

Designing Heterotopic Transversal Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge: Access, Freedom & e/Quality

Johannes A. Smit
Denzil Chetty

Abstract

Following on the publications based on Smit's 2017 International Open Access lecture (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018a; and 2018b), we capture some aspects from his 2018 presentation, in this article. It further develops his exploration of the significance of Michel Foucault's triad, subject – communication – knowledge-power production in the digital paradigm, or e-episteme, in terms of knowledge-power networks (KPNs). For this, the article has two main parts. *Firstly*, it provides a theoretical framework for the empirical interpretation of the 2018 international topic for the Open Access week, seminally, incorporating the notions of the 'heterotopic' and 'transversal'. *Secondly*, in South Africa's *ascendant history into openness, as a free country*, it provides a sample of three significant events in our *affirmative genealogy, or genealogies, of freedom*. These are, *access* to the full participation in, or 'contribution' to, world civilization, or world information-, data-, or knowledge-power, or science-power productions, à la Anton Lembede; *freedom* as founded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR); and *equity/ equality/ e/Quality*, as founded in 'The Freedom Charter'. As such, the advocacy for *access, freedom, and equality* in South Africa's affirmative genealogy of freedom, are three of the seminal elements, and historical empirical events, for South Africa's entry into its free democratic dispensation, in 1994. The presentation was dedicated to the international celebration of the seventieth year of the founding of the UDHR, in 1948.

Keywords: Open Access, heterotopic, transversal, equitable foundations, open knowledge, Access, Anton Lembede, Freedom, UDHR, Equality, The Freedom Charter, knowledge production

Introduction

Following on the publications based on Prof J.A. Smit's 2017 International Open Access lecture (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018a; and 2018b), this article captures some aspects from his 2018 lecture. It further develops his exploration of the significance of Michel Foucault's triad, subject – communication – knowledge-power production in the post-1989 digital paradigm, or, e-episteme. For this, the article has two main parts. In the *first*, it provides a theoretical framework for the empirical interpretation of the 2018 international topic for the Open Access week, seminally, incorporating the notions of the 'heterotopic' and 'transversal'. *Secondly*, in South Africa's *ascendant history into openness, as a free country*, it provides a sample of three significant events in our *affirmative genealogy, or genealogies, of freedom*. These are, *access* to the full participation in, and 'contributions' to, world culture, or world information-, data-, or knowledge-power, or science-power productions, á la Anton Lembede; *freedom* as founded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR); and *equity/ equality/ e/Quality*, as founded in 'The Freedom Charter'. As such, the advocacy for *access, freedom, and equality* in South Africa's affirmative genealogy of freedom, are three of the seminal elements, and historical empirical events, for South Africa's entry into its free democratic dispensation, in 1994. The presentation was dedicated to the international celebration of the seventieth year of the founding of the UDHR, in 1948.

Concerning the brief ten year history of international Open Access week, it may be noted that, at this point, more than one hundred student organisations and more than 200 university libraries worldwide, are involved, including many in Africa. The topic, 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge' was released by, Nick Shockey, Director of Programs & Engagement for Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (or SPARC). The *Right to Research Coalition*, founded in 2009, is the main driver behind Open Access week, SPARC, as well as its annual open conference, or *OpenCon*. The main objective, of the network is to make 'open' the default position, with regard to both access to existing knowledge, and for knowledge production¹. Its main purpose, as on the SPARC website, is to,

¹ Cf. <https://sparcopen.org/people/nick-shockey/>.

For more information, cf. Open 'Access Explained', at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L5rVH1KGBCY>. The official hashtag of Open Access Week is #OAweek (Shockey 2018).

enable the open sharing of research outputs and educational materials in order to democratize *access* to knowledge, *accelerate discovery*, and *increase the return on our investment in research and education*. As a *catalyst for action*, [Open Access seeks to collaborate with] *stakeholders – including authors, publishers, libraries, students, funders, policymakers and the public* – to build on the opportunities created by the Internet, promoting changes to both infrastructure and culture needed to *make open the default for research and education* (e.a. <https://sparcopen.org/who-we-are/>).

So, Open Access to existing past, present and future research is the default position adopted for the networking among stakeholders, and advocacy, in the areas of research, teaching and learning, as well as community engagement (cf. further <https://sparcopen.org/who-we-are/>).

As such, then, the article addresses the topic of the 2018 Open Access week, ‘Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Access’².

The presentation was dedicated to the celebration of the seventieth year of the founding of the UDHR, in 1948.

1 **Theorising Space in the e-Episteme: Heterotopias, and Transversals**

In the ‘The African Digital Humanities (ADH) and *Alternation* on OJS (2018 -): Innovation, Pan-African Collaboration, and Trans-Continental Integration’ we found it helpful to interpret Foucault’s legacy, in terms of a pre- and post-digital revolutionary framework, or, a 1989 global pre- and post-Berners-Lee, entry into the digital episteme. This epistemic demarcation is employed again, and reconfigures Michel Foucault’s triadic model, within a radically different historico-contextually-relevant e-subject, and e-community digital interpretive community. In the e-episteme, this move reveals Foucault’s historical analyses as historicizable diachronic heterotopic events with lesser or greater diachronic genealogical historical, event significance, in the research into the history of the present of the emergent Digital, or e-Humanities.

² For a comprehensive overview of issues and concerns currently involved in open access scholarship, cf. Sollner and Mittermaier’s *Praxishandbuch Open Access* (2017). For Britain, Eve (2017), provides a brief overview.

1.1 Heterotopias

We front this theoretical framework, with a reflection on the notion that Foucault coined in his *The Order of Things*, ([1966] 1969), viz. ‘heterotopia’, i.e. the Greek heteros + topos = different, or other, + place, or space. In his ‘The Subject and Power’, where he reflects on his then previous twenty years’ research endeavours, he captures his explication of his notion of the subject, and which we re-articulated in terms of the (e-)subject – (e-)communication system – (e-)knowledge-power triad, as, diachronically, and historicisably, positioned within ‘diverse forms, diverse places, diverse circumstances or occasions, in which these interrelationships establish themselves according to a specific model’ (Foucault 1982:787). Theoretically, this explication is quite enlightening as to the exigencies of *forms* of discourse, and discursive formations, in their deployments, in *diverse places, diverse circumstances or occasions* and, where it is specifically their *interrelations*, that are represented, or, in our constructivist approach, *produced*, according to *a specific model*, or network. This is modelled diachronically, as well as synchronically. This resonates with Foucault’s use of the notion *heterotopias*, more than a decade earlier, when he reflected on Jorge Luis Borges’ literary representations of different life-forms, in different times, and different places. Yet, in the e-episteme, the notion of heterotopia, could be usefully conceptualised, not in Foucault’s conceptualisation of Borges’ often hilarious³ literary representa-

³ In order to account for the hilarity of Borges’s literary representations, in terms of his notion of the heterotopia, Foucault says: ‘*Heterotopias* are disturbing, probably because they secretly undermine language, because they make it impossible to name this *and* that, because they shatter or tangle common names, because they destroy ‘syntax’ in advance, and not only the syntax with which we construct sentences but also that less apparent syntax which causes words and things (next to and also opposite one another) to ‘hold together’. This is why utopias permit fables and discourse: they run with the very grain of language and are part of the fundamental dimension of the *fabula*; heterotopias (such as those to be found so often in Borges) desiccate speech, stop words in their tracks, contest the very possibility of grammar at its source; they dissolve our myths and sterilize the lyricism of our sentences’ (Foucault [1966] 1970:xix). In some cases, if these heterotopic representations do not elicit laughter, because of their stupidities, obfuscations, and mystifications, they might do the opposite, viz., heterotopically drive you to tears.

tions of forms of human life in specific spaces, of different times and climes, but more objectively, in terms of Foucault's articulation of the subject and the institution, in terms of its representations in 'diverse places, diverse circumstances or occasions', either diachronically, or synchronically, as in 'The Subject and Power'. In terms of our transition into the digital era, and concomitant digital episteme, the study of discourse, or discursive formations, should therefore not only be understood heterotopically *analytically*, as Foucault has done in his numerous studies, but heterotopically, with regard to the production of knowledge-power, and that both diachronically, and synchronically. Transposed into the digital episteme, and of nodal points along the networked information and data flows (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018b:365f), along their curves via variable connectivities, these historicisable nodal points themselves, heterotopically ground, or culturally embed, or situate, their rhizomatic rootedness (cf. Narismulu & Dhunpath 2011:13, with regard to Eco 1984:57). And, obviously, this should be studied, or analysed, in terms of their manifestations, but also articulated from within the specific culturally embedded hubs from within which knowledge-power, or discourse, is being produced, in its specific diachronic and synchronic rootedness. It is not different in South Africa, where we are building and developing a new episteme of discourse, and networked discursive formations, via inter-, multi- and trans-disciplinary approaches, since 1994. However, the emergence of this episteme pre-dates 1994, and we shall reference just three prominent nodal points, of many others, representing a few seminal events from this diachronic trajectory, and in fact, experiential, empirical, and material legacy in the rootedness of our still brief history.

1.2 Transversals

For the notion of the transversal, as well as the next section of these theoretical reflections, we draw on Foucault's reflections on the notion of resistance, and struggle. Yet, as we have suggested in the previous two articles, here, again, we should understand his modelling of resistance, in terms of pro-active innovation, and knowledge production, not neglecting the importance of the social forces, feeding into social formation mobilization, and social action. As such, the transversal must be understood in both its pre-1989 and post-1989 significance. And, we shall here briefly reflect on these two perspectives.

Drawing on Foucault (1982: 779 - 781) and our theorizing of the digital paradigm (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018a; 2018b), we may characterize our

entry into the digital episteme, more specifically, as an entry into a new economy of knowledge-power, and, as we explicated, not only the *analysis* of knowledge-power productions and their continued effects from the past, or, even their morphed horizontal structured, and structuring present, but in terms of the real challenges of and for knowledge production in the empirical present. *On the one hand*, the transversal resistances and struggles that manifested in empirical activities and mobilizations heterotopically, in the past, have been replaced by the heterotopic knowledge-power-producing embodied subjects, and knowledge formations of the new episteme. Even more importantly, is to note that despite the accommodation of Marxist, communist and socialist, strategies of the past⁴, by the West-European-American elite into the liberal paradigm since the 1950s, it has now lost its moral legitimacies among its formerly supportive citizens, as is evident in today's Britain and America. We might add, too that this is in no small measure due to the transversally democratically produced knowledge(s), through science, the diverse branches of and the drive for universal literacy and education. Whereas liberal capitalism was the only world power that remained standing, following the demise of Nazism (after 1945), and then Communism (after 1989), it now too, has met its nemesis, in the dawn of the exponential multiplication of the digital network society, and the radical democratization of access to knowledge, information, and data via well-known algorithms such as Google and Facebook, as well as the rising social impacts of mass social media networks, as exemplified since the time of the Arab Spring, and the #Mustfall movements in South Africa. This, obviously has brought Humanities scholarship, in its train, transversally, with the attendant challenge for contextually-relevant knowledge productions.

So, the question of the transversal in this context, allows us to reflect on the fact that Foucault used it to denote the resistances and struggles against the various world hegemonies of colonisation, or later, Nazism, and communism, including, e.g., the political hegemonies in Europe of the 1960s, and Vietnam, and of late, the latest anti-liberal-capitalist and neo-colonising paradigms, were in fact heterotopic, and not confined to one country, or for

⁴ It is today well recognized that systems such as the accommodation of labour union mobilization by Western, liberal states, universal health care, and universal literacy and education, have been copied over from Marxist, Socialist and Communist ideological systems, into Western hegemonic systems. Also, that capitalist economic forms have been appropriated in former communist blocs.

that matter, one continent. In addition, the fact is that they have also not been confined to one specific military-industrial complex, or political-economic system, but manifested as so many forms of individual and social discontent, transversally, is informative. This is even more so, now, in the digital episteme, in so far as global networks and connectivities, are aiding in what we may call transversal processes of education, as well as the general conscientisation, and, in the case of some civil society organisations, mobilization, in relation to other similar movements in different parts of the world.

As such, the variety of forms of resistance have in many cases in the past coagulated, into social forms that brought about small, as well as large-scale transformations. The same has been happening in the last decade, and, what is even more interesting, is that many of these forms of social formation, actually represent, the classes that have been mostly at the receiving end of the various hegemonic powers' knowledge-power impacts, via their hegemonic, and colonizing state and civil apparatuses, institutions, and instruments. And, that social networks and media have played a role in discourse development, as well as social mobilisation, is widely recognized. So, the question of the transversal, acquires particular importance in our empirical present, not least, because of the different kinds of freedom, that it harbours, but also different forms of threat⁵. It is as such, that transversal struggles for freedom, equity and access, during the twentieth century, may, as before, snowball into larger transversal movements, as well as counter-movements, even against democracy, and forms of capitalism, and also meet with pushbacks, from governments, for instance. These may be country-specific, but also co-ordinated amongst governments experiencing the same, transversally⁶.

And, it is in this context, that knowledge-production, by locally-embedded knowledge-production hubs, as nodal points in transversal networks, may become an important strategy for socio-culturally-embedded formations, as well as their mobilization in the interests of goal-directed social and economic advancements. We may well envisage that coalitions, alliances, associations, accords, and similar formations, may ever become more

⁵ Cf. the distinction between the stable and unstable (Smit & Chetty 2018b).

⁶ Cf. for instance, two important studies by Kelly, Truong, Shahbaz, Earp & White on *Freedom on the Net 2017: Manipulating Social Media to Undermine Democracy*, and *Freedom on the Net 2018. The Rise of Digital Authoritarianism* by by Truong, White & Funk *et al.* (2018).

transversally organized – and recognized – than before. In the aiding of local populations, in these and related endeavours, the university, and more specifically, the Digital Humanities may yet prove to be a crucial hub in the international knowledge-power global digital networks dynamics.

2 Theorising Empirical Knowledge-Power Productions

It has recently become evident that we need to put capacity building at the forefront of research, and teaching and learning – both concerning the subject, and society/ community – in, with, and for community. This needs to be done in terms of *present challenges, in the present, done empirically*, and that, in *local, and regional environs*, both *heterotopically*, and *transversally*.

2.1 Empirical Knowledge[-Power] Productions

In this section, we then reflect on the knowledge side of the hyphenated notion of knowledge-power with some transposed insights from Foucault (1984). We abbreviate Embodied Knowledge Production as EKP.

- Transversal EKP may be *country- or more specifically, hub-specific*, and network-embedded, in interpretive communities, including locally, critically-informed political-economy and governance formations.
- EKPs *may assist embedded communities* in both *general and specific capacity building and development processes*, ranging from health, and well-being, through environmental care to subjective and societal capabilities and capacity building plans, projects, and realizations.
- EKP opportunities *may cover a large spectrum*, and are *focused on present relevant needs, and knowledge and information, data requirement productions* i.e. with regard to a range of essential knowledge, information and data generation needs, and future requirements.
- EKPs assert the *centrality* of the subject, *in relation to, and interaction with community*, and seek to maximize subjective aptitude, capacity, and capability development, while asserting life-affirming intersubjective community relations, networks, and interactions, also with a society's 'others'.
- EKPs assert the advancement of the radical subjective *knowledge competence improvement and development*, in community, for the benefits of community and society – for entrepreneurial capacity in the domains of knowledge, information, and data productions and contextually-relevant interpretations, and applications.

- EKPs promote *transparency* in knowledge competence and capacity developments and advancements.
- EKPs happens in *openness*, in so far as *access* to knowledge-power competence and capacity development and advancement, is *open*, and as far as possible, *free*.
- EKPs, are characterized by *accountability, with regard to the subject's optimum development of its own aptitudes, capabilities, and capacity*; and, *with regard to the interpretive community*, including in broader formations such as a region, or a nation's legal and related institutions, pacts, and systems, as these formations are articulated and networked with local and global connectivities.
- EKPs serve to *clarify, explain, and illuminate* about *some mystifications, dis- or misinformation or obfuscations* (or, 'fake-news') that might exist subjectively, or communally, in community, nation, and internationally.
- Subjective, and socially-embedded EKPs, may constructively assist in *social cohesion, community, as well as nation building*, in so far as they creatively move from the question, 'who are we?' to the assertion of (social) identities, dreams and hopes.

2.2 Empirical [Knowledge]-Power Productions

As empirical, embodied knowledge production, is also linked to power in the wide variety of knowledge-power production articulations, this raises the more precise issue of the *conceptualisation of power* in the subject – communication – knowledge-power production triad. Drawing on Foucault's more general focus and findings, with regard to the 'power' aspect in empirical knowledge - power productions, in the constructivist argument, they may be similarly transposed into the digital episteme, i.e. that 1) '*power is everywhere*'; 2) that, in the digital episteme, *the micro-physics of power* may impact embodied subjects in liberatory ways; and 3) that constructivist discourse formation, my productively draw on the *substance of events of liberatory power*, from the past, in the present, as the *historical events and effects of the past in the present*, and *for the future*.

2.2.1 Power is Everywhere

Power is everywhere, not because someone has power and then distributes it to only a select few, in a sense of how you would distribute parts of a budget

to different members of a team to then enact what the policy and budget prescribes. That too. But, more foundationally, we need to reference the systems, institutions, and structures that we humans find and develop to meet specifically human, or humane, needs and create specific contextually-relevant opportunities for members and social formations in our societies and communities, into which we are born, so to speak, but that we too create and construct, for the well-being of all. These may range from our *language, sign, symbol and communication systems*, through our *social formations, institutions, and how society is structured* – according to various socio-cultural formations, and the old base and superstructure distinctions for example – to the *scholarly, and disciplinary, and inter-, multi-, and transdisciplinary digital, and networked discourses, and their discursive formations* into which pupils, students, and academics are intellectually socialized through both the research, and teaching and learning education systems and practices.

In constructivist discursive perspective, all these systems are not only subject to change, in movement, and flows, and continuously evolving. Some, are subject to either planned, or unplanned piecemeal changes. Others are subject to more wholesale changes, as we have seen with the world entering into the digital era, or what we have called the Berners-Lee era. If, in previous eras we have found that ‘power is everywhere’ in so far as that its systems, institutions, and structures, have constricted, dominated, incapacitated, exploited, or routinized the vibrancy of human, animal and environmental life, or created opportunities only for a select few, this was radically changed as we entered into the digital, Berners-Lee era. Where it initially empowered people the world over, to provide knowledge-production opportunities at your fingertips so to speak – with the PC, since the late 1980s and early 1990s –, of late, it has put computing in your hands, following the emergence of Smart technology in the early 2000s, with the advent of the i-Phone in 2007. The radically democratic mass production of multi-purpose smart phones, means that the notion of ‘power is everywhere’, not only references knowledge production in its more traditional sense, of developing and constructing knowledge constructs along traditional print-media lines from your PC. In the context of social transformation, it has put electronic media in the hands of the insignificant, and overlooked, or, even dominated and suppressed, as we have seen with the rise of the #Rhodesmustfall, #Feesmustfall, and #metoo movements for instance. Now, everyone can also record, watch, or report, and/or forward ideas, views, images, or events, for good or ill. And, transversally,

it has provided access to and heterotopic opportunities for multi-media knowledge, information, and data production and interpretations from virtually any location in the world.

2.2.2 *The Digital Microphysics of Power*

Foucault's notion of the *microphysics of power*, encapsulates the wide variety of ways in which reigning ideologies, and socially-constructed systems and institutions – whether empirically built and constructed or not –, together with their 'technologies', and 'instruments', impact subjects, and that moreover, subjects, as *embodied* subjects. They impact behavior, our 'conduct' inside, as well as in relation to the systems, institutions, and structures, constructed by the powerholders, for their advantage, and those of their followers – the reigning elite – which also manifests in democracies contrary to common belief. They also regulate conduct and behavior with regard to the rules of the powerholders, and their representatives, whether in empirical interaction, by threats and occasions of brutal force, or more subtly, in terms of virtual notions of surveillance, as we have learnt from George Orwell's, *1984*, for instance.

Even more subtly, and insidiously, the micro-physics of power do not only regulate human behavior as conduct, but also coerce human subjects to *regulate* their *own* behavior, and conduct themselves, according to how they have been conditioned, by the system's instruments, techniques, according to specified rules and regulations. Universally, the most devastating of this mechanism, has been the ways in which modern colonizing systems and institutions – whether from the East, or the West –, have induced beliefs of superiority and inferiority in subjected colonized peoples over the last about 500 years. On the one hand, these systems were created to subject, suppress, and dominate people with the help, and use of technologies of the modern episteme. On the other hand, their instruments and techniques conditioned subjects to *conduct their own behavior* in line with the beliefs and practices, as well as the rules and regulations, of the colonizing forces. Foucault, is famous for exploring this dynamics of power, in his now famous trilogy on sexuality, and enlightened as to the impacts of his researches not only on power with regard to its functioning in systems and institutions, as is evident from his archaeological researches, but also more particularly, crime-and-punishment, and gender relations, with a focus on sexuality, in his genealogical researches.

Against this background, the digital episteme has provided the conditions of possibility for not only questioning the reigning systems and

institutions, that we have inherited from the past – i.e. as these are being represented in our postcolonial, and decolonising discourses and discursive formations, as to their potential continuation of life-constricting and/ or environmentally destructive institutionalised power effects. It has also opened up opportunities and possibilities, for knowledge production, with liberating, power effects, of Access, Freedom, and e/Quality (cf. below). For this purpose we have been developing knowledge production networks, not least through our locally-grown knowledge-production hubs, which includes, our national scholarly associations and academic journals. We may also add, that in our estimation, it appears that in what, George Orwell missed in 1948, when he wrote *1948*, was that the digital would at some point, very soon after 1984, start to radically democratize electronic media, or in his visionary parlance at the time, the ‘speak-writer’. Together with this event, the world has also started to be swamped by information and data productions.

2.2.3 The Substance of Power as Event

With global emergence into the e-episteme – there are reportedly already 2 billion facebook users at the moment – we *have* to confront the knowledge productions of the world’s past, our internationally-inherited *knowledge-power substance, or, substantial events of history*, and its continuing knowledge-power effects, in the empirical present, as a history, or the world’s histories, of the present, in all its diversity, and dispersal. Not just analytically, but productively, Michel Foucault, has provided historicised examples of such engagements. And, in order to unpack this as an initial and still very partial gesture, we make just three points.

As for the *first*, we need to deal with history as substance, in all its materiality, not merely in the form of the public statues that were supposed to provide ideological rationalizations for past ideologies. That too, yes. But more significantly, for that which these statues came to represent. Specifically, in the South African context, we need to deal with the issues earlier outlined (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018b: 363), as, e.g.,

evidenced in the material continuation of the asymmetrically racially-founded knowledge-production social networks (including academic social networks and journals), in land and property distribution, the actual urban and rural geographies that distinguish between developed infrastructure and under-developed [or stunted], the number of

productive institutions and companies, together with the large diverse array of cross-cutting para-institutional national and international props and networks.

These knowledge-power constructs from the past are the knowledge-power constructs in the present, that continue to shape and determine, and even, in many cases keep scholarship captive in outdated last-outpost-kinds of knowledge-power configurations and constructs, registered in the paradigm paralyses we mentioned earlier.

As African researchers and academics, and intellectuals, and together with international partners, these need to be engaged intellectually, as has been done by many remarkable people, both men and women, throughout world history. As has been shown with the social engagements of the South African government on the land issue, more recently, these should also be engaged together with our communities, and societies⁷. In terms of Gerry Stahl's model, these should be engaged both horizontally, and historically. Many, also in Africa and also southern Africa have, in the past, and recent past, and present, engaged the continuing effects of these legacies, the historical substance of the material effects of past knowledge-power productions, in the present, and have done so critically, analytically, and constructive-interpretively. And, many are continuing to engage this and the related legacies of this challenge.

For the *second sub-point* under this heading of the *knowledge-power substance of history*, we need to flag the promises of our entry into electronic virtual realities. For many reasons, as have become evident in the rapidly expanding of gaming and related software and hardware productions, virtual reality productions provide possibilities for not only past, but also future imaging and scenario building and that, for either/ or mass, or networked

⁷ Significantly for instance, in this regard, is the appeal by Prof Robin Crewe, Chairperson of the the ASSAf Committee on Scholarly Publishing in South Africa (CSPiSA) and the National Scholarly Editors' Forum (NSEF), at its latest meeting on 20 November 2018, Southern Sun Hotel, OR Tambo, Johannesburg, where he urged scholarly journal editors and research group leaders to also become active on facebook, twitter, and related social network and messaging services, so as to take our communities, associations and societies with us, with regard to the more general social significance of our knowledge, information, and data productions, analyses, and interpretations.

distribution, or targeted distribution as in education systems for instance. This, obviously also brings with it a myriad of ethical and related questions, not least of an ideological nature, concerning dystopic scenario and narrative building, as well as the more basic pejorative significances of ideologies, as such, and questions of fake news, and of late, with Elon Musk's initiatives, algorithm-driven fake news and information productions⁸. In this latter regard, the quest for radical, communicative interactive engagements remains the preferred procedures to follow in teaching and learning, as well as community engagement, if not research endeavours.

Finally, with regard to the points made above, in respect of the findings that *'power is everywhere'*; that, *the micro-physics of power impact embodied subjects*; and that it is through the *substance of power-knowledge*, its *materialities*, and *realities and reality effects*, that it impacts human bodies and the material environment, we need to raise the empirical question as well. This concerns the empirical effects of the knowledge-power currently being produced in its multiform impacts on bodies and the environment, and that globally. The question, as we engage both past and future, in the present, concerns the productions of knowledge-power that have liberating, knowledge-power effects within the framework of Access, Freedom, and e/Quality. And, as intimated earlier, the question concerns how to do this, heterotopically, transversally, and most importantly, with regard to attention to both the empirical effects of power-knowledge, not only from the continuing past, and present, but also with regard to the effects knowledge-power productions, in the present, create and produce, and as to their effects into the future. And, below, we just briefly expound on these, under the rubric of the 2018 international Open Access lecture topic, 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge'.

3 Praxis of 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge' in Context

As stated earlier, the general topic of the 2018 Open Access lectures internationally, was 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge'. By using the intransitive verb, 'designing', but obviously, accompanied by transitive implications, the topic assumes that the international *foundations of knowledge* that exist, are not 'equitable', and, too, that *access to this*

⁸ For a preliminary critical foray into this domain, cf. Smit and Chetty (2018c).

knowledge, or knowledge formations, or even knowledge blocks, and their processes and procedures, are not ‘open’. In a simple binary understanding, this means that these knowledge formations and, as earlier explicated, the discourse, or discursive formations, in which they are gestated and generated, that harbour them or represent them, but also as knowledge is disseminated, through various networks, are *inequitable*, or, in common parlance, firstly, *unequal*, and, secondly, as the opposition to *open* knowledge, *closed*. That said, this topic challenges the academic and intellectual fraternities to produce knowledge(s), as well as the how, the what happens and the how things happen, as to the systems, and institutions, including both the software and hardware, in our digital age, for opening up, and in terms of our current concerns, we may mention, for instance, race, class and gender. Because, many knowledge systems and knowledge formations are gendered, racially closed circles, and, given world history, closed in terms of economic class, or, social caste⁹. In this regard, to provide just a mere sample of what is needed from our common African perspective, and as this reflects on the substance of knowledge-power, we shall raise four issues, concerning the move from the focus on the how, to a focus on the what, or content, that is required, for achieving equity via Open access, e.g. access to the productions of modern, and modernising culture.

Whereas we reflected last year on the HOW, on the capacity, and the communication and the knowledge power systems, we want to here reflect on WHAT. With this focus, we shall also identify three of the *foundations* of this

⁹ As earlier indicated, we shall not here reflect further on the how, or the what happens, or technicalities, related to datatech, infotech, techknow, techlit, or e-Learning, that, since the 1990s, also including the diverse modalities of communication and interaction that became available with the dawn of the digital, or electronic age or, for that matter, the important issue of ‘multiliteracy’, as it encompasses the mastering, fluency, and use (contextually-relevant mental representation) of more than mother tongue languages. Cf. for instance, Becker (2004); Brown and Van der Merwe (2015); Ellis and Goodyear (2010); Lea (2015); on MOOCs (McKay and Lenarcis (2015); Mouromtsev and d’Aquin (2016); and on Pedagogy and governance in an open society Peters, Liu & Ondercin (2012); Lea (2015); Surian (2016); and also, for the entry into the latest developments, of humanities scholars, becoming adept in code writing, e.g. Romano’s *Learning Python* (2015), consistent with the notion of the Digital Humanities. Cf. also Sampson, Ifenthaler, Spector and Isaías (2014).

quest for the productions of the requisite substance or content, via openness and access. And this is what people / scholars have called our *ascendant history into openness of South Africa as a free country*. Or what is also been called our *Affirmative Genealogy of Freedom*, of dignity, of openness, of social equality, of equal social justice for ALL (both men and women) and of the collective constructive engagement of social transformation. Constructive engagement of what philosophers have called our historical ontology of the present. What has brought us here and what remains to be done. As is well recognised, these have been three vitally important drivers, in our *South African ascendant history into openness, as a free country*, which has been centrally part of our own *Affirmative Genealogy of Freedom*, of dignity, of openness, and which could be strung together as central part of in our collective historical tapestry, i.e. the centrally important events of what we could thematise as the push of access, freedom and e/Quality.

3.1 Access

With regard to *access*, Anton Lembede has played a very significant role in what has become the substance of South African history. For those familiar with colonial and apartheid Durban, one of Durban's central, and busiest streets, Smith Street, formerly named after a British Captain, was renamed Anton Lembede Street. As such, in Durban, and also within the substance of South African history, Anton Lembede has acquired some posthumous recognition in the minds and culture of the South African people. Anton Lembede was a fascinating intellectual and budding young academic, and a South African activist, who also became the founding president of the African National Congress Youth League (ANCYL). And, in one of his most famous statements, and taken up into the ANC Youth League Manifesto of 1943, he says,

The African ... regards [World] Civilization [/World Culture/ World Knowledge-Production] as the common heritage of all Mankind [Humanity] and claims as full a right to make his [and her] contribution to its advancement and to live free as any White South African [South African Citizen]; further, he [she] claims the right to all sources and agencies to enjoy rights and fulfil duties which will place him [and her] on a footing of equality with every other South African racial [socio-cultural] group (*Freedom in our Lifetime* ... 1944:90).

In terms of international discourse at the time, the notion of Civilization, with a capital C, was reserved for mainly white, 'European', specifically British, American, or European, men from the elite classes. It was produced for their benefit, and they were expected to contribute to it, via a wide variety of forms of scientific and colonising exploits. 'Civilization', with a capital C, here, in context, would be better regarded as knowledge-production, the production of World Civilisation, of World Culture, with a capital C, more globally speaking. So, for Lembede to make this statement, and to found and produce the 'Freedom in our Lifetime' - discourse, was not only a statement of intent, but also a courageous statement. So, if the World Civilisation, or World Culture, is the common heritage of all humanity, then it is incumbent to provide *access* to all, equally, to fully participate in the productions of World Civilisation/ World Culture/ World Knowledge Production, and also to benefit from that equally. Moreover, Lembede asserts the African's right to live free as any white, and for that matter world citizen, of the time. Further he also claimed the right to all sources and agencies to enjoy rights and fulfil duties which will place all Africans on an equal footing and equality with all, internationally. As historical event, this statement, in South Africa's ascendant history, was extremely significant, and a central, foundational building block for opening up *access* to universal civilization, or world culture and knowledge productions. We mention this as one example amongst many, as providing the foundations of South African society as an open society, with *access* to knowledge production, to all that the natural and human sciences offer both as challenge and task. Following Lembede, and as has happened since 1994, South Africans have stepped up to take their rightful proud place as subjects of knowledge-power among the nations, and have grown from strength to strength.

3.2 Freedom

Lembede made his statement while the so-called Second World War was still in full swing. Five years later, following the war, in 1948, the then recently founded United Nations, promulgated the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). And, still amidst fierce resistance from closed academic and political systems, with ideologies rooted in racism, sexism, the capitalist exploitation of the working classes, and sectarianism, not least in South Africa, it opened ALL the people of the world to the benefits and protections of universal rights and freedoms. In its very, very significant 'Preamble', it states:

Designing Transversal Heterotopic Equitable Foundations

Whereas recognition of the *inherent dignity* and of the *equal* and *inalienable rights* of *all members of the human family* is the *foundation of freedom, justice and peace* in the world, ...

And, in Article 1, it states,

All human beings are *born free* and *equal* in *dignity* and *rights*. They are endowed with *reason* and *conscience* and should act towards one another in a spirit of mutual humanity [brotherhood and sisterhood].

....

In terms of our sub-heading, the embodied subject – communication – knowledge-production unitary, and integrated triadic praxis, is positioned within the transversal and heterotopic spatial configurations and networks, as a *free* subject, with inherent dignity, and with *inalienable rights* as an integrated participating member of the *human family*. As is the case with ALL human subjects, the knowledge-producing subject is *born free*, and endowed with *reason* and *conscience*, in addition to human dignity and rights.

In addition to Lembede's thrust for the African subject's full *access* to and equal participation and carrying of equal responsibility, in the universal knowledge-power production systems of the world, we here, have the equally valid and internationally compelling and cogent assertion of, what we may term, ontological, legal, as well as internationally-guaranteed intersubjective *freedom*.

To this, and in the light of the Open access week topic, we need to also consider the importance of the UDHR's Article 26, where it asserts,

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free,

This is an immense challenge for the world. With the advent of technological-driven material productions displacing human labour, and in many cases, making it obsolescent, the challenge to provide access to free education to the world's populations, and also to fund the cyclic re-education, and re-skilling that future scenario builders foresee, this is a real challenge. Yet, the Digital Humanities may provide a very important avenue for addressing this matter and its related challenges. Not only will it call on the research-led education institutions to provide the universally, and

internationally-networked requisite teaching and learning, but also challenge our library systems, as they are at the moment, to transform from mainly print-based to more digitally-based practices. It is the open digital library systems, as advocated by Open Access week, who, as local hubs, together with universities' researchers, and scholarly journals, amongst others, are called upon to step into this vacuum, that has been emerging now for some time, and meet the challenges for present, and continuing education and training. Doubtlessly, as is the case presently in South Africa, free, equal access to these educational, and research hubs, will continue to be a challenge financially for institutions, families, and the state.

3.3 *e/Quality*

Seven years after the promulgation of the UDHR in 1955, the South African Congress of the People, adopted the Freedom Charter at Kliptown, Gauteng. This document is not only important as to its future vision, of what South Africa could, and should be like. More importantly, with regard to the foundations, of the praxis of the African knowledge-producing subject, it is rooted in *equality*. On this notion, or, transposed into our post-1989, digital framework, *e/Quality*, we want to make three observations.

Firstly, traditionally, the assertion of the equality of all human beings, is related to Jean-Jacques Rousseau (cf. Smit 2009). Yet, as Rousseau already recognised, we have to make a distinction between the inherent, and in-born value of a human being – which includes the aptitudes or capabilities of a person – and the actual development, through training, of those aptitudes and capabilities. The recent distinction in the literature, and also in the topic of the 2018 Open Access week, between equity and equality, reflects this distinction. *Equitability*, functions at the level of the equal, born, natural, dignity, including freedoms and rights of all human beings. This is foundational for *all* human beings. As such, it is incumbent on states, and their institutions, to provide equal access and freedom to all their citizens, in terms of their inherent dignity and human value, including the various systems and levels of education. So, equity, is to be guaranteed to, and provided for all equally. That is foundational.

Second, by using the notion of equality and equity interchangeably, we recognise that all human beings are recognised universally, as equal in terms of their human dignity and value, but not their aptitudes and capabilities. Similarly, *e/Quality* captures both the notion of equal dignity, as well as equal access,

and the call for the equal, and free, pro-active participation in knowledge-power productions for the benefit of the human world culture, and civilization, even as this is done according to the aptitudes, capabilities, and capacities of social formations, institutions, and individuals. Given Lembede's foundational thrust for equal and free participation, and the UDHR's foundational thrust for freedoms and rights, the challenge is indeed, to fully participate in the knowledge productions of our modern online, and offline worlds, equally.

Thirdly, and in addition to the recognition of equal dignity, and equal access according to continuous developing capacities and capabilities, e/Quality captures both the notions of the continuously advancing contextually-relevant *quality* of knowledge productions, in both the online (electronic) and offline (print media) worlds. The Subject/ e-Subject is challenged to continuously improve knowledge and skills – especially with regard to electronic data and information systems, e-technologies, and e-media – according to aptitudes and capacities, and to engage knowledge production activities heterotopically, and to do that transversally, so as to contribute to World Civilisation. Even though the contributions of individuals and institutions may vary as to the nature, and impacts of their contributions, e/Quality captures the sense of quality knowledge productions via the infotech and datatech of the digital era. In other words, what the open access knowledge foundations of access and freedom provide, is the opportunity to equally participate in knowledge productions according to the varied capacities and capabilities of the world citizens and their institutions, and to do that according to the highest measures of quality, thereby adding high quality value to World Culture.

Fourthly, if we focus these three seminal perspectives on the freedom Charter, we see that there are multiple opportunities for engaging what has been envisioned by our forebears. This is so in so far as that it resonates with many of the sentiments and assertions of the UDHR. In addition though, it deploys the notion of being 'equal', and a variety of forms of notions of 'equality', with regard to the in-equalities that then existed, and to a large extent continue to exist in South Africa, and more broadly speaking Southern Africa. It uses the word 'equal' 10 times, also echoing the overriding rationale and motivation for the Charter. And, this is done in relation to the 10 primarily identified thematisations, and visionary objects of concern, study and, in our context, in need of e-knowledge-power production. We shall not go further into this endeavour. Suffice to say that as one of the foundational focuses in our affirmative and ascendant genealogies of South Africa's ascendant history, it

also opens the door to incisive historical researches, both *analytical*, á la Foucault's philosophy, and productive, as a productive interweaving of the affirmative genealogies of access, freedom, and e/Quality. Within the e-paradigm, it concerns the the value-added quality that the electronic episteme brings to knowledge production.

Conclusion

We started off this article by reflecting on our earlier publications in 2018 (cf. Smit & Chetty 2018a; and 2018b). In these two publications, we have captured the gist of Smit's International Open Access lecture, of 23 October 2017, and, in the current article, his International Open Access lecture of 22 October 2018. It followed up on the explication of the embodied subject – communication system – knowledge-power production triad, modelled after Michel Foucault's 'The Subject and Power', of 1982, and transposed into the post-1989, or Berners-Lee digital era. It also explicated the triad in the context of the Open Access week's topic, viz. 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge'. We have shown that it should be done as a continuation of historical events that provided such 'foundations', and that this should be done heterotopically, and transversally. Access, Freedom, and e/Quality, are just three of many other conceptualisations of the *foundational* thematisations, that are cornerstones for addressing the issues of making 'open knowledge' the default measure for research, in 'both infrastructure and [scientific/ scholarly/ publishing] culture'¹⁰, in (South) Africa, and Africa more broadly speaking. As just three examples, this model may be helpful in exploring South Africa's *ascendant history into openness, as a free country, our affirmative genealogy, or genealogies, of freedom*, in the present. Similar to other countries, South Africa has its own distinctive foundations, and trajectories of *access* to the collaborative contributions to advancement of world culture, i.e. science, technology, and information, and data productions, or, knowledge-power, á la Anton Lembede; *freedom* as founded in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights

¹⁰ It is noted that, with regard to the transposition of Foucault's triad, we should engage it as an e-subject – e-communication – e-knowledge-power production triad. In both the presentations, by Smit, and the Smit & Chetty publications, and the published articles, Foucault's modelling was also transposed into, and extended, to accommodate the dynamics of the digital episteme that the world entered into with Berners-Lee's mapping of the internet at CERN, in 1989.

(UDHR), and *equity/ equality/ e/Quality*, as founded in ‘The Freedom Charter’.

In the final instance, the paper called for action, with regard to the objects as identified in The Freedom Charter as both part of the vision of a then future South Africa, and a research and knowledge-production task in the present. The question is, whether it is not incumbent on South Africa, and equally, the people of Southern Africa, to engage on knowledge production processes, related to its existing and developing decolonising research hubs and digital networks, to both analytically and productively engage the knowledge productions the country and the continent need. That the historical focus is important in this regard, goes without saying, and as already indicated in Smit, van Wyk and Wade (1996a), this is a continuing task, in the building of our alter-nation. And, as already indicated with regard to the historical study of SALit, in Smit (1996b: 209 - 223), some of the seminal approaches to engage in the broader theoretical framework in which empirical, embodied knowledge production is positioned, in socio-culturally and socio-historically conceptually-relevant researches, need not coagulate into the historicising of thick colonising ‘descriptions’ of historical cultural formations, but shift the focus onto the tracings of the *affirmative genealogies of freedom*, in Africa’s rise into *openness, in its ascendant history as a free continent*. In our three publications, we have attempted to outline some insights into some basic considerations, that could assist in this endeavour, as we engage the requisite knowledge-production challenges, not least, for the Digital Humanities¹¹.

It is also in this spirit, that we have dedicated these publications, to the celebration of the seventieth year of the existence of the UDHR, in 2018.

¹¹ We believe that perspectives and perceptions developed by Dilthey ([1887] 1997), and Geertz (1973), for instance are in need for further developing in our new theoretical conceptualisation and framework, as transposed into the post-1989, digital episteme. And, as far as meaning generation in our digital episteme is concerned, centrally involving the subject, the work represented by Jaspers ([1913] 1997; 1951), Bruner (1990), Prain, *et al.* (2015), and, in this issue, by Jarvis and Mthiyane (2018), are helpful. Cf. also Kenning (2013), and the very brief but seminal broaching of these, and similar issues by Joranger [2019, forthcoming]. Importantly, this is where the subject/ e-subject, is the subject-/ e-subject of contextually-relevant knowledge-power productions, through its various communication systems and e-knowledge, and e-networks, as central to the African Digital Humanities. Cf. also Parkhurst (2017).

References

- Becker, L. 2004. *How to Manage your Distance and Open Learning Course*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brown, T.H. & H.J. van der Merwe (eds.). 2015. *The Mobile Learning Voyage – From Small Ripples to Massive Open Waters*. 14th World Conference on Mobile and Contextual Learning, mLearn 2015, Proceedings. Venice, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer, Switzerland.
- Bruner, J. 1990. *Acts of Meaning: Four Lectures on Mind and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dilthey, W. [1887] 1997. *Wilhelm Dilthey: Selected Works: Poetry and Experience*. Volume 5. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Available at: https://dlcl.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/files_upload/Dilthey%20-%20Imagination%20of%20the%20Poet.pdf
- Eco, U. 1984. Postscript to *The Name of the Rose*. Weaver, William (trans). New York: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Eve, M.P. 2017. Open Access in the United Kingdom. In Sollner, K. & B. Mittermaier (Hrsg.): *Praxishandbuch Open Access*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ellis, R.A. & P Goodyear 2010. *Students' Experiences of E-learning in Higher Education: The Ecology of Sustainable Innovation*. London & New York: Routledge, and Taylor and Francis.
- Freedom Charter 1955. Adopted at Kliptown. Available at: http://www.historicalpapers.wits.ac.za/inventories/inv_pdfo/AD1137/A1137-Ea6-1-001-jpeg.pdf (Accessed on 21 October 2018.)
- Foucault, M. [1966] 1970. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. 1982. The Subject and Power. In Faubion, J.D. (ed.): *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954 – 1984, Volume 3*. London: Penguin. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1343197?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents (Accessed on 21 October 2017.)
- Foucault, M. [1997] 2003. *Society must be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975 – 1976*. New York: Picador.
- Gates, M. 2018. Smoothing the Shift to the Digital Age. Interview with Associated Press. Available at: <https://chicago.suntimes.com/news/melinda-gates-speaks-on-smoothing-the-shift-to-digital-age/> (Accessed on 21 October 2018.)
- Geertz, C 1973. The Impact of the Concept of Culture on the Concept of Man.

- In Geertz, C. *Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jarvis, J. & N.P. Mthiyane 2018. Conversing at the Intersection: Religious Identity and the Human Right to Gender Equality in a South African Teacher Education Context. *Alternation* Special Edition 23: 60 - 83. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/sp23a4>
- Jaspers, K. 1951. *Man in the Modern Age*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.
- Jaspers, K. 1974. Philosophical Autobiography. In Schilpp, P.A. (ed.): *The Philosophy of Karl Jaspers*. La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- Jaspers, K. [1913] 1997. *General Psychopathology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Joranger, L. [2019, Forthcoming]. An Interdisciplinary Approach to the Human Mind: Subjectivity, Science and Experiences in Change. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Kelly, S., M. Truong, A. Shahbaz, M. Earp & J. White (Freedom of the Net project) 2017. *Freedom on the Net 2017: Manipulating Social Media to Undermine Democracy*. Freedom House. Full Report Available at: www.freedomonthenet.org
- Kenning, W. 2013. Open Source Identity Management Patterns and Practices Using OpenAM 10.x: An Intuitive Guide to Learning OpenAM access Management Capabilities for Web and Application Servers. Birmingham: Packt Open Source.
- Lea, J. 2015. Enhancing Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Engaging with the Dimensions of Practice. Maidenhead: OUP.
- Lembede, A. Lembede, A. [1944] [1996] 2015. *Freedom in our Lifetime: The Collected Writings of Anton Muziwakhe Lembede*. Edgar, R.R. & L. Ka Msumza (eds.). Cape Town: Kwela Books.
- Narismulu, P. & R. Dhunpath 2011. Editorial: Diversity, Transformation and Student Experience in Higher Education Teaching and Learning. *Alternation* 18,2:1 - 14. Available at: <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/docs/18.2/01%20Edi.pdf>
- Mboweni, T. 2018. The World has Changed; We must Change our Mindset about the Economy. Minister of Finance, Tito Mboweni: Second Kader Asmal Memorial Lecture, at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology. Available at: <https://m.fin24.com/Budget/mboweni-the-world-has-changed-we-must-change-our-mindset-about-the-economy-20181021>
- McKay, E. & J. Lenarcic (eds.) 2015. *Macro-Level Learning through Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs): Strategies and Predictions for the*

- Future*. Hershey: Information Science Reference.
- Mouromtsev, D. & M. d'Aquin (eds.). 2016. *Open Data for Education: Linked, Shared, and Reusable Data for Teaching and Learning*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Open Access Week 2018. ABOUT – Open Access Week. Available at: <http://openaccessweek.org/page/about>
- Peters, M.A., T.C. Liu & D.J. Ondercin 2012. *The Pedagogy of the Open Society: Knowledge and the Governance of Higher Education*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Romano, F. 2015. *Learning Python. Learn to Code Like a Professional – An Open Source Versatile and Open Source Programming Language*. Birmingham: Packt Open Source.
- Ross, A. 2010. Internet Freedom: Historic Roots and the Road Forward. SAJS Review 30,2, Summer-Fall:3 – 13.
- UDHR 1948. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/>
- Parkhurst, J. 2017. *The Politics of Evidence: From Evidence-based Policy to the Good Governance of Evidence*. London & New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Prain, V., P. Cox, C. Deed, D. Edwards, C. Farrelly, M Keffe, V. Lovejoy & L. Mow (eds.). 2015. *Personalising Learning in Open-Plan Schools*. Rotterdam & Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Sampson, D.G., D. Ifenthaler, J.M. Spector & P. Isaías (eds.). 2014. *Digital Systems for Open Access to Formal and Informal Learning*. Switzerland: Springer International Publishing.
- Shockey, N. 2018. *Theme of 2018 International Open Access Week to be: 'Designing Equitable Foundations for Open Knowledge*. Available at: <http://www.openaccessweek.org/profiles/blogs/theme-of-2018-international-open-access-week-to-be-designing-equi>
- Smit, J.A. 2009. The 'Dis-embodied Mind' and Religion. *Alternation* Special Edition 3: 354 - 391; Available at: <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/docs/Alternation%20Spec%20Ed%203%20Pdfs/17%20Smit%20FIN.pdf>
- Smit, J.A., J. van Wyk, & J-P Wade (eds.) 1996a. *Rethinking South African Literary History*. Durban: Y-Press. Available at: <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/resources/jsmit/1996b-Rethinking-History-and-Literature.pdf>
-

- Smit, J.A. 1996ba. Rethinking History and Literature. In *Rethinking South African Literary History*. Durban: Y-Press. Available at: <http://alternation.ukzn.ac.za/Files/resources/jsmit/1996b-Rethinking-History-and-Literature.pdf>
- Smit, J.A. & D. Chetty 2018a. 23/ 25 Years of *Alternation*, and the African Digital Humanities: Capacity, Communication, and Knowledge-Power. *Alternation* 25,1 (2018): 8 - 30. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/v25n1a2>
- Smit, J.A. & D. Chetty 2018b. The African Digital Humanities (ADH) and *Alternation* on OJS (2018 -): Innovation, Pan-African Collaboration, and Trans-Continental Integration. *Alternation* 25,1: 360 - 393. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.29086/2519-5476/2018/v25n1a15>
- Smit, J.A. & D. Chetty 2018c. Debunking Marvel Comics' First Pakistani-American Born Muslim Female Superhero: Reading Religion, Race and Gender in *Ms. Marvel* (Kamala Khan). *The African Journal of Gender and Religion* 24,2,December: 1 - 24. Available at: <http://epubs.ac.za/index.php/AJGR/issue/view/22>
<https://doi.org/10.14426/ajgr.v24i2.366>
- Sollner, K. & B. Mittermaier (Hrsg.) 2017. *Praxishandbuch Open Access*. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, Sauer.
- Surian, A. (ed.). 2016. *Open Spaces for Interactions and Learning Diversities*. Rotterdam & Taipei: Sense Publishers.
- Truong, M., J. White & A. Funk. Roylance, T. (ed.). Yu, C. & A. Greco (res. Assits.). 2018. *Freedom on the Net 2018. The Rise of Digital Authoritarianism*. Full Report Available at: www.freedomonthenet.org

Johannes A. Smit
Editor-in-Chief: *Alternation*
College of Humanities
University of KwaZulu-Natal
smitj@ukzn.ac.za

Denzil Chetty
Assistant Editor: *Alternation*
College of Human Sciences
University of South Africa
chettd@ukzn.ac.za