

PUNDUTSO: Journal of Trans4mative Thought and Praxis (PJTTP)

Volume 1 Issue 1 Year 2019

Available online@<http://www.....>

Social Innovation in Southern Africa: Pre-modern Age-sets to Trans-modern Communiversity

Ronnie 'Samanyanga' Lessem¹, Munyaradzi Mawere² & Daud 'Shumba' Taranhike³

¹Professor & Co-founder of Trans4m Communiversity Associates.

²Professor & Research Chair, Great Zimbabwe University.

³Da Vinci/TCAs Candidate.

Abstract

In Africa as elsewhere in the world, neo-liberal economics has failed many. This has necessitated the need to proffer “novel” social innovative pathways aimed at transformative development moored on re-GENE-ration and relationality. Drawing from our recent book on *Nhakanomics...* (2019), this paper is an attempt to chart a path of *Social Innovation*, aligned with anthropology-and-economics (together with business and management studies), to what we have termed *Nhakanomics* in Southern Africa. This is explicitly opposed to Neo-Liberal Economics coming from America or the Global North in general. “*Nhaka*,” being the indigenous Shona term for “legacy” in Zimbabwe, we also build on the legacy, the *nhaka*, of an arguably most remarkable Zimbabwean social innovator, or *intenhaka* in our terms, the recently late Mr Phiri Maseko, and the Muonde Trust that has followed in his wake. In this light, the paper lobs for integral research, transformative social innovation and praxis that is locally-globally grounded.

Keywords: Social Innovation, Re-GENE-ration, Integral Research, Communiversity, Southern Africa, Zimbabwe

Introduction: Centering Re-GENE-ration for Integral Research and Innovation

“*Nhakanomics*” is born out of, firstly and processually, a “southern” *relational* path (Lessem and Schieffer, 2010) of research and innovation, and trajectory from origination to transformation. Secondly, and substantively, it straddles *anthropology-and-economics-and-enterprise*, including also business

and management. This, altogether then, like the double-helix of our integral DNA, is the process and substance of “southern” social innovation. In fact, while in the “west”, neo-liberal economics is spearheaded by the business, or now also social, entrepreneur, in the “south”, for us, an *integral* economy and enterprise are spearheaded by an *intembaka*. Whereas “*nbaka*”, as we have seen, embodies legacy, “*integrality*” embodies nature and culture, technology and enterprise, within an all-round “policonomy”.

In the relational South, we say goodbye to the entrepreneur, and to enterprise as we conventionally, and economically, know it. The Pundutso Research Academy, we have formed, as opposed to a Business School lodged within a University, part of what we term a Communiversality (see Lessem, Adodo, and Bradley, 2019), alongside learning communities, socio-economic laboratories, and what we term a “regenerative pilgrimum”. Our overall mission in Zimbabwe specifically, if not also in the Global South generally, is to re-GENE-rate society, through local Grounding and origination; tapping into a local-global Emergent foundation; via newly global emancipatory Navigation; culminating in global-local transformative Effect in, as we shall see, four recursive cycles.

As Trans4m Communiversality Associates (see, www.tc-a.org), moreover, spread across Nigeria and Pakistan, Jordan and the UK, in addition to Zimbabwe, we are co-evolving several other such research academies, that is OFIRDI (Ofure Integral Research and Development Initiative) in Nigeria; iSRA (integral Souldarity Research Academy) in Pakistan; in Jordan Medlabs’ ASIIL Academies; and RAISE (Research Academy in Integral Semiotic Economics) in Liverpool in the UK.

That said, in this paper, drawing from our recent book on *Nhakanomics...* (2019), we, that is, Ronnie Samanyanga Lessem as an Afro-European economist and academic, Munyaradzi Mawere as a Zimbabwean philosopher cum anthropologist, and Daud Shumba Taranhike as an African business and community practitioner, Lessem and Taranhike both being sons of the Buhera soil, chart a path of *Social Innovation*, aligned with anthropology-and-economics (together with business and management studies), to what we have termed *Nhakanomics* in Southern Africa. This is explicitly opposed to Neo-Liberal Economics coming from America. “*Nbaka*,” being the indigenous Shona term for “legacy” in Zimbabwe, the paper also builds on the legacy, the *nbaka*, of a most remarkable Zimbabwean social innovator, or *intembaka* in our terms, the recently late Mr Phiri Maseko, and the Muonde Trust that has followed in his wake. But the mind boggling questions that remains lingering is: “How is all this to be accomplished?”

The Call for Social Innovation

One of the most urgent calls of our day and age is for *social innovation*, recognising that technological innovation, on its own, will not address the major social, economic and ecological issues that we are facing today, in each and every particular context. In fact, for all the current emphasis on social enterprise, and entrepreneurship, about which, as we shall see, we have very mixed feelings, not much more than lip service has been paid to thoroughgoing “social innovation”. Instead technological innovation is all the rage. It is our attention to redress this imbalance, most specifically, in relation to this current work, in the context of Southern Africa. The re-GENE-rative route to such, as we shall see, both processally and substantively, is through Grounding (origination), Emergence (foundation), Navigation (emancipation) and Effecting (transformation), on the one processal hand, and through Nature, Culture, Technology and Enterprise, on the other, substantive one, altogether in this “southern” *relational* case involving most especially Anthropology-and-Economics.

Indeed, when it comes to technological innovation few would argue that such could not take place without an in depth knowledge of physics, or chemistry or biology, just for a start. Similarly, most of us are aware that such innovation, be it a next generation of mobile phone, or a space shuttle, requires some kind of scientific foundation, say in physics or astrophysics, and method of scientific experimentation, to be followed by commercialisation. Yet the social sciences are another matter: there is little if any understanding of what “social innovation” actually involves. What we shall be arguing, as such, is that purposeful attention has thereby to be paid to both the substance of social science, and to the process of social research, with a view to social innovation.

As far as “substance” is concerned, firstly, with our pre-emphasis on the “Global South”, our particular focus will be on the interplay between anthropology and economics, situated at the two extremities of the social sciences, the one, anthropology, being the most “southern” in orientation, and the other, economics, the most “western”. As far as the conduct, or process, of social scientific research is concerned, secondly, and complementary-wise, we (6) take on from where our prior work on *Integral Research and Innovation : Transforming Enterprise and Society* (Lessem and Schieffer, 2010), left off.

In fact, in the above work, we identified four overall research paths, respectively spanning four overall worldviews or transcultural Realities: the “southern” *relational*, the “eastern” path of *reason*, the “northern” path of *reason*, and the “western” path of *realisation*. Moreover, each such path is comprised of an overall, integral Rhythm, or trajectory, from research to innovation, spanning research method (local Grounding and origination); methodology (local-global Emergent foundation); critique

(emancipatory Navigation); and finally action research (transformative Effect), altogether serving to re-GENE-rate an organisation or a country (transforming enterprise and society).

However, and up to now, there was still one glaring thing missing. We, at Trans4m, had not yet practiced what we preached, and applied the *process* of integral research and innovation, in the guise of one such social research path or another, aligned with social scientific *substance*, to our own approach to social innovation. This is what we shall now be attempting, specifically involving the “southern” *relational* path. As far as social scientific “process” of innovation is concerned, then, as compared with technological innovation, relational origination, foundation, emancipation and transformation, in the social sciences, will be aligned with scientific discovery, development, engineering and commercialisation, in the natural sciences. Moreover, and in “substance”, anthropology, economics and management takes the place of physics, chemistry and biology.

One of the Greatest Discoveries of This Age: Anthropology, Not Physics

In this paper, we set the stage for our *Pundutso Research Academy* in Zimbabwe specifically, and for our Communiversity based Research Academy, in the South, East, North and West, if not also the Middle East, generally. Following in the footsteps of our *Integral Kumusha: Aligning Policonomy, Nature, Culture, Technology and Enterprise* (2019), it comes in the wake of Zimbabwe’s problematic attempt to “restore legacy”, in 2018. Following 37 years of President Mugabe’s rule, indeed ultimate misrule, we serve thereby to play our part in re-constituting Africa-and-the-world, through our communiversity-and-academy, linking and regenerating anthropology-and-economy. This then we accomplish through social research, leading to social innovation, via a series of four cycles, as we shall see, of Re-GENE-ration: that is re-GENE-ration (we shall reveal below the significance of our GENE) of C (K) umusha, Culture, Communications, Capital.

Why, to begin with, substantively, have we plucked such a seemingly unrelated anthropological discipline out of the cold, when we face such burning political and economic issues in our African birthplace? For while Zimbabwe is my own specific place of birth, Africa is generally humanity’ own. The new President Manangagwa’s “operation restore legacy”, in fact, has proved problematic, to say the least in our view, for three main reasons. The first is that he and his government did not take *legacy* – in the indigenous Shona language “*nbakā*” – seriously. They merely paid lip service to such rather than delving wholeheartedly, and thereby anthropologically, into its meaning and scope, locally and globally. Indeed, for the renowned African American historian, Chancellor Williams (8), after spending some 17 years undertaking research in his native Ghana, alluding to Africa’s legacy in the latter part

of the last century, and most specifically, for our purposes as we shall see, to the traditional African “Age-Set”:

One of the greatest discoveries of this age, was made in the field of anthropology, not physics. It was the discovery that in the rush from primitive life man actually left behind some of the more fundamental elements needed for a truly civilized life. Chief among these was – and of course is – the sense of community, direction and purpose. This is why Africa is very important now. It can profit if it sees the precipice towards which we are drifting, and takes the opposite course in an effort to build a different kind of society on a spiritual foundation. Some African leaders are not aware of this their most precious heritage. They are therefore rushing pell-mell to become Westernised all down the line. The situation throughout the world, however, calls upon them to halt, to take another look at their own cultural values, and start from a different base.

This, we shall be do throughout our *Nhakanomics*, albeit duly building on this base, from anthropological origination to socioeconomic transformation, locally and globally.

Social Innovation the Relational Path: Descriptive Method, Phenomenological Methodology, Feminist Critique, Participatory Action Research (DPFP)

In inaugurating what we term “social” innovation, it is primarily to anthropology-and-economics, and not most especially to, say, physics-and-electronics, as our substantive knowledge base, that we firstly turn. Secondly, such social substance is set alongside a social scientific process, from origination-to-transformation, from grounding to effect. This, moreover, is a specifically “southern” *relational* substantive aligned thereby with our process of *Integral Research to Innovation*. As such, we recast such social research in terms of four integral paths or *realities* – “southern” *Relational*, “eastern” *Renewal*, “northern” *Reason* and “western” *Realisation*, each one comprised of an integral *rhythm* or trajectory from local *Origination* (Grounding) to local-global *Foundation* (Emergence) onto newly global *Emancipation* (Navigation) and ultimately global-local *Transformation* (Effect), whereby the cycle repeats itself.

This indeed is the equivalent, in the natural sciences, of scientific discovery (origination), development (foundation), engineering (emancipation), and commercialisation (transformation). Of course, and inevitably in both technological and social cases, there is many a twist and turn along the way, so that the overall process becomes recursive, as much as it is progressive. In the “southern” relational case specifically drawn upon here, indeed for the first time in the literature as far as we are aware, the integral GENE *Rhythm* we draw upon, successively and cyclically, is:

- *Descriptive Method*: local **G**rounding and origination,
- *Phenomenological Methodology*: local-global **E**mergent foundation,
- *Feminist Critique*: newly global emancipatory **N**avigation, and
- *Participatory Action Research* as global-local transformative **E**ffect.

This is our newly constituted rhythm, or trajectory, from research method (Grounding and origination) to methodology (Emergent foundation), from research critique (emancipatory Navigation) to action research (transformative Effect). This rhythm serves to turn social research into innovation, just like the parallel, technological trajectory of invention to innovation, or indeed discovery to commercialisations, works. In then cyclical, if not also spiralling terms, we will be repeating that DFPF rhythm – having indeed an African *rhythmical*, if not also “rhyming” ring to it.

As such, and through Nature, we shall be re-GENE-rating **C** (K) umusha; via Spirit, re-GENE-rating **C**ulture; through Technology, re-GENE-rating **C**ommunications; and ultimately via a Nhakanomics, re-GENE-rating **C**apital. This means, and in relational terms, we will be cycling *descriptively* (method of origination), *phenomenologically* (foundational research methodology), *feminist-wise* (emancipatory critique), and *participatively* (transformative action) through social innovation in natural, spiritual, technological and economic turn.

Let us now explore how such an approach to social innovation, as opposed to the more commonplace “social research” – involving statistical analysis, social and economic surveys, individual interviews, case studies, and so forth – originally came about?

Uncovering Four Worlds via Depth Psychology, Philosophy and Economics

One of us, as a longstanding student of both economics and business administration, at such illustrious academic institutions as London School of Economics (LSE) in the UK and Harvard Business School (HBS) in the U.S., as well as formerly at the then (in the 1960) University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland (UCRN), had come to the conclusion that business and economics – at least each in their conventional, theoretical form, and Africa, just don’t meet. For while Africa was rooted in nature and community lodged anthropologically so to speak, in the “south”, the LSE, HBS, and indeed the colonially based economics department at UCRN, were founded upon so called economic and management science lodged in the “west”. At the time, in the 1960’s moreover, Samanyanga had not been formally exposed to anthropology, though his own family roots in rural Buhera in Zimbabwe provided him, informally at least, with such an anthropological backdrop.

It was out of such an African, rural grounding that his long journey began, as a ultimately an “academic researcher”, after some three decades of prior incubation, to find the local, African, de-colonised “southern” alternative approach to economy and enterprise, if not also the “eastern” and “northern” one. For like the noted political economist John Maynard Keynes, he too reckoned, despite the prevailing belief that industry and academe don’t meet, that “there is nothing as practical as good theory”. As such, he started out in the 1970s, after his formal business and economic education, and thereby incubation, informally researching outside of such, that is into depth psychology, philosophy – including culture - and spirituality, from all four corners of the globe. As such, he was continually seeking newly contextualised insights into standardised business and economics, from south and east, north and west. Summing up such, in an article Lessem (2001) wrote on *Managing in Four Worlds* at the turn of the new millennium:

The collapse of the Berlin wall within the Germanic heartland of Europe supposedly heralded, three decades ago, the re-birth of a continent, if not of the whole of the world. The sudden demise of communism called for – in prospect if not yet in current reality - a newly variegated economic, integral and dynamic, worldview, born out of variety rather than duality. For both capitalism and communism were born out of partial, monolithic views of our humanity. Each being European, and respectively Scottish and German in origin, neither doctrine, despite the seminal nature and scope of each, attempted to capture the cultural richness of the European continent, not to mention the whole of the globe, an endeavour taken up by artists rather than political economists. Whereas Adam Smith, by implication, called upon the merchants of the world to unite, Karl Marx invited the workers to do the same. Moreover, while Adam Smith’s perspective was the more integral, of moral sentiments and of the wealth of nations, so to speak, Marx’s was much more dynamic. Sad to say, never the twain did meet. Ironically in fact, Smith promoted the cause of labour (labour theory of value), and Marx promoted the perspective of capital (Das Capital).

Each, moreover, appealed to one class of society rather than to another - Smith to the merchants, Marx to the proletariat - while neither appealed explicitly to Scottish-ness, to English-ness, or to German-ness, not to mention African-ness or Asian-ness. Yet Smith was an embodiment of the Scottish Protestant enlightenment, while Marx was a messianic (albeit non-confessing) Jew. In the same way as European cultural variety was explicitly ignored by both of the great modern ideologies, so was the variety of “trans-modern” cultures, and indeed worldviews, in societies at large. Capitalism or communism was assumed to be of unilateral appeal, north of the equator or south, eastern hemisphere or west.

Restoration to Re-GENE-ration: From Local Identity to Global Integrity

This brings us to perhaps the most important reason why “operation restore legacy” in Zimbabwe was to be problematic, to say the least. For restoration without *regeneration*, just like social research without innovation, origination without transformation, is fundamentally flawed, if not an outright waste of time! As important as it is to draw on the local past, it is equally important to bring the local past into the local-global present, and for the past and present to inform a newly global future, as well as altogether vice versa. In other words, as time meets place, the global needs to be informed by the local, introverted social research needs to be informed by extraverted social innovation. In the natural sciences, this constitutes the division between “basic” and “applied” research, both of which are deemed important, at least in so called “centre of excellence”. In the social sciences the complementary between the two, with context now a vital addition to both of such, is seldom recognised.

In fact, contextually speaking, the conventional business adage “think global-act local” is, for us, a travesty of the integral truth. Instead, it is critical that we, as academics and practitioners, *feel* locally, then *intuit* local-globally, thereafter *think* newly globally, and ultimately *act* globally-locally. We allude to such, overall, as transforming *local identity into global integrity*. In similar guise the local grounding of social research, and its subsequent local-global emergence towards, ultimately, social innovation, needs to be furthered through purposeful, “newly global” navigation, that is, conceptual innovation in the mind, towards practically global-local innovation, in order to effectively embody such, in a particular place.

The Need to Draw on Cultural and Philosophical Soils

So what do we mean, more specifically, by such overall re-GENE-ration? Specifically, we *originally* Ground ourselves locally, naturally and communally; thereafter establish an Emergent *foundation* locally-globally, culturally and spiritually; then pursue *emancipatory* Navigation newly globally, scientifically and technologically; and finally *transformative* Effect economy and enterprise globally-locally, altogether set within an integral polity. This all round GENETic process, in cyclical as well as linear guise, was anticipated in Samanyanga’s original article cited above:

Politics, economics and enterprise, through the ages, have been characteristically outgoing activities. For unlike philosophical, religious, artistic or even scientific activity it has involved extroverted rather than introverted attitudes and behaviours. The aggressive, individualistic, and competitive “north-western” (Anglo-Saxon) nature of polity, economy and indeed military activity, has in fact dominated man’s consciousness in the modern

era to the exclusion of more spiritual and artistic activities, even though, in Europe at least, an artistic Renaissance and spiritual Reformation had to precede a scientific Enlightenment and industrial Revolution. Consequently, as technological and economic adaptation has raced ahead of psychological and cultural transformation, natural and cultural diversity have fallen by the wayside, rather than serving to promote an integral dynamic.

Economies at large then, as well as business enterprises around the globe, if they and their societies are to prosper together over the long term, need to draw more purposefully and creatively on their indigenous, alongside their exogenous, cultural and philosophical soils. While the business and economic ethos in America is superficially (“topsoil”-wise) different from that in China - and these two countries combined have recently dominated the business world - further variants, including those within Europe, Africa and much of Asia today, and in Japan hitherto, remain now substantially hidden.

It is as if a business and economic geologist has been unable to differentiate, at least in any fundamental way, granite economic and enterprise formations in the Pyrenees from limestone business cliffs in Wales! The implication is, as it were, that volcanic rock in Japan (ever less so today), limestone formations (only superficially visible) in China, and coal shale in America are the only identifiable formations in the “econsphere”. Now, moreover, it seems that even the volcanic rock is being eroded, leaving us, if we’re not careful, with only “world class” coal shale, or upcoming limestone formations, with which to do business!

The old ideological divide in fact, whereby either the free marketplace (capitalism) or state (communism) reigned supreme, served to hide such worldly variations, even distorting, along the way as we have noted, the original ideas of Adam Smith and Karl Marx. Perceived business and economic differences were restricted to easily visible surface phenomena, what may be termed “topsoil” or “surface” attributes, such as culinary preferences, susceptibility to corruption, social habits, flexible labour practices and time keeping orientations of different cultures. Substantive “bedrock” or “mainstem” differences were, by implication then, lumped together under the respective guises of misconstrued “capitalism” or “socialism”, with a so called mixed economy being seen to lie somewhere in the nondescript in between.

For all the core or “root” natural and cultural differences, such as in the arts and in depth religion, differences between, for example, the French and the English, the American and the European, the Brazilian and the Chinese, none of these entered into the forefront of our economic awareness. It was as if political and economic ideology concealed cultural and psychological, of not also natural, variety. Why then should this have been so?

Until comparatively recently, that is within the last thirty years or so, culture and psychology were considered to be entirely peripheral to business and economics. Still to this day, business in its raw and primal

context, and “the economics of the euro-zone”, for example, is much more about buying and selling, or indeed in today’s terms, “e-commerce” or “financial bailouts”, “competitiveness” or “export markets” than it is about personal development and the purposeful cultural evolution, of, for instance, a pre-modern into a trans-modern Greece, in its nature and spirit, its technology and economics.

Economics then, as a rationally based science underpinning business activity, has been hitherto more concerned with “culture free” notions of “monetarism” or “scientific socialism”, or indeed now financial derivatives, comparative interest rates and the monolithic and overbearing “view of the markets” than with culturally comparative philosophies, or naturally based ecosystems. In fact, whereas at least since the nineteen sixties, industrial and organisational psychology, if not also anthropology, has entered into mainstream MBA curricula, that same MBA remains a “western” import, wherever in the world you go, while economic policy at large has remained dominated by the capitalism – socialism divide.

To that extent such evolved philosophies as, for example, the rationalism of the Enlightenment, Renaissance based Italian humanism and Taoist based Chinese holism, have remained on the periphery, economically eclipsed by the narrowly misconceived pragmatist Adam Smith and the equally misinterpreted “scientific socialist” Karl Marx. Moreover, economic dynamics, in its capitalist dispensation, is restricted to “wilful entrepreneurs, on the one hand, and depersonalised “markets”, on the other, so that social and cultural, not to mention ecological and spiritual, for example Taoist dynamics, are left out in the cold.

This restrictive, and allegedly “culture-free” duopoly, was recently – in the seventies and eighties – partially broken by the Japanese, and their hitherto successful brand of communitarianism, which seemed to transcend the conventionally polarised economic debate. In the nineties, though, the Japanese communitarian miracle, came to an end, to be replaced, more recently, by a Chinese, if not also an Indian, form of materialism, that is, only differentiated from “Western” capitalism through, at least in the Chinese case, the material political influence on the economy. If we’re not careful we could be back to square one, or even square zero, with “north-western” capitalism, of a kind that would even lead Adam Smith – imbued with his moral sentiments - to turn in his grave, becoming the only available horse in town!

As Samanyanga, now drawing on the renowned Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung (2001) further wrote in his article for “Long Range Planning” on *Management in Four Worlds*:

Jung in fact, while of Swiss nationality, was particularly trans-cultural, as well as trans-disciplinary, not to mention also trans-formational in orientation. A student of the literature and mythologies of comparative cultures all around the world, he took a particular interest in China in the “east” and also spent a considerable amount of time in the depths of Africa in the “south”. Most of his work of course was conducted in “northern”

Europe and he made frequent lecture tours to the United States in the “west”. As an inter-disciplinary scientist he studied philosophy and theology, biology and medicine, as well as mythology and psychology. As a psycho-dynamic as well as integral psychologist, philosopher and human being, as we shall see, he also had a profoundly transformational orientation toward his work, focused on individuation. However, he ignored the worlds of economics and enterprise, which is where we come in!

To the extent that we individuate, individually or collectively, our particular, human grounding (formative) in our childhood and youth, psychologically and culturally, emerges holistically (re-formatively) as self-interacts with world, physically, emotionally, intellectually. Mid-life crisis moreover, heralds further potential dynamic, now rational-holistic development (normative), whereby you newly conceive of your integral self, individually and collectively, while ultimate maturity serves to effect (transformational) such, pragmatically and “for real”. Unlike capitalism and communism, which, in effect (this was not Marx’s intention who borrowed Smith’s labour theory of value) shut each other out, the inner worlds of “southern” feeling, “eastern” intuiting, “northern” thinking and “western” sensing, progressively, and indeed cyclically, welcome each other in, through psycho-dynamic individuation, that is for you as a person. For an enterprise or a society, such transformational “individuation” is inevitably a more complex, “trans-personal”, “trans-cultural” and “trans-disciplinary” integral dynamic process.

Further to such, and in our current transformational case, we outline our core process – **Grounding, Emergence, Navigation, Effect** – underlying social innovation, for each transcultural path (Schieffer and Lessem, 2014) as is captured in Table 1 below.

TABLE 1. SOCIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL INNOVATION: A PROCESSAL ORIENTATION

Technological Innovation	Social Innovation	Learning Processes	Re-GENE-ration Trajectory	Relational Integral Rhythm
<i>Discover</i>	<i>Origination</i>	<i>Experiential</i>	<i><u>G</u>rounding</i>	<i><u>D</u>escription</i>
<i>Develop</i>	<i>Foundation</i>	<i>Imaginal</i>	<i><u>E</u>mergence</i>	<i><u>P</u>henomenology</i>
<i>Engineer</i>	<i>Emancipation</i>	<i>Conceptual</i>	<i><u>N</u>avigation</i>	<i><u>F</u>eminism</i>
<i>Commercialise</i>	<i>Transformation</i>	<i>Practical</i>	<i><u>E</u>ffect</i>	<i><u>P</u>articipatory Action</i>

Courtesy: Authors

The Southern Relational Path of Social Innovation

Descriptive Method to Participatory Action

Social innovation, processually as well as substantively, in contrast with such social business or enterprise, specifically located along a “southern” *relational* path, is altogether reflected processually in a respectively cyclical, spiralling, linear and pointed journey, altogether embodying the GENE-ius of each one of you “southerners”, individually and collectively. Bear in mind, as such, that hitherto neglected “southern” grounding, combined with “south-eastern” emergence needs to precede “southern-northern” navigation, prior to ultimately “south-western” effect so as to constitute an integral overall rhythm. This can be seen below, providing the dynamic underlying research-and-innovation, substantively aligned with anthropology-and-economics, to constitute overall social innovation in Southern Africa, facilitated overall, institutionally speaking, by an integral Communiversity:

- $G = \underline{G}$ round/Originate : Descriptive Method : Learning Community

You, individually and collectively, are *grounded* in a particular nature and community, which needs to be engaged with, if not also *activated*. For any life world, the “southern” grounds represent its *local identity* and its *source of origin*. “Southern” grounding then is about *being* as well as feeling and *experiencing*, thereby, in research terms, richly **Describing** a particular world, which thereafter continually cycles through, and indeed is recycled in *discovering* the stories we are. As such, and overall, you not only uncover a *call*, but also begin to *activate* a community around you, building up Communiversity-wise, a *learning community*.

- $E = \underline{E}$ mergent Foundation : Phenomenological Methodology : Regenerative Pilgrinium

Moving to “south-eastern” emergence locates you and your community in a developing organisational and societal *context*, co-engaging with a cultural and spiritual life *world*, duly *interpreting* the *local-global* imbalances therein, with a view to alleviating them. Here, we envisage in dialectic interaction between “local and global”, thereby coming to a newly imagined understanding, with a view to *catalysing regeneration*. Such an emergent, spiralling process always includes a “stepping into the unknown” and “letting go” thereby becoming as it were a *local-global non-entity*. New insights emerge, *phenomenologically* so to speak, that provide clues for the transformative process. “Eastern” emergence is therefore essentially about *becoming*. It deals with *intuiting* and *imagining* the new *emergent*, in the interactive journey-like form, Communiversity-wise, of our so called Regenerative Pilgrinium.

- *N = Emancipatory Navigation : Feminist Research Critique : Research Academy*

The move to “southern-northern” navigation requires that the new insights gained are translated into newly global *concepts*, new knowledge, new technologies, new institutions, that now assume global, or universal, proportions. “Southern-northern” navigation is hence about *knowing* and about *making explicit* what hitherto had been rather implicit, through innovation driven *research* (method and substance). Such conceptual *navigation* is about activating the *mind*-level, the conceptualising prowess of social science and technology, now explicitly aligned with anthropological-economic substance, through *critical* emancipatory ***Feminist*** research, without losing touch with the emotional and spiritual levels that came before. At this point, we conceive a newly *global entity*, as a newly emancipatory concept and institution, as a basis now for a *Nhakanomics Research Academy*, promoting *co-creation*.

- *E = Transformative Effect : Participatory Action Research : Socioeconomic Laboratory*

Moving to “south-western” economic and enterprise imbued transformative effect, finally now, requires us to put all prior three levels into integrated, *practical* action. It is about pragmatically applying the new knowledge that has been developed, thereby actualising the research and innovation that it contains, thereby making a *contribution* to yourself, your organisation and/or society, thereby *embodying* re-GENE-ration of C (K) umusha, Communications, Culture, Capital, and all round Constitution. Such “South-western” effect is hence about *doing* and about *making it happen*, via ***Participatory Action Research***, thereby “to the point”, though building altogether on what has come before. This is the ultimate *transformative* level of the GENE-process, activating, metaphorically, the *body* or *hand*. This is the time where the newly global is actualised at a now global-local level, through a *Socioeconomic Laboratory*, to realise ultimate *integrity*.

Having completed the GENE-storyline, moreover and so to speak, experientially-imaginatively-conceptually-practically, the process does not stop. Rather, it continuously moves on, in circular (iterative), spiralling (evolving) and linear (accumulative) as well as ultimately pointed (directive) form. Any transformative effect has to be continuously revisited, exploring whether it remains resonant with the “southern” grounds (e.g. the needs and capacities of nature and community) it seeks to serve. Any “resolution” is considered a temporary one. Re-GENE-ration though is ongoing, and indeed iterative, applying in turn to the re-GENE-ration of C (K) musha, Culture, Communications, Capital, which now leads us on, more generally, to Re-Constituting Africa, with which we now conclude.

Re-GENE-rating Age Sets: Integral Communiversity

Interestingly enough more specifically, the re-GENE-ration of “age sets”, and thereby the transformation of research-and-education, can lead, as per the African way, through what we have termed a new kind of integral Communiversity:

G: Origination: Community Activation: Naming, Storying: **Communal Learning:**

Storytelling, community songs and dances, naming plants, animals and people

E: Foundation: Awaken Consciousness: History, Geography: **Re-GENE-rative Pilgrinium:** *Nature of soils, family/ community history, regional geography, and the relations with them; childcare, housekeeping, gardening, cooking, marketing, poetry, socio-economic relations.*

N: Emancipation: Research/Innovation: Planting/Construction: **Research Academy**

Women responsible for markets operations, and the formation of women’s societies; men for hunting, community construction, industrial craft guilds, upkeep of village roads.

E: Transformation – Embody Development: Election as Elders: **Integral Laboratory**

Men and women were elected to the most highly honoured body of society, the Council of Elders, over the course of their mature lives.

Our Communiversity, as such, not only serve as a vehicle for social innovation, but also, and in the process, revisits and renews the way Africa was originally constituted.

Conclusion

By way of conclusion to Africa’s original “age-set” (childhood, youth, adulthood to maturity), we now turn, as depicted by the renowned African American historian, Chancellor Williams (1993), to whom you were introduced above. In his seminal work on *The Rebirth of African Civilisation*, Williams recovered the formative notion of the *age-set*. By parting company from conventional training and education, and indeed research and innovation, which serves to disconnect self from society, organisation from community, we serve to re-GENE-rate society, and “renew legacy”, or *nbaka*. In the process, moreover, just like those days of old, but newly informed by combining *dwelling* with *livelihood* we eliminate unemployment and alienation, at least in theory of not yet in practice, in one fell swoop.

The age-grade or age-set, then, was the specific organisational structure, and process, through which the community-and-society governed, thereby, in contemporary terms, combining research and

education, economy and polity altogether, anticipating, moreover, the social innovation generally, and the Communiversity specifically, with which we are concerned here. *The age-set then, seemingly, has been totally by-passed in the modern era, rather than being renewed.* The result of such, we would argue, has been nothing short of catastrophic, resulting not only in a singular lack of self-government but also in rampant unemployment, not to mention also alienation in the classroom, notably resulting in South Africa of late in the *RhodesMustFall* university movement (Chikane, 2018). What did such original age-set based research-and-education then look like? In fact, and using some artistic licence, we align each such “age-grade” with our budding Communiversity, altogether serving to re-GENE-rate economy and polity.

REFERENCES

- Chikane R.** (2018) *Breaking Rainbow Building Nation.* Johannesburg. Picador-Africa.
- Heron J** (1994) *Feeling and Personhood.* Abingdon. Routledge.
- Lessem R** (2001) *Managing in Four Worlds: Culture, Strategy and Transformation,* Long Range Planning 34. Pages 9-32.
- Lessem R, Adodo A, and Bradley T** (2019) *The Idea of the Communiversity.* Manchester, Beacon Academic.
- Lessem R, Mawere M and Taranhike D** (2019) *Nhakanimics: Harvesting Knowledge and Value for Re-generation through Social Innovation.* Mazvingo. Africa Talent Publishers.
- Lessem R, Mawere M, Matupire P and Zongololo S** (2019) *Integral Kumusha: Aligning Policonomy, Nature, Culture, Technology an Enterprise.* Masvingo. Africa Talent Publishers.
- Lessem R and Schieffer A** (2010) *Integral Research and Innovation: Transforming Enterprise and Society.* Abingdon. Routledge.
- Schieffer A and Lessem R** (2014) *Transforming the Potential of Individuals, Organizations and Societies.* Abingdon. Routledge.
- Stevens A** (2001) *On Jung.* London. Penguin.
- Trans4m Communiversity Associates,** Available at: www.tc-a.org
- Williams C** (1993) *The Rebirth of African Civilization.* Chicago.