



RATIONAL MANLINESS AS GOODNESS: RESPONSES TO INTERSECTIONAL DOMINATION AND THE PRESERVATION OF THE MORAL SELF IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Gabriella Beckles-Raymond¹

Independent researcher, London, UK.

Abstract: How should we understand the persistence of racism in the British academy and the efficacy of current responses to address racism? Drawing on philosophers Sylvia Wynter and Charles Taylor, I claim higher education in Britain is a manifestation of ‘Rational Manliness’ – a co-constitutive moral framework - as a hypergood. I then, deploy the Rational Manliness framework to evaluate three common responses to injustice in higher education – Rational Man fragility, confessions/self-forgiveness, and intellectual decolonization. Ultimately, I argue that, insofar as higher education holds Rational Manliness as a hypergood, responses to injustice are rooted in a commitment to preserve a sense of self as good, by maintaining the intersectional matrix of domination. As such, I suggest that higher education in Britain must be reconstituted and transformed in ways that depart from Rational Manliness as a hypergood towards establishing the-eradication-all-forms-of-domination as a morally defensible hypergood.

Keywords: ‘Rational Manliness’, Intersectional domination, Self, Higher education, Decolonize

RACIONALIDADE MASCULINA COMO BONDADDE: RESPOSTAS À DOMINAÇÃO INTERSECCIONAL E À PRESERVAÇÃO DO EU MORAL NO ENSINO SUPERIOR

Resumo: Como devemos entender a persistência do racismo na academia britânica e a eficácia das respostas atuais para enfrentar o racismo? Baseando-se nos filósofos Sylvia Wynter e Charles Taylor, eu afirmo que o ensino superior na Grã-Bretanha é uma manifestação de Rational Manliness (racionalidade masculina) - uma estrutura moral co-constitutiva - como um hiperbem. Eu, então, implanto a estrutura ‘Rational Manliness’ para avaliar três respostas comuns à injustiça no ensino superior - fragilidade do Homem Racional, confissões / perdão a si mesmo e descolonização intelectual. Em última análise, argumento que, na medida em que o ensino superior considera a ‘Rational Manliness’ um hiperbem, as respostas à injustiça estão enraizadas em um compromisso de preservar um senso de self como bom, mantendo a matriz interseccional de dominação. Como tal, sugiro que o ensino superior na Grã-Bretanha

¹ Dr. Gabriella Beckles-Raymond is an interdisciplinary philosopher, writer, award-winning educator and co-founder of the Black Thought Collective. Gabriella’s research and writing focuses on what it means to live well particularly as it pertains to questions of intersectional justice and ethics, and moral psychology. E-mail: grblkbwsw@hotmail.com ; ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3101-5737>

deve ser reconstituído e transformado de maneiras que partam de ‘Rational Manliness’ como um hiperbem para estabelecer a erradicação de todas as formas de dominação como um hiperbem.

Palavras chave: Rational Manliness (racionalidade masculina), Dominação interseccional, Auto, Ensino superior, Descolonizar

RATIONAL MANLINESS COMO BONDAD: RESPUESTAS A LA DOMINACIÓN INTERSECCIONAL Y LA PRESERVACIÓN DEL YO MORAL EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR

Resumen: ¿Cómo debemos entender la persistencia del racismo en la academia británica y la eficacia de las respuestas actuales para abordar el racismo? Basándome en los filósofos Sylvia Wynter y Charles Taylor, afirmo que la educación superior en Gran Bretaña es una manifestación de la ‘Rational Manliness’, un marco moral co-constitutivo, como un hiperbien. Luego, implemento el marco de ‘Rational Manliness’ para evaluar tres respuestas comunes a la injusticia en la educación superior: la fragilidad del hombre racional, las confesiones / perdón de uno mismo y la descolonización intelectual. En última instancia, sostengo que, en la medida en que la educación superior considera ‘Rational Manliness’ como un hiperbien, las respuestas a la injusticia tienen sus raíces en el compromiso de preservar el sentido de uno mismo como bueno, manteniendo la matriz interseccional de dominación. Como tal, sugiero que la educación superior en Gran Bretaña debe ser reconstituida y transformada de manera que se aparte de ‘Rational Manliness’ como un hiperbien hacia el establecimiento de la erradicación de todas las formas de dominación como un hiperbien.

Palabras-clave: ‘Rational Manliness’, Dominación interseccional, yo, Educación más alta (educación superior), Descolonizar

RATIONAL MANLINESS COMME BONTÉ: RÉPONSES À LA DOMINATION INTERSECTIONNELLE ET À LA PRÉSERVATION DU MOI MORAL DANS L'ENSEIGNEMENT SUPÉRIEUR

Resumé: Comment devrions-nous comprendre la persistance du racisme dans l'académie britannique et l'efficacité des réponses actuelles pour lutter contre le racisme? En m'inspirant des philosophes Sylvia Wynter et Charles Taylor, je prétends que l'enseignement supérieur en Grande-Bretagne est une manifestation de ‘Rational Manliness’ - un cadre moral co-constitutif - en tant qu'hypergood. Je déploie ensuite le cadre de ‘Rational Manliness’ pour évaluer trois réponses courantes à l'injustice dans l'enseignement supérieur: la fragilité de Rational Man, les confessions / le pardon de soi et la décolonisation intellectuelle. En fin de compte, je soutiens que, dans la mesure où l'enseignement supérieur considère ‘Rational Manliness’ comme une hypergood, les réponses à l'injustice sont enracinées dans un engagement à préserver un sentiment de soi comme bon, en maintenant la matrice intersectionnelle de domination. En tant que tel, je suggère que l'enseignement supérieur en Grande-Bretagne doit être reconstitué et transformé d'une manière qui s'écarte de ‘Rational Manliness’ en tant qu'hypergood vers l'établissement de l'éradication de toutes les formes de domination en tant qu'hypergood.



Mots-clés: ‘Rational Manliness’, Domination interseccionnelle, Soi, L'enseignement, Décoloniser

INTRODUCTION

In the wake of George Floyd’s killing at the hands of Minnesota police (BBC 2020) and the subsequent Black Lives Matter protests that erupted across the UK and globally, there has been an unprecedented public acknowledgement of the impact of racism on people racialized as black in the UK and our shared experience with people racialized as black globally. However, universities have been criticised for not doing enough to acknowledge and address racism (WILSON & JONES 2020). Such criticism is not new, nor is it on account of the absence of gestures by universities, ranging from public statements about George Floyd’s death and Black Lives Matter protests to staff training and policy initiatives claiming to address racism (BELMAS 2020, TATE & PAGE 2018, ARDAY & MIRZA 2018, BECKFORD, 2014). So how are we to understand the persistence of racism in the academy and the efficacy of current responses to address racism?

In this paper, I want to sketch out what I call *Rational Manliness* as a meta-ethical framework that enables us to respond to these questions. This framework allows us to identify the actual phenomenon of Rational Manliness as a co-constitutive moral framework and set of identity commitments – a moral identity framework – that we see at play in higher education in Britain.² Drawing on Sylvia Wynter’s (2003) exposition of Euro-modernity’s religio-secular conception of Rational Man and combining it with Charles Taylor’s notion of hypergoods (1989), I show how Rational Manliness, constituted as anti-Otherness, ‘overrepresents’ itself as Goodness. The structural dimensions of this framework indicate it is necessarily embedded in the intersectional matrix of domination (Collins 2000) and thus also operates at the group and institutional level. On this basis I claim higher education in Britain is a manifestation of Rational Manliness as a hypergood.

² I use the italicised *Rational Manliness* when I am referring to the meta-ethical framework and the unformatted form, Rational Manliness when referring to the actual moral identity framework that emerges out of the construction of Rational Man, as what Wynter calls the ‘overrepresented’ human. In essence, *Rational Manliness*, identifies the ‘identifier’ of Goodness. The presentation of italicised and unformatted versions of the term Rational Manliness resembles the presentation of “Racial Contract” as non-ideal theory distinguished from Racial Contract as real by Charles Mills. See Mills, C.W. *The Racial Contract*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1999.

Second, therefore, I deploy *Rational Manliness* to evaluate three common responses to injustice we see in the higher education context, namely 1) Rational Man Fragility, 2) Confession/Self-forgiveness, and 3) Intellectual Decolonisation, finding that in failing to dismantle the relationship between Rational Manliness, anti-Otherness and Goodness, these responses are fundamentally problematic. Ultimately, I argue that, insofar as higher education holds Rational Manliness as a hypergood, responses to injustice are ultimately rooted in a commitment to preserve a sense of self as good, by maintaining the intersectional matrix of domination.

MORALITY OF 'MAN'

To begin, we need to unpack the evolution of the modern moral self on account of contradictions entailed in its formulation. Drawing primarily on Wynter's discussion of the 'coloniality of being/ power/ truth/ freedom' (2003), I develop an intersectional account tracking religion, race, economics, and gender and sexuality.

Wynter (2003) traces the transition of the self from a Judeo-Christian framework, in which the human is understood in relation to a divine order, to a secularised political subject, whose being is understood in relation to the state. Wynter explains the ethno-geographical significance of this move (266). Previously on religious frameworks, the Other was distinguished by their unbelief; the extent to which they failed to subscribe to the dominant religious values. As such the categories of 'other' or 'evil' Wynter notes, were formulated in religious terms – 'heretics', 'enemies of Christ', 'infidels', 'pagan-idolators' (266). However, Wynter further claims (266),

In the wake of the West's reinvention of its True Christian Self in the transmuted terms of the Rational Self of Man₁, however, it was to be the peoples of the militarily expropriated New World territories (i.e., Indians), as well as the enslaved peoples of Black Africa (i.e., Negroes), that were made to reoccupy the matrix slot of Otherness-to be made into the physical referent of the idea of the irrational/subrational Human Other, to this first degodded (if still hybridly religio-secular) "descriptive statement" of the human in history, as the descriptive statement that would be foundational to modernity.

In this new moral paradigm, Othered persons became the embodiment of moral degeneracy through the mapping of terms like 'savage', 'barbaric' onto particular groups, identified by biological, geographic, and ethnographic characteristics (Wynter 2003, 266 & Mills 1999, 13). Although nuancing the varied categorisations of



differently racialized groups, both Wynter and Mills note that these ethnographic divisions ultimately produce race as a general moral category, with white being its particular ideal. Mills, describes this invention of whiteness and the ascription of personhood, exclusive rights and advantages to it as a Racial Contract that is moral, historical and a constitutive element of liberalism. He states, (2017, 29),

Liberalism, I suggest, has historically been predominantly a *racial* liberalism, in which conceptions of personhood and resulting schedules of rights, duties, and government responsibilities have all been racialized. And the Contract, correspondingly, has really been a *racial* one, an agreement among white contractors to subordinate and exploit non-white noncontractors for white benefit.

In this way, whiteness becomes not only morally superior (and non-whiteness or blackness as morally inferior), but also *the* only acceptable moral paradigm. Recognition of other ways of being in the world as equally morally legitimate becomes an oxymoron. It is in this sense that Wynter (2003, 282) describes ‘Man’ as ‘overrepresented’; the white Rational Man - racially, geographically, and ethnically defined - comes to represent the only viable way to be human.

It is in the context of this primordial religio-secular soup that the oldest and most prestigious universities emerge. Indeed, early universities were almost exclusively designed for the education of the clergy (TWADDLE, 1966). In the English context of the maintained monopoly of Oxford and Cambridge, one had to be a member of the church to have a BA degree conferred and it wasn’t until the repeal of the University Test Act in 1871 that non-Anglicans could be granted a degree from Oxford and Cambridge respectively. Notwithstanding the emergence in the early nineteenth century of other institutions that would become universities, and the ongoing denominational and political contestations within and beyond universities, crucially, Rational Manliness as the racialized Judeo-Christian turned secularised ideal, prevailed.

On account of its moral positioning, the critical development that I want to frame in the religio-secular shift Wynter describes, is that whiteness, synonymous with Rational Manliness becomes Goodness. This production of the rational self, or as Taylor (1989, 49) calls it, the ‘punctual’ or ‘neutral’ self, is not only distinguished in juxtaposition to racial categories; Othering is a set of intersectional processes. We can already see in the quotes from Wynter and Mills above, references to the significance of Western expansion to this construction of the ‘colonial’ self (287). Wynter (2003, 266,



292-297) argues that imperial expansion and material gain were central motivating forces in both the True Christian and Rational conceptions of self. Indeed, she claims the conceptual shift was born out of a moral imperative to provide a legitimate justification for conquest, enslavement and sovereignty. For the Spanish, seizing land and enslavement were legitimate where the territories and populations were categorised as ‘Enemies-of-Christ’. However, according to Wynter, this framework became problematic in the ‘New World’ context because the Spanish could not rightly claim the original peoples of the Americas were Enemies-of-Christ or Christ refusers because the Christian apostles had never been there! (293). When the logic of the Enemies-of-Christ model failed to meet the Christian theological parameters of legitimacy, a new ethno-cultural religious orthodoxy was ushered in. Wynter explains (296),

Instead, the projected "space of Otherness" was now to be mapped on phenotypical and religio-cultural differences between human variations and/or population groups, while the new idea of order was now to be defined in terms of degrees of rational perfection/imperfection, as degrees ostensibly ordained by the Greco-Christian cultural construct deployed by Sepúlveda as that of the "law of natural law": as a "law" that allegedly functioned to order human societies in the same way as the newly discovered laws of nature served to regulate the processes of functioning of physical and organic levels of reality.

What we see here is the formulation of an intersectional Othering based on religion, race and economics, such that the superior mode of human existence entails a logic of rationality that renders non-Christians, non-exploiters, and non-whites morally and intellectually inferior. It is in this context that capitalism emerges as an ‘indispensable’, ‘irreplaceable’, and specific mode of economic production not merely in the functional sense but more importantly according to Wynter (316), as the necessary material conditions for producing and reproducing the ‘ethnoclass’ or Western-bourgeois answer that we now give to the question of the who and what we are.”

We can again observe the evolution of higher education in Britain, as very much tied to the wider historicity of expansion. During this period the establishment of institutions that would become some of the most prominent universities in Britain came directly or indirectly from the money the British acquired through slavery and its colonial exploits (WILLIAMS 2007, DRAPER 2007 & 2018). However, the relationship between Rational Man and universities is not simply economic; it is at these institutions, with their development of new ‘sciences’ and disciplines that play a



crucial role in rearticulating and legitimising Rational Man in its secular form (BERNASCONI & LOTT 2000, PARK 2014). Consequently, not only is what it means to be human restricted to one narrow mode of being; also fundamental to this conception of ‘man’ is the irrefutable moral erasure of all those who are positioned outside its conception. Once categorised as ‘other’, which is established by ‘natural’ differences, it is impossible to reclaim one’s status as human. Scholars like Bernasconi and Park remind us that the very emergence of science as knowledge, by way of departure from/extension of religious epistemological dominance is indelibly linked to ideas of race and racism. English universities were central to this process of secularising Rational Manliness economically, epistemically and politically. Take, for example, the promulgation of the eugenics movement and its far-reaching impact (UCL 2020, MORE 2020, SINGERMAN 2016) as well as the racist notions of liberalism rooted in the ideas of British philosophers, like John Locke (BERNASCONI & MANN, 2005), that are today re-elevated as ‘British Values’ (DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION, 2014).

The final piece of the intersectional puzzle, that of Othering according to gender and sexuality, can also be traced through both the religious and rational frames that position white, Christian, ‘economic’ ‘man’ as the only legitimate form of human. Wynter is less detailed in her analysis of gender and sexuality as it pertains to the production of the Rational Man and neither Mills³ nor Taylor take up the question explicitly. However, we can piece together the thread from Wynter, and other scholars, like Maldonado-Torres (2007), for example, who show how coloniality shapes notions of sexuality and feminisation through rape and the non-ethics of war.

In terms of the religious framing Wynter discusses with respect to ‘colonial man’, denigrated and dehumanised conceptions of gender and sexuality map onto the same logic as race. She argues (316),

the Caucasoid physiognomy (as symbolic life, the name of what is good, the idea that humans can be selected by Evolution) and the Negroid physiognomy (as symbolic death, the "name of what is evil," the idea that some humans can be dysselected by Evolution)- as the new extrahuman line, or projection of genetic nonhomogeneity that would now be made to function, analogically, as the status-ordering principle based upon ostensibly differential degrees of evolutionary selectedness/eugenicity

³ Mills’ *Racial Contract* (1999) takes up where Carole Pateman’s *Sexual Contract* (1988) left off so while both comprehensively cover race and gender respectively, neither gives an intersectional analysis, and therefore fail to account for the ways in which these identities operate in relation to each other.



and/or dysselectedness/dysgenicity. Differential degrees, as between the classes (middle and lower and, by extrapolation, between capital and labor) as well as between men and women, and between the heterosexual and homosexual erotic preference - and, even more centrally, as between Breadwinner (job- holding middle and working classes) and the jobless and criminalized.

This secular rendering of women and homosexuality as problematic, is a continuation of manifestations of Othering discussed above. In patriarchal Christian frameworks, the narrative of ‘the fall’ positions women as the evil Other; morally responsible for the state of ‘original sin’ that humans occupy (ELLISON & DOUGLAS 2010, FOX 2000) and sex itself becomes a sin, permissible only in the context of Christian marriage. Homosexuality is further demonised as ‘unnatural’ and un-Christian (ELLISON & DOUGLAS 2010). As Wynter notes, prior to the secularising effects of the Renaissance, there existed a theological hegemony whose social order was governed by a male ‘celibate clergy’ (275). The rise of the rational state paradigm mapped conveniently onto this religious view and the gendered Greek framework in which men were citizens and women their dependents (272). Patriarchy as the legitimate world order continued to be justified and reproduced through a range of hegemonic narratives, including the notion of Darwinian natural selection (316), women’s alleged intellectual inferiority (326), and in economic constructions like ‘breadwinner’ (316). Again, systemically, higher education is central to the marginalisation of women both in terms of the production of the knowledge that rendered them inferior (PATEMAN 1988, STOLER 1995, LETTOW 2014, MCCLINTOCK 2015) and also with regard to their exclusion from the academy itself. It was not until the nineteenth century that women were permitted to have degrees conferred upon them at the major universities (CARTER, 2018).

Based on the discussion of religion, race, economics and gender above, the crucial points are twofold: 1) that these categories of inferiority, just like Man as the prevailing category of superiority, are fundamental to the production of Euro-modernity’s moral paradigm. Wynter explains, the condemnation of those categorised as ‘Other’ is, ultimately, in “the name of what is evil” (2003, 325). As such, the categories and the material manifestations of this logic, like the British higher education system, are not superficial off-shoots of an ideology that needs tweaking. Rather they are inextricably tied to how we have come to understand good and evil; there is, to use



Mignolo's (2011) words, a "darker side to Western Modernity". 2) That even as the construction of the Rational Man attempts to divorce itself from a religio-moral commitment, it simultaneously re-inscribes a moral paradigm, which we will explore further in the discussion of higher education responses to intersectional domination.

Although the net result of secularisation in terms of the dominant philosophical paradigm, thereafter, is to sever the relationship between religious morality and identity, what Wynter (2003) and Mills (1999, 2017) reveal, and Taylor (1989) argues explicitly, is that morality and identity are not only fundamentally connected, they are co-constitutive. Moreover, if we take seriously the moral claim here, that Goodness = Rational Manliness, taking account of Rational Manliness as anti-Otherness, as outlined above, it then logically follows that Goodness, as posited by Rational Manliness, is also anti-Otherness – it is anti-blackness, anti-non-white, anti-non-European, anti-‘immigrant’, anti-non-Christian, anti-female, anti-LGBTQIA+, anti-non-binary, anti-poor, anti-disabled, anti-non-rational, anti-human. Thus, to restate my formulation of this version of the good:

Goodness = Rational Manliness

Rational Manliness = anti-Otherness

Goodness = anti-Otherness

This intersectional dismissal of all Othered identities as the dominant version of moral Goodness appears as a fundamental contradiction of the liberal notions of freedom and equality for all. However, what this actually represents is a fundamental contradiction at the heart of liberalism itself. If morality and identity are co-constitutive, we need to better understand how Rational Manliness as both an identity and a moral framework works to produce and reproduce injustice through intersectional domination. To facilitate this discussion, I now turn to Charles Taylor's work and his notion of hypergoods.

MORALITY AND IDENTITY

We have seen above that Rational Manliness as Goodness and as anti-Otherness functions as the organising principle for Euro-modernity and we have seen how



identities are inextricably tied to morality. However, this does not help us understand moral decision-making. If Rational Manliness is the moral backdrop of all our lives, how do we account for the range of moral positions – from deeply prejudicial to more open - we see within higher education and beyond? And what role do our personal identities, and conceptions of self, play in determining our moral commitments?

According to Taylor, the disengaged rights/obligations model of morality that falls out of the ‘overrepresented’ Rational Man is an inadequate conception of how humans actually function morally. In construing humans as morally neutral and capable of an objective rationality, Taylor (1989, 89) argues that modern Western morality has reduced humans to beings that function in instrumental terms making consequentialist plans with consequentialist ends. This rejection of ontology and emphasis on the ‘punctual’ self, as Taylor refers to it, is a fallacy of Western moral philosophy. According to Taylor, (1989, 5) “a moral reaction is an assent to, an affirmation of, a given ontology of the human.” What is crucial to note here, is that we are all always making decisions against a moral backdrop. Thus, Taylor claims (27), the human self is necessarily moral - we have some moral orientation. Moreover, this moral orientation – what it means to be good - will be, as we have seen in the previous section, ‘inextricably’ tied to our identity. In this sense, some conception of the good is not only fundamental to the constitution of the self, it means that as individuals, we cannot be morally neutral as the rational conception of self suggests.

As such, Taylor claims, our moral reactions are the function of a moral ‘background picture,’ consisting of claims we have about the nature and status of human beings. “We are only selves insofar as we move in a certain space of questions, as we seek and find an orientation to the good” (TAYLOR 1989, 34). Through teaching, research, and public engagement, the academy plays a critical role in both, re-producing this moral background - the content of such claims, and in determining the parameters for what counts as the legitimate scope of moral discussion and discourse (BOYCE-DAVIES, 2003). Insofar as the self is constituted through this on-going process of grappling with who we are in relation to conceptions of the good, we do not, and Taylor wants to argue, cannot, live our lives in the absence of a meaning, as a neutral morality would suggest. These questions about one’s life as a whole and the version of the good against which these moral deliberations take place are necessarily posed in the context of a language community. As Taylor puts it, “One is a self only among other selves. A



self can never be described without reference to those who surround it.” This ‘web of interlocutors’ is the frame of reference in which I come to understand my moral and spiritual principles. As Taylor (1989, 35) puts, “I can only learn what anger, love, anxiety, the aspiration to wholeness, etc., are through my and others' experience of these being objects for us, in some common space.”

Although Taylor recognizes that these questions of who I am, one's self-definition, are relational - a function of the context in which a person grows up and to whom they are speaking - he does not interrogate the intersections of the identities contained in the ‘self’ he presents, nor does he provide a robust account of the structural power relations that operate within the social context he describes. For example, Taylor claims that a person's formative ‘conversation partners’ are essential to self-definition and exist in reference to a wider ‘defining community’, which we have seen, prominently features the university. However, he does not take up questions pertaining to the ways in which the colonality of being power/ truth/ and freedom, through, and as a function of, the academy, have rendered Othered identities and therefore Othered selves, as illegitimate. This is a crucial omission precisely because as Taylor rightly claims, the version of the good that constitutes the defining community will in turn be constitutive of the versions of the good that constitute the identities of those who exist within the defining community. Thus, the formulation Rational Manliness as Goodness operates not only as an individual's moral orientation and personal identity as Taylor would have it; it is also macro-social - the moral backdrop of our global society (Mills 2015).

This picture of morality, however, does not tell us the basis for any given person's moral decision-making. This Taylor develops through his discussion of what he calls ‘hypergoods’. Having explained that we make sense of our moral reactions/intuitions through evaluative judgements, in reference to a backdrop of moral frameworks that orient us in relation to the good, Taylor claims there are two distinct ways in which this process of orientation occurs. First, we make qualitative judgements based on a framework or frameworks, which will include multiple goods. Consequently, we make decisions concerning which among the goods we value qualitatively outrank others. This process of making qualitative distinctions helps to carve out a person's moral orientation and sense of self. For Taylor (1989, 63), those goods which “not only are incomparably more important than others but provide the standpoint from which

these must be weighed, judged, decided about” are hypergoods.

Second, in addition to making these qualitative distinctions, we make judgements about where we stand in relation to our moral frameworks and our hypergoods. For some, their hypergoods might be their faith or commitment to God, for others loyalty to family, for others self-expression. According to Taylor (1989, 47), the result of this fundamental moral and spiritual orientation is that we make sense of our lives in a narrative; an ‘unfolding story’ “...What I am has to be understood as what I have become”. Hypergoods are of significance then, because they define our sense of moral success or failure and ultimately the extent to which we can feel good about ourselves and what we have become. According to Taylor (1989, 63), “It is orientation to this [hypergood] which comes closest to defining my identity, and therefore my direction to this good is of unique importance to me.” Conversely, if a person fails to live according to their own hypergoods or, feels that version of the good is unattainable this would be ‘devastating’ and ‘insufferable’. Indeed, Taylor claims, there are some ‘hypergoods’ that are so fundamental to our sense of self and how we orient our lives that being without them, “threatens to plunge me into a despair at my unworthiness which strikes at the very roots of my being as a person” (TAYLOR, 1989, 63). In the context of Euro-modernity’s moral framework, for some, Rational Manliness is a hypergood. Rational Manliness is that version of the good that is so important to their own identity and understanding of their life, what they are and where they are going, that without it such persons would feel lost, ‘unworthy’, ‘plunged into a sense of despair’ that threatens their very being. While Taylor discusses hypergoods in relation to the individual, the orientation around hypergoods can be extended to any entity that can formulate moral ideals, frameworks, or values, including universities.

Insofar as Rational Manliness equates Goodness and anti-Otherness, persons, groups, organisations, institutions and systems that hold Rational Manliness as a hypergood are less able to contribute to the project of dismantling the matrix of intersectional domination. They are more resistant to letting go of anti-Other systems, attitudes and behaviours because to do so would be to fundamentally undermine their sense of self – their fundamental organising principles and values. Given Rational Manliness as an identity is intersectional and multifaceted, our analyses must grapple with these complexities. In particular we must take into account the ways in which Rational Manliness tends to hierarchise Othered identities in relation to each other as

well as to the dominant schema. It is the dynamic interplay of these facets of Rational Manliness that we can understand as a crucial starting point for unpacking the relationships between moral identities and the matrices of domination.

‘UNSETTLING’ MORALITY AND IDENTITY

Ultimately, in order to ‘unsettle’ or disrupt these moral-identity dynamics of Rational Manliness, at least two crucial steps are necessary. First, we must disrupt the links between, on the one hand, Rational Manliness and Goodness, and on the other, Rational Manliness and anti-Otherness. Second, and most importantly, we must also deconstruct the link between Goodness and anti-Otherness. This two-fold disruption is necessary to facilitate the re-construction of identities about which the holder of such identities can feel good and that are morally coherent. This applies at the level of the individual as well as the level of the group//organisation/institution. For it is the ways in which these other formations ensure individuals produce and reproduce intersectional domination internally and externally that is at stake. The idea that we can change the hearts and minds of a few individuals and leave the values and identities -made manifest in their structures and policies- of groups, organizations, institutions and systems intact is fundamentally misguided. If we take Taylor’s framework seriously, this is particularly relevant within higher education. With regard to faculty, their identity, and the very nature of the work – what persons dedicate their lives to researching and writing about, are mutually constitutive. Likewise, how universities, or indeed any of their constituent parts, schools, research groups, departments, administration etc. identify themselves whether through expressions of values (mission statements, etc) or strategic partnerships and alliances, and the work (including ways of working) they undertake, fund, support, encourage are also co-constitutive. Thus, to eradicate intersectional domination, upholders of Rational Manliness must imagine themselves with a completely different moral identity. This is, in part, what makes structural change so difficult.

Two further points of clarification are necessary here. First, persons, groups, organizations, institutions, and systems from any of the categories of being that have been produced in the context of Euro-modernity can have Rational Manliness as a hypergood (MILLS, 2007, 22). While it obviously is more common for people, groups,

organizations, institutions and systems who fit the religious, racialized, economic and gendered profile of Rational Man, to have Rational Manliness as a constitutive identity, it is also possible for those who have been positioned as Other to also hold Rational Manliness as a hypergood. We must be mindful of that class of Othered persons who serve as gatekeepers and whose livelihoods depend on being the solution to a problem that will never be solved. Likewise, it is possible, albeit far less probable, for those who fall within the identity categories of Rational Man, to not have Rational Manliness as a hypergood. Moreover, given an identity holder can be differently positioned depending on the particular category that is most salient in any given situation, when assessing the commitment of a person, group, organization, institution or system to intersectional justice, we must look at their constitutive moral identities, not simply their socially constructed categorical identities. As Audre Lorde (1983, 9) reminds us,

...oppression and the intolerance of difference come in all shapes and sexes and colors and sexualities; and ... among those of us who share the goals of liberation and a workable future for our children, there can be no hierarchies of oppression. I have learned that sexism and heterosexism both arise from the same source as racism.

In short, in matters of intersectional domination, one's moral identity is of greater import than one's socially constructed categorical identities. As such, a simplistic 'representational' approach to addressing racism and intersectional domination in higher education must be seen as wholly insufficient. Ahmed (2012, 151) reminds us that "diversity pride becomes a technology for re-producing whiteness: adding color to the white face of the organisation *confirms the whiteness of that face.*"

Second, being able to decouple the association of an identity holder's moral stance from their categorical identities is an important although often unidentified aspect of the first element of 'unsettling' the Rational Manliness = anti-Otherness schema, which, simply put, is to just stop associating Otherness with 'evil' or inferiority. This is of course fundamental to the process, but in order to do that effectively, we have to literally start seeing and constructing people differently. Looking for a person's moral commitments as decoupled from their constructed identity categories, is not the same as being colour-blind or Other-blind. Rather, it is to resist falling foul of simplistic stereotypes and to grapple with the actual structure and workings of the intersectional matrix of domination. As we saw previously, this has

been a process of producing and reproducing formulations of a 'moral' framework that deliberately but inaccurately links particular visible (ALCOFF, 2006) and categorical identities to subordinated and dehumanised images for the purpose of material exploitation and moral superiority.

The second, and I would argue, more important, more hidden element that must be exposed if we are to 'unsettle' the Rational Manliness schema pertains to the Goodness = anti-Otherness formulation. It is fairly obvious to say we have to stop seeing difference in terms of inferiority, but how do we re-imagine Goodness? What is wrong with being good? This is the heart of the rub. To answer this question, we need to unpack what Goodness really is within the Rational Manliness moral schema. For it is not simply that Others are bad or evil. The more insidious aspect is the way in which, insofar as Others are constructed as inferior, Goodness becomes infused with assumptions that are deeply problematic. It is these problematic assumptions, like the assumptions about identities, that must be discarded.

At the root of problematic interpretations and manifestations of Goodness is the idea that Rational Man is morally superior and thus he is positioned as the gatekeeper and arbiter of Goodness. This means that he, and he alone, has the power to define and distribute Goodness. In conceiving of moral relations in this way, the unequal power relations that are at the heart of domination are similarly embedded in our conception of the good, such that Goodness itself becomes a form of domination. As such, Goodness becomes characterised by Rational Man's ability and willingness to make Others more like the ideal it represents, to make Others 'better', to 'help' Others. Rational Man constructed as saviour, as a position of superiority, also gives rise to the second assumption, which, is that those who are designated Others are not legitimate moral agents. In addition to stripping us of agency this renders us forever at the behest of those who dominate us. We see this most obviously in the religious logic of 'civilising the natives', which justified slavery, colonialism, and imperialism. In the move to the rational state framework, this becomes re-transcribed as 'spreading democracy' and 'development' thus providing the moral justifications for international military interventions and cultural, political and economic hegemony (Tikly 2004). Universities play a key role in the above kinds of projects, but more specifically over the past decade we have also seen universities embark explicitly on their own re-colonising missions, euphemistically branded in the language of 'global partnerships' and an emphasis on

student's 'global citizenship' (CARUANA & MONTGOMERY, 2015). These new markets are the next frontier for Western universities, and it is hard to see how the impact of these 'partnerships' are going to be qualitatively different to previous versions of colonisation.

In the domestic context, Rational Manliness is also the logic at the heart of terms and related policies articulated as tolerance, diversity, inclusion, and representation housed in categories such as Black Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME). For the Other to be tolerated there must be a tolerator – someone who has the power to determine whether indeed the Other is morally acceptable. Similarly, for the Other to be included, there must be someone in charge of the including – someone who gets to decide whether the Other gets to participate. Diversity as a policy rhetoric that betrays the reality that it is a fact of being human separate from ascriptions of difference via social categories. BAME, as a state and public policy category, reflects the power of Rational Man to define who we are, as simultaneously and singularly Othered. In higher education the language of Rational Manliness is deployed across teaching, learning, and research in a variety of ways (STEVENSON, *et. al.*, 2019). For example, BAME is the category that enables clumsy analyses of the complex dynamics of racism in the UK, collapsing all Othered persons into one group such that data can be strategically manipulated to conveniently explain away the long-standing attainment gap or reflect the research, corporate and commercial agendas of higher education institutions and their stakeholders. Such practices are symptomatic of what Shilliam (2017) calls 'the academy's production of a Black deficit'. Moreover, the use of BAME precludes our own definitions of self and our own aspirations of what we deem good to be or how we want to make our good manifest. Suffice to say, any version of Goodness that is to be understood as genuinely good must eradicate the logic and language of domination from its make-up. In this particular historical moment, there is much clamouring about the need for self-reflection and change within the higher education sector. However, I have not observed any substantive discussion about the moral identity of the academy and its relation to the academy's hegemonic practices. So, let us look at how this moral identity framework plays out if we apply it to some categories of response to intersectional domination we have seen in the sector.



RESPONSES TO INTERSECTIONAL DOMINATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Responses to injustice have assumed certain identifiable patterns that scholars have categorised in various ways. Here I take account of three such categories of responses, namely: 1) 'white fragility' (DiANGELO 2011), 2) confession/self-forgiveness (MILLS 1995), and 3) 'intellectual decolonization' (MOOSAVI 2020) and examine the extent to which the phenomena these frameworks illuminate can be understood as ways Rational Manliness manifest within higher education in Britain. The hope is that *Rational Manliness* offers an insight into why intersectional domination remains entrenched in the higher education sector, in spite of protestations and commitments to the contrary. By illuminating the relationship between identity and moral frameworks, perhaps we can develop more effective methods for eradicating Rational Manliness in universities.

RATIONAL MAN FRAGILITY

Robin DiAngelo coined the term white fragility in 2011. She describes the phenomenon as follows (54):

White people in North America live in a social environment that protects and insulates them from race-based stress. This insulated environment of racial protection builds white expectations for racial comfort while at the same time lowering the ability to tolerate racial stress, leading to what I refer to as White Fragility. White Fragility is a state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves. These moves include the outward display of emotions such as anger, fear, and guilt, and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and leaving the stress-inducing situation. These behaviors, in turn, function to reinstate white racial equilibrium.⁴

⁴I do not have space to discuss here, but I think the gendered connotation of fragility in some ways is unfortunate because although I completely agree whiteness or as I am suggesting Rational Manliness is fragile, the responses that could and should be encompassed by the term are not in the least bit delicate. So fragile is Rational Manliness it actually requires extreme violence, cruelty, war to maintain it. The murder of George Floyd is, among other things, a display of Rational Man fragility, as were the murders of Belly Mujinga (BBC News), Steven Lawrence (Charitable Trust), and Sheku Bayoh (Daly and McKay 2020), where we can see the very existence of a person designated Other is a threat to Rational Man's sense of self.

I agree with DiAngelo when she describes white fragility as defensive and an effort to restore equilibrium. I also suggest that the kinds of responses captured in the concept ‘white fragility’ should be extended to the more expansive notion of Rational Manliness such that DiAngelo’s conception of fragility is understood to be applicable to a multi-categorical, intersectional notion of dominating identity – Rational Man Fragility. Doing so allows this framework to account for efforts to avoid the Goodness as anti-Otherness dilemma that strikes at the core of the self as constructed in terms of Rational Manliness. Rational Man fragility then, functions as a mechanism that enables people who hold Rational Manliness as a hypergood to ignore the contradiction entailed in that moral identity framework. It does this by enacting behaviours that completely shut down reasonable conversations about intersectional domination and ensure the genuinely difficult conversations that are necessary, if we are to move forward, cannot happen. In DiAngelo’s language, this is to ‘reinstate racial equilibrium’.

In the academy, we see examples of Rational Man fragility all the time – in meetings, at conferences, in the backlash of commentaries that seek to shut down dialogue when it dares to veer towards exposing anti-Otherness within the academy (TATE & PAGE 2018, GABRIEL & TATE 2017, AHMED 2012). This kind of fragility should not be understood only in reactionary terms, however. Practices that reveal an ideological refusal to permit the recognition that there are other ways of being in the world are also indicative of how fragile Rational Manliness really is. Not surprisingly, the need to protect Rational Manliness is in the very fabric of the culture of UK universities - the food that is served, the layout of rooms, what is accepted as epistemologically and pedagogically legitimate, in workshops and training, in the refusal to include voices and perspectives from those designated Others in the curriculum, when students are shut down for asking ‘difficult’ questions.

Again, it is important here to remember that it is not only those who visually fit the Rational Man profile who can engage in the fragility strategy. For example, I vividly recall an experience at a workshop, specifically for early career ‘black’ researchers (which in the UK context was defined as politically black and thus included people of Global South heritage), to develop scholarship around intersectionality. The workshop was completely hijacked by a woman who had an attack of Rational Man fragility. During the question and answer segment following her presentation, someone posed what she apparently found to be a ‘difficult question’ that disrupted her self-positioning

as an ally to people racialised as black. As Tate and Page put it (2018, 151), “The need to focus on white suffering, white fragility, to say it is not your fault, produces a paradox at its centre where those racialised as white are victims of the racism from which they benefit.” Unfortunately, in part because we were in what was intended to be a space for ‘us’, our collective response to this outburst failed to directly confront the behaviour for what it was. The fact that this woman was not racialised as white does not preclude us from identifying her behaviour as fragility in the way DiAngelo describes. The net effect of which was that this particular woman’s behaviour completely shut down what was an invaluable discussion about intersectional domination and how our scholarship could contribute to combating it.

This is why speaking up about manifestations of intersectional domination like Rational Man fragility is so crucial to eradicating it (CZOOP, 2006). Rational Man fragility is essentially a strategy for silencing and erasure, which in the UK context has been one of the most effective strategies for maintaining intersectional domination thus far (ABBAS, 2020; DOTSON, 2011). In this way, Goodness as anti-Otherness, like other forms of domination, precludes other expressions of Goodness. Thus, it remains unquestioned and the human suffering that continues to result from it remains in the neat moral box of ‘don’t see/don’t know, don’t have to worry about/don’t have to take responsibility for’. In this sense, Rational Manliness becomes its own special kind of protected characteristic; a moral identity for which any mention or association with anything even remotely negative or even questionable becomes off-limits not just to moral discourse but to discourse in general. The moral framework of Rational Manliness remains intact and free of contradiction and there is no crisis of the self to grapple with. Thus, that self can rest assured that it is indeed good as it understands itself to be. Here the moral contradiction is not so much resolved as it is avoided altogether (FRANKENBERG 1993, GORDON 1999). Goodness as anti-Otherness escapes recognition in the world of Rational Man fragility. If, however, such discussions cannot be completely silenced, other strategies that can be deployed.

CONFESSIONALS/ SELF-FORGIVENESS/ SELF-DETACHMENT/ DEFLECTION

According to Jon Mills (1995) self-forgiveness can be understood as “(1) a primary intrapsychic act motivated out of conflict in moral self-representation, (2) a necessary process in sustaining a cohesive self-image as a moral agent, and (3) having greater ontological and moral priority than interpersonal forgiveness.” He further claims (405-406) that

The self does not become depleted of moral agency after moral transgressions but only our conscious self-representation of ourselves as a moral person. Upon acknowledging a moral wrongdoing, our self-representation as a moral being is immediately challenged, which results in intrapsychic conflict due to the antithetical clash between one's moral self-representation and the immoral action under question. In most cases, forgiveness is sought, and our positive self-representation is restored.

Self-forgiveness refers to the kinds of behaviours in which people who hold Rational Manliness as a hypergood admit the presence of injustice but detach themselves from the responsibility for addressing it. Rather, their response has two distinct but often related forms: 1) self-forgiveness and/or 2) self-detachment. According to Tate and Page (2018, 143), confession and self-forgiveness, and I want to add, self-detachment and deflection, are at work in ideas and interventions like implicit/unconscious bias, where there is a superficial acknowledgement of some manifestation of intersectional domination, accompanied by a simultaneous denial of it. This is possible because confession, often confined to problematic behaviour at the individual level, such as racism or patriarchy, is explained away as unconscious, thus, presumed unavoidable and therefore not blameworthy (BECKLES-RAYMOND, 2019a).

Self-detachment is often followed by deflection, a strategy to secure the restoration of the self as good. After detachment has taken place, the responsibility of identifying and rectifying the injustice is deflected onto those who are either unable to - ancestors, previous generations, remnants of a bygone time - or those struggling to survive it, rather than placing accountability the feet of those who produce and reproduce intersectional domination. The observed responses to the superficial acknowledgement of racial disparities (still not widely referred to or characterised as intersectional domination) fit this variant. Such approaches sidestep the fact that anti-blackness, like anti-Otherness, is produced and is not a biological, social or psychological inevitability; they fail to deconstruct the link between whiteness and Goodness or the link between whiteness and anti-blackness. Deflection comes in a



variety of forms, many of which are referred to as the ‘deficit model’ (SHILLIAM 2017, CABRERA 2019, DAVIS AND MUSEUS 2019) placing blame and the responsibility of addressing injustice on Others – the maleficiaries of intersectional domination. Lorde explains (2007a, 113),

Women of today are still being called upon to stretch across the gap of male ignorance and to educate men as to our existence and our needs. This is an old and primary tool of all oppressors, to keep the oppressed occupied with the master’s concerns. Now we hear that it is a task of women of Color to educate white women – in the face of tremendous resistance – as to our existence, our differences, our relative roles in our joint survival. This is a diversion of energies and a tragic repetition of racist patriarchal thought.

Deflecting can include prompting recounts of racialised trauma (framed as the Other’s problem) and emphasising a lack of role models to shifting the burden of already undervalued ‘equality, inclusion and diversity’ work to Othered people through tokenistic involvement on panels and committees, educating one’s colleagues, reverse mentoring, and so on (LEATHWOOD *et. al.*, 2009, JONES 2006). These attempts at self-distancing and deflecting, like self-forgiveness, usually suffice to restore the moral equilibrium and also serve to render persons, groups, organisations, institutions and systems blameless such that there is no moral imperative to change (LORDE, 2007b).

However, in the wake of George Floyd’s death and subsequent protests in the context of Covid-19, we have seen the additional element that often accompanies this cluster of responses in a particularly pronounced version – commiserating with Othered persons and asking if there is any way in which they can help alleviate the Other’s pain. We are witnessing this in multiple forms – universities issuing public statements, letters reaching out to their ‘Black/BAME alumni community’, and workplace surveys asking is there any special treatment ‘BAME’ staff want or need in light of the allegedly new revelation that things are disproportionately difficult in the present moment. The holder of Rational Manliness simultaneously confesses their wrong and atones for them, while showing the requisite proportion of forgiveness and support to become a picture of moral fortitude. However, this advancement of the deficit model approach that typically takes a passive form of leaving the work of dismantling domination to Others, now becomes a very active version of deflecting responsibility. The move to specifically ask Others how they can help the holder of Rational Manliness address intersectional domination is an act of power only available to a dominator. It places the weight of that

challenge on the victims and in doing so within prescribed parameters actively strips those who are Othered of their own choices of how to respond. As Mills' (1995) analysis of self-forgiveness suggests, the concern here is restoring the representation of self rather than a more fundamental shift in the actual moral self. The offer of 'help' is aimed at reinstating Rational Man to the role of saviour and again restoring Rational Manliness as manifested in higher education as the dominant paradigm of Goodness, which necessarily entails reconstituting Others as morally inferior. An even stronger version of this bent towards reinserting oneself as good can be seen in what Esposito & Romano (2014) call 'benevolent racism' that in essence co-opts the very language and tools of social justice efforts towards maintaining the status quo. In line with this, the following section explores a growing phenomenon, which has intensified in the wake of George Floyd and BLM protests, to address intersectional domination in higher education in a more specific and practical way through intellectual decolonization.

INTELLECTUAL DECOLONIZATION

Over the past decade, discussions questioning the matrix of intersectional domination manifested in our universities have been gaining more traction. In 2003, Professor Robert Beckford's *Ebony Towers* documentary highlighted the limited opportunities for participation and progression in higher education for black scholars (Beckford 2014). More recently, the *Why Is My Professor White?* and *Rhodes Must fall UK* movements, and the calls to decolonise my curriculum, led by student's unions across the country, have helped to ensure the conversation remains on the table (Coleman 2020). As Moosavi (2020) notes, since 2014 there has been a dramatic increase in scholarship about intellectual decolonization. Although the notion of decolonization has a much longer history and covers a wide variety of claims and initiatives, in the higher education context, many UK universities take Keel University's manifesto for decolonizing the curriculum as their guiding principle. It begins by stating:

Decolonization involves identifying colonial systems, structures and relationships, and working to challenge those systems. It is not "integration" or simply the token inclusion of the intellectual achievements of non-white cultures. Rather, it involves a paradigm shift from a culture of exclusion and denial to the making of space for other political philosophies and knowledge



systems. It's a culture shift to think more widely about why common knowledge is what it is, and in so doing adjusting cultural perceptions and power relations in real and significant ways.

However, academics Marcia Wilson and Lorraine Jones (2020) claim that despite the increase in discussion, there is little evidence that universities have actually made the kinds of substantive shifts necessary to make intellectual decolonization a reality. Moosavi (2020) has gone so far as to describe the show of interest as a 'decolonising bandwagon'. Given the significance of education in shaping our perceptions of the world, a genuinely decolonised curriculum and academy would have a huge impact on dismantling intersectional domination in ways articulated by Gus John (BELMAS, 2019). So how can we tell whether current calls for intellectual decolonizing show real promise for eradicating Rational Manliness?

Decolonization initiatives, for most universities, are in the early stages (as I am writing a number of UK universities are having 'town hall' meetings to discuss what they should do, formulating action plans on the basis of these discussions and others still are in the process of putting committees together). Nevertheless, Moosavi (2020) has already provided a comprehensive account of some of what he calls, "the dangers of intellectual colonization". He argues we must do the following (2-3): 1) rethink the genealogy of intellectual colonialism, tracing it from those who were indeed colonised rather than from the global north; 2) recognise intellectual decolonization is not as easy as we think either ideologically or logistically; 3) resist essentializing and appropriating the Global South; 4) recognise and attend to the fact that coloniality produces multiple forms of exclusion; 5) avoid 'nativist decolonization' – the glorification of scholarship from the global south in the absence of existing standards of academic rigour; and 6) avoid 'tokenistic decolonization' – only gesturing towards the idea but not making sufficient changes to make it a reality. Taking these pitfalls as criteria, we can apply the *Rational Manliness* framework to illustrate how Goodness as anti-Otherness as a constitutive hypergood functions within universities to preserve intersectional domination.

Recalling how Goodness according to Rational Manliness posits the Other as inferior, makes Rational Man saviour, and dismisses the agency of the Other, we can see the relevance of Moosavi's list. Moreover, the list reveals that this superior saviour syndrome functions both ideologically and practically. Points 1, 3, and 5 highlight the



ideological risks associated with the impact of Goodness as anti-Otherness. In these cases, there is a presumption that Rational Man has the knowledge, expertise, and perspective to best determine the intellectual parameters of decolonisation efforts as opposed to scholars and activists from former colonized countries, whose efforts predate the current wave of intellectual decolonization. As Moosavi rightly cautions in point 4 (16), this does not mean indiscriminately privileging voices from the global south in the name of decolonising but, “rather it is about active disruption of the colonial past and the assumptions that it has generated to arrive at something that is prepared to rupture the colonial legacy in drastic ways”. That being said, the criteria for what constitutes academic rigour itself needs decolonizing, which brings us to points 2, 4, and 6, and the practical challenges of intellectual decolonization. Failing to appreciate the monumental task of intellectual decolonization, nativist decolonization, tokenistic decolonization, and assuming people from the global north are best placed to lead such efforts, are all indicative of a desire to re-inscribe a prevailing sense of Goodness. Thus, intellectual decolonization efforts that fall foul of the limitations Moosavi detailed, function to reify the Goodness of Rational Manliness by appearing to address intersectional domination, while simultaneously reinstating people and systems in the positions of power that ensure intersectional domination is reproduced.

I have argued elsewhere that what is needed is a transformative shift in the values that underpin higher education in Britain, evidenced in dedicating the time, consideration, and resources necessary to affect substantive change (BECKLES-RAYMOND 2019b). As Wynter put it (1984, 56), “The *Studia* must be reinvented as a higher order of human knowledge, able to provide an “outer view” which takes the human rather than any one of its variations as Subject; must be re-formulated as a science of human systems.” Indeed, the entire edifice of our higher education system and the relation of the university to wider society must be radically transformed before we can rightly begin to speak of it as decolonized. Decolonization then means going beyond the Keele Manifesto, which while suggesting functional changes within the academic space, says nothing of the moral identity, nothing about the hypergoods in relation to which the university orients itself. Nor does the manifesto speak to the cosmos of the university beyond its own walls. The very notion of the university, which itself is an over-representation, sets the terms and conditions of its dominating power relations with those who are excluded within and beyond its walls, hence, the growing



movements towards a complete re-imagining of ‘the university’ that are gaining traction in the UK as I write this (SWAIN, 2020). Decolonization of higher education as I am casting it requires that the very moral identity that undergirds the system is reconstituted such that the mission, form and function of higher education is no longer in service of Rational Man’s desire to dominate Others, but rather is fashioned according to a new hypergood - one that recognises the full scope of humanity ideologically and practically. Decolonizing, then, is synonymous with eradicating intersectional domination.

CONCLUSION

Indeed, if we take Wynter’s and Mill’s analyses of Euro-modernity’s moral legacy seriously, Britain must be ‘born again’ in the sense that Martin Luther King Jr. (1967) used the phrase. The transfiguration of Judeo-Christian religious conceptions of Goodness into their secular form - Rational Man - weds us to an understanding of Goodness that is, by definition, morally bankrupt; Goodness simply cannot necessitate the destruction of the Other – everyone who falls outside of the category Rational Man.

We have seen that the British higher education system was both fundamentally intertwined with the evolution of Rational Manliness and continues to function as an archetypal expression of it as a hypergood. I have argued that insofar as higher education holds Rational Manliness as a hypergood, responses to injustice are ultimately rooted in a commitment to preserve its sense of self as good, conceived as anti-Otherness, by maintaining the intersectional matrix of domination. As such, the reconstitution and transformation of British higher education must be placed at the centre of efforts to dismantle intersectional domination.

My claim in this paper is that by using *Rational Manliness*, we can assess any such efforts in a more accurate and useful way so that we do not direct our energies towards false prophets. Legitimate approaches to dismantling intersectional domination will look closely at the role of moral identity frameworks, both in terms of how people, groups, organisations and institutions understand themselves and how they orient their moral priorities, process and policy decisions, and ultimately their lives, work and legacy. They will directly tackle the Rational Manliness as anti-Otherness aspect of moral identity *and* the Goodness as anti-Otherness aspect in systemic and structural ways. These two elements are fundamental to the decisions we make and the systems

we build for good and for bad. Ultimately, what it means to be Good, as a moral identity, must establish eradicating all forms of domination as a hypergood.

REFERENCES

- ABBAS, M.-S. "The promise of political blackness? Contesting blackness, challenging whiteness and the silencing of racism: A review article." *Ethnicities*, 20(1), 2020: 202-222.
- AHMED, S. *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life*. Durham; London: *Duke University Press*, 2012.
- ALCOFF, L. *Visible identities: Race, gender, and the self*. New York: *Oxford University Press*, 2006.
- ARDAY, J., & MIRZA, H. S. *Dismantling race in higher education: racism, whiteness and decolonising the academy*. Cham: *Palgrave Macmillan*, 2018.
- BECKFORD, R. *Documentary As Exorcism Resisting the Bewitchment of Colonial Christianity*. London: *Bloomsbury Publishing Plc Bloomsbury Academic*, 2014.
- BECKLES-RAYMOND, G. "Implicit Bias, (Global) White Ignorance, and Bad Faith: The Problem of Whiteness and Anti-black Racism." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*. Special Issue: Bias in Context. 37(2), 2019a: 169-189.
- _____. "The Value of Love in Higher education: Ethical Dilemmas for Faculty and Students Racialized as Black in Britain" *Journal of Underrepresented and Minority Progress*. 3(1), 2019b: 33-50.
- "[Belly Mujinga: CPS to review Covid-19 death of station worker](#)." *BBC News*, 5 June, 2020.
- BELMAS. (2019). "Decolonising Curriculum | Professor Gus John | BELMAS Annual Lecture 2019." [Video] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kD-s_UDRftM
- BERNASCONI, R., & LOTT, T. L. *The idea of race*. Indianapolis: *Hackett Pub. Co.*, 2000.
- BERNASCONI, R. & MANN, A. M. "The contradictions of racism: Locke, slavery, and the two treatises." In ANDREW Valls (ed.), *Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy*. Ithaca N.Y.: *Cornell University Press*, 2005.
- BOYCE DAVIES, Carole. *Decolonising the Academy: African Diaspora Studies*. Trenton, N.J.: *Africa World*, 2003.
- CABRERA, N. L. "Critical Race Theory v. Deficit Models." *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 52(1), 2019: 47-54.
- CARTER, P. (2018). "[The first women at university: Remembering 'the London nine'](#)." *Times Higher education*. January 28, 2018.
- CARUANA, V., & MONTGOMERY, C. "Understanding the transnational higher education landscape: Shifting positionality and the complexities of partnership." *Learning and Teaching*. *The International Journal of Higher education in the Social Sciences*, 8(1), 2015: 5-29.
- COLEMAN, N. A. T. "My journey in our struggle." *Biopolitical Philosophy*, 3 June, 2020.

COLLINS, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: *Routledge*, 2000.

CZOPP, A.M., MONTEITH, M.J., & MARK, A.Y. (2006). Standing up for a change: Reducing bias through interpersonal confrontation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90, 784-803.

DALY, M & MCKAY, "[Sheku Bayoh: Why did my brother die in police custody?](#)" *BBC Disclosure*. 19 June 2020.

DAVIS, L. P. & MUSEUS, S. D. "What Is Deficit Thinking? An Analysis of Conceptualizations of Deficit Thinking and Implications for Scholarly Research." *NCID Currents*. 1(1), 2019.

DEPARTMENT FOR EDUCATION. "[Guidance on promoting British values in schools published.](#)" 2014.

DIANGELO, R. "White Fragility." *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3(3), 2011: 54-70.

DOTSON, K. "Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing." *Hypatia*. 26(2), 2011: 236-257.

DRAPER, N. 'Possessing Slaves': Ownership, Compensation and Metropolitan Society in Britain at the time of Emancipation 1834–40, *History Workshop Journal*, 64(1), 2007: 74–102. _____ . "British universities and Caribbean slavery." in eds. J. PELLEW and L. Goldman, *Dethroning historical reputations: universities, museums and the commemoration of benefactors*. London: *Institute of Historical Research*, 2018, 93–107.

ELLISON, M. M, & DOUGLAS, K. B. Eds. *Sexuality and the sacred: sources for theological reflection*. 2nd ed. Louisville, Ky.: *Westminster John Knox Press*, 2010.

ESPOSITO, L., & ROMANO, V. "Benevolent Racism: Upholding Racial Inequality in the Name of Black Empowerment." *Western Journal of Black Studies*, 38(2), 2014: 69–83.

FOX, M. *Original blessing: A primer in creation spirituality: presented in four paths, twenty-six themes, and two questions*. New York: *Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam*, 2000.

FRANKENBURG, R. *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: *University of Minnesota Press*, 1993.

GABRIEL, D., & TATE, S. A. *Inside the ivory tower: narratives of women of colour surviving and thriving in British academia*. London: *UCL Institute of Education Press*, 2017.

"[George Floyd: 'Pandemic of racism' led to his death, memorial told.](#)" *BBC News*, 5 June 2020.

GORDON, L. R. *Bad Faith and Antiracist Racism*. Amherst, N.Y.: *Humanity Books*, 1999.

JONES, C. "Falling between the Cracks: What Diversity Means for Black Women in Higher education." *Policy Futures in Education*, 4(2), 2006: 145–159.

KING, M. L. "[Where do we go from here?](#)" Address Delivered at the Eleventh Annual SCLC Convention. 1967.

LEATHWOOD, C, U. MAYLOR and M-P. MOREAU. “The Experience of black and minority ethnic staff working in higher education: Literature Review 2009, *Equality Challenge Unit*, 2009.

LETTOW, S. *Reproduction, race, and gender in philosophy and the early life sciences*. Albany: *State University of New York Press*, 2014.

LORDE, A. “There is No Hierarchy of Oppressions.” *Interracial Books for Children Bulletin* 14(9), 1983.

_____. “The master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” in, *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. New York: Crossing Press, 2007a: 110-133.

_____. “The uses of anger: women responding to racism.” in, *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. New York: Crossing Press, 2007b: 124-133.

MALDONADO-TORRES, N. “On the coloniality of being.” *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 2007: 240-270

MCCLINTOCK, A. *Imperial leather race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York, NY London *Routledge*, 2015.

MIGNOLO, W. *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Durham: *Duke University Press*, 2011.

MILLS, C. W. *The Racial Contract*. Ithaca: *Cornel University Press*, 1999.

_____. (2007). “White Ignorance.” In S. SULLIVAN and N. TUANA, *Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance*, edited by, 11-38. New York: SUNY.

_____. “Global White Ignorance” in GROSS, Matthias, and Linsey McGoey. *Routledge International Handbook of Ignorance Studies*. London: Routledge, 2015.

_____. *Black rights/white wrongs: The critique of racial liberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

MILLS, J. K. “On self-forgiveness and moral self-representation.” *Journal of Value Inquiry* 29, 1995: 405–406.

MOOSAVI, L. “The decolonial bandwagon and the dangers of intellectual decolonisation.” *International Review of Sociology*, 2020: 1-23.

MORE Subgroup. *Investigation into the History of Eugenics at UCL [Recommendations]* UCL, 2020.

PARK, P. K. J. *Africa, Asia, and the history of philosophy: Racism in the formation of the philosophical*. New York: *SUNY Press*, 2014.

PATEMAN, Carole. *The Sexual Contract*. Stanford, Calif: *Stanford University Press*, 1988.

SHILLIAM, R. “[How black deficit entered the British academy](#)”. June 20, 2017.

SINGERMAN, D. “Keynesian Eugenics and the Goodness of the World.” *Journal of British Studies*, 55(3), 2016: 538-565.

STEPHEN LAWRENCE CHARITABLE TRUST “[Stephen's Story](#)”.

STEVENSON, J, J. O'MAHONY, O. KHAN, F. GHAFAR and B. STIELL. *Understanding and overcoming the challenges of targeting students from under-represented and disadvantaged ethnic backgrounds. Report to the Office for Students*, 2019.

STOLER, A. L. Race and the education of desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the colonial order of things. *Durham: Duke Univ. Press*, 1995.

SWAIN, H. "Payback time: academic's plan to launch Free Black University in UK" *Guardian News* 27 June, 2020.

TATE, S. A. and D. PAGE. "Whiteness and Institutional Racism: Hiding Behind (un)conscious Bias." *Ethics and Education*. 13(1), 2018: 141-155.

TAYLOR, C. *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge, Mass: *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1989.

TIKLY, L. "Education and the New Imperialism." *Comparative Education*, 40(2), 2004: 173-198.

TWADDLE, M. The Oxford and Cambridge Admissions Controversy of 1834. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 14(3), 1966: 45-58.

UCL, Inquiry into the History of Eugenics at UCL - Final Report [Commissioned Report] University College London 2020.

WILLIAMS, E. E. *Capitalism & Slavery*. Chapel Hill: *Univ. of North Carolina Press*, 2007.

WILSON, M. A. and JONES L. "Dear senior university leaders what will you say you did to address racism higher education?" *Times Higher education*, June 9, 2020.

WYNTER, S. "The Ceremony Must Be Found: After Humanism." *Boundary 2*, 1984: 19-70.
_____. "Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument." *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3), 2003: 257-337.

Recebido em: 29/03/2021

Aceito em: 29/05/2021