

MICHAEL SINGH

13. TRANSFORMATIVE KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE AND CRITICAL PEDAGOGY: INTERNATIONALISING EDUCATION THROUGH INTELLECTUAL ENGAGEMENT

In 1901, Alfred Deakin became the founding Attorney-General of Australia; he was its Prime Minister—three times. His memory is honoured in the name of my alma mater, Deakin University, established in 1974. Alfred Deakin's (cited in Willard, 1923, p. 119) vision for Australia was expressed thus:

no motive power operated more universally on this Continent,
or in the beautiful island of Tasmania,
and certainly no motive power operated more powerfully
in dissolving the technical and arbitrary political divisions
which previously separated us
than the desire
that we should be one people,
and remain one people,
without the admixture of other races.

A eugenic corporate vision—and division; there was to be no racial admixture of Australia's (imagined) sparkling White gene pool (Anderson, 2002). Contestation over Indigenous and immigrant knowledge formed and informed challenges to Alfred Deakin's ideology. Deakin University's critical pedagogies were a part of these struggles. This chapter argues that White Australia politics provided a normative framework within which Deakin University's critical pedagogies were theorised; both regulated the uses of 'other races' knowledge. The intellectual admixture of Alfred Deakin's 'one people' with 'other races' provides the focus for exploring critical pedagogies in internationalising research education via transformative knowledge exchange.

MAKING CRITICAL PEDAGOGIES IN A POST-WHITE AUSTRALIA

On December 21, 1972, Australia's Whitlam Government was the first Western nation to establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, ending the Cold War containment begun with its founding on 1 October, 1949. The

following year, in Manila, Prime Minister Whitlam announced the death of White Australia politics. Its burial took longer and the mourning by some continues (Rutherford, 2000). The people of Australia—the demos—have now changed, along with the theoretical knowledge now available to critical pedagogy and its research community. For some, the loss of the fixity and meaning of White Australia's knowledge and the introduction of knowledge from multiple non-White intellectual cultures and its transformative effects have been painful. For others, the interlocking of *yin/yang*—through the admixture of higher order knowledge of 'other races' with the 'one people'—provides an ever-changing link in the Eurasian chain of continuity and discontinuity in intellectual exchanges.

The Whitlam Government's provision of free tertiary education provided me an all too brief lesson in the possibilities of a state opening up insular intellectual communities to the contemporary globalisation of knowledge from around the world. China's Government, led by Deng Xiaoping was a major contributor to this new founded global dynamism. The Australian Government's commitment to the education of the public enabled me to study, free of charge at Deakin University during the 1980s. This took me from an Honours degree in action research through to a doctoral project on building a post-White Australian nation through multicultural knowledge production. I explored the prospects for state-sponsored education in reworking the relationship between what was known about Australia's 'one people' and what was unknown about their admixture with 'other races.' Deakin University's critical pedagogies initiated me into conceptualising a post-White Australia that produces new knowledge about the world by making intellectual connections with other potentially powerful knowledge from around the world.

Eventually, I came to see the identities of my students—immigrant, refugee and international research candidates—as work-points for challenging the alienation from their intellectual heritage. This was ignored by celebrations of everyday multi-culturalism and the internationalisation of Australian higher education. Deakin's critical pedagogies gave me Germanic ideas (Habermas, 1998) for encouraging these beginning researchers to draw on their experiential and scholastic knowledge; their bilingual multi-competence for using new technologies; their critiques of Western constructions of Asia, its peoples and intellectual heritages; and the knowledge networks which they could access. They are now taking us beyond the transfer of Western knowledge to the rest of the world. Instead, they are making possible transformative knowledge exchange, with each party contributing theoretical ideas and being changed by what they come to know from the other (Wang & Singh, 2007).

China's Political Chaos, which began in 1966, came to an end in 1976 with the death of Mao Zedong and the arrest of the Gang of Four for the excesses of the 'Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.' The collapsing economy made possible the Deng Xiao-ping Government's 'open door' policy—*kai fang*. China re-established its centrality globally through market capitalism, albeit having the

Chinese characteristics of an interventionist state. This made possible my first visit there in 1979, as a member of the Australia-China Friendship Society. Initially, China provided a staging post for Western businesses to out-source manufacturing, opening the door to low-paid manual labour, and a huge, untapped consumer market. Three decades later, China provides much of the mental labour required by the global, multilingual knowledge economies, giving added impetus for engagement with its intellectual projects. The international ranking of the world's top 500 academic institutions by Shanghai Jiao Tong University is a key indicator of the re-emergence of China as a global intellectual power. It is an overstatement and misperception to read such rankings as a measure of the USA's continuing educational superiority (Wendler, Bridgeman, Cline, Millett, Rock, Bell, & McAllister, 2010).

Along with money, ideas and media, I joined those rushing across the Lohu Shenshen border, a short train ride from Hong Kong. I participated in the Australian 'rediscovery' of China, making it an object of my own admixture of scraps of ancient Chinese history; a romantic view of the Cultural Revolution; television stereotypes of 'Chinese cooks and crooks.' I know so little about a globally important civilization. China did much to provoke explorations of the alternative senses of my Eurasian Australian self; White Australia's protectionism was meant to eliminate the admixture I represent. Travelling from outback Australia to China's southern and northern capitals—Nanjing and Beijing—I discovered myself to be a long-nosed, big-eyed 'Westerner.' Anxious about being a foreigner in a country where everyone was poor, I felt the apparent equality of people dressed in blue 'Chairman Mao' suites claustrophobic. Not the subject for picturesque tourist snaps, the poverty tugged at my newly minted qualifications in cultural studies of pedagogy. My studies of Deakin's critical pedagogies, its principles and procedures, and participation in its intellectual community, connecting trans-formative action and theoretical knowledge: "Case study research always involves 'the study of an instance in action.' ... Case studies are 'a step to action'" (Adelman, Jenkins & Kemmis, 1976, p. 141). Not surprisingly, I was attracted to Tao Xingzhi's (1891–1946) argument that "knowledge derived from 'doing', or direct experience [is] a conscientious activity that involves working with one's mind while working with one's hand" (Yao, 2002, p. 255).

At the end of the 1980s, my studies of socially critical education culminated in a doctorate from Deakin University. This set me on the road to affecting the intellectual admixture of 'one people' and 'other races,' focusing on connecting emancipatory intellectual projects between Australia and China (Singh & Han, 2010). This is not without its challenges. University academics announcing their regret at the renouncement of the Alfred Deakin's vision of Australia being for just 'one people' (Hage, 1998), signalled the fragility of Deakin's critical pedagogies, and the place of other races' theoretical knowledge in creating a post-White Australian education.

SINGH

Commoditisation of Australian education

In the 1980s the Hawke Labor Government initiated the commoditisation of Australian higher education (Dawkins, 1987). The roots of neo-liberal state intervention extend well back in time, crossing the parties of labour and capital. The trade-weighted, visa-laden category, 'full-fee paying overseas student,' was introduced in 1985, with international marketing targeting Asia's expanding upper and middle classes. The internationalisation of Australian higher education continues to grow as a result of Government policies directed at disinvestment in the public good, inciting financially strained universities to recruit international students. Australia has the 'highest proportion of international students in higher education in the OECD: 20 percent in 2006' (Bradley, 2008, p.12). The presence of international students, mostly from Asia, continues to be driven by Australian Government policies for exporting education and recruiting skilled migrant labour. By 2009, about one-quarter of international students enrolling in Australian higher education came from China; more from wealthy coastal provinces such as Zhejiang than inland Gansu. However, with most studying in instrumental technical fields, little attention is given in their education to the transnational exchange of knowledge about the democratic virtues of public reasoning (Sen, 2006) or the genres of public contention (Yang, 2009).

I was attracted to pedagogies which emphasised a critical orientation to extant theories and practices of education and educational research, especially those that enable 'other races' to lay claim to being able to reason critically and publicly (Sen, 2006; Yang, 2009). During the 1980s I engaged the debates over Deakin University's critical pedagogies through action research (McTaggart & Singh, 1986; Singh, 2001). There were terms other than 'action research' that might have been used to name this field, but they were questioned. For instance, 'participatory research' was seen as 'too exclusively as a form of social research for the oppressed in third world countries' (Kemmis, 1986, p. 52).

What, however, happens to Deakin's critical pedagogies when research candidates from China begin studying in Australia? The massive historical changes signified by the end of Alfred Deakin's White Australia politics confounded my investment in such pedagogies. Research candidates from a former Second World country, a former communist ally of the former USSR, are now full-fee paying students and knowledge producers in this First World country, the capitalist ally of the USA. Can Deakin's critical pedagogies continue to reject democratically inspired concepts as being too exclusively 'Third World'? What of the socially critical knowledge accessible to international research candidates from the former 'Second World'?

The re-emergence of China as a global intellectual power continues with great leaps forward—and steps backward. The Six-Four Incident (4 June, 1989), the flap of guns in Tiananmen Square, left many people, Chinese and non-Chinese, at home and abroad uneasy. By November 1993, some 28,000 mainland Chinese students

and their families, who had arrived before June 1989, had been given refuge—permanent residency—in Australia. Some became my work colleagues and others my students.

Many Australian cities are now sites of ‘super-diversity’ (Vertovec, 2007), complex cultural and linguistic differentiation and stratification. However, Australia is mostly White and Anglophone, and riven with multiple racisms (Hage, 1998). Racism is no longer a singular, dichotomous phenomenon of ‘one people’ versus ‘other races.’ Racism has a complex, plural, and heterogeneous character. Australia is geographically close to Asia, and like much of the world, heavily dependent on the region for trade. China underwrites Australian jobs, mortgages, consumer credit and the massive bail-out of capitalism during the 2008–09 financial crisis. But how could Alfred Deakin’s Australia of ‘one people’ ever expect to be part of Asian intellectual projects and the admixture of the knowledge of these ‘other races’?

I started work on what the Australian Government called ‘Asia literacy’ in the 1990s, making use of postcolonial theory to reconceptualise Deakin University’s critical pedagogies as a way of intellectually engaging with Asia (Singh, 1992; 1995; 1996). I discovered that a limited focus on ‘identity’ issues as an end in itself provided little ground for intellectual engagement with Asia. ‘Identity-as-an-end-in-itself’ distracted my attention from internationalising Australian research education through trans-formative knowledge exchange. Identity issues of race, class, and gender now provide a point of departure for what intellectual engagement means for exchanging the different forms of knowledge—experiential, scholastic, linguistic, scientific, worldly, networked—that international, immigrant and refugee students have or can access in order to relate it to what they are learning and/or researching in Australia.

From the mid-1990s onwards the struggle between intellectuals representing Alfred Deakin’s ‘one people’ and those arguing for the admixture with ‘other races’ was felt in Australia through the hammering of fear over immigration; repeated attacks on refugees and asylum seekers, and the exploitation and bashing of international students—most of whom come from continental Asia. Alfred Deakin’s revived vision was dismissed as racism, *zhongzu zhuyi*. Nevertheless, claims about ways of knowing and sources of higher order knowledge in Australian education are being affected by the increasing presence of Asian intellectuals (Singh & Han, 2010). These ‘knowledge workers’ are being recruited to meet shortfalls in labour demand, due in part to an aging (largely Anglo-ethnic) academic workforce, and in the process bringing Asian concepts into educational conversations.

NEOLIBERAL POLICIES IN EDUCATION

During the 1990s educational relationships were distorted by the state’s neo-liberal *disinvestment* in the common wealth. The state’s underwriting of the protection of

SINGH

Australian citizens and residents was minimised. Angwin (1992) reported that changes in migrant education in Australia were linked to the rise in government neo-liberal projects. The irrational economic reductionism that came to dominate government policies drove the education and training sector to 'casualise' teacher employment and to compete for the provision of courses. Kemmis (1998) argues that government commitment to reducing public goods and services in accordance with its neoliberal economic metrics is based on, 'trusting to market forces to determine the demand, and the availability of courses and teachers at a competitive price in any particular location.' (pp. 272–273) Nation re-building now faces multiple challenges, including daring to establish the purposes of education in terms of knowledge production, acquisition and transmission.

In the late 1990s, my work in languages and international studies led to renewed visits to multilingual China. I had to rely on Chinese colleagues for translations; China is competing with India for having the world's largest English-speaking population. This renewed mobility provided insights into what the productive use of my ignorance of China's scholarly heritage might mean pedagogically for engaging the intellectual resources of research candidates from there (Singh, 2009; 2010). This led me to foreground their access to multiple intellectual resources and to encourage their creative capabilities for blending Chinese concepts into their interpretations of evidence of Australian education. Of course, as an educator I was uncertain about the relevance and usefulness of Chinese theoretical ideas in this changed context; their power and significance has to be judged by the educational research community. I was equally worried about exposing my intellectual struggles with not knowing what my Chinese students knew or could find out in other languages. But if Deakin University's critical pedagogies were to continue to be of use, then making my ignorance pedagogically productive seemed warranted:

As college faculty members we are assumed to have expertise in what we teach. To the degree that we expect ourselves to appear certain about what we know, we may find it difficult to encounter hot spots or knowledge gaps exposed by our interactions with students (Bell, Washington, Weinstein & Love, 2003, p. 470).

Without admitting to students that I too am a learner, I could leave them with the mistaken impression that more is known than is not known. The 'pedagogy of the unknowable' (Ellsworth, 1992, p. 110) refers to only ever having partial knowledge of students from different intellectual cultures; to not fully knowing what intellectual resources these students can access, and never knowing with certainty the affects of our pedagogical actions of encouraging them to use this knowledge in an unusual context. Government policies in labour migration and education have created 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007), a level differentiation and complexity surpassing Australia's previously experiences. This poses significant challenges for reworking Deakin University's critical pedagogies,

including disclosing how just such ignorance creates spaces for students to demonstrate what they know, and the procedures for establishing the credibility and value of such knowledge. By confronting

ignorance and the blindspots of privilege, we create possibility for modelling honesty and openness to what can be learned by listening to others who are different from us, especially those who have been targets of dominant stereotypes and assumptions (Bell, Washington, Weinstein & Love, 2003, p. 470).

By the late 1990s, however, there were signs of disenchantment with the neo-liberal policies Labor had initiated in the 1980s. They were failing many Australians. This policy adversity was having detrimental effects on their jobs. Alfred Deakin's successors had created a nation through public services for child care, water, telecommunications, electricity and commuters to underwrite the protection of Australian citizens and their investment in the nation-state. Their access to these public services as part of the nation-state's assets has been undermined by the bipartisan policies of Liberal and Labor Governments that continue to sell off the common wealth and de-structure the structural and cultural basis of the nation. However, the public still bears the costs of failure in the provision of any of these public goods, as it does for underwriting so much of the economy. This socialisation of the risks of private enterprise was demonstrated in government interventions to shore up the businesses that contributed to the globalisation of the 2008–09 financial crisis that emerged out of the USA.

Those Australians who retained Alfred Deakin's visions for 'one people' deflected their critiques of government neo-liberal politics into anti-Asian racism (Singh, 2000). Ironically, they resorted to words derived from speakers of Cantonese, a Chinese language to do so. Resurgent White Australia political activists asserted their claims to being *jin gum* (dinkum)—true, honest, real Australians—and refused to *ke tou* (kowtow)—submit. Misrecognising the central role of government neo-liberal politics in causing their disaffection, they used an admixture of languages to seek solutions by resuscitating Alfred Deakin's exclusionary, anti-Asian nation building project (Stratton, 1998). The impact of neo-liberal policies was linked, mistakenly to the shift away from Alfred Deakin's vision for a Whites-only Australia. But as Kemmis (1995) explains:

the plurality of national, ethnic and linguistic viewpoints with internationalisation of communications and global interaction [led to] a radical shift from colonialist to post-colonialist perspectives on modernisation, North-South relations, and questions of 'Third World' and community development. (p. 135)

By the mid-1990s, Deakin's critical pedagogies emerged as having marked a White, Anglo-Australian theoretical stance that could no longer be taken for

SINGH

granted. The extraordinary diversity of linguistic and intellectual resources manifested by international students from Asia troubles the credibility of Deakin's critical pedagogies, its largely Western-only intellectual sources, and of those educators who invest these with an exclusive authority.

IGNORANCE AS A CHALLENGE TO DEAKIN'S CRITICAL PEDAGOGIES

Intellectual parochialism and suppositions about the culture-boundedness of knowledge pose serious challenges. Given the pre-constructed intellectual frameworks governing different educational cultures this requires much more than tolerance and benevolence. Crossing conceptual boundaries to affect transformative knowledge exchange necessarily calls for critical analysis and explanation. Challenges to Deakin's critical pedagogies by different intellectual traditions now come from the former 'Second,' 'Third,' and 'Fourth' (Indigenous) Worlds. These sources of theories have opened up the possibility that there is much more depth to human knowing than the Western education of international (and domestic) students allows.

Recognition of Western ignorance of the other intellectual traditions accessible to international students from Asia creates problems for Deakin's critical pedagogies (Miike, 2006). The ignorance at stake here refers to "academic practices and discourses that enable the continued exclusion of other than dominant Western epistemic and intellectual traditions" (Kuokkanen, 2008, p. 60). The neglect and loss of these alternative intellectual resources poses challenges for pursuing Deakin's critical pedagogies. Kemmis (1995) contends:

the task of emancipation remains manifestly necessary in a vast range of political struggles in the contemporary world. These struggles continue to be necessary not just in Third World settings, but also in the new, sometimes desperate, conditions of First World social life. (p. 152)

The intellectual struggles over the implications of First, Second and Third World knowledge being present here because of the internationalisation of education are played out everyday throughout Australian universities. The presence of international students from China—Han, Mongolian, Hui, and Man Chinese who are just as likely to be conservatives, neo-liberals, postmodernists as progressives or leftists—presents serious challenges for Deakin's critical pedagogies. Chow (1993) argues that the growing presence of international students "in 'first world' intellectual circles fundamentally disrupts the production of knowledge ... that has hitherto proceeded by hiding the agenda of the inquirers and naturalizing the 'objects' as given." (p. 115) With an increasing number of educational research candidates coming from China, the conceptualisation of Deakin's critical pedagogies is much debated. Kemmis (1995) observes that, throughout the world, there are numerous places:

where ‘the culture of silence’ continues to characterise lived social relations, not only in the Third World, but also, in new and developing forms, in the First ... In the face of such challenges, it seems to me that the need for emancipation continues to exist, though what counts as ‘emancipation’ itself needs critical reconstruction if we are to avoid the consequence of some of the political programmes that have taken its name. (p. 156)

My supervision of research candidates from China, mostly young to middle aged women—English language lecturers—brings insights into the intellectual liberations they long for; the two-way knowledge exchange from which both Australia and China can benefit, and the complications inherent in theorising the philosophy and pedagogy of such transformative knowledge exchange. I want to make their apprenticeship in the language(s) of ideas a means of initiating them into reasoned and reasonable contestations of Western intellectual hegemony, rather than accepting the marginal positioning of their heritage of intellectual claims, principles and procedures within an unquestioned Euro-American framework. However, as a matter of tactics, few are interested in directly and explicitly questioning, let alone critically reconstructing their Western education. Even so, some discover that their international education opens up possibilities for discovering the West’s multicultural intellectual amalgam, and this presents them with opportunities to bring their Chinese knowledge and intellectual norms to bear on reconstructing Deakin’s critical pedagogies.

The increasing admixture of intellectual encounters with diverse educational cultures informs continuing debates over Deakin’s critical pedagogies, albeit without necessarily leading to their critical reconstruction. Collaboration with Indigenous critical pedagogues by Altrichter, Kemmis, McTaggart and Zuber-Skerritt (2002) brought to the fore that “action research derives from the western cultural contexts of their creators. It also highlighted how the western action researcher ... must be prepared to ‘give away’ or share their knowledge of action research.”(p. 126) Here the play of epistemic ignorance in Deakin’s critical pedagogies’ comes to the fore. This ignorance arises because Altrichter, et al. (2002) had,

little opportunity to develop deep understanding of the other participants’ culture, [so they need] to work creatively to encourage the other participants—by and for whom the research project is largely conducted—to ‘reshape’, to ‘remake’, to ‘reconstitute’ action research in ways that make sense within the participants’ culture while retaining the philosophical features familiar to the [Western] researcher. (p. 126)

The one-way, unilateral flow of the theory and practice of Deakin University’s critical pedagogies provoked cause for concern. The uni-directional transfer of theoretical knowledge from the First to the Second, Third or Fourth Worlds, from the North to the South, from the West to the East aggravated these worries.

CRITICAL PEDAGOGIES FOR TRANSFORMATIVE KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE

The critical awareness of having research candidates from ‘other races’ who want to, and do deploy their own intellectual resources in their Western education, is reinforced by consciousness of the commercial exchange involved in Australian international education. Moreover, the presuppositions in Deakin’s critical pedagogies about Western theory being applied by ‘other races’ were confronted with the prospect of using the conceptual tools of ‘other races’ to generate pedagogical action, knowledge and ignorance (Singh & Han, 2009). The insistence on retaining the Western philosophical concepts used in Deakin’s critical pedagogies to the exclusion of testing the theories of ‘other races’ for whom these practices are intended has become a problem.

The unquestioning, privileged retention of Western concepts sanctions epistemic ignorance of potentially socially critical concepts from elsewhere. That is to say, the theories and practices of Deakin’s critical pedagogies “ignore, marginalize and exclude other than dominant Western European epistemic and intellectual traditions” (Kuokkanen, 2008, p. 60). This insistence on retaining the philosophical concepts of Deakin’s critical pedagogies means that the emancipatory epistemic resources of international students from Asia are excluded, their secular heritage of scholarly argumentation ignored (Sen, 2006; Yang, 2009). There is little recognition and understanding of these other critical intellectual traditions in producing and critiquing theories of knowledge, ignorance and action. This epistemic ignorance extends beyond not-knowing or lacking in understanding, irrespective of whether it is Chinese or Indigenous knowledge. Kuokkanen (2008) argues that it forecloses:

other than dominant episteme and refuses to seriously contemplate their existence. ... the academy at large usually knows very little, if anything, about Indigenous epistemes, creating various kinds of conflicts with and perpetuating discrimination against those Indigenous people who ‘speak through’ their own epistemes. (p. 60)

With the globalisation of Deakin’s critical pedagogies came self-critical concerns about epistemic ignorance. Altricher et al., (2002) call for intercultural dialogues that explore alternatives to Alfred Deakin’s refusal of any admixture of the intellectual resources of ‘other races’:

In the face of striking cultural differences, the appropriate attitude towards identifying the meaning of concepts seems to be incremental rather than normative. The emphasis here is ... on offering support for developing the idea and practice of action research, in ways useful to people within the host culture. This cross-cultural approach aims to create space for participants from the host culture *to develop their own self-reflective practice informed by*

action research philosophy rather than to control the ... naming and framing of practice (italics added). (p. 126)

‘Other races’—the ‘culturally different’—were supported to develop practices informed by Deakin University’s philosophy of critical pedagogies. Here, worries about epistemic ignorance led to the questioning of the exclusionary Euro-American intellectual resources mobilised via Deakin’s critical pedagogies. Such ignorance is not random or manifested in isolated incidents, but reflects a systemic, structural problem. The individual and institutional epistemic ignorance present in Deakin’s critical pedagogies is, as Kuokkanen (2008) suggests,

manifested by exclusion and effacement of Indigenous issues and materials in curricula, by denial of Indigenous contributions and influences and the lack of interest and understanding of Indigenous epistemes or issues in general by students, faculty and staff alike. (p. 64)

Recognising this epistemic ignorance, Deakin’s critical pedagogies have been challenged to forgo purity to test conceptual admixture, and to develop a hermeneutic understanding of other intellectual traditions. I have no substantial knowledge of the immensely diverse intellectual heritage or the educational cultures from where my international students come. Nor do I have fore-knowledge about the impact of the long-term effects of my use of (and challenges to) Deakin’s critical pedagogies for encouraging the critical cross-cultural blending of intellectual resources. For McTaggart (cited in Altrichter et al., 2002) this means that the stance taken by Deakin’s critical pedagogies:

should be modest and supportive, “giving away” action research to be used and transformed by the “host culture” for its own good rather than monitoring the process to prevent the concept from being “damaged” or “misconstrued” or to protect its conceptual purity from “contamination” or “dilution.” (p. 126)

Here Deakin’s critical pedagogies mobilised efforts to redress the epistemic ignorance that prevails in the Western academy, and especially our own practices and norms for theorising, research and teaching. The problem, however, is that this form of ignorance has not been given adequate philosophical or pedagogical focus in the teaching and learning opportunities created for international students. Deakin University’s critical pedagogies are now being troubled by research candidates from places once characterised as the Second, Third and Fourth Worlds for foreclosing or otherwise not connecting epistemically with non-Western intellectual projects. This is because, as Altrichter et al., (2002) acknowledge, concepts:

are rooted in specific cultures—ethnic, social, political and others that give definitions particular meaning and significance. To understand and be

SINGH

understood in other cultures, we must do more than produce a literal, translation of the idea into the language and cultural frameworks of the new culture. The idea must be appropriated in an active process of deconstructing old definitions and models and of reconstructing and re-enacting them in relation to the settings, circumstances, values and interests of the “host culture. (pp. 126□127)

In a particularly Australian sense, Deakin’s critical pedagogies are rooted in Western intellectual culture. The internationalisation of research education presents possibilities for testing the context independence of higher order knowledge from diverse intellectual cultures. Despite a desire to link knowledge and action, it was only possible to see ‘other races’—other intellectual cultures—as appropriating Deakin’s ideas about critical pedagogies through action. These other intellectual cultures were ignored as a source of powerful, transformative theoretical concepts. Deakin’s critical pedagogies necessarily used concepts from Western intellectual culture, especially the German Jewish Frankfurt School of critical theory (Habermas, 1998). Nevertheless, there is growing critical self-awareness of the need for hermeneutic interactions to make meaning across hugely diverse languages and intellectual cultures, in particular to use these to probe the presumptions of Deakin’s critical pedagogies in which a great deal has been invested. Continuing interest in Deakin’s critical pedagogies is directed to finding ways in which international students—as transnational researchers, potential immigrant knowledge workers and diasporic intellectuals contributing to the knowledge economy of their homeland—can test conceptual tools from their intellectual culture, and to give new meaning to the issues in Western education they are researching (Singh & Fu, 2008; Singh & Guo, 2008). It is through, against and with Deakin University’s critical pedagogies that I define the internationalisation of Australia research education as a praxis of transformative knowledge exchange. Even so, while I may occasionally manage to distance myself from Deakin University’s critical pedagogies through working to affect transformative knowledge exchange, often I find myself complicit with Alfred Deakin’s concerns about intellectual admixture. Guilt provides no vehicle for moving forward in these circumstances.

Deakin’s critical pedagogies are not a matter of working to predetermined models. Instead, the emphasis is on praxis, engaging in informed, principled action based on one’s own knowledge—and ignorance—of prevailing social, economic and cultural circumstances. To explore this interrelationship between knowledge, ignorance, and action it is important to examine (mis)understandings and (mis)interpretations of educational conditions and their material reality. Kemmis (2005) refers to Mao Zedong’s advocacy of:

thinking methodically about situations, and changing one’s plans as practice in the situation unfolds: when circumstances change, or when one faces

setbacks. ... [Mao] argues that people need to become more skilled and methodical at understanding situations in terms of the changing relationships between 'subjective conditions' and 'objective conditions'. Subjective conditions include the practitioner's own characteristic ways of thinking and interpreting situations, and the ways others in the situation appear to think and interpret them. Objective conditions include material circumstances, resources, and similar aspects of 'objective reality': things to be taken into account in deciding how to act. (p. 407)

Here is an inkling of Deakin's critical pedagogies knowing little, if anything, about non-Western intellectual projects. The internationalisation of Australian education points to the need for making just such intellectual connections, albeit from a position of ignorance. The presence in Australia of students from China, both members and non-members of the Chinese Communist Party, now creates possibilities for intellectual exchanges beyond their own dispersed communities through transnational knowledge networks. They know themselves to have more to offer to the world's multilingual intellectual communities than the fees they are charged. The internationalisation of Australian (research) education as a project in transformative knowledge exchange offers, as yet unrealised possibilities for affecting knowledge flows across intellectual borders, and not only from the South to the North, but also from East to West.

CONCLUSION

Most of my engagements with Deakin's critical pedagogies were initiated as tentative explorations, and some have continued into deeper layers of complexity and ignorance. With an eye on the uncertain political, economic and social conditions of the nation and the state, and reflecting on my own self-doubts about what I am doing, this has forever left me feeling I wish I had known and understood more—such ignorance drives one crazy. I do not want to disappoint my students by providing a mere sham—what sometimes seems to be a basis for the reputation of some Western educators and educational providers operating throughout Asia. Sometimes I think I have grasped a few modest insights into China's intellectual projects, only to be reassured about how little I could know about the intricacies of its complex, contested intellectual heritage.

Despite efforts to internationalise Australian higher education since the 1980s, there remains a tendency to marginalise the prior academic learnings and intellectual resources available to international students when studying here. This minimises the potential for conceptual knowledge from these students' homelands having any influence on knowledge, ignorance and action in Australia. A new generation of critical pedagogies is having these students' use of their intellectual resources in Australian educational research; investigating the range of ideas that might be woven into research about Australian education; and demonstrating how

SINGH

and by whom. Through the legacies of Alfred Deakin and Deakin University, I cannot escape from seeing Australia's educational culture, and knowledge itself, as a site of struggle over the admixture of the intellectual resources of 'one people' and 'other races'—or the discomfort and confusion that results.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The chapter arises from research funded by the Australian Research Council's Discovery Scheme (DP0988108).

REFERENCES

- Adelman, C., Jenkins, D., & Kemmis, S. (1976). Re-thinking case study: Notes from the second Cambridge conference. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 6(3), 139–150.
- Anderson, W. (2002). *The cultivation of whiteness: Science, health and racial destiny in Australia*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Angwin, J. (1992). The changing workplace: The effect of change on teachers' work in adult language and literacy programs. *Critical Forum*, 1(3), 48–77.
- Altrichter, H., Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2002). The concept of action research. *The Learning Organisation*, 9(3), 125–131.
- Bell, L., Washington, S., Weinstein, G., & Love, B. (2003). Knowing ourselves as instructors. In A. Darder, M. Baltodano, & R. Torres (Eds.), *The critical pedagogy reader*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Bradley, D. (Chair) (2008). *Review of Australian higher education*. Canberra: Australian Government.
- Chow, R. (1993). *Writing Diaspora: Tactics of intervention in contemporary cultural studies*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Dawkins, J. (1987). *Higher education: A discussion paper*. Canberra: AGPS.
- Ellsworth, E. (1992). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), *Feminisms and critical pedagogy* (pp. 90–119). New York: Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *The inclusion of the other: Studies in political theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hage, G. (1998). *White nation: Fantasies of white supremacy in a multicultural society*. Annandale, VA: Pluto Press.
- Kemmis, S. (1986). Of tambourines and tumbrils: A response to Rex Gibson's 'Critical times for action research'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 16(1), 50–52.
- Kemmis, S. (1995). Emancipatory aspirations in a postmodern era. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 3(2), 133–167.
- Kemmis, S. (1998). System and lifeworld, and the conditions of learning in late modernity. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 6(3), 269–305.
- Kemmis, S. (2005). Knowing practice: Searching for saliences. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 13(3), 391–242.
- Kuokkanen, R. (2008). What is hospitality in the academy? Epistemic ignorance and the (im)possible gift. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 30, 60–82.
- McTaggart, R., & Singh, M. (1986). New directions in action research. *Curriculum Perspectives*, 6(2), 42–46.
- Miike, Y. (2006). Non-western theory in Western research? *Review of Communication*, 6(1&2), 4–31.

- Rutherford, J. (2000). *The Gauche intruder: Freud, Lacan and the White Australian Fantasy*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Sen, A. (2006). *The argumentative Indian: Writings on Indian culture, history and identity*. London: Penguin.
- Singh, M. (1992). Studying Asia from the standpoint of active women citizens. *Asian Studies Review*, 15(3), 95–106.
- Singh, M. (1995). Edward Said's critique of orientalism and Australia's 'Asia literacy' curriculum. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27(6), 599–620.
- Singh, M. (1996). Studying Asia for the national economic interest: An analysis of the Australian Governments' strategy for schools. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 17(2), 153–170.
- Singh, M. (2000). Changing uses of multiculturalism: Asian-Australian engagement with White Australia politics. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 27(1), 115–130.
- Singh, M. (2001). Networking action research: A critical analysis of key issues. *Australian Journal of Environmental Education*, (17), 95–104.
- Singh, M. (2009). Using Chinese knowledge in internationalising research education: Jacques Rancière, an ignorant supervisor and doctoral students from China. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 7(2), 185–204.
- Singh, M. (2010). Connecting intellectual projects between China and Australia: Bradley's international student-migrants, Bourdieu and productive ignorance. *Australian Journal of Education*, 54(1), 31–45.
- Singh, M., & Fu, D. (2008). Flowery inductive rhetoric meets creative deductive arguments: Becoming transnational researcher-writers. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 4(1), 121–137.
- Singh, M., & Guo, W. (2008). Centring students' bilingual capabilities in quality university teaching: Bringing 'knowledge detours' and 'zigzag learning' in from the margins. In J. McConachie & Others (Eds.), *Changing University learning and teaching* (pp. 221–235). Brisbane: PostEd Press.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. (2009). Engaging Chinese ideas through Australian education: Using chéngyǔ to connect intellectual projects across 'peripheral nations'. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(4), 397–441.
- Singh, M., & Han, J. (2010). Peer review, Bourdieu and honour: Connecting Chinese and Australian intellectual projects. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(2), 185–198.
- Stratton, J. (1998). *Race Daze: Australia in identity crisis*. Annandale, VA: Pluto Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024–1054.
- Wang, Y., & Singh, M. (2007). Bi-lateral engagement in research: Trans-national collaborations in knowledge production. In P. Kell & G. Vogl (Eds.), *Higher education in the Asia Pacific: Challenges for the future* (pp. 29–52). Newcastle: Cambridge.
- Wendler, C., Bridgeman, B., Cline, F., Millett, C., Rock, J., Bell, N., et al. (2010). *The path forward: The future of graduate education in the United States*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.
- Willard, M. (1923). *History of the White Australia policy to 1920*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Yang, G. (2009). *The power of the Internet in China*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Yao, Y. (2002). The making of a national hero: Tao Xingzhi's legacies in the People's Republic of China. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 24(3), 251–281.

Michael Singh
 Centre for Educational Research
 University of Western Sydney