs the balance of a centrifugal, space-enlarging movement toward the fringes or outside the system, if facile gestures and numbing assimilation are to be prevented.

For when the distance between candidates and supervisors collapses, critical potential is likely to be annihilated. Supervision relationships without adequate space for critique can be suffocating and traumatic for candidates. Then, the intensely personal nature of postgraduate supervision is likely to intensify power differentials and place the supervisor into an overwhelming expert role. As Michael Singh points out in reference to Jacques Rancière, a degree of separation is necessary for a candidate to flourish. In *Althusser's Lesson* (2011), Rancière cleared a terrain on which to think independently by submitting his former teacher Louis Althusser's theories and attitudes to a sustained critique (see Chambers, 2010a, p. 195; Ross, 1991, p. 65). Whether confrontational, as in Rancière's case, or by some other way – distancing or disidentification seems necessary for candidates to assert space for their own thinking so that something new can emerge.

To Hannah Arendt, imagination is capable of "putting things into their proper distance," removing those that are too close to see and understand, but also "strong enough to bridge the abysses of remoteness until we can see and understand those that are too far away as though they were our own affairs" (Arendt, n.d.). The back-and-forth movement of resistance and compliance has at least a morphological similarity with the twofold operation of the imagination: removing and bridging both belong to what Arendt, in reference to Kant, called the "visiting" imagination. In the power struggles over boundaries, and the co-mingling or clashing of groups within an institution, "territories, spaces, and contact zones" expand and shrink (Giroux, 2005, p. 2), laying bare contexts and working modes, interests and assumptions, and analogous degrees of complexity and "self-referencing strategies" (Strathern, 1990, p. 9). Even when they talk past each other, the (linked but different) practices and perspectives of feminists, Marxists, Indigenous scholars, practice-led researchers, deep ecologists, candidates and supervisors of colour, radical anthropologists, sexual minorities researchers or artist activists may provide critical distance for each other, enhancing understanding not only of their internal relationships but also those they have with the mainstream. From there, the question of what issues *others* take to be in dispute becomes apparent (Latour, 2004, p. 452).

If the world can be known in multiple ways, and if our need to interpret the world, our will to know, is always "a kind of lust to rule," a supervisor's mastery is brought into question: each will has its own perspective "that it

would like to compel all the other drives to accept as a norm" (Nietzsche, 1968, p. 267). Supervisors who manage to restrain such will help preserve differences and support collaborative explorations that transgress competitive self-interest. This is crucial, given that the conversion of the University from a democratic public sphere to a contributor to the economy leads to a view of students as sources of revenue, all too often creating a "crippling fear, insecurity, and resentment that makes it difficult … to take risks" (see Giroux, 2011, p. 117).

Exchanges and dialogues that affirm spaces in which "the political is actually taken up and lived out through a variety of intimate relations and social formations" (Giroux, 2011, p. 139) create, by contrast, a public space of "common matters, shared solidarities, and public engagements" – a culture. (p. 139). Henry Giroux points out that working with culture requires the development of a language of resistance and possibility, which can counter forces that "seek to turn … hope into a new slogan or punish and dismiss those who dare look beyond the horizon of the given" (p. 121).

Re-configuring Borders

Without the challenges of non-traditional and renegade candidates and supervisors concerning the value and validity of established institutional goals and norms, inclusion tends to take place "from the inside out:" the terms will be set by those who already have a part, while "those who wish to be included [have] to meet those terms" (Bingham, Biesta, & Rancière, 2010, p. 81). But border crossers can lever out these terms when they act "as if intellectual equality were indeed real and effectual" (Rancière, 2004a, p. 219; see also 2010, pp. 1, 15). In a climate of obligatory institutional harmonisation, they provide a transgressive will and dissonance to throw different epistemologies into focus and reveal the contingent nature of any academic constellation. Ultimately, their border work will exponentially expand the field and production of knowledge (see Foucault, 2003, p. 78).

Whether institutions can respond adequately to these processes depends crucially on their self-understanding: as establishments, they tend to be aloof and beyond the influence of students. There is a strong impulse to close spaces of resistance, to prevent rupture, to produce continuity and consensus, and to consolidate and arrest movements that threaten to run out of control. If this impulse produces inflexible and unbending attitudes and policies, renegades or holdouts have little choice but to seek out their own spaces. Too often not welcome in the "hostile halls of the academy" (Todd, 2014), many of those researchers leave. Thus, in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Māori students and postgraduate researchers have voted with their feet by enrolling in Wānanga (tertiary institutions which provide education in a Māori context).

Mainstream universities are all the poorer for it. Within my own institution, three PhD candidates independently told me that they left our School of Art and Design to enrol at Te Ara Poutama (Auckland University of Technology's Faculty of Māori Development) because they wanted to work in an environment where their Māori and Pacific research orientations would be wholeheartedly and competently supported, even if Te Ara Poutama cannot offer expert supervision in art and design. Our School, too, is all the poorer for it – particularly since all candidates, understandably, left without instigating an open debate of the problem that could have prompted our School to confront its self-understanding. Jean-Paul Sartre foresaw such disengagements already in 1961, telling a French and European audience in his prologue to Frantz Fanon's *The wretched of the earth* to listen and pay attention, "Fanon is no longer talking to us" (Sartre quoted in Mignolo, 2013).

On the other hand, institutions can also draw on "processes, creative phenomena, meaning-making activities or supports" that are not only more amenable to change and collaboration but are already part of their constitution (Pesce, 2011). These would help universities to transform current versions of educational apartheid through a greater engagement in genuine politics, acknowledging a dissensus about the unequal logics of equality and domination, the prevailing distribution of the sensible, and about "who has a part or who counts" (Chambers, 2010a, p. 199, 200). As a set of practices, both *Other Thoughts* and *Renegade Knowledges* can contribute to this process. Taking place inside *and* outside, they are both linked to *and* contradict the epistemologies and methodologies prevailing in Western institutions. The tensions and struggles they engage not only reconfigure the academy's borders, they also have the potential to spread into the entire institution (Mezzadra & Neilson, 2013, p. 13) and redefine the territory of postgraduate research.

How, then, can universities engage with the pushes and pulls of these often contradictory challenges – and be inspired by them? How can we develop mutually beneficial forms of engagement in postgraduate supervision or advising, which adequately consider non-traditional candidates' interests and contributions? How can researchers from marginalised groups, or academics engaged in new modes of knowledge production, resist co-option and subjugation? How can emerging kinds of intelligence avoid being institutionalised by the academy? How can postgraduate candidates and supervisors develop adequately complex ways of thinking that allow for exchanges of perspectives (Latour, 2004; Viveiros de Castro, 2004)?

These were the questions posed in the Call for Papers for this issue of *Knowledge Cultures*, and to which the contributors responded. In "Building meeting grounds," Ross Jenner recounts and reflects on his experiences in cross-cultural supervision with Pacific and Māori postgraduates in Aotearoa/New Zealand. What stands out is the imperative of cultivating intersections

and meetings, embracing the fact that neither party can know in advance. To render what cannot be thought outside of one's culture, or to render something new, visible and open to conceptualization, both students and supervisors have to learn to deal with unknown epistemic potentialities. Relating practice and theory, and native and new cultures in different ways can lead to fruitful encounters and reversals, in a friction or traction between cultures, languages and modes of thinking. Carl Mika considers oppositional grounds of Māori doctoral experience in "Papatūānuku/Papa," a metaphysics Māori are encouraged to speculate on and reclaim, and which is perhaps the most fundamental of the significant challenges facing Māori students and supervisors as a "doctoral team." As an active entity, Papatūānuku defies strict definition and influences both doctoral text and team. Mika argues that Māori students and supervisors must both take notice of the conventions of academic writing *and* recollect Papatūānuku as potential being in the process of PhD research.

Extending the perspective of new epistemic potentialities beyond Aotearoa/ New Zealand, to a supervision team involving candidates and supervisors from several cultures, Michael Singh, Catherine Manathunga, Tracey Bunda and Qi Jing's article, "Mobilising Indigenous and non-Western theoretic-linguistic knowledge in doctoral education," explores possibilities that arise from the increasing presence of Indigenous and "non-Western" students in Australia's White, Western universities. In a shared space of research education, they activate and mobilise Indigenous and non-Western contributions to knowledge. The article is also a demonstration of collaborative research-writing as part of the development of transcultural co-research practices. In the USA, Krystie Nguyen, Roland W. Mitchell and Chaunda Allen Mitchell diagnose a sanitized narrative of American exceptionalism in the wake of the Civil Rights Movement, which is undergirded by a static black/white racial binary. Their article, "Crafting spaces between the binary: Renegade locations for the radical re-visioning of non-traditional graduate advising," examines how those sanitised binaries curtail the development of mutually beneficial forms of postgraduate supervision. In response, they evoke bell hooks' politics of location to consider how educators can create renegade locations from which to re-vision education for advisors and mentees of colour beyond the black/white paradigm. Also writing in the US, and also drawing on hooks, Kirsten T. Edwards and Denise Taliaferro Baszile describe and scrutinise "Scholarly rearing in three acts: Black women's testimonial scholarship and the cultivation of radical Black female inter-subjectivity." In the struggle to negotiate life in the US, the testimonies of Black women intellectuals have powerfully supported perseverance and healing. Their relevance to scholarly rearing among generations of Black women academics is highlighted by hook's notion of *radical black female subjectivity*. The reading of critical

testimonial scholarship becomes a *textual pedagogy* for the emergent Black woman intellectual, which cultivates a sense of "scholarly rearing" and scholarly resistance.

Back in Aotearoa/New Zealand, another supervisory team of women, Ingrid Boberg and Nesta Devine, write about "Ignorance and intensity: Becoming through the doctoral thesis." Deleuzian, Deweyan and Spinozan influences form the lenses through which they show the lived experience of the doctorate, as experience or experiment, by the supervisory team. They reflect on their research biographies and the processes that led to the writing of the research outcome, the thesis. Underpinning their account is an agreement that research is about creation as much as discovery: the cultivation of an under-standing that is simultaneously epistemological and ontological. Finally, in "Shared differences: Creativity in graduate research," Barbara Milech and Sarah McGann talk across shared differences from Australia. They come from different but cognate disciplines, have different but cognate migrant histories and share difference in a (past) supervisor/supervisee relationship. Their article engages three dimensions of postgraduate research: the *nature* of a creative-production thesis; the *process* of making/writing such a thesis; and the *potential* of a supervisory relationship supporting such making/writing. In imagining strategies for doctoral students to develop elegant theses, especially for creative-production researchers, they want to avoid any simple opposition between "traditional" and "creative" research. They also suggest how the principally hierarchically structured supervisory relationship can be collegial, productive – creative.

Though oriented towards dissensus as a motor for change, the articles in this issue also deploy figures of genealogy, interlocutors, sistas, families and mentors. They point to changing constellations between present and future students and teachers, or candidates and supervisors/advisors, which Mieke Bal foregrounds in the conceptual persona of the friend, or the model of a kind of knowledge production that takes knowledge to be principally provi-sional. The teacher no longer holds the position of knowing but facilitates an ongoing and interactive reflection: "Knowledge is knowing that reflection cannot be terminated" (Bal, 2002, p. 54). Like friendship, knowledge-production takes time, is open to interpretation and admits degrees and change. Importantly, along with the reversibility of roles, "the 'more-or-lessness' of this knowledge affirms the need to reserve and revise judgment" (p. 55), allowing the forces of friendship to hold renegade knowledges and other thoughts together.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

NOTES

I am very grateful to Prof. Marilyn Waring (AUT) and Assist. Prof. Moana Nepia (University of Hawai'i) for their comments and suggestions for improvement. Several colleagues and students at AUT and beyond, but also professionals, non-academic experts in this area and members of the public, have contributed to the gist of my argument, and I gratefully acknowledge their inspiration and challenge.

1. Heterotopia are sites which "have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralize, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect." They "are linked with" yet "contradict all the other sites" (Foucault, 1986, p. 24).

2. I originally picked up the term *renegade knowledge* as a throw-away comment in a conversation with Michael Peters. Surprisingly, the term is deployed rarely in the literature, one exception being Thierry de Baillon (http://www.debaillon.com/2011/05/the-hidden-power-of-renegade-knowledge/).

3. See Rancière's definition of *police* as "a partition of the sensible;" society is "made up of groups tied to specific modes of doing, to places in which these

occupations are exercised, and to modes of being corresponding to these occupations and these places. In this matching of functions, places and ways of being, there is no place for any void. It is this exclusion of what 'is not' that constitutes the police-principle at the core of statist practices" (2010, p. 37).

4. This situation sometimes applies also, more generally, to other research based on non-Western knowledges. E.g., the significantly higher fees paid by international students have made them attractive targets for recruitment – without, usually, prompting a sufficiently rigorous consideration of their particular interests, strengths and needs.

5. I am not aware of systematic research into the ways in which collective self-identities impact on research parameters and procedures, and how these fit or jar with mainstream paradigms. Yet, this question seems to be crucially important if we are to engage with non-traditional research modes. What can be said in advance, I propose, is that Indigenous people's self-determination includes the determination of the researching self.

6. Terms like *partner* for industry and *community* for lobby groups in University marketing speech nostalgically suggest personal dimensions that are widely felt to have been lost in social relations. The creation of "affective bonds that extend beyond the face-to-face contact of traditional communities" under Neoliberalism (see Calhoun, 2002) to further principally capitalist agendas is, precisely, part of the commodification of "community" and "collaboration."

7. Once safe ground has been forsaken and the ship has taken to sea, wrote Nietzsche, we have "destroyed the bridge behind us – more so, we have demolished the land behind us!" The ocean of uncertainty is infinite, and there is "nothing more awesome than infinity. ... Woe, when homesickness for the land overcomes you, as if there had been more freedom there – and there is no more 'land'!" (2001: 119).

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., & Turner, B. S. (2006). *The penguin dictionary of sociology*. London: Penguin Books.

Anae, M., & Mila-Schaaf, K. (2010). *Teu le va* – Relationships across research and policy in Pasifika education: A collective approach to knowledge generation & policy development for action towards Pasifika education success. Retrieved from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications

Arendt, H. (n.d.). *On the nature of totalitarianism: An essay in understanding*. The Hannah Arendt papers at the Library of Congress. Essays and lectures series: Speeches and writings file, 1923–1975, n.d. (12, MSS Box 76). Library of Congress. Retrieved from http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId= mharendt_pub&fileName=05/051930/051930page.db&recNum=10

Bal, M. G. (2002). *Travelling concepts in the humanities: A rough guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2010). Varieties of second modernity: The cosmopolitan turn in social and political theory and research. *The British Journal of Sociology, 61*(3), 409-443.

Bingham, C. W., Biesta, G., & Rancière, J. (2010). *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation*. London: Continuum.

Bishop, R. (2011). *Freeing ourselves from neo-colonial domination in research*. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-94-6091-415-7.pdf

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., & Wearmouth, J. (2008). *Te kotahitanga: Towards effective education reform for indigenous and other minoritised students*. Retrieved from http://www.nzcer.org.nz.ezproxy.aut.ac.nz/nzcerpress/te-kotahitanga

Calhoun, C. (2002). Community. *Dictionary of the social sciences*. doi:10.1093/acref/9780195123715.013.0313

Chambers, S. A. (2010a). Jacques Rancière (1940-). In J. Simons (Ed.), *From Agamben to Žižek: Contemporary critical theorists* (pp. 194-209). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Chambers, S. A. (2010b). Police and oligarchy. In J.-P. Deranty (Ed.), *Jacques Rancière: Key concepts* (pp. 57-68). Milton Park, UK: Routledge.

Chambers, S. A. (2012). *The lessons of Rancière*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dabashi, H. (2011). Slavoj Zizek and Harum Scarum. *Al Jazeera.* Retrieved from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2011/11/2011111011283172950.html

De Castro, E. V. (2014). *Cannibal metaphysics*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1986). Of other spaces. *Diacritics 16*(1), 22-27. (Original work published 1984 'Des Espaces Autres' in *Architecture-Mouvement-Continuité*, based on a lecture of 1967)

Foucault, M. (2003). Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76 (D. Macey, Trans.). New York, NY: Picador.

Foucault, M., & Kritzman, L. D. (1990). Politics, philosophy, culture: Interviews and other writings, 1977-1984. New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education. New York, NY: Routledge.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy* (Vol. 1.). New York, NY: Continuum.

Hansen, D. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and education: A view from the ground. *The Teachers College Record, 112*(1), 1-30.

Ings, W. (2014). *The Back of Beyond. Re-search and thought in postgraduate education*. AUT University. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=T_BqzYG5bBI

Latour, B. (2004). Whose Cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich Beck. Symposium: Talking peace with Gods, part 1. *Common Knowledge, 10*(3), 450-462.

Mezzadra, S., & Neilson, B. (2013). *Border as method, or, the multiplication of labor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Mignolo, W. (2013). Yes we can: Non-European thinkers and philosophers. *Al Jazeera*. Retrieved from http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/02/20132672747320891.html

Mika, C. (2015). The Co-existence of self and thing through ira: A Māori Phenomenology. *Journal of Aesthetics and Phenomenology, 2*(1), 93-112.

Nietzsche, F. (1968). *The will to power* (W. Kaufmann & R. J. Hollingdale, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage.

Nietzsche, F. (2001). The gay science: With a prelude in German rhymes and an appendix of songs. Edited by Bernard Williams (J. Nauckhoff & A. Del Caro, Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Olssen, M. (2003). Foucault and critique: Kant, humanism and the human sciences. In M. Peters, M. Olssen, & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Futures of critical theory: Dreams of difference* (pp. 73-102). Lanham, MD: Rowman&Littlefield.

Pesce, S. (2011). Institutional pedagogy and semiosis: Investigating the missing link between Peirce's semiotics and effective semiotics. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 43*(10), 1145-1160.

Peters, M. A. (2016). Dissident thought: Systems of repression, networks of hope. *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice, 8*(1), 20-36.

Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement. Politics and philosophy* (J. Rose, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Rancière, J. (2001). Ten theses on politics. *Theory & Event, 5*(3).

Rancière, J. (2004a). *The philosopher and his poor* (A. Parker, Trans.). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rancière, J. (2004b). *The politics of aesthetics. The distribution of the sensible* (G. Rockhill, Trans.). London: Continuum.

Rancière, J. (2010). *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. London: Bloomsbury.

Rancière, J. (2010). On ignorant schoolmasters. In C. W. Bingham & G. Biesta (Eds.), *Jacques Rancière: Education, truth, emancipation* (pp. 1-24). New York, NY: Continuum.

Rancière, J. (2011). *Althusser's lesson* (E. Battista, Trans.). London: Bloomsbury. (Original work published 1974)

Ricoeur, P. (1974). Existence and hermeneutics (Willis Domingo et. al, Trans.). In D. Ihde (Ed.), *The conflict of interpretations: Essays in hermeneutics* (pp. 3-26). Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published 1969)

Rosenberg, T. (2000). The reservoir: Towards a poetic model of research in design. *Working Papers in Art and Design, 1*. Retrieved from www.herts.ac.uk/__data/ assets/pdf_file/0017/12293/WPIAAD_vol1_rosenberg.pdf

Ross, K. (1991). Rancière and the practice of equality. *Social Text, 29*, 57-71.

Strathern, M. (1990). *The gender of the gift: Problems with women and problems with society in Melanesia.* Berkeley, CA: U of California Press.

Taylor, S., & Beasley, N. (2005). *A handbook for doctoral supervisors*. Milton Park: Routledge.

Todd, Z. (2014). An Indigenous feminist's take on the ontological turn: 'Ontology' is just another word for colonialism. *Urbane Adventurer: Amiskwacî – thoughts of an urban Metis nomad (and sometimes a Mouthy Michif)*. Retrieved from http://zoeandthecity.wordpress.com/2014/10/24/an-indigenous-feminists-take-on-the-ontological-turn-ontology-is-just-another-word-for-colonialism/

Viveiros de Castro, E. (2004). Exchanging perspectives. The transformation of objects into subjects in Amerindian ontologies. *Common knowledge, 10*(3), 463-484.

Wood, H. (2003). Cultural studies for Oceania. *The Contemporary Pacific, 15*(2), 340-374.