

**DISCOURSES SURROUNDING 'RACE', EQUITY,
DISADVANTAGE AND TRANSFORMATION IN TIMES OF RAPID
SOCIAL CHANGE: HIGHER EDUCATION IN POST-APARTHEID
SOUTH AFRICA**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

MASTERS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

of

RHODES UNIVERSITY

by

DONOVAN ROBUS

December 2004

ABSTRACT

Since the dismantling of Apartheid in South Africa in 1994, the South African socio-political and economic landscape has been characterised by rapid change. In the ten years since the 'new' democratic South Africa emerged, transformation has become a dominant discourse that has driven much action and practice in a variety of public areas. One of the areas of focus for transformation has been Higher Education whereby the Department of Education aimed to do away with disparity caused by Apartheid segregation by reducing the number of Higher Education institutions from 36 to 21.

This research draws on Foucauldian theory and post-colonial theories (in particular Edward Said and Frantz Fanon), and the concept of racialisation in an analysis of the incorporation of Rhodes University's East London campus into the University of Fort Hare. Ian Parker's discourse analytic approach which suggests that discourses support institutions, reproduce power relations and have ideological effects, was utilised to analyse the talk of students and staff at the three sites affected by the incorporation (viz. Rhodes, Grahamstown, Rhodes, East London and Fort Hare) as well as newspaper articles and public statements made by the two institutions.

What emerged was that in post-Apartheid South Africa, institutional and geographic space is still racialised with virtually no reference to the historical and contextual foundations from which this emerged being made. In positioning space and institutions in this racialised manner a discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure emerges with the notion of competence gaining legitimacy through an appeal to academic standards. In addition to this, transformation emerges as a signifier of shifting boundaries in a post-Apartheid society where racialised institutional, spatial and social boundaries evidently still exist discursively.

Keywords: Discourse, 'race', equity, disadvantage, transformation, Apartheid, post-colonialism, racialisation, Higher Education, competence.

*Make your own notes,
NEVER underline or
write in a book*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of appendices	vi
Acknowledgements	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Setting the scene	1
Rationale for the research	3
The theory underlying the research	3
A brief description of the research	4
Overview of the chapters	4
Chapter 2: Context: Higher Education institutions as racialised spaces in South Africa.....	7
Introduction	7
The establishment of university institutions in South Africa	7
Implications of racialised Higher Education	11
Further developments in a racialised university system	12
Conclusion	15
Chapter 3: Foucault, power, discourse and post-colonial theory	18
Introduction	18
Foucault, power and discourse	18
Post-colonial theory	25
Critiques	32
Conclusion	36

Chapter 4: ‘Race’, ‘racism’, racialisation, equity and disparity	38
Introduction	38
Where does ‘racism’ come from?	38
‘Race’ as a signifier	40
‘Scientific racism’	40
The shift from ‘scientific racism’ to ‘institutional racism’	42
Racialisation and redefining ‘racism’	44
‘New racism’	47
‘Racial’ policies in the South African setting	49
Conclusion	50
 Chapter 5: Methodology	 52
Introduction	52
Background: What is discourse?	52
Method	53
Saussure’s linguistic theory and the emergence of discourse theory ...	54
Varying approaches to discourse analysis	55
Parker’s approach to discourse analysis	58
The research question	60
Sample and data collection	61
Reflexivity	64
Data analysis	66
Ethical considerations	68
Conclusion	68
 Chapter 6: Racialised space, ‘white’ excellence and ‘black’ failure	 70
Introduction	70
Positioning RUEL and UFH	70

The rural/urban divide as racialised space	74
‘White’ excellence and ‘black’ failure	79
The transformational ‘gravy train’ as a means to overcome ‘black’ failure	100
The international gaze	105
Conclusion	109
 Chapter 7: Racialised boundaries and transformation	 111
Introduction	111
Racial integration or ‘mix’	112
‘White’ maintenance of and ‘black’ expansion across racialised boundaries	116
‘Coloureds’ as ‘undecidables’ in post-Apartheid South Africa	119
‘Race’ euphemized	120
Discourses surrounding transformation	124
Conclusion	127
 Chapter 8: Conclusion	 128
 References	 132
 Appendices	

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Consent Form

Appendix B: Correspondence

Appendix C: Data References

Acknowledgements:

I wish to thank all staff and students who participated in this research.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, Professor Catriona Macleod, for providing me with the guidance and motivation required to produce this academic product. Thank you for offering assistance, insight and great knowledge wherever I needed it.

A number of individuals were not directly involved in the research process, but provided me with valuable assistance, guidance and advice. I would thus like to thank Dr. Terry Marsh, Mrs. Lorraine Denison, Mrs. Sue Morrell-Stewart, Mr. Andile Gwabeni, Dr. David Woods, Mrs. Sandy Stephenson, Dr. Petrus Strijdom, Professor Kevin Durrheim, Jaques Maehler-Coetzee and Camilla Perks. The following people deserve great thanks and appreciation: Nic Pietersma, Kerry McLuckie-Wilson, Desmond Painter, Clifford van Ommen, Eric Harris, David Neves, Jill Henderson, Professor Andy Gilbert, Milly Stead, Penny Jaffray and Derek Mosenthal.

The following people made an essential contribution to this research: My dear friends Vuya Mazibuko and James Robinson, Phindezwa Mnyaka, Rod Bally, Tracey Gardiner, Ryan Megaw, Trevor Falkenberg, Dr. Nico Cloete, Hennie De Beer, Portia Matlejoane, Charlie Alberts, Nola Summers (PC genius), John Rautenbach (Microsoft Word genius) and my brother Brendan Robus (proof-reader & academic extraordinaire). Special thanks to Jan Richter, Lynne Woods, Sheila Hartwanger and Mariette Lotter of the East London campus library.

The support (and nagging) of my friends Glenn Adcock, Tracy Morison, Vicky Wright, Vicki Parker, Kerry Oosthuysen, Lisa Kesson, Ryan Riley, Mike Schultz and Robyn Baldwin made the completion of this project possible. Thanks especially to Clare Godfrey for providing me with the ultimate inspiration to finish this.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Setting the scene

Since 1994, South Africa has undergone rapid social, economic and political change. Restructuring has aimed at repairing the disparities created by the Apartheid regime. Among these reforms has been the transformation of Higher Education. In 1997, 'The Education White Paper 3: a programme for the transformation of Higher Education' was presented to Parliament. This paper resulted in the passing of the Higher Education Act (Act 101 of 1997), the purpose of which was to provide a framework with which to transform Higher Education (South Africa Yearbook, 2001).

Cabinet approved the National Plan for Higher Education in February 2001 and through its implementation the Minister of Education, Dr. Kader Asmal, appointed the National Working Group (NWG). The task of the NWG was to act as an advisory committee to the Education Minister (Carlisle, 2000). Based on the recommendations by the NWG, the Council of Higher Education proposed the reduction of the number of Higher Education institutions from 36 to 21. This transformation, according to Professor Wiseman Nkuhlu (Chairperson of the Council of Higher Education), would aim at 'creating a more responsive Higher Education landscape particularly in relation to increasing the participation rates of African and coloured learners' (Carlisle, 2000, p.1).

Transformation of Higher Education needs to be viewed within the legacy of Apartheid Higher Education in which the curriculum was Eurocentric (Nkomo, 1991), and demographic ratios were not representative of South African society. Such disparity resulted from the Extension of the Universities Act of 1959 which led to the complete 'racial' segregation of Higher Education institutions (De La Rey, 2001). Due to this, Higher Education institutions have become what Durrheim and Dixon (2001) refer to as 'racialised spaces'.

The recommendations of the NWG aimed at redressing the disparities which resulted from the segregation of Higher Education. These recommendations were approved by

Minister Asmal in April 2002. In terms of these recommendations it was suggested that, particularly pertaining to the Eastern Cape Province, Rhodes University (both the Grahamstown and East London campuses) would merge with the University of Fort Hare (UFH) and the University of the Transkei (Unitra). After a period in which comment was called for by the various institutions, the recommendations of the NWG were revised and the final plan deviated substantially from the initial recommendations (particularly regarding Rhodes University and UFH). This culminated in Minister Asmal's announcement on May 30th 2002 that restructuring would begin following a three month legal phase for comments from various institutional stakeholders. With the announcement, plans to merge a number of institutions nationwide took effect.

Among these changes is the incorporation of Rhodes University's East London (RUEL) campus into the University of Fort Hare (UFH) with Rhodes University, Grahamstown being excluded from the merger process to continue as an autonomous institution. Unitra was also excluded from this particular merger process though it was recommended that its medical school be retained and merged with the Eastern Cape and Border technikons (Carlisle, 2002).

Both RUEL and UFH are historically located within the Apartheid era. RUEL was established in 1981 as a satellite campus of Rhodes University, Grahamstown (RUGHT) (Rhodes University Calendar, 2002) which at the time was a traditionally 'white'¹ institution. In contrast, what was established as the South African Native College in 1916 became UFH bearing a distinct history of anti-Apartheid struggle especially since its affiliation with Rhodes University was severed in 1959 due to the Extension of Universities Act (De la Rey, 2001).

¹ Many authors use inverted commas when using words such as 'black' or 'white' to indicate the socially constructed nature of such terms. These authors recognise the necessity of deploying these terms because of the real effects that racialisation has, but wish to distance themselves from any suggestion that these categories are necessary or self-evident. For these reasons, terms such as 'black' and 'white' will appear in inverted commas in this thesis.

Rationale for the research

After the announcement on May 30th 2002 that a number of institutions would be merged (or incorporated), it was evident that an attempt was being made by government and the Education Department to take measures to narrow the gap between historically disadvantaged institutions and historically privileged institutions. Due to the history of South African university education, and based on the research conducted by Durrheim and Dixon (2001) on post-Apartheid segregation on South African beaches, university institutions should be considered to be 'racialised spaces'.

What was interesting was that in the Eastern Cape, the East London campus of Rhodes University was being incorporated and thus handed over to the University of Fort Hare. In the nationwide restructuring process the RUEL/UFH incorporation is unique for two reasons. Firstly, RUEL is one of few incorporations (as opposed to mergers). Secondly, RUEL is the only historically 'white' institution being incorporated by an historically 'black' institution. This unique set of circumstances affords the opportunity for research to be conducted on racialisation in post-Apartheid South Africa in terms of how this might continue to operate.

The theory underlying research

This research utilised the theoretical framework of Michel Foucault (1979, 1980a, 1980b, 1980c), particularly his notion of knowledge and power. Foucault postulates that power is everywhere and that it exists in the day-to-day lives of all individuals (or subjects) in society. At the same time he asserts that power is not possessed by any person or group of people. This framework was used in order to gain some understanding of how Apartheid power might still be present in the post-Apartheid situation through the racialisation of Higher Education (particularly university) institutions.

In terms of South Africa's post-colonial situation the theoretical framework of Edward Said (1978) was infused with the work of Foucault. This was not done merely due to the post-colonial stance of the work but because it utilises much of Foucault's

work and Said extensively utilises the concept of 'colonial discourse'. Similarly, the post-colonial work of Frantz Fanon (1963, 1967) which also draws on notions of 'colonial discourse' was included. These analyses illustrate how power relations in the post-colonial situation are played out with regard to how colonial discourse operates in the construction of subjects, objects and binary opposites in the post-colonial situation.

A brief description of the research

This research was conducted at three sites. These included the East London campus of Rhodes University, the Grahamstown campus of Rhodes University and the Alice campus of the University of Fort Hare. Interviews were conducted with staff at all three sites and with students at the Alice and East London campuses. In addition all news reports and letters to the editor published in the *Daily Dispatch* pertaining to the incorporation, along with public announcements made by Rhodes University and the University of Fort Hare were included for analysis. The research question aimed to illuminate discourses invoked by stakeholders in the incorporation process that centred on ideas central to the transformation of Higher Education. Transformation in this context is understood to be measures taken by Government to ensure and promote equity in terms of access to Higher Education with the particular aim of redressing past inequality and ensuring that student and staff profiles reflect the demographic composition of South African Society (South African Education Department, 2001).

Data obtained were analysed within Parker's (1990a, 1990b, 1992) framework as this is the analytical approach most aligned with the work of Foucault. Particular attention was paid to Parker's postulation that discourses support and maintain institutions, reproduce power relations and have ideological effects.

Overview of the chapters

Chapter Two serves to contextualise the rationale for the research. In this chapter I detail the development of university education in South Africa from its inception in 1829. What is noted is the fact that though many universities were regarded as 'open'

to all 'race' groups, access was still limited. In providing this brief history, I go on to outline the effects of Apartheid policy from 1948 onwards on the racialisation of Higher Education. The chapter concludes with the suggestion of various implications that the segregated system has had for university education as I outline some of the developments in Higher Education since the dismantling of Apartheid.

Chapter Three provides an account of Foucault's articulation of power and knowledge and how these operate. An account of how Foucault postulates that disciplinary power emerged as a modernised form of power is presented. In addition details of Foucault's notions of governmentality are briefly discussed in relation to Apartheid power. Said's notion of 'colonial discourse' is incorporated into this and the post-colonial theory of Fanon is drawn on in order to provide a theoretical standpoint from which to view the post-colonial situation.

Chapter Four traces the origins of 'race' as a concept. I provide an exploration of how 'race' has been conceptualised and used from its origin as a concept, through to the period characterised by what is known as 'scientific racism'. This provides the backdrop to the theories pertaining to how 'race' is viewed in contemporary society whereby 'racism' has become less overt in what is referred to as 'new racism'. The chapter concludes by arguing for the employment of racialisation as a manner in which to view the operation of 'race' in contemporary society.

Chapter Five outlines the methodological assumptions that underlie this research. It provides a brief overview of the development of discourse analysis as a method of research including the origins of the notion of discourse in post-modernism, post-structuralism and social constructionism. In addition, some of the various approaches to discourse analysis are outlined. An explanation of Parker's (1990a, 1990b, 1992) approach is provided along with justifications for why this particular approach to discourse analysis was chosen for this study. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the research process along with some of the methods used in data collection and some of the difficulties that were faced in the research process.

Chapters Six and Seven provide a discussion of the predominant discourses that were invoked by the stakeholders. Chapter Six deals with how these discourses were

invoked and what particular institutions were maintained or supported through the use of these discourses, along with what subjects and objects are constructed in the talk of the speakers and how these various subjects and objects are positioned. Discourses invoked by the stakeholders drew on particularly racialised notions. The majority of respondents in this research perpetuated the racialised character of Higher Education institutions in that speakers seldom spoke of the historical character of these institutions in terms of how they are defined as 'black' and 'white' institutions. Chapter Seven takes up the racialised discursive positioning of these institutions and provides a discussion of how the positioning of these institutions leads to the construction, maintenance and destruction of racialised boundaries. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the implications of racialised boundaries in talk around transformation in South Africa.

Chapter Eight serves as a concluding chapter whereby the main themes and discussions that emerged in the preceding chapters are summarised. This chapter also provides a brief discussion of how the history of racialisation in South Africa (both before and during Apartheid) has implications in contemporary South African society and how these implications emerged in the discourses invoked by the respondents in this research.

Chapter 2:

Context: Higher Education institutions as racialised spaces in South Africa

Introduction

With the implementation of a policy geared towards transforming the landscape of South African Higher Education in a post-Apartheid context, it is evident that a high degree of complexity and disparity has been bequeathed to the education system by the Apartheid legacy and for this reason the South African Higher Education system is highly stratified (De la Rey, 2001). This kind of disparity in the Higher Education system can be traced back to the point at which South African Higher Education began (long before Apartheid). De la Rey (2001) traces the beginning of South African University Education back to the establishment of the South African College in Cape Town in 1829. This institution would eventually become the University of Cape Town (UCT), which was modelled on the University of London. Already the effects of colonialism were influencing the way that South African Higher Education would take shape.

In this chapter I will provide a brief history which outlines the establishment of universities in South Africa in 1829 which would ultimately lead to the Higher Education system as it exists in contemporary South Africa. The effects that Apartheid legislation had on the development of a segregated education system will also be highlighted in order to illustrate how this impacted on the racialised character of the education system at present. The chapter concludes with an exploration of what the implications are for the present situation and what developments have occurred since Apartheid legislation was dismantled.

The establishment of university institutions in South Africa

'Race' has played a pivotal role in South African Higher Education since its inception in 1829. In 1916, The University Act of South Africa was passed whereby the

University of Cape Town (UCT) and Stellenbosch University were established for 'white' students in 1918. It was also at this point in time that attention began to be paid to the establishment of an institution for the Higher Education of 'black' people and this resulted in the establishment of the South African Native College which later became the University of Fort Hare. Only one university existed in South Africa prior to 1918. This was the University of the Cape of Good Hope; it would ultimately become the University of South Africa. In the same year (1918) two colleges were transformed into universities. The South African College became the University of Cape Town and Victoria College became the University of Stellenbosch (De la Rey, 2001). After World War 2, other university colleges began to attain full university status. This began with Natal University being established in 1949, the University of the Orange Free State in 1950 and both Potchefstroom University and Rhodes University in 1951 (Cooper and Subotzky, 2001).

By 1951, South Africa had eight teaching universities for 'whites' and the South African Native College, for 'blacks'. Of these eight 'white' institutions, only three provided limited access to 'black' (which included all 'race' groups not considered 'white') students. After 1946, the University of South Africa (UNISA) admitted students of all 'races'. The University of Witwatersrand and UCT allowed 'black' students to attend lectures but segregation was implemented on all other levels. The University of Natal was seen as less 'liberal' (De la Rey, 2001) due to the fact that although it allowed limited access to 'black' students, they had to attend separate classes to 'white' students.

In 1953 Prime Minister H.F. Verwoerd passed the Bantu Education Act and in terms of this, control of 'black' education was no longer in the hands of the provincial governments but was placed in the hands of the central government (Harrison, 1981). In 1957, the Minister of Education J.H. Viljoen proposed that integration of education at university level should end (Harrison, 1981). This was the point at which the Nationalist government began to take serious steps towards racialising and segregating the education system, including Higher Education. This culminated in the passing of the Extension of Universities Act of 1959. This act was particularly controversial in that it made provision for the establishment of separate universities for 'race' groups. Furthermore, it served not only to prohibit the 'open universities' in

South Africa (the University of the Witwatersrand and the University of Cape Town), from admitting any more black students but led to the establishment of separate universities for 'Indians', 'coloureds' and Sotho-speakers (Grobler, 1996). With the passing of this act, university education was completely segregated after 1959. De la Rey (2001) warns that it is easy for one to be misled to believe that before this point in time (1959) universities were open to all 'race' groups as universities that were referred to as 'open' still maintained a policy of limited access to 'black' students.

The establishment of the University of Fort Hare and Rhodes University followed similar, although in some ways unique and intertwined developmental trajectories. In 1923, the Higher Education Act was passed and the South African Native College was recognised as a Higher Education institution and began to receive grants, but the grants received were a great deal less than what the 'white' institutions were receiving (De la Rey, 2001). After the Extension of Universities Act of 1959, the South African Native College became known as the University of Fort Hare. Even with the establishment of this college as an institution for 'black' Higher Education, the staff contingent was predominantly 'white'.

Having been established as the Rhodes University College in 1904, Rhodes University became recognised as a Higher Education institution in 1951. This occurred after a period of approximately thirty-two years in which the institution struggled financially. In 1949, an appeal was made for funds and through the support of the Rhodes Trustees and De Beers Consolidated Mines financial stability was attained. On March 10th 1951 the institution was inaugurated with Sir Basil Schonland taking up the position as the institution's first vice-chancellor (Rhodes University Calendar, 2002). It was in this same year that The South African Native College became an affiliate of Rhodes University. This affiliation would be terminated in 1959 by the Extension of Universities Act (Harrison, 1981; De la Rey, 2001).

The South African Native College had been established on the site of Fort Hare, a former British military stronghold. It practiced a policy of non-'racialism' and produced graduates from across Africa. All these achievements were dashed in 1959 when the National Party took control of the institution and established the University of Fort Hare. What was detrimental to the institution was that it was transferred to the

Department of Bantu Education and was transformed into an ethnic college for Xhosa-speaking students which meant the exclusion of those African students who had been welcomed before (De la Rey, 2001; University of Fort Hare Prospectus, 2004).

In 1959, then Prime Minister of South Africa, D.F. Malan declared that admission for 'blacks' at universities was undesirable. Complete 'racial' segregation was imposed and enforced at all levels. This, for Harrison (1981), was a symbol of the death knell being rung for the future of 'black' education:

The existing University College of Fort Hare, that was affiliated to Rhodes University, had long drawn students from all over Africa. But it was now to be reduced to a Xhosa tribal college. The tradition which helped form Nelson Mandela, Gatsha Buthelezi, Robert Mugabe and Charles Njongo, the Attorney General of Kenya was to be set aside. In the eyes of the Minister, Fort Hare was nothing but an English University for non-whites and he said as much in Parliament. What the Xhosa needed, he said, was an institution of their own, expressing their own culture and rooted in their community. Knocking a final nail into the coffin of academic freedom the Minister also announced that it would be a punishable offence (a fine of R200 or six months imprisonment) for a black to register at a white university without his permission (p. 193).

It was the manner in which the Nationalist Apartheid government imposed their ideology, as Harrison (1981) outlines above, that gave them legislative control of Higher Education. Not only was this achieved, but by basing the segregation on racialised policies that used culture as a justification for segregation they had the support of the 'white' population of South Africa.

This is not to say that there was no resistance to the new legislation. There was widespread protest against the government's actions, particularly at Wits (University of the Witwatersrand) and UCT (Harrison, 1981). Nicholas (1994) and Cooper and Subotzky (2001) point out the irony in the title of the Extension of Universities Act as it was an act that brought an end to the hopes of many 'black' students. Nicholas (1994) also notes that even though the law was amended in 1960 which meant that allowances would be made for some 'black' students wishing to attend 'white' universities by applying for a government permit, of the 190 applicants, only four were approved.

With segregation being a priority in the development of the Nationalist Higher Education system two more 'white' universities were established in the 1960s. These were the University of Port Elizabeth (established in 1964), and Rand Afrikaans University (established in 1967). At the same time, institutions initially termed 'tribal colleges' (they would later become full universities), were established for different 'ethnic groups'. In addition to the establishment of the University of Fort Hare in 1959 (for 'Xhosa' and 'South Sotho' groups), the University College of the North opened in 1960 in the Northern Transvaal for 'Sotho', 'Venda' and 'Tsonga' groups. The University College of Zululand also opened in 1960 for 'Zulu' and 'Swazi' groups. In the same year the University of the Western Cape was established for 'coloureds' and the University of Durban-Westville was established for 'Indians' (Cooper and Subotzky, 2001). This resulted in the 36 Higher Education institutions that would survive well into the post-Apartheid democracy of the 'new' South Africa, making South Africa the only country in the world with a population of fewer than 50 million to have that many tertiary institutions (Cooper and Subotzky, 2001).

Implications of racialised Higher Education

This segregation had a huge impact on the structure of South African society as Apartheid ideology utilised the education system to set up a system that would serve the 'white' supremacist ambitions of the regime. Ralekheto (1991) suggests that "knowledge and education became organic points of Afrikaner ideology...a reproduction of mental (for 'whites') and manual (for 'blacks') division of labour" (p.102). This was the Apartheid government's manipulation of a functionalist approach to society based on 'racial' distinction, the maintenance of 'white' power in South Africa and the inferiorisation and oppression of an economically and politically engineered 'underclass' (Solomos and Back, 1996).

Thus the Apartheid regime used a racialised Higher Education policy to institutionalise 'racial' segregation in South Africa. Ralekheto (1991) notes that the Apartheid government used education to set up a system of false elitism through the university system further inferiorising the 'black' person, the 'black' institution and the 'black' intellectual. Harrison (1981) attests to this by noting that seven 'black'

students were refused access in 1953 after applying for tertiary education because the Minister of Education believed there was no prospect of education for them in that the 'white' supremacist policy of 'white'-orientated affirmative action had been implemented. His sentiments on the matter are summed up in the following statement:

As the Nationalists erected their apparatus of Apartheid it was vital to prepare future generations for their role in the Grand Design. The white man's superiority must never be doubted, the Afrikaner's right to restructure the whole South African society must be unquestioned and men (sic) of colour must be taught to accept the position assigned to them. *For all this education was the key* (Harrison, 1981, p. 190, my emphasis).

Horrel (1967, cited in Nicholas 1994) affirms this by stating that it was difficult for 'black' students to gain practical experience in fields such as accounting and law because even if they were qualified in a particular field very few established firms (which were obviously 'white'-owned) would employ them particularly for fear of the 'black' employee occupying a position that was superior to 'white' subordinates in the firm.

It must be remembered, as De la Rey (2001) pointed out earlier, that even the so-called 'liberal white' universities offered very little resistance to the above-mentioned ideologies in that even these institutions limited access to 'black' students. Furthermore, Afrikaans universities had tight relationships with the Apartheid government, even supporting the government and its educational policies to a certain extent (Jansen, 1991) and the University of South Africa (UNISA) practised a policy of segregated graduation ceremonies (Nicholas, 1994). After 1959, segregation at tertiary level had been firmly implemented with limited access to 'white' universities for 'black' students.

Further developments in a racialised university system

After 1979, threats were made to implement a quota system to limit the number of 'black' students enrolling at 'white' universities and although it was never implemented, the Minister of Education promised to keep an eye on the number of 'black' students entering 'white' universities (Nicholas, 1994). In 1991, the Universities Amendment Act (Nicholas, 1994) was passed and the possibility of such

a quota system was finally obliterated. This act aimed to repair the segregated character of the education system and pertaining to universities, particularly to amend the impact that the Extension of Universities Act had on the university system. It was at this point in time (April 1991, over a year after the release of Nelson Mandela), that the South African government decided that after just over thirty years of separate education, steps would be taken toward restructuring what had become a highly racialised and segregated education system in favour of a single education system (Nicholas, 1994).

This decision came following the tumultuous four-year period in Higher Education (1984-1989) in which numerous referendums were held whereby the Afrikaans universities (University of the Orange Free State, Potchefstroom University for Higher Christian Education and Rand Afrikaans University) expressed resistance to demolishing segregation in Higher Education (Nicholas, 1994). Such referendums were held in 1984, but by 1989 after what was clearly a change in the thinking of those involved, RAU students marched against 'racist' practices in Higher Education and through this, new regulations were implemented allowing universities and technikons autonomy in their admission policies. By April 1990, the University of Potchefstroom had opened its admissions to all 'races' (Nicholas, 1994). This was the first step towards demolishing the institutionalisation of 'racism' in Higher Education. This is not to say that the English-speaking universities and so-called 'bush colleges' had not protested against separate education but it is interesting that after resisting transformation, the Afrikaans institutions opened their doors to all 'race' groups. Though the legislation had been amended, it did not necessarily mean that 'race' was no longer a factor in Higher Education.

Duncan, van Niekerk, De la Rey and Seedat (2001) note that despite the changes in South Africa since 1994 'racist ideology and practices have persisted in all sectors of South Africa, including academia' (p.1). For this reason it is necessary to view sites of academic work such as universities as sites where constructed 'racial' differences, the Apartheid legacy and the power relations that this produces are enacted, even in a post-Apartheid context.

With the dismantling of Apartheid there is the illusion that racialised power has been diffused in an attempt to provide equal opportunities to all South African citizens. However, Vilikazi and Tema (1991) ask 'Where does the power lie?' and they continue to ask what constitutes the 'white-ness' or 'black-ness' of a university? They suggest that this is not decided 'only by the proportion of 'whites' to 'blacks' in the student body, but also and above all by the proportion of 'whites' to 'blacks' in the *power* structure of the university all the way from the University Council to Rector to the lowest lecturer of each department' (p. 129).

Cooper and Subotzky (2001) have noted that although the proportion of 'white' to 'black' enrolment in Higher Education has changed in that between 1988 and 1998 the number of 'white' enrolments has decreased and the number of 'black' enrolments has increased, the changes have not necessarily been dramatic or revolutionary. They argue that from a leftist perspective it might be argued that nothing, or at the most, very little has changed in both the social structure of South Africa and as a result in the Higher Education system itself. Cooper and Subotzky (2001) point out that in the period of 1988-1998 the number of 'black' staff employed in tertiary institutions only increased by eight percent (from 30% to 38%). In 1990, 96.5 % of academic staff at 'white' universities were 'white'. At the same time, 63.5 % of academic staff at 'black' universities were 'white'. By 1992, 87 % of all teaching and research staff at universities were 'white'. In the same year, statistics show that the proportion of white students enrolled in universities was almost four times the 'white' group's relative proportion in the South African population whereas less than half the overall proportion in the population of South Africa of 'black' students were enrolled in universities (De la Rey, 2001).

More recent statistics indicate that from 1993-2002 the percentage of 'white' students enrolled at universities and technikons decreased from 47 % to 27 %. At the same time, the number of 'black' student enrolments in tertiary institutions increased from 40 % to 60 % with the percentage of 'Indian' and 'coloured' enrolments remaining the same at 7 % and 6 % respectively from 1993-2002 (Bunting and Cloete, 2004).

In terms of staff 'racial' profiles, statistics indicate that in 2003, of the total of teaching and research staff at universities, 66.6 % were 'white', 21.9 % were 'black',

6.5 % were 'Indian' and 3.1 % were 'coloured'. This indicates that since 1992, the number of 'white' academic staff has decreased by nearly 20 percent (South African Department of Education, 2003).

What these statistics indicate is that progress has been made towards 'racial' diversification in Higher Education but due to the Apartheid system there are still some obstacles in the path of equity. Among these is the differential funding of historically 'white' universities (HWUs) and historically 'black' universities (HBUs) whereby the majority of HBUs remain under-resourced in comparison to their former 'white' counterparts. Of course the original motivation behind the restructuring was to collapse HWUs and HBUs. While this has occurred in some instances, for example, the merging of the University of Natal (an HWU) with the University of Durban-Westville (an HBU), in other instances the labels of HWU and HBU are applied with continued veracity. The Eastern Cape is an example in point where Rhodes University in Grahamstown remains untouched and continues as an HWU.

In addition, those institutions that are referred to as 'historically black' were known during the Apartheid era as 'bush campuses' due to the fact that they were established in the former homeland areas but were established close enough to former 'white' areas so as to ensure that 'white' academics and other staff members who aligned themselves with Apartheid ideology could be employed at such institutions. The creation of these homeland (ethnic) institutions ensured separate education and sustained the homeland policy in that such institutions were really only established to 'produce professionals for their [the homelands'] bureaucracies (Dyasi, 2001, p. 1). This has implications in terms of diversifying the 'racial' profiles of students at HBUs due to the fact that the majority of South Africa's rural population is made up of 'black' people (Dyasi, 2001).

Conclusion

In this chapter, a brief history of university education in South Africa has been outlined. The roots of South African Higher Education lie in the establishment of the South African College in Cape Town in 1829. Evidently, this institution was

established in colonial times and it is thus apparent that 'race' was already a factor in the education system at the time. From this period up until 1948 a number of other universities were established as distinctly 'black' or 'white' institutions although some 'white' institutions were considered to be 'open' universities in that they allowed limited access to 'black' students.

In 1948, the National Party came to power and began to implement legislation that would segregate South African society into four major 'race' groups. This had an effect on the university setting in that in 1959, the Extension of Universities Act was passed and prohibited the access of 'black' students to 'white', established institutions. This would continue throughout the Apartheid era up until its demise in 1994.

Moulder (1991) suggests that even with the demise of Apartheid, universities 'are the children of a colonial mentality' (p. 111). This is a great problem in that the colonial heritage of South African Higher Education, dating back to 1829, has caused great disparity in the Higher Education system. This has serious implications for the restructuring process as it is Moulder's belief that 'South Africa is essentially a third world country with some complicated products of first world privilege' (1991, p. 121).

The focus of this research project will be on the racialised interrelationships, which have resulted from the segregation brought about by the Apartheid system and how this informs the discourses relating to 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation in Higher Education. This will be viewed in terms of how such discourses are set in motion in contemporary South Africa, particularly regarding the current Higher Education setting. There is a clear indication that power relations are at play due to the practices of the Apartheid regime which are embedded in both 'racist' and classist foundations. The purpose should thus be to highlight the manner in which these power relations operate along with the discourses that inform the practises that have brought about the current Higher Education situation.

It can be argued that little change has taken place in the university system since the demise of Apartheid. This can be attributed to the fact that even though the Apartheid

regime has been dismantled Higher Education institutions in South Africa still remain the 'racialised spaces' that Durrheim and Dixon (2001) refer to. In the next chapter, I will discuss the theory of Foucault on power and knowledge in conjunction with the post-colonial theories of Fanon and Said.

Chapter 3:

Foucault, power, discourse and post-colonial theory

Introduction

In the previous chapter, the history of Higher Education and particularly the development of university education in South Africa was outlined. The racialised nature of the education system in South Africa can be traced back to the inception of Higher Education in 1829, which marked the starting point of disparity with its foundations grounded in both colonialism and Apartheid.

Toward the end of the chapter it was pointed out that such racialised disparity has led to the institutionalisation of racialised power relations in the university system. In this chapter the focus shifts to the work of Foucault and the post-colonial theories of Fanon and Said in order to conceptualise the South African Higher Education system within the theoretical frameworks proposed by these authors.

Foucault, power and discourse

Foucault (1979, 1980a, 1980b) provides a remarkable critique of modern society in terms of how he proposes that power operates within the social realm. In *Discipline and Punish* (1979), Foucault details the transformation of power in terms of how it operates in society and argues that with the advent of new parliamentary systems and the subsequent transformation of civil and political liberties there emerged a regulatory system aimed at regulating the forces and operations of individuals in society and the economy.

Foucault (1979) speaks of how power has become disciplinary in its enactment in society and draws on examples of schools, hospitals, army barracks, prisons and factories in order to illustrate the manner in which power operates. What Foucault refers to as disciplinary power is a modernised anonymous form of power which utilises not only power and knowledge, but an interaction and interrelationship between the two to ensure control over society. The way in which he conceptualises

this transformation of the operation of power is to provide an interesting account of how power has become less visible since the late 18th century. In *Discipline and Punish*, he argues that in the period of time characterised by the rule of a sovereign or monarch, torture was the predominant means of discipline. Through this, the power of the monarch was visibly enforced as a means to maintain order in the community. Any person who resisted the power of the sovereign was seen to act against the entire community and thus the punishment inflicted upon them for indiscretions was put on public display in a symbolic fashion whereby they were tortured or put to death in full view of the community. This form of public torture had many limits in that it was inconsistent, partly due to the existence of minor crimes and criminals who did not warrant such an elaborate and public display of punishment.

As a result of this, Foucault (1979) argues that with time a need developed for power that was more consistent and effective and with this came the advent of humanism. With humanism came a shift in focus to the individual and the individual soul or spirit as an object of study. In a sense, there was a turn to implementing a more humane approach to the exertion of power on the community. This, to Foucault, opened the door to ways in which the individual subject could come to be known, described, constructed and defined. Individuals in society now became juridical subjects. With this came the development of a series of disciplines that would ultimately lead to a consistent set of techniques used to 'scientifically' describe and control society.

Foucault (1979) speaks of such disciplines as not only disciplines like Psychology and Psychiatry that lay claim to knowledges of the human condition but also as forms of power-knowledge that serve to ensure control and normalisation of the population. These aim to discipline the subjects in society by prescribing ways in which the individual could become more productive and efficiently useful to society. He draws on Jeremy Bentham's design of a circular prison (The Panopticon) to illustrate the anonymous manner in which power operates in society.

The Panopticon is designed in such a manner that there is a central tower occupied by a guard. On the periphery of the central tower, a number of prison cells are found. The structure is built in such a way that the guard can see any one of the prisoners at any time but the prisoners cannot see the guard and thus need to police themselves in

order to avoid punishment. What this means is the gaze of the guard is internalised and self-regulation by the prisoner is ensured. Foucault (1979) uses this notion as a means of describing how power operates in society. Individual subjects internalise the normalising gaze of society in order to ensure that they self-regulate. This, to Foucault, is how power operates in modern society where internalisation of what is required by society in terms of order, efficiency and productivity is imposed upon individuals themselves. This sets up a system of power relations based upon the interaction of knowledge and power that acts upon individuals in society without there having to be a visible source of power.

When Foucault (1979) speaks of power relations, it is his intention to make it clear that power is everywhere. He suggests that everything that we as social beings engage in or undertake to do, that is, every daily activity, every interpersonal activity can be understood to be enacted within some kind of power relation. What Foucault attempts to establish is the sense that almost everything in the social world is a source from which power emerges. In this sense, power is not an all-embracing entity, but is rather a social process.

Foucault (1980c) states that power 'is always already there, that one is never outside it, that there are no margins for those who break with the system to gambol in it' (p. 141). Foucault (1979) sees the relationship between the economy, social relations and discourse as a complex network of power whereby all three are tied up and engaged in a net-like system of interaction. It is here, according to Foucault, that power relations emerge. To this he adds the notion that people tend to negotiate these power relations. Thus power relations can shift and change according to context and history. Through the complexity of these activities and their interaction, Foucault (1980c) suggests that the construction of social and discursive structures is inevitable.

To say that the construction, emergence, maintenance and reproduction of such social and discursive structures are inevitable is not to say that change or resistance is impossible. Foucault (1980c) suggests that 'to say that one can never be outside power does not mean that one is trapped and condemned to defeat no matter what' (pp. 141-142). Foucault (1980c) insists that power is 'co-extensive' in the sense that individual liberty is enmeshed within social networks of power, affirming that no

individual can exist outside of some kind of power relation. He goes on to state that power relations are 'interwoven' with all spheres of society, which include work, family, religion, sexuality and other relations of social existence and social institutions (Foucault, 1976, 1980c). In addition to this, power relations are not necessarily always punitive or disciplinary but exist in a multiplicity of forms. What this means is that this multiplicity of power relations does not lead to binary forms of social oppression or domination, with a clearly delineated dominant group and a dominated other. Since Foucault's articulation of power is not repressive, it thus does not serve to gain control through punitive or negative constraints. Instead it enjoys an omni-presence.

These power relations then serve in the sense that they are used in strategies, such as economic interests. Most importantly, Foucault asserts that power relations cannot exist without resistances. Such resistances are 'more real' and 'effective' because these are

formed right at the point where relations of power are exercised; resistance to power does not have to come from elsewhere to be real, nor is it inexorably frustrated through being the compatriot of power. It exists all the more by being in the same place as power; hence, like power, resistance is multiple and can be integrated in global strategies (Foucault, 1980c, p. 142).

Foucault (1979) asserts that power has modernised and this kind of modern power has productive effects. It has developed in a manner in which it brings things into being.

Levett, Kottler, Burman and Parker (1997) utilise this understanding of Foucault that power is 'productive rather than only repressive' (p.2) to suggest the urgency to theorise action and modes of resistance in prevailing socio-political contexts. They believe that this is where academic and theoretical work can be done in order to make change possible. They go on to highlight the fact that Foucault's conception of power and his discourse analytic approach is particularly useful in the field of psychology in that 'Foucauldian discourse analytic approaches allow us to connect directly with issues of power and subjectification' (Levett et al, 1997, p.2) when analysing discourse in, for example, post-Apartheid South Africa.

Foucault (1972) made it clear that discourses are not merely verbal activities and utterances but that these construct the social world and at the same time emerge from particular institutional contexts. He notes the fact that these discourses have emerged with time based upon rules and governance for how these structures and discourses come to be. He refers to this kind of understanding of the development of knowledge as archaeology. In this sense, discourses construct systems of knowledge and these knowledges continue to produce, maintain and reproduce discourses.

Foucault (in Dant, 1991) does not write about knowledge as an entity but rather of knowledge as an ephemeral process. Howarth (2000) speaks of Foucault's notion that there are formative rules that structure the production of discourse. In a sense, colonialism had a strong impact on the formative rules that produced colonial discourse (Said, 1978 – see later discussion). In this sense, just as discourses are produced, so too are knowledge and power. For this reason, it can be said that knowledge, power and discourse are social products, produced according to whatever formative rules the context allows. In the colonial and Apartheid setting in South Africa, knowledge was produced that invoked racialised discourses about equity, advantage, privilege and space.

What is required here is an application of Foucault's writing to social contexts in which to analyse power relations and related discourses. An appropriate arena in which to consider the work of Foucault is in the post-colonial setting as many writers, particularly Said (1978), have done.

Foucault's conception of power sees the operation of power as being capillary. What he means by this is that

in a society such as ours, but basically in any society, there are manifold relations of power which permeate, characterise and constitute the social body, and these relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse. There can be no possible exercise of power without a certain economy of discourses of truth which operates through and on the basis of this association (1980b, p.93).

By this Foucault speaks of how power is eternally in pursuit of producing truth. The important point is to note how, and especially where, power operates in its pursuit of

truth. While power is everywhere this does not mean that there is no domination or oppression. Based on this Foucault (1980b) asserts that

one must rather conduct an *ascending* analysis of power, starting, that is, from its infinitesimal mechanisms, which each have their own history, their own trajectory, their own techniques and tactics, and then see how these mechanisms of power have been - and continue to be - invested, colonised, utilised, involuted, transformed, displaced, extended etc., by ever more general mechanisms and by forms of global domination (p.99, emphasis in the original).

It is not only that individuals drift about within a network of power, but that individuals in society are the points at which power is transferred, reproduced and articulated. To live in the post-colonial setting is to reproduce the power relations of colonial discourse. In a sense, as Foucault (1980b) puts it, the subjects within a particular context collaborate in the dissemination of that particular context's discourses and power relations.

When Foucault (1980b) speaks of power as capillary, he intends to illustrate that power operates on many levels where there is no longer a single visible force from which power emerges. This is not to say that there is no structure or institution from which the techniques of maintaining power emerge. This means the state (macro-power) does not necessarily have to make itself obvious or evident in the day-to-day lives of individuals anymore but that power operates on a micro-level too in the sense that there exists a micro-politics or micro-power in the daily lives of individuals.

This conceptualisation is important in terms of this research in that it can be used to illustrate how Apartheid (macro-power) still exists in capillary form in the daily lives of individuals even though it is assumed that Apartheid was completely dismantled ten years ago. Hook (2004a) provides an example of this by utilising Foucault's ideas of governmentality (macro- and micro-power). What he argues is that Apartheid legislation was 'racist' in its intentions and implementations but never did it insist that the 'white' South African community should be equally 'racist' in their judgements of others. He continues to argue that due to the micro-level functioning of Apartheid legislation the inherently 'racist' sentiment of the National Party was reproduced and maintained on a daily basis between 'white' South Africans and in this sense the separatist and 'racist' ideology of Apartheid trickled down in capillary form into the

daily lives of 'white' South African citizens assuring their allegiance to the National Party vote. This is the manner in which Apartheid power relations were maintained and reproduced.

Hook (2004a) notes how the effects and power of Apartheid discourse became disseminated through this capillary functioning of power and 'is grasped not simply through a listing of governmental policies, by cataloguing its ideological commitments and their various institutional manifestations.' (p. 249). Apartheid needs to be understood in terms of Foucault's (1980b) conceptualisation of governmentality whereby power not only descends from a macro-level but also exists at a micro-level which ascends. In this way there is an interaction between the different levels of power. It is not Foucault's aim to explore the intentions of those who wield power but rather to highlight the practice of power in terms of what real effects the exercise of power has.

In addition to this, his conceptualisation of power involves an analysis of government. Foucault (1991, cited in Macleod and Durrheim, 2002b) defines government as " 'the conduct of conduct' or, in other words, as an activity which aims to shape, guide or affect the behaviour, actions and comportment of people" (p.45). This kind of conceptualisation aims to illustrate the multiplicity of power in terms of how it is not possessed by the state or by those who are perceived to wield power but that it is in fact possessed by none. Rather it operates in capillary form in multiple forms on all levels of society. In this manner, governmentality is concerned with the regulation of personal daily interactions between individuals but also at a macro-political level.

In viewing power as a ubiquitous process rather than coming from a single source such as the state Foucault (1976) does not deny the fact that sovereign power continues to co-exist along with disciplinary and pastoral power. It is thus possible to apply the work of Foucault to the South African context. Levett, et al (1997) utilise Foucault's conception of power and assert that 'the power of Apartheid was relayed through millions of channels of communication, from the government controlled media through to everyday conversation. Power is, rather, a function of multiplicity of discursive practices that fabricates and positions subjects' (p. 3). Apartheid discourses became so enmeshed in South African society that they remain operant in 'racial'

power relations and still function in post-Apartheid, or the 'new', South Africa (Levett, et al, 1997). It is important thus to link these analyses of discourses with how power and ideology¹ operate in the everyday existence of individuals. On the other hand it is also interesting to note that with the demise of Apartheid there has been a shift in power relations. Power in South Africa has become legislatively or officially deracialised although, as Levett et al (1997) note, Apartheid or segregationist discourses are still operant in the 'new' South Africa.

Through the utilisation of this kind of conceptual and theoretical framework, it is hoped that this research can illustrate that in the absence of an Apartheid authority, the kind of racialisation of institutional space it propagated still continues to exist in the daily (micro-level) lives of all South African citizens and less overtly in the actual power structures of university institutions. That is to say that the dismantling of Apartheid legislature and that particular system of government does not guarantee the demise of the ideology (or regimes of truth) proposed by that system. In the next section the discussion turns to the post-colonial approaches of Fanon and Said to the issue of racialisation and power.

Post-colonial theory

The Foucauldian analytic framework can be applied to the post-colonial context and be infused with the theory of Fanon (1963; 1967) and Said (1978) who analyse the construction and function of discourses in colonial and especially post-colonial contexts. Said (1978) uses the Foucauldian notion of discourse when referring to colonial discourse (though he notes how Foucault overlooked the imperialist project in the post-colonial setting) to describe power relations in colonised and decolonised territories. Here Said notes how colonial discourse is used as an instrument of power. Foucault (1972; 1979; 1980a, 1980b, 1980c) analyses how power and knowledge are connected. Based on this Said (1978) uses Foucault's analysis to point out how knowledge produced by colonial Europe was ideological in that it supported colonial power. This kind of colonial discourse continues to exist in post-colonial contexts.

¹ Note Foucault (1980a) preferred the phrase 'regimes of truth' instead of ideology.

South Africa exists in such a post-colonial (though uniquely post-Apartheid, in addition) situation. Durrheim and Dixon (2001) have conducted research into how discourses on 'race' have continued to exist in post-Apartheid South Africa and state that it is possible to explore 'how a racialised rhetoric was recast with the historical transition to Post Apartheid South Africa' (p.434). Using the above framework, it is possible to explore the possibility that discourses on 'race' and segregation in particular may continue to be generated and rhetorically maintained even though legislation enforcing segregation no longer exists. Essentially the use of this framework highlights how power and knowledge are used to maintain the use and function of Apartheid discourses in a post-Apartheid South Africa.

In order to understand how such discourses come about and operate one needs to apply these to real social situations. One needs to take a particular period in history or a social context into account and illuminate what knowledges, power relations and discourses emerged and what contributed to the emergence of these. Said (1978) uses the Foucauldian (1972) notion of archaeology to make sense of Orientalist discourse and thereby shows how useful the post-colonial setting is for elaborating on Foucault's postulations.

Said (1978) highlights how texts about the Orient not only created knowledge about the Orient but also created a social reality of the Orient as a system of knowledge by authors from the West who produced these texts. What happens in turn is that the people of the Orient (and Africa, or any other colonised territory) are also constructed. This constructs a sense of difference between coloniser and colonised with the colonised inevitably being constructed as the 'Other', opposed to the coloniser. Both Said (1978) and Fanon (1963; 1967) use the term 'colonial discourse' although in different manners. On the one hand, Said uses the term to refer to constructions of 'Other-ness' in terms of texts written about geographic space with particular regard to the people and cultures that occupy that space. On the other hand, Fanon uses the notion of colonial discourse in order to illustrate how the 'native' constructs him/herself as 'Other' in comparison to the coloniser. However, a common utilisation of the term by both authors is that it is used to construct the 'Other' in the post-colonial setting.

Mills (1997) points out that colonial discourse emerged through texts written about colonies. However, this is not just a reference to a body of such texts written about colonies but rather how these colonies are viewed and perceived in relation to the colonising nation and how they come to exist in their capacity as colonised territories.

In light of this Said (1978) notes the fact that the world, along with its cultures and histories is constructed by those who describe it. He asserts that such a constructed history is in turn applied to geography and particularly in the naming of territories, making these territories not just geographical, but also cultural and historical entities. When this is done, he insists that one should seek to identify how these histories are configured in terms of power. With reference to the Orient, he states that the West (or Occident) made the Orient and in so doing the Orient became a 'system of knowledge' (1978, p. 5). What Said (1978) adds as a critique of Foucault is that one should not ignore the imperialist project as he believes Foucault did in analysing western institutions and thinking. Through the imperialist project, the power of the Occident became viewed as scientific and the knowledge produced by texts that emerged describing the Orient, the social reality of the Orient became defined in comparison to the West. Said speaks of western disciplines (like Anthropology and natural history) as 'scientific' techniques utilised by the West to organise the world into different categories or types and organise these types into a system of related generalisations about a particular constructed other.

Thus, Said (1978) borrows the ideas of Foucault and uses the term 'colonial discourse' to illustrate the process described above. This process is not merely a simple set of texts within which colonial discourse exists but rather, colonial discourse is the daily social reality of those who live in the post-colonial setting and has very real effects in terms of how these people are constructed and defined.

What Said (1978) aims to point out is that the Orient as a system of knowledge is constructed through colonial discourse. This he describes in the following manner:

'[T]he Orient is not an inert fact of nature. It is not merely *there*, just as the Occident is not just *there* either. We must take seriously Vico's great observation that men (sic) make their own history, that what they can know is what they have made and extend it to

geography...geographical sectors such as "Orient" and "Occident" are man-made' (pp. 4-5, his emphasis).

It is here that Said (1978) turns to the distinction between pure and political knowledge. He aims to show that there is a misconception that most knowledge produced in the contemporary West is deemed non-political and in turn impartial. It is essential, to Said, to remember that the author is part of the project and cannot be considered to be producing an objective account of what is being written about. He goes on to say that 'the general liberal consensus that "true" knowledge is fundamentally non-political (and conversely, that overtly political knowledge is not "true" knowledge) obscures the highly if obscurely organised political circumstances obtaining when knowledge is produced' (Said, 1978, p.10). Said's essential argument here is that any knowledge produced, particularly about the 'Orient' is inherently political and for this reason any kind of colonial discourse is inherently political.

This colonial discourse is reproduced and maintained on a daily basis in the post-colonial context and Fanon (1963) illustrates how colonial discourse is not only reproduced and maintained but is legitimised by the colonial *and* the colonised themselves. Fanon argues that the ways of the coloniser have been so imposed upon the 'native' even the young colonised intellectual engages in ways of thinking and writing prescribed by what he (Fanon) refers to as the 'mother country'. Fanon claims that this is so because colonialism conceals the past and destroys the history of those who have been colonised, making it seem as though they almost did not exist in pre-colonial times.

He utilises the idea of national culture to clarify this point. European states are separated by borders set up through history and on different sides of different borders, different languages are spoken and different cultural practices are engaged in. However, when references are made to Africa with culture in mind, it is almost inevitably so that no attention is paid to individual national cultures, but rather that a seemingly homogenous 'African Culture' is spoken of instead. This is probably due to the fact that the construction of nations in Africa was and still is a colonialist endeavour. Fanon (1963) goes on to argue that European culture is used to fill the

void left by the absence of other cultures and still African culture is always treated as secondary to European culture.

Through such discursive actions, the African/colonised person is lured into the racialisation process him/herself and will also engage in the discursive construction of a supposedly homogenous African culture, which inevitably will be known as the other culture set up in opposition to European culture. Through this, African people themselves engage in the practice of overlooking the existence of individual national cultures and they thereby define themselves as 'Other' in the light of colonisation. Colonialism thus penetrates the daily lives of the colonised as they define and regulate themselves according to what is prescribed by the colonial power and this continues even after what is referred to as 'decolonisation'. This is evident in statements made by 'black' academics and 'black' students in Chapter 6 in that these speakers turn to 'white' academia as a reference point in order to position themselves in the world of scholarship. What is more, when invoking a discourse of international recognition, certain speakers regard international as 'overseas' meaning Europe and the USA thereby disregarding the internationality of other African nations.

Fanon notes how the African Cultural Society claims that it was only formed because African intellectuals felt the need to exist side by side with the European Cultural Society. This, to Fanon, only plays a role in further affirming the existence of a homogenous African culture. This process of the 'Other' defining themselves en masse in comparison to the coloniser is what Fanon (1963) refers to as 'Negro-ism'. This is a process of racialisation whereby the 'Other' is lumped into one homogenous group classified only by 'race' where Europeans classify themselves as French, Belgian or British with distinct cultures and histories. Africans are not defined as Algerians, Angolans or Nigerians but as Africans and doomed to the fate of only having a culture and history characterised (and over-emphasised by the colonials) by savagery and tradition.

Herein lies the implication that European culture has rescued the African from his/her own history and culture, rendering such past histories and culture as unnecessary when compared to what European culture has to offer. Similarly to what Fanon describes Chapter 6 highlights how a discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black'

failure emerges in talk around transformation. The implications of this discourse are that historically 'white' institutions are not only positioned as better when compared to historically 'black' institutions, but are also positioned as coming to the rescue of former 'black' institutions in terms of how restructuring of Higher Education has been implemented in South Africa.

Fanon (1963) agrees with Said (1978) when he speaks of a body of texts written by outsiders about the Orient, bringing it to life but only in the sense of its description by such outsiders. Fanon notes that even colonial literature about Africa is written from the perspective of the occupying power. This in turn reproduces the coloniser's knowledge of Africa and its people and brings forth the Foucauldian (1972) notion that the 'native' describes the world that he/she occupies through the lens of the occupying power as this is the only knowledge that is made legitimately available to him/her. What Fanon suggests is that even the 'native' intellectual cannot try to revive the culture of the 'native' people because in doing so he/she can only utilise the techniques of description and the language provided to him/her by the colonial power. To a certain extent she/he is also oblivious to the fact that this is so.

Essentially, colonisation is a process of assimilation, an incorporation and identification with the culture of the occupying power. It is a movement away from custom denying the history of those being assimilated. Though this assimilation occurs, Fanon (1967) always manages to conjure up a strong sense of a society divided by colonial history. What is most impressive and visible about the work of Fanon is that he uses realistic post-colonial examples to illustrate the invention of 'race', the invention of the 'Negro' by and opposed to the 'white' man. Even in the post-colonial setting, the 'native' and even the 'native intellectual' exists only in a sense that is defined by his/her colonised past. Even though he/she has become socio-politically autonomous, that is freed, from the control and dominance of the coloniser, he/she continues to exist in a manner defined by the former oppressors.

The post-colonial situation is one of distorted and forgotten culture and especially alienation. It is about a constructed 'black' man/woman, a person who, while living in their own land is constructed and abused by those who invaded his/her land. The 'black man', according to Fanon (1967) is the colonial subject whose existence in the

social world is determined by the 'white' colonial. The colonised subject will always exist as the history- and culture-less 'Other', to be assimilated into the coloniser's mode of living, but never to be the coloniser's equal.

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that Fanon offers a fairly bleak reading of the colonised person's perpetuation of colonial discourse. This reading can be counteracted by the reading of the post-colonial situation by critics such as Homi Bhabha. Bhabha suggests that, as Fanon does, the colonised have no choice but to use colonial discourse – but he adds that they (the colonised) have the ability to produce a hybrid form thereof (Young, 2001). Thus '[p]ostcolonialism is neither western nor non-western, but a dialectical product of the interaction between the two' (Young, 2001, p. 68) whereby the colonised change colonial discourse into a hybrid product.

Within all the facets of colonial and post-colonial life there is an understanding of power and domination, where the indigenous culture and people are made to feel like aliens or 'Other' in their own land. In illuminating power relations inherent in the post-colonial context one should question how these power relations came to be and how it is that they continue to be reproduced.

As it will be pointed out in the next chapter, 'race' and 'culture' are invented. These concepts emerged through real historical actions such as trade, war and religious missions. With these inventions come the power relations employed in those historical contexts that re-emerge in the post-colonial situation to maintain the constructions of 'race' and cultural superiority.

Said (1978) speaks of the Orient (both the middle and far East) in its relationship to the Occident (the West) and notes that both the Orient and Occident were invented in much the same way as 'culture' and 'race' were. He claims that the Orient was invented by the imperialist West and this led to the development of a typically colonial and post-colonial power relationship between the West and the Orient.

Said speaks of the Orient as a discourse, a colonial discourse in which a binary is set up that sees the West as always superior to the Orient. The Orient is set up as an institution created by colonial discourse. Though Said never defines imperialism or

Orientalism (Kennedy, 2000), he does draw the following distinctions between the two: by imperialism Said means the domination of a territory, usually quite distant from the national borders of the imperialist state, whereby dominance is exacted in the fields of economy, politics, through military control and the dominance of culture (Kennedy, 2000). Interestingly, Said intends for colonialism to be understood as the discourses that emerge through imperialism. Colonialism is thus the modes of daily living through which imperialism is legitimated and imperialist dominance is maintained. His argument is that imperialism brought with it the emergence of colonial discourse whereby the main intention was to exercise dominance but especially power over others, with 'Other' being the colonised nations. Through constructing the Orient, the African or the colony, the imperialist West constructed their 'right' to exercise power over others.

Gandhi (1998) suggests that in light of the above it is erroneous to assume that after decolonisation, colonialism ends. The post-colonial state and its inhabitants are all trapped in a sort of culture-less and history-less state and bound to engage in the colonial discourses to which they have grown accustomed. Any future for the post-colonial state can only be founded upon the discourses and power relations that emerged during the period of colonial occupation.

Critiques

It is the conception of the operation of power as omni-present and capillary that has made Foucault's work so influential and crucial to social science research and an understanding of the operations of society in general. Said's (1978) utilisation of Foucault's ideas in his study of the colonial Orient has led to a powerful illustration of the post-colonial situation. However, there are some flaws or oversights in the postulations of both theorists.

Critiques of Foucault's notion of disciplinary power include the argument that his work, particularly *Discipline and Punish*, utilise a limited number of historical sources and cannot thus be considered to be an accurate analysis of history. An argument against this critique is that 'Foucault is not interested in history for history's

sake, but is using it in critical ways to theorise insidious forms of modern power' (Hook, 2004b, p. 235). In terms of disciplinary power, feminists such as Bartky (1992) argue that though there is agreement that Foucault's theory is useful, he never alluded to the possibility that female bodies might be viewed differently to male bodies in society requiring different internalisations and regulations, particularly the internalisation of the (modern) patriarchal gaze. Similarly to this, though Fanon's (1963, 1967) account of the colonial and post-colonial setting is regarded as influential, many feminist authors have taken his work to task regarding the fact that he does not illustrate how the colonised ('black') woman is 'doubly oppressed' and therefore 'doubly colonised' (Loomba, 1998, p. 166).

Said (1978) as I mentioned earlier critiques Foucault's notion that power is anonymous in that he believes the imperialist project was quite blatant in its exertion of power and control over colonised territories. Hook (2004b) acknowledges that many would view Foucault's notion of anonymous power as being meta-physical but advises that one should apply Foucault's ideas to particular political, social and historical contexts. In addition to this Hook (2004b) notes that Foucault's later works do take this into account and suggest ways in which to apply and qualify the model of disciplinary power better.

Much critique has been levelled at Foucault and in turn at Said and this is greatly due to his utilisation of Foucault as a theoretical foundation. Gandhi (1998) observes that although Said's *Orientalism* (1978) was an extremely useful and essential contribution to post-colonial theory, one should not forget that it was written, and Said's assumptions developed, in the 1970s which was the period dominated by the emergence of post-structuralists like Foucault² and Derrida. Gandhi believes that for this reason it should be regarded as a work highly influenced and bound by an Anglo-American post-structuralism. It seems Gandhi is suggesting that Said's theory is too heavily influenced by the West and is thus a contradiction of what he is trying to use his theory for. He goes on to suggest that there are some critics who would say that *Orientalism* is a product of an Anglo-American academy that was still reeling from the 1968 student worker revolutions.

² Note that Foucault never referred to himself as a post-structuralist.

Kennedy's (2000) critique of Said's work takes on a greater theoretical depth than that of Ghandi (1998). She asserts that although Said claims to derive his theorising of colonialism from the work of Foucault, he tends to contradict himself at times and leaves the theory hanging somewhere between the work of Foucault and that of Antonio Gramsci. She argues that Foucault and Gramsci emphasised the importance of history with reference to power quite differently and this in turn could lead to convolutions and contradictions in theory.

Another critique of Said's attempt to utilise Foucault's ideas for his theorising of the colony is that Foucault asserts that power is everywhere in a web-like capillary form of network (Kennedy, 2000). The way in which this conflicts with Said's writing is the fact that he constantly asserts that a concentration of power or source from which power is enforced does exist, whether he is referring to one of the economic powers such as the USA or Britain, or referring to one of the former colonial powers. It is possible, however that perhaps Kennedy is misreading Foucault owing to the fact that Foucault did not deny the existence of a concentration of power. In his discussion of capillary power Foucault (1980c) asserts that individuals exist within a network of power on a daily basis in everyday life. It is here that discourses of truth are perpetuated, reproduced and maintained. Thus, even though Said (1978) refers to dominant economic powers such as the USA or Britain, it is his intention to note that colonial discourse is no longer enforced by these 'outside' powers, yet it continues to exist. In this sense he quite aptly utilises Foucault's conception of capillary power to illustrate how colonial discourse and the resulting power relations of such discourses continue to be regenerated at the level of individuals, even in the post-colonial setting. This capillary notion of power does not mean that there are not concentrations of power but in colonial discourse; 'race' is an object. In this sense, certain 'race' groups might enjoy more dominance in power relations.

On the other hand, Kennedy does admit that Said cleverly uses the work of Foucault to illustrate how institutions emerged in the Orient and how these were maintained and reproduced. However, she believes that strangely it is in this utilisation of Foucault's conception of discourse that Said stumbles across two major inconsistencies. These inconsistencies involve, firstly, Said's confusion of truth and

representation and the acceptance of the possibility of misrepresentation. At points in time Said refers to the Orient as located discursively in the texts that describe it but at other times he actually alludes to a true Oriental reality.

The second inconsistency that Kennedy (2000) suggests is that Foucault's conception of the relationship between knowledge, discourse and power is quite different from that of Said. This has been discussed in part above in that Said allows the colonising force to be identified as the source from which power descends whereas Foucault spoke more of an anonymous power that exists between individuals and was ever-present. Based on this Foucault (1980b) asserted that one should conduct an ascending analysis of power. In that Said sometimes alludes to an Oriental reality that can be represented or misrepresented, Kennedy (2000) believes that he loses sight of Foucault's postulation that all text and 'reality' is discourse and he thereby opens himself up to yet another contradiction.

What Kennedy may be overlooking here though is that the Orient is a particular example that Said uses to illustrate how the coloniser's knowledge of the Orient has been discursively constructed as a social reality that has come to be known as the Orient. The Orient has come to exist as a 'regime of truth' that Foucault (1980a) speaks of and is the 'truth' or 'reality' along with its own global power relations available to those who exist and were colonised in the Orient.

A final critique of post-colonial theory in general is that it stands a chance of becoming yet another totalising theory or grand narrative just like Marxism became (Gandhi, 1998). In addition, the methodology of post-colonial theory is challenged. Claims are made that post-colonial theory assumes a universalistic approach to epistemology and agency. What is important to note is that colonialism, like feminism or any other experiential aspect of social life cannot be conceived of as a monolithic or homogeneous subject matter. What Gandhi is arguing is that even though colonial and post-colonial theory refers to more than three quarters of the world's population, these people have experienced colonialism and anti-colonialist struggle differently. Evidently, the South African experience of colonialism and anti-colonialism (along with the anti-Apartheid struggle) is very different to that of a Zimbabwean society in that the history, the time and the context of the particular colonialism may be

different. This is especially so in the South African context as it was the last nation to remove racialised ideals from legislation. South Africa is a former colony that developed from being a colonialist state into what became known as Apartheid. In a sense, the colonialists became the insiders in the resulting dominant regime.

What Gandhi is suggesting may be useful. It cannot be said that colonialism has been experienced in exactly the same manner in every colonial context across the globe. However what can be said to be the same is that the power relations are played out in contexts of dominance. For this reason viewing the colonial and post-colonial context within a discursive framework proves useful in that such power relations can be conceptualised and understood in a context-specific manner. Foucault's (1980b) conception of power, power relations and his writing in general as Levett et al (1997) suggested earlier is useful in exploring the power relations that are operant in the post-colonial and post-Apartheid context. For this reason Said is justified in utilising Foucault's work in his attempt to illustrate the very real social effects of 'colonial discourse'.

Conclusion

In this chapter Foucault's theoretical conceptualisations of power-knowledge were outlined in order to illustrate how he understands power to operate in society. At the same time Foucault's understanding of the modernisation of power was illustrated. Foucault (1979) argues that through time, power has transformed in terms of how it is exacted. This transformation was characterised by a move from what Foucault calls 'sovereign' to 'disciplinary' power. With reference to this, examples were provided of how this can be related to the power of National Party ideology in both Apartheid and post-Apartheid South Africa in that the separatist power relations of Apartheid continue to be reproduced in South Africa (Durrheim and Dixon, 2001).

In the latter half of the chapter, the theories of Said and Fanon were infused with that of Foucault and showed how through the use of what Said calls 'colonial discourse' an understanding of power relations in the post-colonial setting can be understood in Foucauldian terms. At the end of the chapter some critiques of the theorists were presented and suggestions regarding how their theories might be applicable to the

highly racialised post-colonial and post-Apartheid South African context were made. In the next chapter, I will be outlining various theories surrounding the notion of racialisation.

Chapter 4:

‘Race’, ‘racism’, racialisation, equity and disparity

Introduction

In the previous chapter the theory of Foucault provided a framework within which to view power relations in the post-colonial setting in terms of how he suggests power and knowledge operate in society. In light of this the work of Said was included as a theoretical frame of reference in that he utilises the work of Foucault in his analysis of the post-colonial setting. What is required now is a shift in focus to the idea of racialisation and ‘race’ as a concept.

In this chapter the notion of racialisation will be discussed, highlighting the invention of the concept of ‘race’. In doing so, the way in which ‘race’ has transformed historically and contextually will be outlined. ‘Race’ as a concept has developed and transformed since its initial utilisation to its legitimisation through what is referred to as ‘scientific racism’ and ‘institutional racism’ to its operation at present which is referred to as ‘new racism’.

Where does ‘racism’ come from?

‘Where does racism come from?’ is the question posed by Callinicos (1993, p.16). He claims that the phenomenon of ‘racism’ is an ‘historical novelty’ (1993, p.16) and suggests capitalism as a possible source of the existence of ‘racism’. However, many would disagree with this postulation and argue that ‘racism’ existed before capitalism developed. Jansen (1991) notes that the concept of ‘race’ and thus ‘racism’ and racialisation are complex theoretical issues that require more than debating the ‘race’/class issue and capitalism’s involvement in ‘racism’. For this reason a far more pertinent enquiry into the concept of ‘race’ would be a focus rather on how racialisation

has occurred throughout history and how this came to be used by institutions such as the Apartheid government to bring about segregation.

It is possible to trace the origin of 'race' or 'racism' as concepts but this is not to say that 'racism' or the utilisation of the concept 'race' did not exist before the term 'racism' was coined. Fredrickson (2002) claims that the word 'racism' first became commonly used in the 1930s, when it was coined to describe the actions of Hitler and the Nazi regime in Germany. Of course it must be noted that 'racism' as a practice existed long before Nazi Germany and the actual coining of the term to describe it. 'Racism' as a practice is not simply Xenophobia, the feelings of hostility toward an 'Other' as the Ancient Greeks used the term but Fredrickson (2002) concedes that it 'may be a starting point upon which racism can be constructed, but it is not the thing itself' (p.6).

Fredrickson (2002) continues to argue that as above a distinction should also be drawn between 'racism' and religious intolerance because religious intolerance is based on an acceptance of 'Other' if said 'Other' were willing to be assimilated into one's own faith or belief system. What is necessary to approach the complexity of the matter of 'racism' and in order to clearly define the boundaries of such a concept is possibly the use of a word like 'culturalism'. At the same time there is also a grey area between 'racism' and 'culturalism' (Frederickson, 2002). Wetherell and Potter (1992) in their study discovered that culture is utilised to imply 'racial' difference in that culture defined as heritage renders the notion of culture one that is traditional and unchanging and thus denotes 'race' in some way..

The question of how exactly 'racism' began is not a question that will be easy to answer but Miles (1989) notes that 'racism' is derived from the concept 'race'. 'Race' is a discourse, which is a necessary precondition for identifying 'racism' (Miles, 1989). In this light it is thus important to note the fact that 'racism' and 'racial' categorisation and differentiation were invented (Foster, 1999).

'Race' as a signifier

Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1993) suggest that

race is one way by which the boundary is to be constructed between those who can and those who cannot belong to a particular construction of a collectivity or a population. In the case of 'race', this is on the basis of an immutable biological or physiognomic difference which may or may not be seen to be expressed mainly in culture or lifestyle but is always grounded in the separation of human populations by some notion of stock or collective heredity traits (p.2).

The concept of 'race' according to Jones (1997, cited in Macleod & Durrheim, 2002b) 'surfaced as a signifier of difference in scientific and philosophical thought in the early nineteenth century' (p. 779-780). These biological conceptions of human or 'racial' difference emerged as a form of distinction and separation of human populations into groups. Donald and Rattansi (1992) define 'race' as a concept that refers to genetics, physiology and biology but that these distinctions have 'shown to be trivial' (p.1). For this reason they go on to argue that there is no ethical case that can be put forward to justify differential or inequitable treatment. What Donald and Rattansi (1992) propose is that we should not question whether or not 'race' exists or even how or why it exists but rather try to illuminate how 'race' as a category operates in practice.

These 'racial' signifiers ultimately reified and legitimated the notion of 'racial' difference whereby the boundaries to which Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1993) refer were constructed and came to exist as methods of distinction in social reality. Based on this, 'racial' categories became defined and scientifically legitimated with not only distinction between groups as its intention but also domination and exploitation. This would become known as 'scientific racism'.

'Scientific racism'

Hossain (2000) argues that 'racism' became a reified and legitimated practice through what he terms 'scientific racism.' He claims that 'racial' classification and notions of

'white' or western supremacy emerged and were legitimated through the use (and misuse) of the 'academic' and 'scientific' theories of Charles Linnaeus ('The General system of Nature', published in 1735), Charles Darwin ('The Origin of Species', published in 1859) and Sir Francis Galton ('The Comparative Worth of Different Races', published in 1869).

Such texts introduced the so-called Enlightened Europe to a manner of categorising the different members of the human species into particular 'racial' categories. Said (1978) expresses particular interest in this as he argues that the Orient emerged as a cultural and racialised 'fact' based on the way in which colonisers describe and construct the 'Other'. Fanon (1963, 1967) too notes how racialisation is used to construct the 'native' and the coloniser and this in turn sets up boundaries, limitations and power relations for the various subjects constructed through racialised categories. This understanding of the world was in turn used to justify colonisation of non-western territories. Colonisation led to the development of racialised theories of the world and the knowledge produced and reproduced by such theory was manipulated to exaggerate 'racial' distinctions. 'Racial' differentiation, categorisation and discrimination became accepted common sense practices based on the assumed scientific validity of such constructions of the world. 'Scientific racism' should thus be viewed as a tool saturated with ideology in the playing out of power relations in which 'race' group dominance (especially the myth of 'white' supremacy) was the intention.

It has since been disproved that biology (and thus physical appearance) play any significant role in delineating 'races' particularly regarding comparative worth and ability (Miles, 1989; Callinicos, 1993; Foster, 1999). Thus, the argument that biologically distinct 'races' exist has no scientific basis. It is now only possible to study the existence of the concept of 'race' as the unfolding of a process of racialisation due to the mutability of 'race' as a concept (Foster, 1999) based on context and history.

It follows that with the understanding that 'racial' differences are invented and socially constructed there needs to be a re-formulation of the way in which we study 'race'. This

understanding that 'race' is a process suggests that though 'racial' categorisation existed before the advent of capitalism, such categories have been emphasised and exploited so as to form the foundation of a global capitalist (and colonial) power struggle. This suggests that 'race' was invented and coded as an entity with a particular end in mind, exploitation (Callinicos, 1985). For example, those assigned the designation 'black' were to be utilised by the Apartheid government for the 'white' capitalist elite. The intention was to keep the 'races' separate in every social and economic sphere through using these 'racial' categories.

The shift from 'scientific racism' to 'institutional racism'

Fredrickson (2002) suggests that the term 'racism' tends to be used rather loosely and unreflectively. 'Racist' theories tend to have been evoked by occurrences in different parts of the world, which include Nazi Germany and the Jim Crow era American South. His argument is that the climax of the history of 'racism' occurred in the 20th century in the period after World War 2, a period characterised by the downfall of what he refers to as 'overtly racist regimes'.

With Hitler's anti-Semitism there was widespread international reaction against the actions of the Nazis and it was at this point that the 'scientific racism' that had been upheld and respected as a valid theory in the USA and Europe before World War 2, began to unravel. This was a strange period in modern history as it seemed to mark the end of explicit 'racism' as decolonisation of Africa and Asia was taking place simultaneously (Fredrickson, 2002).

It was during this time that the former colonial states and particularly the USA began to express sentiments of national embarrassment at having upheld explicitly 'racist' policies. With this, legalised segregation and discriminatory policies were outlawed in the USA in the 1960s (Fredrickson, 2002).

The only 'racist' regime that survived World War 2 and the Cold War was the Apartheid system of South Africa. This lasted from 1948 until 1994. The 'racist' policy of South

Africa lasted for three decades after the USA had amended segregationist and discriminatory legislation in the 1960s (Fredrickson, 2002). However, though this kind of legislation in the USA had been amended and would eventually be amended in South Africa, the notion of 'racism' had begun to, and would continue to exist in an institutional manner.

In a study conducted by Myers and Williamson (2002) it is noted that although 'racism' is most overt in what they refer to as 'private discourse' it is also systemic and thereby becomes embedded in institutions such as the judiciary, education, religion, the family, the economy and politics. In light of this understanding of 'racism', Miles (1989) argues that since the late 1960s 'racism' has come to be understood as an exclusionary process, which is acted out intentionally or unintentionally by those in power. In terms of this, 'racism' can now be defined as those activities and practices that serve to perpetuate or protect the advantage of one dominant group at the expense of a subordinate group. It is almost always the case that it is a 'white' dominant group excluding a subordinate 'black' group whereby 'racial' distinction is always based on a reference to skin colour.

The Apartheid regime of South Africa is a perfect example of 'institutional racism'. In a South African context, the practice of such an institutionalised 'racism' is explicit in that 'racial' segregation based on skin colour was legislatively enforced on all socio-political and even geographic levels. The effects of this kind of institutionalisation of 'racist' policy become reified and legitimated in such a manner that discourses of 'racial' segregation will continue to exist long after the institutions and authorities that upheld them have been dismantled. One of the reasons why the restructuring and particularly the merging of Higher Educational institutions has been encouraged is to overcome these institutionalised notions of 'race' at a Higher Educational level.

Durrheim and Dixon (2000, 2001) and Dixon and Durrheim (2000) have pointed out that a segregationist discourse is still entertained by many South Africans in that even though segregation and its references to 'race' have been legislatively demolished, there is still a sense that 'race' groups are spoken about as naturally separable. These discursive

understandings of the world are no longer expressed as overtly as ideas of 'racial' supremacy and biological difference once were as Hossain (2000) highlighted in his elaboration of the origins of 'scientific racism'. In the same sense as 'race' was contested as scientifically justifiable, so too was the institutionalisation of 'race' contested. . What this suggests is that the concept of 'race' is mutable and can change and continue to exist whereby it is used and understood in a different manner. The way in which 'race' has now come to be used is more subtle than ever before, as in the case of 'scientific' or 'institutional racism'. This change in the manner in which 'racist' sentiments are expressed is referred to as 'new racism' (Donald and Rattansi, 1992 – see later discussion).

Racialisation and redefining 'racism'

'Racial' discourses are constructions of the social world. They are the means by which a particular set of power relations, which are both historical and contemporary, are carried out in daily life. It is important to note that the boundaries that are constructed (Anthias and Yuval-Davis, 1993) still exist and continue to be reproduced and that these lead to a sense of identity in individuals and groups that are imbued with 'racial' categorisations and distinctions. With time 'racism' has come to be defined and justified based on more than biological difference (Foster, 1999; Durrheim & Dixon, 2000). The concept of 'race' is no longer the predominant signifier of difference, but rather a process which now involves references to 'culture or nationhood rather than "race" directly' (Foster, 1999, p. 332). Foster (1999) claims that 'these strategies, albeit in more flexible and subtle discursive forms nevertheless serve ideologically to reproduce a process of racialisation and to justify or defend existing racialised inequalities and exclusions' (p. 332).

Miles (1989) acknowledges the redefinition of 'racism' and suggests that in the late 20th century 'racism' has come to refer to practices and procedures that result in a social world that is delineated by a socially constructed notion of 'racial' difference. The concept of 'racism' has become a term for political abuse and since the latter half of the 20th century only small minorities would willingly define themselves as 'racist'.

Though 'race' has been discredited as biologically determined the term continues to be used and is discursively pervasive. 'Race' as a category has very real effects in the discursive arenas in which it operates and through this, discourses are produced and reproduced that lead to the playing out of power relations. Michael (1996) asks: 'Who promoted identity X? Where and when, how and why? What linguistic, social, cultural tools did they use? Who was persuaded? Who resisted? And how do we as analysts and the participants we consider variously construct these various who's?' (p.9). Although this study does not delve into the notion of identity construction that Michael (1996) highlights, it is important to note that the construction of the category 'race' plays a role in how individuals operate and exist in society and the ways in which they speak about the world around them based on these categories. The question to be asked is where these categories or identities exist and how they are maintained and reproduced? From a discursive perspective it would be suggested that the answer lies in language and social practices, that these are the domains in which the category exists and is reproduced in its daily use.

Language not only describes, but also constructs the various 'racial' categories to which it refers. Various studies (Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Lea, 1996; Durrheim & Dixon, 2000; Dixon & Durrheim, 2000; Durrheim & Dixon, 2001; Myers & Williamson, 2002) have been conducted to explore where these constructions occur, how they emerge and how they contribute to the emergence and reproduction of 'race talk'. What is commonly outlined by each of the studies is that 'race' as a concept is still in use and that the way in which it is used has changed. The concept of 'race' is no longer a 'pseudo-science' (Miles, 1989, p.43) but exists as a discourse which no longer renders the term as overtly prejudiced as it was when 'race' was considered to be scientifically or biologically legitimate. What this means is that although 'race' is a socially constructed concept (i.e. constructed in and by language), it has very real effects in people's lives through institutional structures and everyday practices. What has been discussed thus far is that the utilisation of 'race' in acts of prejudice has changed with time. It is evident that after 'scientific racism' was discredited, a process of institutionalising 'racist' policy occurred

which Miles (1989) refers to as 'institutional racism'. Once 'institutional racism' was essentially abolished, 'race' as a concept continued to exist. This is what has come to be referred to as racialisation.

Miles (1989) uses the concept racialisation to refer to 'those instances where social relations between people have been structured by the signification of human biological characteristics in such a way as to define and construct differentiated social collectivities' (p.75). Foster (1999) speaks of racialisation as a process whereby human physical features are used to signify social worth and become a foundation upon which to base acts or practices of inclusion, exclusion and discrimination. Macleod and Durrheim (2002b) note that the term racialisation first emerged in the writing of Fanon (*The Wretched of the Earth*) and note the fact that racialisation is anchored in historical and social power relations. The important point to note though is that 'race' was discursively constructed or 'invented' (Callinicos, 1993) and by utilising the term racialisation we are reminded of the process (Barot and Bird, 2001), which led to (as opposed to the natural occurrence of) 'race' as a concept.

Barot and Bird (2001) define racialisation as 'the process of making or becoming racial in outlook or sympathies' (p. 602). They go on to point out that the term racialisation has become used instead of 'race', but that the term 'race' is still widely in use. What is more, they continue to note, along with Miles (1989), that 'race' is an invalid term.

Macleod and Durrheim (2002b) have applied these notions of racialisation to teenage pregnancy with very specific South African applications and explore how racialised notions of 'culture' and 'tradition' permeate scientific literature as points of reference for 'racial' difference. Barot and Bird (2001) argue that this is a common European phenomenon in that Europeans hold science in high regard and through colonisation, the notion of racialisation has been applied to all corners of the planet. Even with decolonisation these notions continue to remain.

Racialisation remains a problem across the globe but is so much more intense in the post-colonial setting. Racialisation has led to particular discursive strategies in South Africa and has impacted on social, political and economic circumstances. All these resulted from pre-Apartheid and Apartheid practices and continue to be a problem faced by those in the 'new' South Africa attempting to create a context of socio-political and economic equity. This has created a situation characterised by some serious obstacles which need to be overcome. For this reason and although 'racial' difference is no longer enforced by legislature, post-Apartheid South Africa is still a highly 'racialised space' (Durrheim & Dixon, 2000) and research now needs to focus on the discourses that are reproduced in daily speech that maintain understandings of 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation. Though 'race' is no longer a valid notion upon which to base prejudice, marginalisation or exclusion, it is used differently in contemporary society to do just these things. This is what various authors refer to as 'new racism'.

'New racism'

Donald and Rattansi (1992) suggest that this 'new racism' emerged in the 1980s whereby 'racism' was no longer based on ideas of innate biological superiority, but rather on notions of culture and the incompatibilities thereof (Donald & Rattansi, 1992; Foster, 1999). In this sense 'racism' has become modernised and manifests itself in a more subtle and symbolic fashion (Lea, 1996). Thus the biological understanding of difference (Hossain, 2000) from which the category 'race' and subsequently 'racism' emerged has now been replaced with cultural arguments which aim to maintain the understanding and existence of different 'race' groups (Foster, 1999; Durrheim & Dixon, 2000).

Macleod and Durrheim (2002b) suggest further that signifiers such as "'race', 'culture' and 'ethnicity' are utilised to highlight differences...and as explanatory tools" (p. 778). In contemporary society blatant and overt 'racism' is no longer tolerated but through the use of such signifiers and particularly cultural and ethnic explanations of difference, racialised divisions continue to exist.

Lea (1996) has argued, based on research conducted with university students who aligned themselves with the National Party, that although 'race' talk has become less overt, cultural arguments for segregation and/or difference are often accompanied by arguments of biological or cognitive differences. In her study with these students she found that though they would attempt to convey notions of non-'racialism', their talk was imbued with arguments in favour of 'racial' difference which regularly used culture as a justification of difference and, at times utilised biological and cognitive differences which are more overtly biological than the cultural argument.

With regard to post-Apartheid and supposedly post-'racist' (or non-'racist') South Africa a question to be posed is 'How does racism survive the dismantling of Apartheid legislation?' What discursive resources are available to those who engage in 'race' talk in a post-Apartheid South Africa? Rostron (2000) offers a potential answer to this question. He speaks of a 'pigmentocracy' as a mindset shared by 'white racists' who hold onto and claim colonial ideas of supremacy. This supposedly outdated form of viewing the world clearly still exists in post-colonial countries such as South Africa. Foster (1999) offers the idea that 'racism is not an invariant form' (p.332). The historical period and context in which 'racism' exists will change and be different and the survival of 'racism' in post-Apartheid South Africa will be ensured by some re-invention of how 'racism' is discursively used. Foster (1999) notes that 'race' is an 'empty signifier' and makes it apparent that 'the meanings constructed from the signifier have varied over time' (p. 332). In this sense, Rostron (2000) highlights how those who engage in the utilisation of 'racist' discourse do not use overtly derogatory terms as those used in the past but tend to use phrases like 'these people' to denote 'racial' difference. This is a fine example of what Donald and Rattansi (1992) call 'new racism'.

With the demise of Apartheid legislation in 1994 one might imagine that all regimes based on biological 'racism' or cultural essentialism have been dismantled. However, one needs to bear in mind that though the justification for 'racism' may have been reviewed, the practice is certainly not a thing of the past. Fredrickson (2002) suggests 'racism does not require the full and explicit support of the state and the law. Nor does it require an

ideology centred on the concept of biological inequality. Discrimination by institutions and individuals against those perceived as 'racially' different can long persist and even flourish under the illusion of non-racism' (p. 4).

This is in agreement with Donald and Rattansi's (1992) suggestion that there is a 'new racism' which Fredrickson (2002) calls a 'cultural racism' as culture is now the foundational justification for hostility and discrimination. This change in the manner in which 'race' is operationalised and utilised in defining difference needs to be couched within a new term and this term, as mentioned earlier is racialisation.

'Racial' policies in the South African setting

South African society is characterised by communities and institutions that are the products and by-products of a colonial and Apartheid past. With the demise of Apartheid there is an indication that the South African socio-political landscape is one characterised by great disparity and inequity based along 'racial' lines. This is due to the racialised policy of the regimes that existed in South Africa both before and during the Apartheid era.

During the Apartheid era a number of acts were passed which racialised legislation. These included The Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act (1949), which prevented marriage across 'racial' lines, particularly 'black' and 'white'. This was the first of much major legislation passed by the National Party to ensure segregation. The Immorality Amendment Act (1950) went so far as to prevent extramarital sexual relations across 'racial' lines. It effectively outlawed sex between 'whites' and any person belonging to any of the other 'race' groups. Further steps were taken to ensure 'racial' categories and the passing of the Population Registration Act (1950) ensured that all South Africans were designated to a particular 'race' group. In order to bring about spatial segregation the Group Areas Act was passed in 1950 which ensured the physical segregation of 'race' groups. This act is often referred to as the 'cornerstone of Apartheid'. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act (1953) ensured that even the public domain such as park

benches, public transport, beaches and other amenities were segregated. These were already segregated before the Apartheid government came to power in 1948 but with the passing of this act it became legislatively enforced. In the same year, 1953, the Bantu Education Act was passed which ensured that education was segregated along 'racial' lines and what this meant was that particularly 'black' education would experience a decrease in quality (Grobler, 1996).

This legislation brought with it great power imbalances based on racialised policies which no longer exist but whose after-effects are still clearly visible. With this understanding comes a need for bringing about the transformation of the racialised imbalances of power and necessary transformation of the socio-political disparity in South Africa. Such disparity has been perpetuated by racialised discourses in South African society that have not subsided with the demise of Apartheid (Durrheim & Dixon, 2000).

Conclusion

In this chapter, the origin of 'race' as a concept was highlighted. Though it is not possible to determine exactly when in history the notion of 'race' was popularised, it is possible to attribute the effects of constructing 'racial' categories to the advent of 'scientific racism'. This was a form of 'racism' that attributed 'racial' difference to biology but would ultimately be disproved. It was however to contribute to the institutionalisation of 'race' in society. Attempts have since been made to make amends for such institutionalisation of 'racism' but what has occurred since is a reconceptualisation of the notions of 'race' where culture, instead of biology, is now used as a justification for 'racial' difference. This has come to be known as 'new racism'. In pointing out that 'race' is an invention it has become evident that the effects of 'racial' categorisation are still widespread in society, South African society in particular.

The process of racialisation has had a profound effect on Higher Education in South Africa due to the fact that four 'races' were identified and Higher Education institutions were set up to cater separately for each of these four 'race' groups (see Chapter 2). What

arose from this was an understanding that education needed to be separated along 'racial' lines. Ten years after South Africa's first democratic election (in 1994), there is still great disparity between what are now referred to as 'historically black' and 'historically white' universities.

The university context in post-Apartheid South Africa is thus still an area of great division and disparity and can be deemed an important area of focus for the analysis of discourse and power relations. De la Rey (2001) notes that '...South African universities are important sites of knowledge production and dissemination' (p.8), suggesting that Higher Educational institutions are sites in which power relations are played out.

Thus within a Foucauldian (1980b) framework, Higher Educational institutions can be viewed as 'transfer points of power relations' (p.103) and as functioning as producers of discourses and rhetoric aiming to maintain or undermine dominant structures leading to disparity. In the next chapter the methodology used to explore the various discourses invoked in talk about Higher Education will be explained. The aim of this is to outline the power relations in operation in the university setting in South Africa and how discourses around 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation are invoked by the speakers.

Chapter 5:

Methodology

Introduction

In Chapter 3 the theoretical frameworks of Foucault, Said and Fanon were discussed. In the previous chapter the notion of racialisation was discussed in relation to these theories and the concept of racialisation in Higher Education was highlighted. In these chapters the necessity for research around racialisation and the power relations in the Higher Education setting were noted. This chapter will deal with the research conducted on Higher Education transformation with particular reference to the incorporation of the Rhodes University East London campus into the University of Fort Hare.

Background: What is discourse?

This research falls within the field of Social Psychology and aims to explore discourses around 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation invoked by stakeholders in the process of Higher Education transformation. Transformation is not merely structural but is produced and constrained by the discourses available to stakeholders. Discourse, according to Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn and Walkerdine (1984) is 'any regulated system of statements' (p.105). They point out that discourses 'form specific systems of statements that are identifiable as disciplines and whose rules of formation can be described and understood' (Henriques et al, 1984, p. 113). It is important to realise that discourses do not just appear or emerge as these systems of statements though (Henriques, et al, 1984) and thus are not just a pre-existing set of questions about what is 'real'. Instead discourses and questions about what is 'truth' emerge through the social construction of a material 'reality' through history. So, just as what is considered to be 'truth' is an historical product, so too are discourses an historical product (Henriques, et al, 1984). Most importantly, discourses are 'historically located, create the objects to which they refer, support

institutions, have ideological effects and produce and reproduce power relations' (Parker, 1992, p. 16).

Macleod (2002) suggests that discourses 'do not simply describe the social world but are the mode through which the world of "reality" emerges' (p. 18). It is through these social descriptions of the social world that a reality imbued with meaning emerges. These socially constructed 'realities' have very real effects in the lives of those who engage with, reproduce and maintain discourses.

Method

This research was conducted within the discourse analytic framework of Parker (1990a, 1990b, 1992). This framework takes account of how language is used to construct social realities through discourse and the manner in which these discourses are used. In addition to Parker's (1990a, 1990b, 1992) approach, there are numerous other (Fairclough, 1989; Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Billig, 1997) approaches to discourse analysis and these will be outlined shortly to provide contrastive frameworks for the one utilised in this research.

Burman and Parker (1993) suggest that discourse analysis 'attend[s] to the linguistic resources by which the socio-political realm is produced and reproduced [wherein] meanings are multiple and shifting, rather than unitary and fixed' (p. 3). It is through verbal acts of describing institutions through the accounts of stakeholders that it is possible to account for how language is organised into discourses (Burman & Parker, 1993).

Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) state that in order to engage in discourse analysis one needs to turn to language in a particular manner and take account of what effects language has in the social realm. What they mean by this is that the discourse analytic approach holds that the social world is 'constituted in language' (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999, p. 149) and thus a turn to language is necessary in order to take account of how discourses operate. Due to this turn to language and the understanding that it has immense social effects, it has become significant to identify what it is that

language does. Language as text or any form of communication does not only signify a concept or phenomenon to which it refers but in turn it constructs the reality of that concept or phenomenon in that the world is 'constructed within language itself' (Dant, 1991, p.120). This in turn has had huge implications in the field of research in that the researcher now has to remain aware of the fact that he/she, through research, is engaging in the interpretation of meaning and its construction and so there has been a turn toward a close observation of the role of the researcher which now requires the practice of reflexivity (Burman, 1991; Parker, 1992 – see later discussion).

Saussure's linguistic theory and the emergence of discourse theory

Discourse analysis emerged with a turn toward an environmentalist epistemology (Burr, 1995), an approach which views social reality as constructed. This brought with it the tenets of post-structuralism which has an anti-humanist and anti-essentialist theoretical stance. Language became the main terrain of contention in the multi-faceted fields of social constructionism, post-structuralism and post-modernism. Ferdinand de Saussure was one of the key underpinning theorists in post-structuralism. Using his theory, Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) note that within this paradigm, language is seen to be an arbitrary signifier of meaning. What emerged from Saussure's analysis of language was an understanding that language constrains the way in which the speaker is able to experience and perceive the social world. On the other hand, Terre Blanche and Durrheim (1999) remind us that Saussure noted that 'language is not a collection of signs each pointing to a particular concept, but a system of meanings - more particularly, a system of differences without any positive terms' (p.151). Saussure's theory postulated that referents (objects in the world) do not have a natural or necessary connection to the words (or linguistic signs) that describe them. Instead all these words, signs or symbols do is give the objects meaning. The notion that such a connection between signs and meanings is rather a social convention than a natural phenomenon led to a massive epistemological revolution in the social sciences (Terre Blanche and Durrheim, 1999).

This revolution in the ontological understanding of the world and particularly society began in the 1950s and 1960s (Kvale, 1992) with the emergence of post-modernism.

This approach was popularised in France in the 1970s and achieved more general public attention in the 1980s as a trend began to develop globally which was no longer interested in a quest for an essential truth or subject matter (Gergen, 1992) but was rather interested in narratives.

This had a huge impact on many disciplines including Psychology in that there was a sudden reassessment of psychological notions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). For decades psychological theory and the notions developed out of such theory had postulated a completely intra-psychic social reality and with the advent of social constructionist theory such postulations had to be reconsidered. One of the main areas of investigation that was reconsidered was the idea of individual attitudes, especially in terms of where these exist and reside (Billig, 1987; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Durrheim & Dixon, in press a; Durrheim & Dixon, in press b). Durrheim and Dixon (in press a) have utilised these revisions and reconsiderations of attitude theory to investigate notions of 'race' and 'racism' particularly to point out how such notions of categorisation exist interpersonally rather than intra-psychically.

Varying approaches to Discourse Analysis

Within the varying approaches to discourse analysis there is consensus that accounts of the social world exist in the linguistic resources which produce and reproduce a socio-political world that is perceived as reality (Burman and Parker, 1993). However, it is these linguistic resources that are analysed and understood differently.

Potter and Wetherell (1987) speak of interpretive repertoires which are the means by which a person in society makes sense of the world and describes it. These interpretive repertoires are constituted in and by language and they (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) note that there is always variation in the accounts that people provide. Language and speech do not only have the simple function of transmitting information and all spoken and written language is not new, but constructed out of resources that already exist.

It is Potter and Wetherell's (1987) contention that it is these repertoires that exist and act as the source from which we extract all written, spoken and symbolic meaning and thereby construct meaning. What they suggest is that concepts such as attitudes and personality and other such supposed intra-psychic phenomena can only exist and have meaning within language and it is through illuminating these repertoires that talk can be analysed.

Wetherell and Potter (1992) conducted a discourse analysis of 'racist' discourse in New Zealand. The analysis was conducted using very particular theoretical principles regarding how to go about conducting a discourse analysis. Based on these theoretical principles, Potter and Wetherell's (1995) approach to discourse analysis is concerned with what it is that people do with their writing and speech. They refer to this as discursive practices. In addition to this they try to highlight what resources people draw on through the use of these practices. A further emphasis of this approach is that it is important to note how discourses are constructed and how they describe what it is they construct (Potter & Wetherell, 1995). The content of what people say and write is thus secondary to Potter and Wetherell. Another aspect of this approach is the concept of rhetoric and the emphasis on the argumentative nature of speech and writing (Potter & Wetherell, 1995). This is a concept that is of central importance to the theory of Billig (see Billig, 1997 & Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gore, Middleton & Radley, 1988).

Billig et al (1988) take Potter and Wetherell's (1987) notion of 'interpretive repertoires' a step further and note that a characteristic of discourse is that it is 'dilemmatic' in that a repertoire exists beyond the field of meaning and that discourses can co-exist and exist even in opposition to each other, essentially offering two opposing views and understandings of reality. These authors contend that competing accounts of reality exist due to their interrelationship to each other.

Billig (1997) adds to this the notion that the individual exists in a rhetorical dimension which is construed as social reality where argumentation is central to social life. It is not the individual's personality that decides what opinions are expressed by the individual. Rather, the source of these opinions is actually the historical and contextual system or network of social relations in which the individual is located.

This echoes Potter and Wetherell's (1987, 1995) notion that knowledge and opinion that are expressed are not created anew by the speaker but that the individual speaker draws on discursive understandings of the world that already exist.

Another approach to discourse analysis is that of Norman Fairclough (1989, 1992, 2001). Fairclough (2001) notes the importance of language and his analysis of language and the discourses it constructs is referred to as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Fairclough's (1989) analysis of language focuses particularly on the significance of language in the production, maintenance and change of social relations of power. The purpose underlying this is to analyse common sense understandings of the world as realised in language, to illuminate the origins of such assumptions and to expose the power relations at play within these assumptions. Fairclough (1989) contends that these assumptions, (and for the sake of this research let us consider 'race'), are embedded in language which gives them a life as real objects or concepts in the social realm. It is through the consistent use of the language that constructs these assumptions that they are reproduced and maintained. The central tenet thus of Fairclough's argument is that power is produced and maintained through the use of language. He is not suggesting that power only lies in language but that language is the essential tool necessary in order for power to exist (Fairclough, 1989). He uses the term 'ideology' as the means of describing the linguistic distribution of power much the same as Billig (1997) views discourse and rhetoric as the source of ideological messages.

The above offers some of the approaches to discourse analysis and outlines some of the similarities that exist between the three approaches in terms of how discourse is understood. What can be gathered from the above discussion is that all three approaches cite language as productive in the construction of social meaning. For this reason discourse is central to all three approaches. However, differences emerge between the three approaches in terms of how discourse is understood. Potter and Wetherell focus their analysis on how discourse is employed in rhetorical strategies and choose to analyse how speakers use what they say rather than the actual content of what is said. Billig similarly focuses on rhetorical strategies but aims to highlight the contextual and historical resources that are drawn on in argumentation. Fairclough on the other hand, uses discourse analysis to highlight how language (and thus

discourse) plays a pivotal role in the production, maintenance and change of social relations of power.

Although influential in their contribution to the study and analysis of discourse the above approaches were not used as the preferred approach to discourse analysis in this research. Instead of the above, this research relied on the Parkerian (1990a, 1990b, 1992) approach to discourse analysis. The reason for this choice is that the Parkerian approach is most closely aligned to a Foucauldian approach.

Parker's approach to discourse analysis

Parker (1992) notes how his approach to discourse analysis has roots which lie in the work of Foucault and thus this analysis will move beyond merely identifying discourses but will also probe into the interrelation of discourse with institutions, power and ideology. Parker (1992) has outlined seven criteria for identifying discourses.

Parker (1992) postulates that discourses are realised in texts. This means that the object of study, for instance 'race', equity or disadvantage, should be treated as a text and studied as such. What language and essentially discourses do is construct objects - for this reason a discourse is about objects. In terms of this, a discourse analyst should focus his/her inquiry on what objects are referred to, describing them and viewing any act of communication (whether it be verbal or written), that is any process of meaning-making and meaning transmittance as an object or discourse.

In addition to constructing objects, Parker (1992), postulates that a discourse contains and constructs subjects. What this means is that discourses will construct a particular type of person and the discourse will determine how the person is talked about. The contextual and historical origin of the discourse should also determine what can be said about the person being talked about and constructed as a subject.

Parker (1992) draws on Henriques (et al., 1984)'s assumption that discourses are regulated systems of statements or coherent systems of meaning which construct a

world or an understanding of reality. What needs to be done in terms of this is to lay out a coherent understanding of what it is that the discourse represents and possibly how this coherent system of meanings would contend with any competing understanding of the world.

As it was noted earlier (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, 1995) competing accounts of the world do exist and often do so in relation to, and by mere virtue of each other's existence. For this reason Parker (1992) makes it clear that discourses refers to other discourses. In addition, Parker looks at how two discourses or more may be set against each other and how each may construct different objects. In addition to this it is possible to identify points at which these discourses overlap and most importantly how they construct objects that appear to be the same in different ways.

Parker (1992) highlights how a discourse reflects on its own use in that it refers to other texts to elaborate the discourse as it occurs and possibly how it is used to address different audiences. In addition to this a discourse can reflect on the term used to describe the discourse, a matter which involves moral or political choices on the part of the analyst (describing discourses about 'race' or 'racist' discourse).

In suggesting how to identify discourses Parker (1992) concludes with the notion that all discourses are historically located. It is important here to make enquiries into where and how the discourse emerged and how such a discourse has possibly changed with time.

In addition to these seven suggestions for identifying discourses, Parker (1992) suggests three auxiliary criteria. The first of these is the understanding that discourses support institutions. When taking this into account while conducting a discourse analysis, one should identify institutions and take account of how these are reinforced or reproduced through the use of discourse. Furthermore, he suggests that it is important to identify institutions that are attached to a particular discourse and which institutions are subverted or silenced when a particular discourse is utilised.

Due to the institutional nature of this aspect of Parker's approach and his leanings toward Foucault, it follows that secondly, discourses reproduce power relations. This

involves an analysis of who benefits from the utilisation of a particular discourse and who loses out through its use. Another aspect that needs to be considered is who would be willing to promote the discourse and why. On the other hand, who would wish to see the discourse dissolve?

Thirdly, Parker (1992) suggests that discourses have ideological effects. This necessitates the analysis of how discourses connect with other discourses and how this relationship may bring about subordination or oppression of a particular group or collectivity. In addition to this, discourses can also allow dominant groups to manipulate 'narratives about the past in order to justify the present and prevent those who use subjugated discourses from making history' (Parker, 1992, p.20).

The predominant reason for using Parker's (1992) approach in this research is based largely upon the three auxiliary aspects of discourse outlined above. With regard to research pertaining to Higher Education, the institutions involved should be viewed as discursively constructed and maintained. This allows for a clearer investigation into how these institutions came to be racialised and how they are spoken about. This in turn allows for an analysis of the power relations that might possibly emerge based upon the existence of these institutions and how official and unofficial discourses invoked by these individuals in these institutions maintain and reproduce such power relations. This ultimately illuminates ideological power and the intentions thereof that underlie the existence and maintenance of such institutions (Harrison, 1981; De La Rey, 2001).

The Research Question

The research question consists of the following aspects:

- What discourses around 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation are invoked by stakeholders in the RUEL/UFH incorporation?
- How do these discourses either maintain/reproduce or undermine/dislodge disparity?

- What kinds of Higher Education institutional structures do these discourses reproduce/ undermine?
- What are the implications of these discourses in the transformation of Higher Education in South Africa?

The research did not aim to evaluate the incorporation process. Instead it focused on understandings of 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation in South Africa as they are played out in these particular institutional settings.

Sample and data collection

The triangulation of three sources of data took place. Richardson (1998) states "in triangulation, a researcher deploys 'different methods' – such as interviews, census data and documents – to 'validate' findings. These methods, however, carry the *same domain* assumptions, including the assumption that there is a 'fixed point' or 'object' that can be triangulated" (p. 358, emphasis in original). In this research three particular types of data were triangulated.

These included:

- Interviews with staff and focus group discussions with students;
- Newspaper articles and letters and
- Official documentation and communication.

Each of these will be discussed in full in the following:

1) Interviews with staff and students.

Interviews with staff:

The interview sample was drawn from staff of the three sites involved (RUEL, RUGHT and UFH). Three academic staff members (one senior-level, one middle-level and one junior-level) were interviewed from each site, except for RUEL where six staff members were interviewed. For the sake of comparison all RUEL and

RUGHT staff members interviewed held posts in the Humanities Faculty (which includes Social Sciences) at Rhodes University. All UFH staff members held posts in the Social Sciences cluster in the Faculty of Management, Development and Commerce. More staff members were interviewed at RUEL as it was the site at which the most change would be experienced due to the fact that it was the campus being incorporated into UFH.

Interviews took place when the incorporation had not yet happened but when its inevitability had been announced in order to draw on people's thoughts and 'fantasies' about the incorporation. The announcement that RUEL would be incorporated into UFH was made on May 30th 2002 though the official date of incorporation had yet to be announced. Ultimately the University of Fort Hare took full administrative control of the RUEL campus on January 1st 2004. Interviews began on the East London campus in October 2002 and were conducted in Grahamstown on March 7th 2003 and in Alice on April 14th 2003 once the vice-chancellors of each institution had been informed that the research would take place¹ (See Appendix B for correspondence to and from Dr. David Woods and Professor Derrick Swartz). Each interview lasted between twenty-five and forty-five minutes. Interviewees at the RUEL campus were chosen from those in the Humanities faculty who were known to me. Graduate assistants were used to arrange the interviewees at RUGHT and UFH.

Semi-structured interviews were used. These were made up of questions regarding the respondent's reactions to the incorporation, their plans for the future, their personal and academic hopes and concerns regarding the incorporation and their views regarding issues of equity and disadvantage in the context of Higher Education.

Interviews with students:

Focus Group discussions with students consisted of:

- Three focus groups of undergraduate Humanities students from RUEL and

¹ In the meeting of the higher degrees committee of Rhodes University (attended by the supervisor of this thesis) it was argued that for reasons of academic freedom the correspondence to the vice-chancellors of the respective campuses should serve to inform them of the research rather than to seek their permission to conduct the research.

- One focus group of undergraduate Faculty of Management, Commerce and Development (Social Sciences cluster) students from UFH.

The focus groups interviewed at Rhodes University, East London were divided according to 'race' due to the fact that it was believed that students may not articulate their views on 'race' if there were members of other 'race' groups in the focus group. For this reason the three groups were divided into a group of only 'black' students, a group of only 'white' students, and a group of only 'coloured' students. The UFH focus group was made up entirely of 'black' students.

Focus group discussions involved students' plans for the future, their personal and academic hopes and concerns regarding the incorporation and their views on equity and disadvantage issues in Higher Education. Follow-up individual interviews were offered to RUEL students if they wished to clarify any particular points they had made in the focus groups. None of the students involved took up the offer. More focus group discussions were held with RUEL students as they were enrolled at the site which experienced the most drastic change, including the removal of its affiliation to Rhodes University.

2) Newspaper articles and letters:

All articles and letters published in the *Daily Dispatch* since Cabinet's approval of the implementation of the National Plan for Higher Education in February 2001 pertaining to the incorporation were collected and analysed. The *Daily Dispatch* is (as the name implies) a daily publication distributed to the area occupied by RUEL, RUGHT and UFH. These three institutions are found in the Border/Kei region but the *Daily Dispatch* is distributed throughout the Eastern Cape. It has the biggest distribution of any news publication where distribution and readership is in a region that is not considered to be a major centre (Lisa Kesson, Journalist: *Daily Dispatch*, personal communication, May 5th 2004). According to a survey conducted in 2003 it was established that on average 33 335 copies of the *Daily Dispatch* are sold daily (Ryan Megaw, Subscriptions Manager: *Daily Dispatch*, personal communication, August 31st 2004). Market research conducted in 2004 on those who subscribe (note that this is not an accurate indication of the actual readership of the publication) to the

Daily Dispatch and *Saturday Dispatch* indicate the following: 72 % of the readership who subscribe to the publication are 'black', while 3.5 % are 'coloured' and 24.4 % are 'white'. Statistics indicate that no 'Indian' readers actually subscribe. 19 % of subscribers are 16 to 24 years old, 29.2 %, 25 to 34, 29.2 %, 35 to 49 and 22.5 %, 50 years old and above. All subscribers (100 %) live in the Eastern Cape. In addition to this the home language of 22.8 % of subscribers is English, 6.1 % are Afrikaans (and/or bilingual) and 71.06 % speak an African language at home. 33.1 % of all subscribers have obtained a matric certificate and 23.4 % have some form of tertiary education (South African Advertising Research Foundation, 2004).

Though the above information does not accurately reflect the actual *Daily Dispatch* readership, it does give an indication at least of which particular demographic groups in the Eastern Cape subscribe to the publication. This information is important as discourse is produced in interactional spaces. The writers of articles and letters produce text for an audience, who read and respond (possibly by means of letters to the editor), or by buying or not buying the publication. Letters to the editor and newspaper articles will thus provide data illuminating the discourses operant outside the university setting.

3) Official documentation and communication.

All official documentation and communication from the University of Fort Hare and Rhodes University pertaining to the incorporation were included for analysis. These proved useful in illuminating institutional discourses and rhetorical devices operant in the transformation process.

Reflexivity

Reflexivity, as defined by Burman (1991), is 'self-conscious attention to accounts and presentation, to context as well as content' (p.328). She goes on to note how useful reflexivity can be in maintaining an awareness that the involvement of the researcher in any research project can have effects on the interviewee and also the interpretation of accounts provided by the interviewees. The focus shifts from the content of the

account to the actual construction of the account. This in turn can be problematic. The problem that arises here is that the subjectivity of the researcher in the process of research and power relations that exist in the interviewer/interviewee relationship need to be remembered in that these are not neutral, as positivists would argue (Burman, 1991).

Two themes characterise reflexivity in the process of research. These are a) an exploration of the involvement in the research of the researcher and the resulting effects and b) paying attention to the way in which discourse analysis constructs its data (Parker, 1992, Macleod, 2002). What this suggests is that attention needs to be paid to the power held by the researcher in his/her capacity as one who is perceived to have knowledge. In addition, the way in which participants are socially described in terms of 'race' and gender needs to be taken into account (Macleod, 2002).

In this research I was positioned as a 'white' male researcher. Not only are these signifiers of 'white-ness' or 'male-ness' imbued with meaning in the social context, in the academic setting, my positioning as a Masters student is also imbued with meaning. This is particularly important to remember in the sense that all the students interviewed were undergraduates and my positioning as a post-graduate Masters student may have had an effect on their expectations of me in the research setting. At the same time I do believe that at the time, my appearance may have been deemed unconventional in terms of what one might expect of a Masters student or a researcher. My dress was casual and, at the time, my hair was long (down to my shoulders). In this sense I may have appeared more relaxed as I assume that I looked more like a student than a researcher, which may have led to a more relaxed research setting. I was fortunate to have known each and every student in the RUEL focus groups as I had tutored all of them before (in either the Sociology or Psychology departments) and they were familiar with being in a group situation with me. The situation was different in the case of the UFH focus group in that I had never met any of the students in that group before. Their unfamiliarity with me may have led them to make assumptions about me. It is also possible that their construction of me as a 'white' male from Rhodes University had an impact on what they were prepared to say (or rather, not say) in the interview situation. This is quite apparent in a statement made by a 'black' female staff member at UFH who stated that Rhodes is well-

resourced. When I asked her why she considers Rhodes to be well-resourced in comparison to UFH she replied “I’m sorry; I hope that I’m not offending anyone, but it is because Rhodes is a white institution” (see Chapter 6, Extract 6.55).

Data analysis

All transcribing was completed and checked by July 2003. Focus group participants were differentiated by being assigned a number to indicate different speakers. Shefer and Foster (2001) suggest that the more neutral numbering of participants rather than the use of pseudonyms makes the quantity of participants more manageable. ‘Q’ refers to me as I was the facilitator or interviewer in all interviews conducted. Twelve staff members were interviewed across three campuses and were assigned a letter of the alphabet which depended on the chronological order in which they were interviewed. Thus the first interviewee is ‘A’, the fourth is ‘D’ and the twelfth is ‘L’. Focus group members were coded Speaker 1 (S1) or Speaker 3 (S3) depending on the order in which they began speaking in the group. All interviewees (including focus group members) were assigned codes to denote their ‘race’, gender, position (as a student or staff member) and the campus at which they were interviewed. All codes were comprised of four letters. The first letter denotes ‘race’, the second gender, the third position (student or academic, as all staff members interviewed were academic staff) and the fourth denotes the campus at which they were interviewed. Thus BMAE denotes ‘black’, male, academic, East London. BFAF thus denotes ‘black’, female, academic, Fort Hare where WFAG would denote ‘white’, female, academic, Grahamstown. The letter ‘S’ was used to denote student, thus CFSE would denote ‘coloured’, female, student, East London. In addition to this the following transcription conventions that were loosely based on the conventions suggested by Shefer and Foster (2001) were used:

[]: text omitted.

[unclear]: inaudible material omitted.

.... : Pause.

=: Speaker cuts in on another speaker

[clarification]: this indicates what was probably meant by the speaker.

Text underlined: A statement, word or phrase was emphasised by the speaker.

Interviews were conducted in English and since many of the participants are not first language English speakers a number of grammatical errors appear in the transcriptions. These have been noted through the use of the word 'sic' wherever possible.

Few difficulties were experienced in terms of transcribing other than the fact that equipment used to record the interviews was not of an impeccable quality. However, the recordings were mostly audible.

In order to code the data I read and re-read the transcriptions of the interviews, news reports and public announcements. Numerous initial attempts at reading and re-reading the data yielded a number of themes which were coded. However, after a third re-reading of the data, the final codes upon which the analysis was based were decided. Data was thus coded in the following manner. The discursive positioning of Rhodes University and Fort Hare was coded '1'. Sub-codes for this category were '1a'-racialised positioning, '1b'- advantage/disadvantage and '1c'- quality. Racialised rural and urban space was coded '2' with the sub-codes '2a' – 'black' = rural, '2b'- 'white' = urban, '2c'- advantage/disadvantage and '2d' – quality. The 'race'/class divide was coded '3' with sub-codes '3a' - 'black' = poor and '3b' - 'white' = middle class. Racialised boundaries were coded '4' with the following sub-codes: '4a'- mix/integration, '4b'- 'black' expansion/'white' maintenance and '4c'- 'coloureds' as undecidables. 'Race' euphemised was coded '5' with '5a'- culture, '5b'- interests and '5c'- background as sub-codes. '6' was the code assigned to notions of transformation with '6a'- transformation as a numbers game, '6b' – institutional culture and '6c' – 'new' South Africa = 'black' as sub-codes. The final code was '7' the 'International gaze' with '7a'- international recognition as the only sub-code. It often occurred that the same piece of text had several codes.

Data was analysed using Parker's (1990a, 1990b, 1992) method which outlines seven criteria for distinguishing discourses. In the context of Higher Education data was analysed so as to point out what effects talk around 'race', equity, disadvantage and transformation might have. Using Parker's (1990b, 1992) method, data was analysed in terms of what objects were being referred to, what systems of meaning are attached to these objects, who the subjects in this kind of talk are and what constraints there are regarding who and what is spoken about. Based on this, the discourses that emerged were considered in terms of what purposes they serve, what kinds of institutions they might support and what ideological effects they may have (Parker, 1990b). Comparisons of the data were made in order to investigate divergences and convergences across the sources of data.

Ethical considerations

The identity of all respondents remains anonymous. Interviews were conducted with informed consent from all participants (see Appendix A). All participants were informed that this research is not an evaluation of the process of the incorporation but rather aimed to investigate their views regarding the incorporation and issues of equity and disadvantage in Higher Education. Letters informing the respective vice-chancellors (Dr. D. Woods, Rhodes University and Prof. D. Swartz, University of Fort Hare) of each institution that the research would be conducted were sent with a copy of the research proposal attached. These can be found in Appendix B along with the reply from the office of Prof. Swartz. Dr. Woods' reply arrived via e-mail and was unfortunately lost when the East London campus changed internet servers.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have outlined the origins of discourse analysis. This approach is derived from the linguistic theory of Saussure. This theory had a major impact on the epistemological underpinnings of social constructionism, post-structuralism and post-modernism. There are various approaches to discourse analysis and these were outlined in terms of their commonalities and differences. Based on these various

approaches to discourse analysis the use of Parker's (1990a, 1990b, 1992) approach in analysing the data was highlighted particularly with reference to the fact that Parker's approach is Foucauldian in that he suggests three auxiliary criteria in discourse analysis. These are that 1) discourses support institutions, 2) discourses reproduce power relations and 3) discourses have ideological effects.

The second half of this chapter is a description of the research process where the process of data collection and analysis is outlined. What follows is a description of the actual analysis of the data and the major findings that emerged.

Chapter 6:

Racialised space, 'white' excellence and 'black' failure

Introduction

From the previous chapters it can be concluded that the South African Higher Education setting (universities in particular) is a highly racialised terrain. What follows is an analysis of the talk of stakeholders, which illuminates the discourses that were invoked in discussions around 'race', transformation, equity and disadvantage. In these discussions 'race' is used to define the identity of institutions and thus positions the two institutions (Rhodes University and the University of Fort Hare), in particular ways. Racialisation does not merely apply to institutional space. Through positioning the institutions 'racially', geographic space is also racialised whereby the rural is equated with 'blackness' and urban is equated with 'white-ness' and the 'white' middle class. Through the discursive positioning of these institutions in terms of racialised institutional and geographic space, notions of class, quality and standards are evidently intertwined in the 'racial' definition of the institution. Through the utilization of these discourses around space, class, quality and standards, the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure emerges frequently.

What follows is a discussion of how these institutions are 'racially' defined by the respondents and the media and how these 'racial' definitions draw on notions of class, quality and standards.

Positioning RUEL and UFH.

Outlining the manner in which these institutions are positioned discursively in terms of 'racial' identity is important in that it connects with Parker's (1992) postulation that discourses support institutions. In addition to this, the positioning of institutions in these

particular ways indicates that power relations are reproduced and at the same time, this kind of positioning has ideological effects.

From the themes that emerged it is evident that not only groups of individuals in South Africa are defined in terms of 'race' but, due to the Apartheid legacy, institutions have become defined in such terms. The various speakers still distinguish between 'black' institutions and 'white' institutions. In doing so it is no longer the student body or those who are employed by the institution alone who provide the 'racial' definition of the institution but the institution itself is defined in terms of 'race'. Only two of the speakers positioned these institutions as 'historically black' or 'historically white'. The first speaker who referred to UFH as an historically 'black' institution is a 'white' male staff member interviewed at RUGHT. He only used this term once. The only other speaker to make use of this understanding of the institutions is a 'white' male staff member at UFH. On two occasions he referred to the more established universities as 'historically white'. In two further statements he refers to UFH as 'historically black'. On one other occasion he refers to UFH as 'historically disadvantaged'. Other than these instances the remainder of the speakers refer to these institutions as 'black' or 'white' with no overt reference to the historical, political or contextual reasons for this situation.

What follows is a discussion of the discourses that emerged in the talk of the stakeholders interviewed regarding the incorporation of RUEL into UFH. What becomes evident is the fact that there is an absolute persistence among the majority of speakers to position the various institutions in terms of their 'racial' identity. It was pointed out above that speakers seldom (in fact the majority never) speak of these institutions as *historically* 'black' or *historically* 'white'. This serves to show how institutional spaces have not been appropriated into post-Apartheid non-'racial' spaces in terms of how the particular institutions are discursively positioned. This section provides a discussion of how the University of Fort Hare and Rhodes University are positioned, particularly in relation to each other.

Extract 6.1

S1: My sister was there [UFH] in 1996 and....and they couldn't study. I had never heard about such things at the multiracial universities. [BFSE]

Extract 6.2

S5: But then actually, what you're saying is hypocritical, because you're seeing Fort Hare as a black institution. [WMSE]

S2: But that is what Fort Hare is seen as....unfortunately. [WFSE]

Extract 6.3

S3: Ja, it's the same thing with the whole Rhodes/Fort Hare thing. Um, because Fort Hare is black, it's a black university, because Fort Hare is black and Rhodes is white. [CFSE]

These examples are extracted from the talk of the RUEL focus groups. Extract 6.1 is taken from the 'black' group, Extract 6.2 from the 'white' group and Extract 6.3 from the 'coloured' group. It is evident in the talk of these students that these universities still operate based on their Apartheid-inspired racialised identities. Fort Hare is positioned as a 'black' institution whereas Rhodes University is referred to as either 'white' or it is referred to as 'multiracial' along with other former 'white' institutions. A 'black' female staff member at UFH also later refers to the 'city culture' in which RUEL operates as 'multicultural'. What this indicates is that HWUs are referred to as 'multiracial' or 'multicultural' as the 'white' space makes room for 'blacks'. However, UFH continues to be positioned as a 'black' as opposed to 'multiracial' or 'multicultural' institution.

Interestingly it is not only students at the RUEL campus (and the 'black' female academic at UFH) who position Fort Hare in this manner but generally both 'black' and 'white' staff at RUEL draw on the same racialised definitions of these institutions:

Extract 6.4

[] because being a black institution, black academics teach at Fort Hare....even Fort Hare, interestingly still sees itself as a black institution....but it is a black institution and so they want to remain that way. [BMAE]

Extract 6.5

So I would like to see Fort Hare preserved as a university for black people [] so I think it would be good to have a black university in an industrialized area. [BMAE]

Extract 6.6

As far as I have seen besides, foreign students, I haven't seen any white students on the Fort Hare campus [] You know you go and sit in [Freedom] Square and you see white lecturers but not white students. Well, I didn't see any white students. [WFAE]

Extracts 6.4 and 6.5 are taken from statements made by 'black' RUEL staff members. It is evident, particularly in the second speaker's talk, that UFH is explicitly defined as a 'black' institution. The third speaker is a 'white' RUEL staff member who positions UFH as a 'black' institution in a more subtle manner, but nevertheless her talk positions it as a 'black' institution. In positioning these institutions as 'black' and 'white' a number of discourses are invoked pertaining to transformation, equity, advantage and disadvantage and these are all gauged against the 'black-ness' and 'white-ness' of each of the institutions. It is almost impossible to indicate the positioning of these institutions separately as it seems when the majority of speakers refer to one of the institutions as 'black' or 'white' they are simultaneously referring to the other in a contrasting manner. That is to say, when a speaker draws on the notion of the 'black-ness' of UFH, they almost inevitably draw on notions of Rhodes University's 'white-ness'.

It is through the use of such notions of 'white-ness' and 'black-ness' of the institutions in terms of how UFH and RUEL are positioned discursively that institutional space is

racialised. However, it becomes apparent that in positioning the institutions 'racially', it is not only institutional space, but also geographic space that is racialised.

The rural/urban divide as racialised space

Geographic space is an essential area of focus in the study of post-colonial settings as such spaces are often imbued with political and 'racial' meaning. This space thus exists in a contextual and historical realm that is constructed and defined by those who occupy that space. In the Apartheid era, government legislation, particularly The Group Areas Act of 1950, set about racialising South African space along urban and rural lines. With the implementation of the separate but equal notion advocated by the Apartheid government, South Africa became divided in a racialised geographic sense particularly with the passing of The Bantu Authorities Act of 1951, The Promotion of Bantu Self-Government Act of 1959 and the Bantu Homelands Constitutional Act of 1971 (Grobler, 1996). This legislation ensured that the South African landscape was divided into rural for 'black' and urban for 'white' (though one should remember that a great deal of land was - and still is - occupied by 'white' commercial farmers) where access to 'blacks' (to urban, industrialised areas) was only allowed in their capacity as migrant workers. This access was also regulated by means of a strict pass system, where 'black' people were required to carry passes in urban areas.

The construction of space, particularly political space, has been taken up by a variety of authors. Said (1978) has used the notion of space to illustrate how the construction of 'Others' is related to the construction of spaces in that subjects come to define themselves in relation to the physical, social and political space that they occupy. Dixon and Durrheim (2000) suggest that 'where we are' often constitutes our construction of 'who we are' and that '[w]e are located in time and space both objectively (since action takes place in context) and subjectively (since our identities are partly defined by these contexts)' (Durrheim & Dixon, 2001, p. 433).

In this study 'race' plays a defining role in terms of how subjects and institutions are positioned spatially. A discourse of 'black' equals rural and 'white' equals industrialized is invoked by speakers from all three campuses. This manner of differentiating space along 'racial' lines sets up difference as a number of binary opposites 'in terms of temporal and spatial metaphors which fold into each other – for example, Modern/backward, First world/Third World; the West/The Rest' (Durrheim & Dixon, 2001, pp. 433-434). What follows is an elaboration of how the speakers invoked the discourse of the rural/urban divide as racialised space.

Extract 6.7

I don't know how many black students are in Rhodes and we are mainly a rural side than an urban side so I believe that East London can now reach out and improve life in the rural sector. [BMAF]

Extract 6.8

Given our situation with a rural setting, we are much more isolated, being part of a HBU and all the problems that go along with that you know. And sort of seeing Rhodes East London has....let's call it a First World situation, or historically white situation. [WMAF]

Evidently, there is a division being made between what is rural and what is urban. Both speakers are employed by UFH in Alice and both equate the rural with 'black' and the urban with what is 'First World' and historically 'white'. This renders the urban environment the centre, the ideal to which the rural and 'black', being on the periphery (Mishra and Hodge, 1993; Spivak, 1993) are compared and defined against. In the first of the two extracts (Extract 6.7), the speaker indicates that he believes 'East London can reach out and improve life in the rural sector' suggesting that the centre is seen as 'improv[ing]' the periphery. At the same time the rural periphery is constructed as 'Other' (Said, 1978) and the urban as a foreign environment to which 'black' is the outsider as the following extract illustrates:

Extract 6.9

[] the mind-set of the people is different in a rural place so I thought that if I have to move to East London and if me, or others had to move there, would they really be able to afford the life there? The lifestyle [] Would we really have the time to adapt to the life? [] As I say, we are mainly black. What if I have to have a white neighbour? Cos here you actually come out and say in the corridor 'Anyone who has bread?' and people just open their door and give you bread. But will you do that if you are in another environment? [BMAF]

The above statement was made by the same 'black' speaker (UFH staff member) who suggested that East London might improve life in the rural sector (Extract 6.7). In the interview he expressed a concern about having to move from the rural setting to an urban setting. He invokes the discourse of rural/urban difference by drawing on notions of culture but in the specific sense that 'black' culture is cast as traditional and rural in character and 'white' culture is seen to be foreign and different. This cultural difference appears to be defined by the spatial context in which it operates where urban 'white' culture might not embrace the communal tradition of rural 'black' culture, rendering the speaker to be positioned as the foreign, 'Other', outsider.

This manner of spatially positioning institutions also draws on notions of advantage whereby the rural/urban divide is deployed to offer understandings of disadvantage and advantage at the same time. In this sense Fort Hare being given access to East London will provide them with the privileges of former 'white' urban advantage.

Extract 6.10

Fort Hare, if you are looking at this particular case. They have given them access to East London. Fort Hare up to now were (sic) a rural university. Who would want to go to Alice and live in Alice? Most of the guys live here [East London]. [BMAE]

Extract 6.11

[] there's a geographic proximity that could lend itself to having a city base for a university that seems to be dying, Fort Hare, and which doesn't have a town to support it because Alice and Fort Beaufort as far as I can understand are rapidly going downhill and so there's very little there to support the sustained growth of that institution. [WFAG]

Extract 6.12

[] Fort Hare is not viable out in Alice and that Fort Hare needed access to an urban place and obviously the urban place is East London [] they were to be saved by being in East London. And you can see it. Their staff either live in Adelaide, Hogsback or East London. Most of their black staff actually live in East London and commute out....so that's not....not viable. Alice is degrading. [WMAG]

The above examples are extracted from the talk of two 'white' RUGHT staff members (Extracts 6.11 and 6.12) and one 'black' RUEL staff member (Extract 6.10). Through these statements, the rural setting is cast as undesirable, as 'degrading' or 'going downhill'. It is here that the notion of 'white-ness' being the salvation of 'black-ness' is suggested (this will be discussed in the next section) whereby a move to an urban (read, 'white') centre will revive the 'black' (peripheral) rural institution and make it 'viable'. This notion of allowances for the movement of 'black' from rural to 'white' urban is made evident in the talk of the speaker in Extract 6.12 where he states that 'Most of their *black* staff actually live in East London.'

Interestingly this is not only apparent in the talk of 'white' Rhodes University staff members as the following extracts highlight:

Extract 6.13

Of course we have professors here but there are not that many and sometimes they don't come to Fort Hare because it is in the rural area and even if we could have

professors they would need to be in an established place. There are many things that are limiting us, like professors and things like that is that we need really to be in a place where they can live their life the way that they want to, not to be limited. [WMAF]

Extract 6.14

“The nursing Science Department [] used to be housed on the All Saints campus just outside Bisho, but access to the campus, the distance from clinical facilities and isolation of the department from the broader university was very limiting”. *RUEL Public Announcement*. August 7 2003.

In referring to rural space as limiting or limited in terms of resources and quality of life it is evident that ‘black’ rural space is associated with disadvantage. At the same time the speaker in Extract 6.13 invokes the discourse of quality through addressing the notion of professors (and the lack thereof at UFH) in that professorship is associated with quality, experience and expertise. The rural setting, to this speaker, is disadvantageous in that it does not attract professors. In order for this disadvantage to be overcome, there is the necessity to move to ‘white’ urban space in order to share in former ‘white’ privilege and quality of life and leave behind the traditional, backward rural environment as the following speaker suggests:

Extract 6.15

Especially the multicultural aspects because [] so if you look at East London you give us the opportunity to work in the city culture. [BFAF]

In her statement, this speaker, a ‘black’ UFH, Alice employee draws on the notion of culture, particularly ‘city culture’. In doing so, she casts ‘city culture’ in the light of advantage, progression and advancement. By referring to the former ‘white’ urban East London as ‘multicultural’ she engages in the discourse of racialising urban/rural space which serves to render the rural as eternally existing as the backward, traditional, ‘Other’,

outsider realm of 'black-ness'. At the same time it is possible to say that she euphemistically utilises the terms 'multicultural' to actually describe 'white'. The euphemistic use of notions of 'race' will be dealt with in Chapter 7.

Discourses of advantage and disadvantage are invoked in the utilization of rural and urban space to differentiate between 'black' and 'white' space. Through the use of these discourses, 'black-ness' is set up in opposition to 'white-ness' and tensions are established by means of binary opposites such as rural-'black'/urban-'white', 'First World/Third World, Modern/backward' (Durrheim and Dixon, 2001, pp. 433-434). Through setting up the tension of 'white' space as the desirable urban centre and 'black' space as the undesirable rural periphery, the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure emerges. This discourse is invoked surrounding notions of institutional and geographic space along with notions of quality and disadvantage.

'White' excellence and 'black' failure

The talk of the speakers often centres on the notion of 'white' excellence as it is constructed in opposition to 'black' failure. In this way, all that is 'white' in terms of institutions, academia and geographic space is seen to be the ideal whereas the historically 'black' institutions with their own academic product are seen to be inferior and doomed to fail or regarded as 'Other' (Fanon, 1963; Said, 1978) resulting in a racialised Higher Education landscape that seemingly continues to perpetuate the disparity caused by Apartheid. The following extracts are taken from interviews with staff and students at the RUEL campus.

Extract 6.16

S3: Um, ja I think, for so long....every time, there is like anything, it is the stuff that is associated with white people that is successful and it's the stuff that's associated with black people that is inferior. [BFSE]

Extract 6.17

S1: =Why didn't they make Fort Hare part of Rhodes? [CFSE]

S4: How can they just throw away Rhodes, EL like that? [CFSE]

S3: Why did they have to change something as good as Rhodes, the name Rhodes and change it to Fort Hare? I mean what about all the students here? [CFSE]

Extract 6.18

"Fort Hare is an emerging institution and black institution but that is more sentiment and politics than reality of academic excellence. [] They [historically 'white' institutions] were given the additional burden of administering malfunctioning black institutions. It's Verwoerdian in that sense in that it still recognizes white excellence and black failure and there are mergers that try to get the white institution to come to the rescue. [BMAE]

Extract 6.19

Oh, Fort Hare. They've been thrown a lifeline, in a sense. They're going to move down here, probably lock, stock and barrel. They've been thrown a lifeline. Ja. [WMAE]

In Extract 6.16 the speaker is a 'black' student from RUEL who acknowledges the perception of 'white-ness' as the ideal and 'black-ness' as the 'inferior other'. This notion is taken up by three of the speakers in the 'coloured' focus group (Extract 6.17) at RUEL who utilize the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure to question why UFH incorporated RUEL. The implications of their statements are that it should be considered an unthinkable strategy on the part of Government (The Department of Education) to 'throw away Rhodes, EL' and 'change something as good as Rhodes' to what to them is clearly considered to be the inferior, 'malfunctioning' institution which is UFH.

Through such discursive strategies these speakers rhetorically argue in favour of the excellence of Rhodes as an historically 'white' institution. By constructing Rhodes (particularly RUEL) in this manner these speakers construct UFH as the weaker of the two institutions, as 'Other' as Extract 6.18 illustrates. The speaker in this extract is a 'black' academic who (as will be pointed out later) positions himself as a 'black' academic working at a 'white' institution. It is he who actually coins the term 'white excellence and black failure'. In his discussion of UFH he refers to the institution as 'emerging' as though it has not yet developed in the First World sense that historically 'white' universities have. This is not to say that he is oblivious to the fact that UFH was established at the same time as Rhodes University (see Chapter 2) but that due to the historical character of South African Higher Education, UFH is only afforded the opportunity to 'emerge' or develop as its 'white' institutional counterparts in a post-Apartheid context. By stating that this 'emerging' is only due to 'sentiment and politics' he engages in the 'black' failure discourse as he does not consider UFH to have attained the standard of 'academic excellence' that a 'white' institution such as Rhodes University has. This serves to emphasise the notion that UFH is a failed 'black' institution and should be considered similarly to other 'black' institutions to which he refers as 'the additional burden', as 'malfunctioning' and in need of 'rescue' by established and developed 'white' institutions.

Through such statements, there is a sense that 'white' excellence has been constructed as the salvation of the failed 'black' institution and in the particular case of UFH and RUEL, the RUEL campus in a sense has been sacrificed in order to rescue UFH. This notion is evident in the talk of a 'white' academic from RUEL in Extract 6.19 in that he considers the incorporation of RUEL into UFH to be a measure in which UFH has 'been thrown a lifeline'. This is a common discourse employed by stakeholders as a means to illustrate how the failure of 'black' institutions can be overcome

The following extract highlights a statement made by a 'white' RUGHT staff member who engages in the discourse of 'white' excellence constructed as the saviour of 'black' failure.

Extract 6.20

But we have saved Fort Hare, so that is a major contribution in transforming education in the Eastern Cape and in South Africa....To save Fort Hare they have to give them our campus. [WMAG]

This statement draws on notions of transformation and in doing so invokes the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure but in the sense that in order for transformation to occur the established campus of RUEL has to be sacrificed in order to save the 'emerging' and 'black' institution. This notion of salvation and sacrifice in terms of 'black' and 'white' institutions also emerged in media statements as the following extracts illustrate:

Extract 6.21

"The task team [National Working Group] proposed various changes to the education landscape including dissolving historically black universities or merging them with traditionally white institutions." Article: *Daily Dispatch*. May 30 2002.

Extract 6.22

"The SA Democratic Student Movement (Sadesmo) said that rather than merging historically black institutions and taking away their names, they should be strengthened where they were lacking [] The organisation accused the government of being responsible for the inequality by providing unequal funding, causing the historically black institutions to be left behind." Article: *Daily Dispatch*. June 1 2002.

In a similar sense the above news reports suggest that in order to overcome 'black' institutional failure, the 'black' institution which is left behind needs to be 'dissolved' and assimilated (Fanon, 1967) into the idealized 'white' institution. In viewing these institutions as racialised spaces (Durrheim and Dixon, 2001) geographic space is also racialised as the following extract illustrates:

Extract 6.23

**[] so I think it would be good to have a black university in an industrialized area.
[BMAE]**

In this extract the speaker who is a 'black' academic from RUEL invokes the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure in that he refers to UCT and Wits as 'established' institutions in an earlier part of the interview. In doing so, he offers an optimistic view of the incorporation of RUEL into UFH in that he sees it to be an opportunity for a 'black' institution to develop in industrialized 'white' space which elicits a unique positioning of UFH as a 'black' institution that does not have to be 'dissolved' and assimilated but has been given the opportunity to 'establish' itself in the fashion of the established 'white' universities in an urban industrialized 'white' space (East London) in order to overcome continued under-development.

The above are examples of how the institutions are positioned as not only 'black' or 'white' but how these racialised definitions are used to define the institutions in terms of excellence or failure. What follows is an illustration of discourses of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure that pertain to the individual within the institution.

Extract 6.24

When you go out to look for a job you find that you are not recognised coming from this university [UFH] where we are not properly trained, not qualified and have no equipment. [BMSF]

Having been positioned as a 'black' student from a 'black' institution, the above speaker (from UFH) illustrates how the racialised character of the institution has real effects in the lives of those who graduate from these institutions. Due to the positioning of the institution from which he will graduate, the speaker assumes that he will in turn not be 'recognised' when applying for a job and due to this will be considered 'Other' in relation to graduates from the 'established' institutions. Such comparisons are present in the talk of the following speaker who is a 'black' academic at UFH.

Extract 6.25

Maybe if there was a graduate from Fort Hare and a graduate from Stellenbosch, the graduate from Stellenbosch stands a better chance of getting a job than a graduate from Fort Hare. [BMAF]

Extract 6.26

“Bantu education only taught us to be teachers, policemen and clerks” Article: *Daily Dispatch*. May 21 2002.

It is evident in the talk of the speakers (and the media) that they see the institution as defining and positioning the individual graduate that it produces - this individual will be defined in such terms in the workplace (particularly by potential employers) in which it seems the discourse of ‘black’ failure continues to operate. However, in the same manner as the institution is allowed the space to overcome ‘black’ failure (for example, Extract 6.23), so too is there space allowed for the individual to overcome ‘black’ failure as the following extracts illustrate:

Extract 6.27

I have never been in a white school in my life. I started here [RUEL]. Most of them [Fort Hare students], they are coming from township schools, just like where I live, but I managed, cos look I’m in second year now. [BMSE]

Extract 6.28

I must admit, Rhodes has a good reputation, it’s a very good university and it provided me with that challenge, to teach at a good institution, especially being a black academic [] to be able to teach at Rhodes and not at UFH as expected because being a black institution, black academics teach at Fort Hare. [BMAE]

The above illustrates how, though it has been a challenge and through great individual labour, the ‘black’ academic or student can overcome the institutional divide along ‘racial’ lines. As a ‘black’ academic, the speaker in Extract 6.28 is proud to be associated

with Rhodes University. Through the above statements the speakers engage in what Fanon (1963) considers to be characteristic of post-colonial settings in that those institutions that are moulded in the likeness of institutions in the 'mother country' or former colonizer are regarded as 'good' institutions whereas those institutions designed for the 'native' (HBUs) will be constructed as inferior. The South African post-colonial landscape is interesting in this regard in that it was the overt intention of the Apartheid regime to make this divide a social and political reality. The manner in which the speakers are proud to be associated with an institution like Rhodes University illustrates Fanon's assertion that the 'native' intellectual will internalize the ideals of the colonizer and is thus an indicator that even after decolonization, the disciplinary power (Foucault, 1979) of the colonizer remains operant in the post-colonial setting. More so, Foucault's (1980b) assertion that power is capillary is evident here in that the power imbalance created by Apartheid continues to exist in the daily lives of 'black' academics and students (and South Africans in general) in that the Higher Education landscape tends to remain divided along the same 'racial' lines that emerged in (and even before) the Apartheid era.

The above discussion has highlighted the operation of the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure in statements regarding Higher Education in South Africa. This discourse operates at both an institutional and individual level where allowances are made for both the institution and the individual to overcome the 'failure' discourse through advancement which either entails the movement of the institution to an industrialized, urban area or the movement of the 'black' individual to a 'white' institution. This elicits the notion that equality might be ensured through the execution of the above strategies but the following extract provides an interesting reversal of this notion when the speaker invokes the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure when referring to the intersection that might occur between the individual and the institution:

Extract 6.29

Sometimes people make racial distinctions. Say a white student and a black student....a white student with a Fort Hare degree and black student with a Rhodes degree, they might still say that the white student is better. So it's not that easy to say that. [WMAG]

What has emerged from the discussion that has preceded is that 'black' failure might be overcome through the movement of the individual across 'racial' space from a 'black' institution to a 'white' institution. At the same time, 'black' failure may be overcome by the actual 'black' institution moving into 'white' urban space as the move of UFH to East London might suggest. However, the discourse of 'white' excellence may still result in the 'white' graduate being positioned as excellent as opposed to the 'black' student whereby a 'white' student may win out as an individual based on judgements of 'white' excellence in terms of potential employment.

Thus far, the utilization of the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure has been based predominantly on how institutions are positioned 'racially'. This kind of 'racial' positioning has its foundations in numerous notions. One such notion is that of class and how class is racialised. What follows is a discussion of how class is racialised with 'black' poverty (a socio-economic reality in post-Apartheid South Africa) being equated with 'black' failure and 'white' excellence being equated with the 'white' middle class.

Class deployed as an indicator of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure

This section highlights how class continues to be racialised in post-Apartheid South Africa. To a great extent the Apartheid regime set in place an economic system whereby 'race' and class became intimately intertwined. This is not to say that the Apartheid system was solely responsible for the development of the race/class divide as it stands today as the racialised economy of contemporary South Africa has its roots in colonial times. This particular development began in 1886 with the discovery of gold on the farm

Langlaagte in the region that would become Johannesburg (Callinicos, 1985). It was through the implementation of Apartheid policy (particularly the homelands system whereby 'races' were segregated and 'black' workers had to take up temporary residence in 'white' industrialized areas in order to find work) that this divide became entrenched in South African society.

With the discovery of gold came the advent of South African industrialization. Due to the colonial character of South Africa at the time, the exploitation of the 'native' was utilized in order to advance the development of capitalism in the colony. Essentialising notions of biological differences between 'race' groups were used in order to justify the exploitation of 'non-whites' (Callinicos, 1993). Such understandings led to the development of a division of labour based on the notion of "mental (for 'whites') and manual (for 'blacks')" (Ralekhetso, 1991, p. 102). This inferiorisation of the 'native' in this manner led to 'blacks' particularly becoming an economic 'underclass' (Solomos and Back, 1996).

Discourses surrounding advantage often draw on socio-economic aspects like 'black' poverty and 'white' privilege. From what was discussed in the earlier sections it is made apparent that institutions and individuals are defined in 'racial' terms and this positioning continues throughout talk around economic access whereby institutions are positioned in terms of such economic access to particular historically and contextually defined and constructed institutions. It is through the employment of such discourses that notions of economic access are 'racially' bound.

Extract 6.30

[] because that would have transformed the whole history of Higher Education in this province....the white/black sort of idea, rich/poor, more urban, metropolitan, cosmopolitan. [WMAG]

In the above extract a 'white' staff member from RUGHT responds to a question pertaining to the restructuring of Higher Education in South Africa. In his response he

acknowledges the 'racial' divide which characterises South African society and suggests that there exists a 'white/black, rich/poor' dichotomy that has resulted from the Apartheid era. In doing so he acknowledges that 'black' is equated with poor (due to the fact that 'black' poverty in South Africa is a reality) and thereby invokes the discourse that middle class equals 'white'. One of the 'black' students interviewed at the UFH, Alice campus reiterates this point and invokes the same discourse but this time does so particularly pertaining to UFH:

Extract 6.31

S1: [] people on this campus, most of the students at Fort Hare, I think 90% of the students, they are studying through financial assistance. And, I mean, I will say they are disadvantaged people. At the end of the day (financial assistance) just quits paying for them and then they will just drop out. [BMSF]

In referring to Fort Hare this speaker positions the students ('black' students) as being unable to afford tuition without some form of financial assistance and suggests that should financial assistance be taken away, these students would have no alternative but to de-register as they are financially 'disadvantaged'. Through this, he draws on the notion that 'black' students have access to tertiary education provided they have the resources to get there but that these resources are almost entirely drawn from financial assistance. Interestingly, speakers from the RUEL campus make allowances for 'black' students to not only gain access to tertiary education but that the possibility exists that these students can attend former 'white' universities. In order to overcome the economic reality of 'black' poverty these two speakers make it clear that this privilege (studying at a former 'white' institution) is only available to those 'black' students who have broken the mould of 'black' poverty ('black' failure) and become more like the privileged 'white' economic class. The following extracts illustrate this point:

Extract 6.32

[] there are a few blacks from an elitist background (sic) go there. Poor blacks don't go there [Rhodes University] and those who did not get good matric results end up at Fort Hare. [BMAE]

Extract 6.33

[] the vision has essentially been the same. The maintenance of a small, elite, predominantly, I wouldn't say white, but privileged student body. You look at the Grahamstown student body and they might be improving in terms of racial demographics but where are those graduates being drawn from? Zimbabwean students and private school kids. [WMAE]

Extract 6.34

There are bursaries and they take the cream of the crop from the black communities. And those others ['black' students] continue to go to black universities because they have no way of attending the white universities. [BMAE]

Extract 6.35

Rhodes University will continue to draw white students and black students but the black students that are middle class, who can't wait to be so far away from their black-ness. [BMAE]

These four speakers evoke the notion that 'black' poverty and 'white' privilege continue to be maintained. What must be remembered is that 'black' poverty in South Africa is an economic reality. Statistics compiled in 2002 indicate that 56.3 % of 'black' South Africans live below the National Poverty line (less than R354 per month per adult equivalent). The statistics for 'white', 'coloured' and 'Indian' groups are 6.9 %, 36.1 % and 14.7 % respectively (United Nations Development Program, 2003). These statistics indicate that the majority of 'white' South Africans still enjoy economic privilege and security whereas more than half of the 'black' South African population live below the poverty line.

In relation to the statements outlined in the extracts above it is the 'elite' 'black' student who has managed to escape the confinement of poverty and become middle class and become more like the idealized 'white', and thus less 'Other', who are afforded the opportunity to attend the privileged 'white' universities. It is interesting that the fourth speaker (Extract 6.35) goes so far as to describe such students as wanting to 'be so far away from their black-ness'. This illustrates how an economic boundary exists between the elite ('white') and the poor ('black') majority of South Africa. However it also speaks to 'white' excellence and 'white' space as desired whereas 'black' space, particularly institutional space is seen to be a failure and undesirable. By overcoming poverty and becoming middle class (closer to 'white-ness') such students manage to distance themselves from the reality of poverty, but also the failure and undesirability that is equated with 'black-ness'. The following two extracts further highlight the point that 'black' is equated with 'poor' and that middle class is discursively constructed as the idealized 'white':

Extract 6.36

We've lost as I say with regards (sic) to access to black students, access to mature learners....we can't do it here [] they [RUEL] were able to draw on students who live at home as opposed to people who live in digs which is expensive....digs here in Grahamstown, the landlords set their rates in relation to uhh....and it's a seller's market....so it will have an impact on our ability to increase the numbers of poor black students. [WMAG]

Extract 6.37

"Now they are entertaining recommendations to close down the University of the Transkei, which is the only institution of higher learning in the region for approximately 4.5 million economically depressed South Africans. And these, by the way, are mostly blacks." Letter to the Editor: *Daily Dispatch*. February 14 2002.

From his statement in Extract 6.36 the speaker who is a 'white' staff member at RUGHT opens his argument by suggesting that through the incorporation of RUEL into UFH, 'black' students (note how he only refers to them as 'poor black students' at the end of his statement) have lost access to Grahamstown. He justifies his statement that 'we cannot do it here' through providing evidence that the cost of studying at RUGHT is too high for those who find themselves in an economic situation that does not afford them the opportunity to attend former 'white' institutions.

From the above discussion it is evident that ten years after South Africa became a democracy the 'black' majority continue to be the economic 'underclass' to which Solomos and Back (1996) referred earlier. In addition to this the speakers draw on notions of disadvantage as a manner of suggesting that change is not likely to occur due to the fact that economic access is still restrictive and that the elite (based on notions of 'white' excellence) are still in place. It is only those who have, since the dismantling of Apartheid, found themselves in a position of financial privilege and advantage who will be able to attend those institutions formerly preserved for 'whites'. The majority of speakers highlighted above have introduced the idea that although 'black' poverty is an economic reality, racialised boundaries continue to be constructed and maintained in post-Apartheid South Africa (see Chapter 7).

What has become apparent in the above section is that the notion 'white' excellence and 'black' failure discursively separates institutions not only along institutionally racialised lines, but also economically racialised lines. Notions of 'white' excellence in terms of class only serve to perpetuate the discourse that in order to overcome the 'race'/class divide (a divide that separates 'white' excellence from 'black' failure) 'black' students need to become more like the idealized 'white' middle class which essentially means, 'get away from their 'black-ness'.

The manner in which the two institutions are positioned discursively invokes the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure. As a result of this positioning of the

institutions, choice is deployed to discursively separate 'white' excellence from 'black' failure.

Choice deployed in the maintenance of the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure.

In the talk about the incorporation of RUEL into UFH the theme of 'choice' emerges which perpetuates the discursive positioning of the two institutions where the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure is simultaneously and repeatedly invoked. The invocation of this discourse operates on a number of levels in terms of how it is utilised in relation to the racialised spaces that are UFH and RUEL. For instance, many of the RUEL speakers (both staff and students) speak of how working at or studying at RUEL was a conscious decision that they made as they position the institution as elite ('white' excellence) and well-resourced according to its status as a traditionally 'white' institution:

Extract 6.38

S1: If we had wanted to go to Fort Hare, we would have gone there. But we chose Rhodes. [BFSE]

Extract 6.39

S2: There is a lot, in a name, itself and I mean just the mere fact that we chose to be here, the fact that we are associated with that name because ultimately when we have a degree, when we graduate, it's not any degree, it's not a UPE degree, but it's a Rhodes degree. [CFSE]

Extract 6.40

Those students, you must remember, very interestingly both black and white, but particularly black students who chose to come to Rhodes, because Rhodes has higher fees....but they made a conscious choice to come here to Rhodes, even when UFH was available with cheaper fees. [BMAE]

What is established by the above statements is that Rhodes University is positioned as the better university when compared to UFH. The speaker in Extract 6.38 is a 'black' student who was part of the RUEL focus group and she makes it clear that the reason that she is studying at Rhodes is because it is her choice to do so. She acknowledges that studying at Fort Hare was an option but that ultimately she chose the university that she considered to be the better of the two. This point is picked up by a 'coloured' focus group member who points to the fact that Rhodes is recognised in terms of its brand name, it is an advantage to have a degree that bears the emblem of Rhodes University. In Extract 6.40, the speaker is a 'black' staff member who earlier states explicitly that it was his choice to teach at Rhodes University because he saw it as a challenge for a 'black' academic to teach at an institution of Rhodes' ('white') caliber. In the statement above, he racialises the notion of choice in stating that not only the 'white' students, but also the 'black' students who attend Rhodes have made the conscious decision to attend the institution based on its positioning as an advantaged, elite institution thereby invoking the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure, the term he coined earlier in the interview.

It is here that the notion of institutional racialisation (distinguished particularly by notions of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure) emerges in the talk of the speakers around the notion of choice. This in turn invokes a racialised discourse of advantage and disadvantage in that Rhodes is positioned as an established, advantaged institution which is predominantly attended by 'white' students. At the same time it is acknowledged that 'black' students do attend Rhodes but only those who have managed to break the mould of 'black-ness' and become socially mobile in the sense that they move across the 'race'/class divide that separates 'black' universities from 'white' universities. This becomes evident in the following statements:

Extract 6.41

S3: Because, obviously very few white people are going to go to Fort Hare, hello, especially Alice. [BFSE]

Extract 6.42

[] But you would have those kinds of students [urban 'white' students] by default because they are in a sense trapped because they are working here [East London] and this is the only institution which has the programs but in a pure choice situation, I don't think that they would want to be here. I mention specifically whites here but there are blacks who made the specific choice to come to Rhodes University, East London. [BMAE]

Extract 6.43

You know I am thinking of the young white students who are completing matric this year and they know that this is going to be Fort Hare. So they may change their plans. Go to UPE, Cape Town or Durban, or Stellenbosch, whatever the case is....I don't remember any white students going to a black university whereas black students have always taken a sort of pride in going to white universities. They will come out saying, I am at UCT, I am at Wits as opposed to UWC and all these places. [BMAE]

Extract 6.44

So those people in East London who would have preferred a Rhodes education as opposed to a Fort Hare education have lost. No doubt about it. They now have to come and live in residence here [RUGHT]. [WMAG]

These instances illustrate the absolute persistence of the speakers to position these institutions as 'black' and 'white' and thereby draw on differences in terms of how staff and students will react to the incorporation of RUEL into UFH. Here a discursive construction emerges suggesting that only the elite 'black' students will continue to go to Rhodes along with 'white' students. In terms of this Rhodes will continue to be positioned as the elite, established institution for 'whites' and those 'blacks' who can get away from their 'black-ness' and break the mould of 'black' failure. On the other hand, UFH will continue to be positioned as the 'black' institution for those who are

disadvantaged (read, 'black') and those 'white' students who are 'trapped' in East London and cannot attend another elite institution. Thus choice is deployed as a means to escape 'black' failure and enjoy the privilege of 'white' excellence thereby perpetuating the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure.

What has been discussed thus far is the racialisation of institutional space and the boundaries set up locally within the South African context. What is evident is the fact that Apartheid institutional structures were highly racialised but that these racialised notions of institutional space continue to operate in post-Apartheid South Africa as the institutions continue to be racialised through the way in which they are positioned discursively. This discursive positioning of the institution has the further implication of drawing on Apartheid-inspired notions of advantage and disadvantage. In terms of this 'white' excellence is set up in a binary opposition to 'black' failure. With this binary tension comes the notion of quality and this is used to further perpetuate the notion of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure.

Quality as an indicator of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure.

Extract 6.45

- S2:** Yes....my concern is the standard, and Fort Hare and how it's going to be. The Fort Hare standard and the Rhodes standard (and how they compare)....I've never been to Fort Hare but they argue that Fort Hare has below average infrastructure. [BMSE]
- S4:** I've got a friend who is also doing [Speaker 4's discipline at Fort Hare] and he never do (sic) practicals. Here [RUEL] in second year, you go to practicals and you go to places and then you gain experience while you are still studying. They don't do it at Fort Hare....there's a huge difference. [BMSE]

Extract 6.46

What I do not understand is why Rhodes East London merged with Fort Hare and not Fort Hare with Rhodes, when clearly Rhodes is the more well established and efficient university? Letter to the Editor: *Daily Dispatch*. Wednesday May 26, 2004.

Extract 6.47

S1: [] but there's this whole thing that Rhodes produces, international whatever, graduates, and it's....the quality of education is lower at Fort Hare. [CFSE]

S5: You say that because it's a black place. [CFSE]

In the first extract both speakers are members of the 'black' RUEL focus group and use the disadvantaged status of Fort Hare as a 'black' university to position the institution in a manner that alludes to lower quality in terms of resources and standards (also see Extract 6.46). This is utilized to construct the sense of a 'huge difference' between Rhodes and UFH which is an idea taken up by two of the speakers in Extract 6.47 who are members of the RUEL 'coloured' focus group who also set up the notion of a divide in quality between the two institutions. The attribution of Fort Hare's 'black-ness' being the determining factor in gauging the quality of graduate produced by the institution is ultimately utilized by the second speaker in this extract to explain the situation as she sees it.

The notion of academic standards is used in very powerful ways. A standard might imply an external barometer against which the performance of a university or individual may be measured. What remains hidden here is that academic standards are a social process steeped in power relations. However, judgements will be made regarding standards and these judgements are inevitably based on racialised notions of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure.

Staff members at RUEL also attributed the racialised history of these institutions to the notions of quality which pertain to the institution's production of graduates:

Extract 6.48

Fort Hare is more geared to the person in the job market, probably working already, possibly in a government type of job, who needs the upgrading skills. It's very focused on technical skills and it's not purely academic [] They [RUEL students] know that in any interview, that if the degree certificate says Fort Hare, they know that as things stand now, they know that they stand at a disadvantage.[WMAE]

Extract 6.49

I think that Rhodes has got a really good reputation; academically....Um and I think you can't deny the fact that people acknowledge a Rhodes degree far more highly than they do a Fort Hare degree. [WMAE]

Extract 6.50

[] um I mean one hears stories about people coming with a Fort Hare degree and they are put at the bottom of the pile and people with a Rhodes degree are put at the top of the pile. [WFAE]

Extract 6.51

[] they [parents of potential students in East London] may discourage their kids and say this is Fort Hare and you won't be absorbed into the labour market with a Fort Hare degree....because, you know the kind of certificate that one comes out of a university with says a lot. So people might not want it to say Fort Hare. [BMAE]

These three RUEL staff members invoke the 'white' excellence and 'black' failure discourse in that they suggest that particularly in terms of competence a degree bearing the Rhodes emblem will win out over a Fort Hare degree in a potential employment situation. What is more, the 'black' male staff member in Extract 6.51 suggests that

potential students who might have registered at the East London campus may no longer do so in order to pursue their studies at former 'white' universities outside of East London. While invoking this discourse, they are at the same time drawing on notions of transformation in that they are alluding to the fact that the incorporation of RUEL into UFH was geared towards restructuring the Higher Educational landscape and ultimately transforming the racialised character of the university system. The suggestion behind this is possibly to incorporate 'white' excellence (RUEL) into 'black' failure (UFH) in order to redress the disparity. However, the manner in which they position the institution in relation to potential students presents a scenario in which particularly 'white' students who would have willingly registered at RUEL will no longer be willing to study in East London and be absorbed into the disadvantaged setting (characterised by 'black' failure) of UFH. Such notions were also evident in the talk of RUGHT lecturers:

Extract 6.52

I have a sense that historically disadvantaged black universities don't have....don't maintain the academic standards that the white universities maintain, especially the white English universities [] almost saying that a Fort Hare degree is less than a Rhodes degree, but I don't think that's true. [WMAE]

Extract 6.53

Whether they can retain and attract good quality staff, good quality staff because I, um....for the past twenty years no really self-respecting academic would have gone looking for a job at Fort Hare. Once you have a job at Fort Hare, you're not going to get out of Fort Hare. That is a reality. [WFAG]

The manner in which the speakers in Extracts 6.52 and 6.53 broach the subject of quality and academic standards, suggests that academic standards are social processes by which individuals will measure the competence of an institution. Individuals invest in the discourses, particularly the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure in this instance and monitor their own actions and emotions accordingly. What the speaker in

Extract 6.53 thus suggests is that if you respect yourself, you will not go to UFH, nor will you take up employment at the institution.

Quality thus becomes a determining factor in how transformation will play out. The perception that Fort Hare has a lower quality of education is utilized to ultimately define the institution as disadvantaged (bolstering notions of 'black' failure) and this disadvantage is rendered static in the sense that it is suggested that both good quality students and good quality staff (which are measured in a context of racialised power relations) will refrain from identifying with (studying at or working for) Fort Hare. This would thereby maintain the divide between the advantaged and disadvantaged institutions. These distinctions ultimately reside in the racialised definitions and subsequent positioning of the institutions. This discourse of quality has ideological effects (Parker, 1992) and is evidently being utilised in a particularly political and ideological manner. The discourse of quality has the ideological effect of maintaining the position of the 'white' institution as one of quality and academic excellence, leaving the 'black' institution positioned as a failure. The discourse of quality as an indicator of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure is not only appropriated by the speakers from the RUGHT and RUEl campuses but also by staff and students at the UFH campus:

Extract 6.54

S1: [] um I once heard that the pass mark at Rhodes is 50% or 55% or something like that so I thought it was going to improve the standard of Fort Hare [] And I understand, that to lecture at Rhodes you need an Honours degree or a Masters degree....We believe that Rhodes offers this kind of learning that is much different than (sic) Fort Hare and when you finish you get the first preferences in these big companies if you are from Rhodes just because of the name Rhodes. [BMSF]

Extract 6.55

There are advantages, like resources....here we are struggling, we don't have much. Rhodes has got resources [] I'm sorry; I hope that I'm not offending anyone but it is because Rhodes is a white institution. [BMAF]

It is thus implied that transformation is going to involve the salvation of the HBUs by HWUs in order to bring about equity and do away with the disparity caused by Apartheid. It is through this kind of discursive positioning of these institutions that, particularly in relation to the notion of transformation, the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure is extensively invoked. When this discourse is invoked notions of standards and especially quality are drawn on in order to position the two institutions. What emerges here is a localized (South African) comparison of the two types of institutions where HBUs are positioned as institutions characterised by low quality and thus epitomized by 'black' failure whereas HWUs are positioned as institutions of former 'white' privilege characterised by academic excellence of both high quality and standards.

It is here that the talk of the respondents, especially around transformation, turns towards the notion of transformation. What emerges is the suggestion that the 'new' South Africa is characterised by measures which aim to redress disparity and show favour towards 'black' people in the transformational process. The talk turns to the notion of affirmative action as a means to provide a 'gravy train' for 'black' people to overcome 'black' failure by being afforded opportunities at the expense of other 'race' groups.

The transformational 'gravy train' as a means to overcome 'black' failure

This discourse around transformation that emerged was interestingly an equation of the advancement of 'black-ness' with the 'new' South Africa. Such arguments drew on the notion of preserving historical 'black-ness' and the incorporation of all things positioned and defined as 'black' into all aspects of South African transformation. The notion of

transformation is thus imbued with the notion that in order for social and economic factors to be considered transformed they should take on a 'black' identity or character. In this sense, this discourse dove-tails with the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure in that it is suggested that one may advance as a 'black' person, but this is usually only because of favour, affirmative action or the 'gravy train'. Thus the notion of special treatment of 'black' people emerges in discussions around equity.

Ramphele (1994a) notes that there is a misconception that equity and equality are one and the same and elaborates on how these should be operationalised:

equity refers to fairness and justice [where] equity in terms of tertiary education implies that all institutions, and individuals within such institutions, would enjoy fair and just treatment regarding the allocation of resources, and access to opportunities for personal development. Equity takes cognisance of the individual's unique capacities as well as historical and socio-economic circumstances. Access to tertiary education for black students or women may entail treating them differently from others. Equality of treatment itself may be inequitable (p. 93).

What follows is a discussion of how discourses surrounding transformation drew on notions that the 'new' South Africa is equated with the advancement of 'black-ness'. These will indicate how, based on Ramphele's distinction between equity and equality made above, equity is construed as 'black'-orientated empowerment.

Extract 6.56

S3: I think that it, I think that in every period of history the institutions always reflect whoever's in power so I think that at the moment with the democratic government, it's almost like a necessary change. [BFSE]

Extract 6.57

S5: I think it's a positive thing, because if you look at the political climate of the country at the moment and....what's better than to actually align yourself with a so-called black institution? I mean if you want to get anywhere in South Africa if you want to get anywhere in business, I mean anywhere, um....if you want to get a government contract or anything like that then you

have to have either a black partner or have been educated at like a black institution and when the government go through any tenders and if your company's name is [] like an Anglo whatever they'll just throw it out, whereas if you've got a um, you know a black name or something like that, something that says you are positively involved in [speaker possibly alludes to transformation] [] Government contracts aren't awarding anything to anyone who doesn't have a black partner, or black name or anything like that. So if you are still, associated with a predominantly white Rhodes, it was deemed predominantly white [] Yes. So if you are a predominantly white Rhodes, okay, as opposed to attended....from a predominantly black or multicultural university and you are a government individual and you are now stuck with the task of going through the tenders, of course you are going to throw out all the white tenders because that's not what South Africa is about. [WMSE]

The emergence of 'black' political power in South Africa has become a defining factor in the definition of the 'new' South Africa. It is an interesting reversal of the political context of Apartheid in that while Apartheid enforced the marginalization of all things 'black' this speaker (Extract 6.57, a 'white' RUEL focus group member) suggests that the 'new' South Africa is embarking upon a transformational campaign to marginalize all that is 'white'. Just as the speaker in the first extract (Extract 6.56, a 'black' RUEL focus group member) suggests that it is a necessary change, he too regards it as a 'positive' step toward transformation. This is not a perception that is commonly held by all students who were interviewed as the extracts that follow will indicate. Members of the 'coloured' group view the 'black-ness' of transformation as a measure of superficially compensating the 'black' community for the wrongs of Apartheid. When they speak of Apartheid in this manner it is implied that transformation is geared towards gross compensation for the 'black' community which can only inevitably provide the current South African setting with a situation in which disparity is re-established, except that it is in reversal to the disparity that was created by Apartheid:

Extract 6.58

- S1: I'm so tired of transformation, it's really overdone. We had our Apartheid days, we got past it, get over it. I mean everywhere you go, I mean, you show more favour to a white face, you're being a racist, you show more favour to a black face, affirmative action, it's the gravy train that they ride. You see, so you're not right either way. [CFSE]
- S2: [] and black people are trying to compensate for what they didn't have. [CFSE]
- S1: I find that now, you have to be so conscious of what you say and what you're doing because it might be offensive to someone. It's like, '94, 2002, that's like what, six, eight years. They're trying to cram all those years of Apartheid, I mean for how long?....it's like centuries of segregation and discrimination and all the shit that you can think of and now they're cramming it into eight years and they think they can fix everything just like that. And it's like the government must do everything for you. They don't allow people to come to terms with the whole thing themselves. It's like "No, okay, those are the white institutions and Fort Hare is one of the black institutions, now let the blacks have what the whites have. I mean, that's not going to fix anything. [CFSE]
- S4: You know what I think the whole thing is. You look at countries like America, you look at that, the reason why most things work, actually because the people there are working together. The ANC is majority blacks, the NP is white. The government now is mostly black people. Why not let other people in there like a white person or a coloured person, in there to do it and do it properly instead of just putting a black person in there just because they are black or putting a white person in because they are white, or putting an Indian person in because they are Indian. [CFSE]

S5: Ja, but we voted those people in there. [CFSE]

S6: And the majority of people in South Africa are black. [CFSE]

S2: Yes, but they're not voted for because they qualified, they're voted for because they are black. I mean if a coloured person is running for president I'm sure all the coloured people will vote for them because of how they look. [CFSE]

S6: They're changing the names of the airports, they're changing the names of the streets because those names mean a lot to the people in power. They don't want names that remind us of Apartheid. They don't want those Apartheid reminders. [CFSE]

S1: It's the whole thing that whites did us wrong and we must change everything black, everything must be black now, all of a sudden. They don't look at the fact that there are white and black people that are homeless. [CFSE]

It is interesting that the above suggests that the new democratic regime is operating in the interests of 'black-ness'. This extract is taken from the 'coloured' focus group interview. It is evident that the speakers are suggesting that affirmative action is geared toward providing jobs to people who belong to a particular 'race' group (read, 'black'). Speaker 4 (Extract 6.58) refers to the job market and suggests that the government should possibly consider putting 'white' or 'coloured' people into positions to do the job 'properly instead of just putting a black person in there just because they are black'. She does reflect on the effects of her own statement and directly after this statement she attempts to include other 'race' groups into her argument so as not to appear biased. However, her initial statement draws on the discourse of 'black' failure in that she suggests that affirmative action operates in the interests of 'black' people who possibly are not competent or qualified but for the sake of equity will be shown favour in the job market. This of course marginalizes other 'race' groups in the process.

It is clear that the speakers, particularly in the 'coloured' focus group do not concur with Ramphele's (1994a) statement that in order to reach equity you may need to treat some people unequally by marginalizing the former privileged groups. However, not all respondents agreed that transformation and restructuring occur solely in the interests of the 'black' community. This is illustrated in the following extract:

Extract 6.59

So I say it's conservative, maybe on the other hand it's a....but I don't think that it's that much of a transformation if you look at the symbolism of it, the transformation. Um, they've tried to make a symbolic thing out of it by taking away the sort of old places of white privilege, but they're actually keeping them in place. [WMAG]

What this suggests is that even though an historically 'black' institution is spatially and politically transplanted by means of an incorporation into traditionally 'white' industrialized space, this institution will continue to be defined 'racially' as 'emerging' and 'disadvantaged'. The preservation of Rhodes University which is widely constructed as a 'white' institution only indicates that transformation symbolically displaces disparity but institutionally it maintains an elitist divide (thus still recognizing 'black' failure) in terms of institutions that are regarded as transformed yet advantaged and disadvantaged in comparison to each other.

What is interesting is the fact that the talk of some of the respondents drew on these notions of quality, standards and excellence and turned to the international community in terms of how this community 'recognises' the quality and standards of South African institutions.

The international gaze

In discussions around academic quality numerous speakers (and reports in the media) draw on notions of international recognition. It is here that Fanon's notion of the desire for approval from the 'mother country', in this case the (particularly Euro-American)

international community, is evoked. What follows is an illustration of how the international community is taken into account and how Rhodes University and UFH are positioned in light of such considerations.

Moulder (1991) has indicated that a major obstacle in the path of restructuring South African Higher Education is the fact that South Africa is divided along racialised lines of advantage and disadvantage and is 'essentially a third world country with some complicated products of first world privilege' (p. 121). South Africa is characterised by colonial discourse whereby imperial power continues to operate discursively in the daily lives of South African citizens. Though Foucault (1979) never spoke of imperial power as centralized, it is possible to apply his theory of disciplinary power and the internalisation of the disciplinary gaze to the Higher Education context of South Africa. In this sense, the perceptions of the international academic community regarding the quality of an institution and the graduate that an institution produces may be viewed as an internalized international disciplinary gaze.

Bartky (1992) employed Foucault's (1979) notion of the operation of power to illustrate how patriarchal power has been modernized in the manner in which Foucault describes. In the same way as she does this, it is possible to illustrate how imperial power has become modernized beyond its visible acts of colonialism in that those who live in the post-colonial context turn to the 'mother country' (Fanon, 1963) for affirmation and recognition. In this section, discourses invoked by speakers pertaining to quality in terms of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure when the international community is taken into account will be illustrated.

Extract 6.60

S1: Well, uh, job opportunities, like to be able to, like, with the standards, if you want to go overseas [] so I don't think [that they are providing the education that we were promised]. [BFSE]

Extract 6.61

S2: It's [Rhodes University] highly recognized, as a degree, it's internationally recognized. [WFSE]

S4: I think Rhodes will bring up Fort Hare's standard, but it will take a lot of time....for it to be internationally recognized again. [WFSE]

S6: And you'll still get a Rhodes degree and it's internationally recognized? [WMSE]

S2: Is Fort Hare internationally recognized? No-one can tell me yes or no. [WFSE]

Q: Would you start a first year knowing that that first year would be a full Fort Hare degree?

S4: /uh mmm/ [meaning no] [WFSE]

S2: No. [WFSE]

S2: [] But the perceptions of people, determines what your qualification, how it is rated. [WFSE]

Q: The perceptions of who though?

S2: Of people. [WFSE]

Q: Which people?

S4: Outside of South Africa. [WFSE]

Extract 6.62

S1: It's got prestige. It's prestigious. Overseas, it's got prestige already, that's why we came here, so the name. [CFSE]

S4: Is a Fort Hare degree actually recognized overseas, I mean what if that is an avenue that you would like to take afterwards? I would like to do that. You can't exactly go overseas with a Fort Hare degree; I mean what the hell is Fort Hare to them? [] and I'm the one that is going to be affected. That's why the first thing I said is is it internationally recognized? [CFSE]

Extract 6.63

I think the students are going to look at that [the perception that Fort Hare is not as recognised in terms of quality as Rhodes is] and those that want to utilize that qualification for purposes of going overseas. [WMAE]

Extract 6.64

"This [four year degree] would still enable a good student to obtain an internationally recognised qualification within four years...." Article: *Daily Dispatch*. March 7, 2001.

The international Euro-American community is clearly discursively invoked as a reference point in terms of how the quality of a university certificate is gauged. In addition to this it (the Euro-American community) is constructed as a distant place where opportunities abound (Extract 6.60). Through the use of the word 'overseas' by Speaker 1 in Extract 6.62 it is implied that 'international recognition' applies to Euro-American communities and not necessarily to other African countries. It is interesting that the notion of international recognition only emerged in the RUEL interviews and the media.

The invocation of this discourse of international recognition serves only to position the institutions in terms of notions of quality and 'prestige'. Importantly, there is no international body that recognises the international status of a university. Nevertheless,

the notion of international recognition seems to be an important point of inquiry for the members of these focus groups. What this suggests is that the colonized need to live up to the expectations of the colonizer ('mother country') in order to be allowed access to the resources (opportunities) that the coloniser retains.

Although there is no international body who determines the internationally recognised status of an institution or the graduate that it produces, Rhodes University did undertake an internationalization project in 2001. This involved the invitation of an international panel of peers to review the international status of Rhodes University in September 2001 (Rhodes University Planning and Quality Assurance Office, 2001). This indicates that institutions too, will at times; turn to the 'mother country' for affirmation.

Conclusion

South Africa's universities may be considered open in terms of access to all South African citizens but the university setting is still a highly racialised terrain. This chapter has outlined various discourses that emerged from data collected in the research conducted on the incorporation of Rhodes University's East London campus into the University of Fort Hare.

In the discussion of these discourses it became evident that even after the dismantling of Apartheid these institutions are still positioned 'racially' in much the same manner as they were in the Apartheid era. With this racialised positioning of these institutions comes a host of implications. Among such implications is the manner in which rural and urban space becomes racialised.

It must be remembered that the Apartheid regime intended for space to be racialised in the sense that urban, industrialised areas were reserved for 'whites' and rural space was preserved particularly for 'blacks' in the form of homelands. What is apparent from the discourses surrounding the institutions upon which this research focused is that the rural/urban divide still distinguishes between the two institutions and brings with it

implications of advantage and disadvantage. At the same time, though South Africa no longer legally operates on any exclusionary basis, the economic reality of 'black' poverty discursively constructs the middle class as 'white'. 'Black' poverty is thus equated with 'black' failure and all that is 'white' is equated with excellence and progression in terms of First World privilege and prestige.

Such notions are hinged on the rhetorical argument of competence. Based on this the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure emerges as a dominant argument in distinguishing between the two institutions. This discourse relies on racialised notions of class, quality and standards. In utilising these notions of quality, standards and especially competence, the respondents often draw on the notion of transformation as a process which compensates 'black' people for the wrongs done to them by Apartheid.

It is here that transformation and equity are construed as a 'gravy train'. This is particularly apparent in talk around affirmative action where it is implied that in the job market (and politics), 'black' people are being employed regardless of whether they are competent or not, but their employment is based solely on their 'race' and thus the discourse of 'black' failure is perpetuated. .

In addition to this the notion of international recognition of graduates and degrees emerges with regard to academic quality. It is here that the specifically Euro-American international community is drawn on in a particularly post-colonial manner as a means by which to measure academic competence in terms of quality and standards.

This chapter has dealt with the aspect of a racialised Higher Education in these terms with regard to how the racialised positioning of university institutions invokes the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure. In the next chapter discourses around the racialisation of Higher Education institutions will be discussed in terms of how racialised boundaries are discursively constructed and how the maintenance and destruction of these boundaries has implications within discussions around transformation.

Chapter 7:

Racialised boundaries and transformation

Introduction

In the previous chapter it was noted that discourses invoked around 'race', transformation, equity and disadvantage have continually drawn on the notion of distinctly different 'black' and 'white' institutions and 'black' and 'white' space whereby the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure is frequently invoked. In this chapter discourses invoked by the stakeholders refer to integration (or 'racial' mix). The notion of mix is employed here by the speakers to deny the existence of any racialised boundaries of exclusion particularly in the university setting in much the same way as the liberal notion of multiculturalism is deployed. However, it is evident that there are racialised boundaries that are constructed discursively to maintain distinctions around racialised institutional space.

In discussing the notion of 'mix' and integration a tension is set up particularly when referring to transformation in terms of 'black' expansion across - and 'white' maintenance of - such boundaries. What emerges is the notion that transformation is seen as a crossing of racialised boundaries while at the same time there is a sense that this has certain implications. In some cases transformation is spoken of as a numbers game. In this sense equity is drawn on to indicate 'racial' representation in universities. In other cases the notion of institutional culture is utilised to distinguish between institutions and, at times, racialise the institutions.

South African society tends to be discussed in a particular manner which constructs and reproduces subjects, objects and institutions that are seemingly polarized as 'black' and 'white'. This introduces the notion of the 'race' group 'coloured' as 'Other' or in another term, Derrida's (1981) 'undecidable'. An undecidable, to Derrida (1981), could be an object, a person or group of people (for example, 'coloureds' as a 'race' group) who exist

within a constructed binary opposition (as it can be seen in this research 'black' and 'white' 'race' groups, institutions and space are set up as binary opposites) but cannot be said to belong to either of the constructed binary opposites and are thus faced with a dual exclusion. 'Coloureds' thus emerge as undecidables in that they disrupt the 'black'/'white' binary. In a sense 'coloured' as a 'racial' category slips across the binary and 'coloureds' don't quite fit into it. This notion is summed up when one of the members of the 'coloured' focus group says: 'we weren't white enough then [Apartheid era], we aren't black enough now' (see later discussion).

Racial integration or 'mix'

This discourse emerged in the 'white' RUEL focus group where the word 'mix' was repeatedly employed as a synonym (and possibly substitute) for integration. The following examples are extracted entirely from the 'white' RUEL focus group as this is the only context in which this particular explanation of racialised boundaries emerged.

Extract 7.1

S2: [] and you know and like all the blacks and whites they mix, there's like a lot of, you know that sort of stuff, so they're [Rhodes University] known for that sort of stuff. [WFSE]

S4: That's what I've heard. I haven't been to RUGHT, I don't know their mixture, or whatever. [WFSE]

S3: Of course there's a mixture. [WFSE]

This extract introduces the idea of 'mix' and 'mixture'. Through the employment of these words Rhodes University is positioned as a 'multiracial' or 'multicultural' university whereby the words 'mix' and 'mixture' evidently refer to 'racial' integration. It is at this point that rhetorical arguments begin to be made in favour of integration but the

implication is made that this mixture should in some sense be regulated and particular boundaries maintained.

Extract 7.2

S2: But the thing is now we going to start mixing, Fort Hare....that's what they're aiming at here isn't it? It's known as a black university and we are the ones that have to mix [] But that's why I came here, because it's not a....that's why I came to Rhodes, because it's been mixed all along, it's not a new thing. Now we have to come in new, and mix....it's been established that it's a multicultural university, Rhodes. [WFSE]

Integration is regarded as inevitable. This speaker is rhetorically positioning herself as an individual who is not opposed to integration but that integration of 'blacks' across boundaries that have historically demarcated 'black' and 'white' institutional space should be regulated in much the same way as conservative immigration control policies might recommend. She also performs a common rhetorical manoeuvre of presenting herself as one who is not 'racist' in outlook but contradicts this depiction of herself by exhibiting fears of being expected to mix with other 'races'. What becomes evident in the talk of this speaker is that she is concerned about the manner in which power relations might be upset should 'white' students be required to 'mix' with 'black' students in what would, through the incorporation, become 'black' institutional space. What she is arguing is that integration is not a problem provided that movement across racialised boundaries allows 'blacks' (on an elitist basis) into 'white' space. She suggests that this is acceptable in terms of integration because then it is (ostensibly) multicultural space. She goes on to engage in a discussion with two other focus group members on the topic of integration and it is here that the notion of 'equal mixture' is introduced.

Extract 7.3

S3: But it hasn't, all universities have been open, the entire South Africa has been open. [WFSE]

- S2: Ja but it hasn't been....it's been open, but have they mixed equally? [WFSE]
- S3: Yeah, I think so....Can you say that East London is more mixed than say, Johannesburg? [WFSE]
- S2: I can say Rhodes is more than say Bloemfontein, or Stellenbosch. [WFSE]
- S3: That's probably because the white population is more= [WFSE]
- S1: =I think it's because it's Afrikaans and a lot of black people don't understand Afrikaans. [WFSE]
- S2: But, there's (sic) many black students there. But they don't mix. They're totally segregated [] can I present a scenario? You go to Stellenbosch University where there's (sic) predominantly Afrikaners. Okay, as a black student, you are the odd one out. [WFSE]
- S1: They're probably a lot more racist up there. We're not such a racist....we're not so racist compared to a place like Bloemfontein where it's a strong Afrikaans= [WFSE]

Through the employment of the notion of 'equal mixture' the discourse of racialised boundaries becomes more complex. It is now imbued with notions of liberal and conservative boundaries between 'racial' groups and these are in turn related to geographic space and ultimately to the language spoken by those who occupy the geographic space with 'black' inevitably being positioned as 'Other' once again. In terms of language it is suggested that conservative Afrikaans space is more regulated in terms of integration than liberal English space. In an interesting reversal of this notion of 'Othering' the same speaker who introduced the idea of 'mix' now introduces the notion of 'white' as a 'minority group' being positioned as 'Other' in the context of 'black' (Fort Hare) expansion across racialised boundaries into 'white' space.

Extract 7.4

S2: You are coming in as the minority group into Fort Hare....how are the black people of Fort Hare going to embrace and welcome the whiteys of Rhodes? This whole thing about, uh you are in our university now, first of all, so you are on our turf. [WFSE]

Through what is said above, the speaker is connecting racialised boundaries to former 'black' and 'white' space. She introduces the notion of 'white-ness' as 'Other' in terms of being enveloped by 'invading' (see next section) 'black-ness'. At the same time she constructs a sense of 'black' space that is unsafe for occupation by 'white' people as the following extract illustrates:

Extract 7.5

S2: I don't want to live in Alice, because....there's to me....the safety thing....it's very black, Alice, I will be scared to live in Alice, so I'd rather change universities and go live in PE. [WFSE]

This statement draws on notions of safety and 'swart gevaar' which emerges in the talk of another speaker later in the chapter who expresses fear that when Fort Hare (bringing with it 'black' students) incorporates East London's campus she would not be safe. This discourse of safety constructs an understanding of 'black' space and the notion of 'blacks' in numbers as unsafe indicating that Apartheid's rhetorical equation of 'black-ness' with danger ('swart gevaar') continues to operate as a rhetorical strategy in the maintenance of racialised, spatial boundaries. In this sense, racial 'mixing' is regarded as an impossibility in that a 'white' minority could not safely 'mix' with a 'black' majority. It is here that the notion of racialised boundaries emerges. These boundaries construct an understanding of 'racial' regulation in terms of who is allowed or denied access to space based on 'racial' definitions.

‘White’ maintenance of and ‘black’ expansion across racialised boundaries

The three extracts that follow invoke the discourse of ‘black’ expansion. It is interesting to note that particularly the first two extracts (Extract 7.6 is taken from a statement made by a ‘coloured’ RUEL student and Extract 7.7 is extracted from a statement made by a ‘black’ RUEL staff member) engage in the discourse of ‘black’ expansion as though it is an ‘invasion’ across the boundaries of ‘white’ space.

Extract 7.6

S1: That’s a big thing. It’s been part of a lot of conversations, the invasion. I mean, you get to Rhodes, you see the people. You get to know the people. You know exactly what the people are like at Rhodes. Then you go to Fort Hare, you don’t know what people are like. You don’t know what goes and what doesn’t go. And now all of a sudden, Fort Hare comes here and I may say something and people will be really offended and they stab me or something....or suffocate me or run me over, or toor [put a spell on] me. [CFSE]

Extract 7.7

There are those who think it is going to have a negative impact on this campus and that it is like an invasion of their space [] But if you see the number black students in the white universities has increased significantly. It has improved so much. It says a lot. [BMAE]

Extract 7.8

S1: Well, I was going to merge them for the sake of doing away with this discrimination and get rid of it. But I think it wasn’t going to be a good idea on the other hand because they thought we would come there and squander their money. [BMSF]

Extract 7.8 is taken from a response by a 'black' UFH student who was asked what he would have done regarding the restructuring of Higher Education had he been Minister of Education. He offers the suggestion that in a sense it may not have been a good idea to merge UFH with particularly RUGHT because it could possibly be construed as an 'invasion' (a term used by the speakers in Extracts 7.6 and 7.7) by the 'black' institution of 'white' space and subsequently would result in the perception that the 'black' invasion would lead to the 'squander[ing]' of 'white' funds.

Through the particular use of the word 'invasion' the speakers in Extracts 7.6 and 7.7 elicit ideas reminiscent of South Africa in colonial times dating back to the 19th century when there was a scramble for land in South Africa fought between the Dutch settlers, the British settlers and the 'black' tribes of South Africa (Callinicos, 1985). These notions are also reminiscent of the Apartheid regime's use of 'swart gevaar' rhetoric to instill a fear of 'black' invasion of 'white' culture into the minds of 'white' South Africans. In Extract 7.6 the speaker does not particularly refer to the 'people' or 'they' of Fort Hare as 'black' but makes it apparent that she constructs them as 'black' in that she exhibits fears that 'they' will 'toor' (put a spell on) her. This demonstrates a parallel between her fears and the fears of colonials regarding the unknown 'traditional', 'warrior' and 'witchcraft' tribes of Africa.

From the above it is evident that racialised boundaries are constructed by the speakers and that 'black' expansion is regarded as a crossing of such boundaries. In contrast to this notion, certain other speakers invoked a counter discourse to 'black' expansion, that is, the discourse of 'white' maintenance.

Extract 7.9

S4: This is not my point of view. This is what I have heard from lecturers here.
They [RUGHT] would have loved to keep themselves lily white. [WFSE]

Extract 7.10

Rhodes University I think probably has one of the worst racial staff demographics in the country, if not the worst. And we've done virtually nothing over the last few years to address that [] the vision has essentially been the same. The maintenance of a small, elite, predominantly, I wouldn't say white but privileged student body. [WMAE]

Extract 7.11

As it is, they have transformed, with black students and black staff members and so on but basically control of this institution is structured in a way that they have been integrated into the Rhodes culture so to speak, but very few [unclear] middle-aged, liberal English men control the institution. [WMAG]

The discourse of 'white' maintenance is invoked in a sense that the speakers appear to acknowledge the necessity of 'black' expansion. Although it is considered an inevitable factor in transformation, the maintenance of boundaries around 'white' space in order to regulate the 'invasion' of 'black' individuals is in operation. This notion of crossing boundaries and integration of 'white' and 'black' individuals in space (particularly what was formerly regarded as 'white' space) introduces an interesting new understanding of integration as a part of transformation (see later discussion).

So far this discussion has centred on the utilization of discourses that construct a dichotomous social landscape demarcating 'black-ness' and 'white-ness' along with 'black' space and 'white' space. Apart from constructing these two social entities as they are employed to construct and maintain individuals and institutions as opposites, such constructions fail to take into account the existence of other constructed 'race' groups or 'the people inbetween'.

‘Coloureds’ as ‘undecidables’ in post-Apartheid South Africa

It is here that the idea emerges that particularly ‘coloured’ and ‘Indian’ institutions and individuals are overlooked and positioned as ‘Other’ through not even being mentioned. In the talk of the majority of respondents a binary of ‘white/black’ is set up in terms of racialised space and racialised institutions. What also emerges is the sense that the Apartheid era was the socio-political time for ‘white’ domination and the ‘new’ South Africa is the time for socio-political domination by ‘blacks’. This sets up a racialised boundary wherein the ‘race’ group ‘coloured’ emerges as Derrida’s undecidable in that they disrupt the ‘white/black’ binary by not fitting into either category of the dichotomy. This notion became apparent in the talk of the ‘coloured’ focus group at the RUEL campus as the following extract reveals:

Extract 7.12

S5: Then what happens to the people inbetween? [CFSE]

S1: Exactly, coloureds. The thing is, now we all seem....it’s like this country has suddenly become so aware of colour. It’s like, you are black or you are white, it’s not the individual, or the potential that you have. I could be highly qualified, but just because I’m not black enough. [CFSE]

S2: We lived separately, the group areas act allowed people to live separately and suddenly now it is like everybody lives together and black people are trying to compensate for what they didn’t have. [CFSE]

S1: We were excluded when Apartheid came and we’re excluded now. [CFSE]

S6: We weren’t white enough then, we’re not black enough now. [CFSE]

These four speakers engage in a discourse which positions the ‘coloured’ community as a particular ‘racial’ grouping who has been negatively affected by the construction and

maintenance of racialised boundaries both in the Apartheid era and the present political situation in South Africa. This serves to highlight the polarized nature of discourses around transformation in South Africa where in some senses many speakers tend to speak of the new South Africa as being 'black'-orientated. What emerges here is the sense that transformation and equity work in favour of 'black' people. This is perceived to be to the detriment of 'whites'. However, in relation to 'coloureds', transformation interestingly is seen to be a measure which brings about dual exclusion for the 'coloured' community in that Speaker 1 suggests 'We were excluded when Apartheid came, and we're excluded now' to which Speaker 6 adds 'We weren't white enough then, we're not black enough now.' What is interesting is that these students accept the construction of 'coloured' and do not question or attempt to undermine it as a 'racial' category where some progressive 'coloureds' refuse the label 'coloured' on the basis that it is an Apartheid creation.

This introduces the notion that boundaries constructed in terms of 'black' expansion or 'white' maintenance serve to exclude other 'race' groups who do not quite fit into the 'white/black' binary. These discussions have explicitly set up a binary tension between 'black' and 'white'. However, some discussions around the boundaries did not use such explicit 'racial' attributions to boundaries but rather euphemised the notion of 'race'.

'Race' euphemized

In the previous section the notion of 'racial' integration was highlighted in relation to the discourses of mix, 'white' maintenance and 'black' expansion invoked by the stakeholders. In these discussions, particularly in the 'white' RUEL focus group, the talk centered on the notion of 'mixture'. In speaking about 'racial' integration in this manner, the students were euphemistically drawing on notions of 'racial' difference with the implication that integration is inevitable but at the same time a challenge. What is interesting is that other literature on race (Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Lea, 1996; Durrheim & Dixon, 2000; Myers & Williamson, 2002; Frederickson, 2002 & Macleod & Durrheim, 2002) indicates that notions of culture are drawn on in arguments around racialisation. This occurred relatively infrequently in the talk of respondents in this research with

notions of competence replacing culture in arguments around 'racial' difference (see discussion in Chapter 6). The racialisation of competence occurred particularly through the use of the discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure. The following section will discuss the manner in which 'race' was euphemized in the discussion of the notion of integration.

Extract 7.13

S3: It's just different culture. [WFSE]

Extract 7.14

S1: [] Fort Hare comes here and I may say something and people will be really offended and they stab me or something....or suffocate me or run me over or toor [put a spell on] me. [CFSE]

The above illustrates how notions of culture are utilized to denote 'racial' difference. Extract 7.13 is taken from the 'white' RUEL focus group where, amidst a debate on 'racial mixing', this speaker accounts for the difficulties faced in integrating 'race' groups as a matter of different culture. This is what Durrheim and Dixon (2000) define as 'cultural racism'. This particular type of 'racism' has developed out of the obsolescence of the notion that 'race' and 'racial' difference can be biologically and subsequently cognitively attributed (Miles, 1989; Donald & Rattansi, 1992; Lea, 1996; Foster, 1999). In Chapter 4 it was noted that Macleod and Durrheim (2002b) suggest that cultural racism has been characterised by a turn to signifiers such as culture to highlight 'racial' differences. Durrheim and Dixon (2000) suggest that '[b]iological and cultural racism understand pathology differently and thus support different kinds of racial segregation and discrimination' (p. 94). This they refer to as 'culture discourse'.

Extract 7.14 not only euphemises 'race' through the employment of cultural connotations but entirely avoids the concept of culture. However this speaker employs the 'culture as heritage' (Wetherell & Potter, 1992) understanding of culture through the use of the notion that those from Fort Hare might act violently or 'toor' (put a spell on) her to make

it evident that she is positioning those from Fort Hare as 'black' and being different due to 'black' culture. Wetherell and Potter (1992) suggest that 'culture as heritage' positions culture as static, unchanging and traditional and this is the manner in which the speaker in this extract uses the notion. What she suggests is that 'black' culture is equated with 'black' magic or traditional practices.

Very interestingly, and although she initially uses the term culture, the speaker in Extract 7.13 goes on to euphemise culture in the following manner:

Extract 7.15

S3: =Can I give my opinion on why whites and blacks don't mix? It's got nothing to do with race. You hang out with people that you have common interests with, you have the same music interests. If you go to Rhodes, Grahamstown, you have like shish man, I don't even know what the percentage is but, it's just all different races there and I think anywhere in South Africa, it doesn't matter what university you're at, there is going to be segregation between different people but it's just because of different interests. Like you're going to get your rockers hanging out together, you're going to get your skaters hanging out together; you can have your hippies hanging out together. You know it's just different interests, you know I really don't= [WFSE]

This piece of speech is extracted from the 'white' RUEL focus group's discussion of 'mix'. Through her statement this speaker employs the notion of culture but avoids the term 'culture' and reframes it as 'interests'. In providing a rhetorical motivation for how she accounts for segregation in universities and South Africa in general, she provides examples of what would commonly be referred to as 'youth culture'. In doing so, she bolsters her argument that 'racial' culture boils down to differences in interests and that this is the reason why 'racial' integration is a challenge and 'race' groups (particularly 'white' and 'black') don't 'mix'.

These are some obvious references to how culture is used to distinguish between 'race' groups. In a similar manner to which these phrases are employed to euphemistically denote 'racial' difference, others who were interviewed euphemise 'race' by drawing on socio-economic terminology to denote 'racial' difference.

Extract 7.16

Um, also I think Fort Hare attracts the rural student. Traditionally, people from a disadvantaged educational background. There's nothing wrong with that, but still emphasis on developing that student into academic potential. [BMAE]

Extract 7.17

We've been told by the administration that we should expect our numbers to go up remarkably, that they will be 'off the street'. That's the phrase that they used. Off the street, makes it sound like they have walked from Butterworth and the like. [WMAE]

From the above it is evident that both speakers are referring to 'black' students but avoid making this obvious by drawing on notions of 'disadvantage', 'background' and geographical space such as Butterworth (part of the 'black' rural periphery) to allude to the fact that the students to which they refer are 'black'.

What emerged in Chapter 6 was the notion of 'racially' distinct individuals and institutions as they are constructed discursively by the speakers. In what has preceded in this chapter, it has been noted that 'racial' integration has become a key point in discussions around transformation. In speaking about integration, rhetorical strategies are utilized by the stakeholders to note some of the challenges that come with integration. In the next section notions of transformation as a measure to bring about integration and equity will be discussed.

Discourses surrounding transformation

In post-Apartheid South Africa transformation has become a dominant discourse that has driven much action and practice in a variety of public areas. In the utilization of the discourse of transformation the notion of equity is inevitably drawn on. Court (1994) notes that 'in an era of democratic transformation universities....have to make efforts to ensure that the composition of their students and staff is an approximate representation of the numerical proportions of the major social and cultural groups in the society in which they are located' (p. 47). Transformation in post-Apartheid is thus regarded as a measure that aims at 'disentangling the Apartheid web' (Bunting, 1994, p. 36) in order to restore institutional disparity created by the Apartheid regime.

Transformation as a numbers game set against the notion of institutional culture

A number of respondents interviewed in this research have drawn on such notions of equity and refer particularly to demographic profiles of the respective institutions in their discussion of transformation. At times transformation is spoken of as a numbers game which entails quantifying the representation of (particularly) 'blacks' in 'white' institutions. While speaking of transformation in this manner certain obstacles to transformation are invoked discursively. At some points transformation is referred to as a numbers game (the meeting of equity demands in terms of demographic representation) while at other times transformation is spoken of as a difficult endeavour in that each institution is positioned as having a particular 'institutional culture' that complicates the merging of two such institutions.

Ramphela (1994b) suggests that '[e]xcellence in performance cannot be promoted in an environment which is not supportive, and in some cases, openly hostile to those previously excluded from the PSE [Post Secondary Education] sector. Issues of language, curricula and social relations are central to institutional culture' (pp. 18-19). In this way 'institutional culture' is seen to be not only a very real result of Apartheid but also a tool which can work against equity and transformation. What follows is a discussion of how

the notions of equity as a numbers game and the notion of 'institutional culture' emerged in this research.

Extract 7.18

Rhodes University I think probably has one of the worst racial staff demographics in the country, if not the worst. And we've done virtually nothing over the last few years to address that. [] What has been achieved here has no transformation impact as far as I can see. [WMAE]

Extract 7.19

As it is, they have transformed, with black students and black staff members and so on but basically control of this institution is structured in a way that they have been integrated into the Rhodes culture so to speak but very few [unclear] middle-aged, liberal English men control the institution. [WMAG]

Extract 7.20

I am also aware that it affected our demographics....badly, because that has been the area that we have been able to claim (or register) black students. [WFAG]

Extract 7.21

"Particularly those institutions not directly involved in the merger processes will be required to pay urgent attention to meeting equity targets for both staff and students and to the development of more inclusive institutional cultures" Article: *Daily dispatch*. May 31 2002.

The above indicates an acknowledgement of staff and student demographic profiles as an indication of transformation geared towards 'racial' equity in terms of integration and representation. On the one hand, transformation is seen as a measure of getting the numbers right in terms of the approximate representation to which Court (1994) refers. On the other hand, Extract 7.19 indicates that 'culture' (and the integration of 'Other' into it, or as Fanon suggests, assimilation) is seen as important. In much the same way that

culture (Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Durrheim & Dixon, 2000) is utilised to denote ‘racial’ difference between both groups and individuals, so too is the notion of ‘institutional culture’ employed to denote differences between the two racialised institutions as the following extracts highlight:

Extract 7.22

Okay, from Fort Hare’s perspective, what we’ve felt strongly - and I include myself fully there- what we’ve felt strongly about is the Fort Hare culture in terms of the unique historical situation for Fort Hare....not to allow that to be....to be....underploughed, so to speak, by having us merge with let’s say Grahamstown [] Rhodes has got its own culture as well, own ethos, own values and so on. Um so maybe it’s not such a bad idea to have Rhodes remaining an independent and autonomous university. [WMAF]

Extract 7.23

“It [The National Working Group] said that while it was aware of the ‘special challenges’ a union between the three entities would involve, including distance and ‘distinct cultures’ [] Fort Hare and Rhodes would help to develop a ‘new mission and culture for the future.’” Article: *Daily Dispatch*, February 12 2002.

Through the invocation of this discourse of ‘institutional culture’ the notion of history is also drawn on to indicate difference between the two institutions. In doing so the implication that transformation is a difficult endeavour is suggested in that it is possibly necessary to preserve these histories and cultures. It is in this manner that the speaker in Extract 7.22 racialises culture through its application to institutions.

From what has been discussed above it is evident that transformation is partially considered to be a numbers game in terms of equity. These numbers as representations of equity almost always draw on the idea of increasing the numbers of ‘blacks’ in institutions but at the same time, ‘institutional culture’ is suggested as a possible obstacle in the path of transformation.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the emergence of talk around 'racialised' boundaries. What became evident is the notion that integration is inevitable and with such notions comes the allusion that 'racialised' boundaries do not exist. This is made apparent in the talk of particularly the 'white' RUEL focus group around notions of racial 'mix' or mixture. What is suggested is that movement from 'black' space across racialised boundaries is possible but that in some sense this movement should be regulated so as not to upset the position of 'whites' in the power relations that occur in the spaces formerly preserved for 'white' privilege. At the same time it is suggested that 'white' movement across the boundaries into former 'black' space is unwise as implications of safety are drawn on regarding 'whites' as a minority group in 'black' space. Though integration and the words 'mix' and 'mixture' are essentially used to deny the continued existence of racialised boundaries in a non-racialised, post-Apartheid South Africa, the existence of such discursive boundaries is repeatedly invoked.

Traversing these boundaries is also seen to be a measure towards promoting equity through transformation. It is here that the notion of 'institutional culture' is suggested as a possible obstacle to promoting equity meaning that equity as a numbers game might not find a favourable outcome. What is interesting is the notion of culture emerging in the literature produced by a number of authors (Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Lea, 1996, Durrheim & Dixon, 2000, Myers & Williamson, 2002, Frederickson, 2002 & Macleod & Durrheim, 2002) indicating that in 'new' or 'cultural racism', culture is used as a means to distinguish between 'race' groups. This is evident in this research in the use of the discourse of 'institutional culture' to denote the difference between racialised institutions. What is interesting is the fact that 'culture' is rarely deployed in its ethnic sense as the other literature would indicate. Instead, competence is utilised by the majority of speakers to denote difference between racialised institutions and the continued existence of racialised boundaries in post-Apartheid South Africa.

Chapter 8: Conclusion

From the previous chapters it was made apparent that the South African Higher Education landscape is a highly racialised terrain. The South African context is one that is not only post-colonial in character but it has a post-Apartheid history that has had a variety of devastating effects on the economic, political and social setting that is the 'new' South Africa.

All aspects of South African society have been racialised and this does not merely have its foundations in the separatist ideology of the Apartheid era. Racialisation and segregation in terms of social life and resources have their roots in the gold-rush of 1886 which brought with it industrialization although segregation in Higher Education dates back to 1829. The manner in which South African society was racialised thus dates back to its colonial past which only saw the entrenchment of segregation ensured by the implementation of Apartheid legislation in 1948.

It was this era of segregation, from 1948 to 1994, of South African history that saw the designation of particular 'racial' identities to particular groups of people. With this came the designation of racialised geographic space under the pretense of separate but equal (though extremely unfair and skewed) development in every aspect of social life. The inculcation of the necessity for separate development into the minds of 'white' voters in South Africa led to forty-six years of 'white' minority rule which was only dismantled legislatively in 1994 which was the year that saw South Africa's first democratic election.

With the legislative demise of Apartheid, it could easily (though mistakenly) be assumed that South Africa had successfully taken steps towards de-racialising the public aspects of social life for all South Africans. With the replacement of the Apartheid regime by a new democratic political ideology, notions of equity and issues of redressing disparity caused by Apartheid came to the fore. It was in this manner that transformation became a buzz word, more so, a signifier of the character of the 'new' South Africa.

It became the task of Government (and the various governmental departments) to take measures towards bringing about equity in all spheres of South African life that would reflect the 'racial' composition of South Africa's population as accurately as possible.

Steps were taken on all levels to make fair representation of South African society a reality. Affirmative action and 'black' empowerment policies began to be implemented in the work-place with quota systems being stipulated in order to ensure this kind of fair representation. These measures have, since 1994, been applied to all spheres of South African social, economic and cultural life, including sport.

Another key area of focus has been education. Since as early as 1990, measures were taken and legislation passed that would aim at redressing the disparity in Educational institutions in South Africa. Tertiary education has thus been an area that has faced great transformation. This has been so since 2001 where it was decided that measures would be taken to make the administration of tertiary institutions more efficient and manageable and it was suggested that in order to bring about such change, a number of mergers would need to be effected in order to reduce the unusually high (with regard to South Africa's population) number of Higher Education institutions. It was suggested that the number of institutions should be reduced from 36 to 21.

Due to the racialised nature of South Africa's past it is clear that South African Higher Education institutions are divided along 'racial' lines with two particularly distinct groupings of universities, these being historically 'black' universities (HBUs) and historically 'white' universities (HWUs). Among the changes that took place was the incorporation of the East London campus of Rhodes University (a satellite campus of an HWU) into the University of Fort Hare (an HBU). The details of the research project discussed in the preceding chapters focused on these two particular institutions drawing on theory about racialisation and post-colonialism.

What became quite apparent in the discursive analysis of the incorporation of RUEl into UFH is the fact that although Apartheid was legislatively dismantled in 1994, the power

relations that emerged in the Apartheid era continue to operate in post-Apartheid South Africa. These power relations have (due to the very character of Apartheid) obviously been racialised and since the dismantling of Apartheid, have continued to operate discursively.

'Race' literature has indicated that with the demise of theories that would legitimate the biological basis upon which to form 'racial' distinctions ('scientific racism', and thus the subsequent dismantling of 'institutional racism'), 'race' as a concept has become deployed differently in contemporary society. This is what has come to be known as 'new racism' or 'cultural racism'. What this means is that 'race' is no longer utilised in traditionally 'racist' endeavours but that 'racial' distinctions continue to be made in less overt manners. What emerged in this thesis is the notion of competence, academic quality and standards (invoking a discourse of 'white' excellence and 'black' failure) which are used in subtle ways to perpetuate the racialisation of the two institutions discussed in the research. Thus 'new racism' uses culture but also competence to maintain particular racialised power relations.

Though institutions are no longer 'racially' distinguished from one another, institutional space is still racialised space. This was made evident by the persistence of a great majority of respondents interviewed in this project to position Rhodes University as a 'white' institution and the University of Fort Hare as a 'black' institution which indicates that institutional space has not been adequately appropriated into the non-'racial' space that characterises the 'new' South Africa. Discourses that were drawn on perpetually invoked notions of 'white' excellence constructed in binary opposition to 'black' failure. In deploying these discourses many respondents utilised notions of quality and disadvantage as ideological and rhetorical devices to position 'white' and 'black' institutions as competent or incompetent. What also became apparent is the notion that ten years after the demise of Apartheid, boundaries continue to be maintained (and at times, destroyed) which operate along both 'race' and class divisions though it should be remembered that 'race' and class in South Africa have been intimately intertwined since colonial times. These boundaries have been discursively constructed in order to

demarcate 'black' and 'white' space though allowances are made for 'black' expansion across these boundaries into 'white' space. It is here that the notions of 'mix' and 'mixture' are deployed in discussions around integration and transformation. What is interesting is the fact that integration and transformation are regarded as inevitable but that boundaries continue to be constructed which serve to maintain and regulate the movement of 'blacks' into former 'white' space.

These boundaries draw on notions of not only space but class. The middle class has been discursively invoked as the economic domain of 'white-ness' with urban, industrialised space being equated with the 'white' middle class. In order for a person (or institution) to become more middle class, he/she (or the institution) should aspire to 'white-ness'. The implication of this discourse was often that becoming 'white' entails more than just social mobility, but may require movement across geographic space inevitably with the implication that movement should ideally be away from 'black' failure in search of 'white' excellence.

Essentially, what has been concluded here is that the racialised character of South Africa's colonial and Apartheid past has had very real effects on the present situation in South Africa. Institutions and privileges that should theoretically be accessible to all South Africans are still discursively invoked as 'racially' separate. These discourses thus maintain the power relations that emerged in the Apartheid era by maintaining the positioning and defining of institutions as racialised space. The ideological implications of this would be that although accessibility to places of former privilege are open to all South Africans, the old places of 'white' social and economic privilege are still being maintained. Through the maintenance of these spaces and institutions, it is clear that the future 'elite' of South African society are being kept in place. This is not to say that the future elite are only 'white' but that those from other 'race' groups, particularly 'black' who are considered to be a part of the elite, are perceived to be becoming more 'white' and thus distancing themselves from their 'black-ness'.

References

- Anthias, F. & Yuval-Davis, N. (1993). *Racialized boundaries: Race, nation, gender, colour and class and the anti racist struggle*. London: Routledge.
- Barot, R. & Bird, J. (2001). Racialization: the genealogy and critique of a concept. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (4), 601-618.
- Bartky, S. (1992). Foucault, Femininity and the Modernisation of Patriarchal Power. In J. Kourany (Ed.), *Feminist Philosophies* (pp. 103-118). Prentice Hall: Englewood Cliffs.
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: a rhetorical approach to social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M., Condor, S., Edward, D., Gore, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988). *Ideological dilemmas. A Social Psychology of everyday thinking*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and opinions*. London: Sage.
- Billig, M. (1997). Discursive, rhetorical, and ideological messages. In C. McGarty & S.A. Haslam (Eds.), *The message of social psychology* (pp. 36-53). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burman, E. (1991). What discourse is not. *Philosophical Psychology*, 4 (3), 325-342.
- Burman, E. & Parker, I. (Eds). (1993). *Discourse Analytic Research: repertoires and readings of texts in action*. London: Routledge.
- Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Bunting, I. (1994). *A Legacy of inequality: Higher Education in South Africa*. Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Bunting, I. & Cloete, N. (2004). *Measuring Performance in Higher Education: A South African Case Study*. Retrieved October 17, 2004, from <http://www.chet.org.za>
- Callinicos, A. (1993). *Race and Class*. London: Bookmarks.
- Callinicos, L. (1985). *Gold and Workers: 1886-1924*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Carlisle, A. (2000, July 19). Merger of Eastern Cape varsities proposed. *Daily Dispatch*, p. 1.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, December 10). Unitra gets new lease on life. *Daily Dispatch*, p. 2.
- Cooper, D. and Subotzky, G. (2001). *The Skewed Revolution: Trends in South African Higher Education: 1988-1998*. Cape Town: Education Policy Unit.

- Court, D. (1994). The university as an equity system: Experience in post-independence Africa and the role of external assistance agencies. In B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Changing by Degrees? Equity issues in South African tertiary education* (pp. 47-74). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Dant, T. (1991). *Knowledge, ideology and discourse: A sociological perspective*. London/New York: Routledge.
- De la Rey, C. (2001). Racism and the History of University Education in South Africa. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. De la Rey & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Race, Racism, Knowledge Production and Psychology in South Africa* (pp. 7-16). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Dissemination*. London: The Athlone Press.
- Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K. (2000). Displacing place-identity: A discursive approach to locating self and other. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 27-34.
- Donald, J. & Rattansi, A. (Eds.). (1992). *'Race', culture and difference*. London: Sage.
- Duncan, N., van Niekerk, A., De la Rey, C. & Seedat, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Race, Racism, Knowledge Production and Psychology in South Africa*. New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2000) Theories of culture in racist discourse. *Race and Society*, 3, 93-109
- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2001). The Role of place and metaphor in racial exclusion: South Africa's beaches as sites of shifting racialisation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (3), 433-450.
- Durrheim, K & Dixon, J. (in press a). Chapter 6. Evaluative practices: A discursive approach to investigating desegregation attitudes. In *Racial Encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation*. London: Psychology Press.
- Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (in press b). Everyday explanation of diversity and difference: The role of lay ontologizing. In G. Ellison & A. Goodman (Eds.), *Diversity, difference and deviance*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Dyasi, M. M. (2001). *Diversity in Higher Education: the case of post-Apartheid South Africa*. Paper presented at the 23rd Annual EAIR Forum, Portugal.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Penguin.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.

- Fanon, F. (1963). *Black Skin, White Masks*. Reading: Cox and Wyman Limited.
- Fanon, F. (1967). *The wretched of the earth*. London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1976). *The Will To Knowledge: The History of Sexuality: Volume 1*. London: Pluto.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin
- Foucault, M. (1980a). Truth and Power. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Selected Interviews and other writings: 1972-1977* (pp. 109-133). Essex: Harvester Press Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1980b). Two Lectures. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Selected Interviews and other writings: 1972-1977* (pp. 78-108). Essex: Harvester Press Ltd.
- Foucault, M. (1980c). Power and strategies. In C. Gordon (Ed.), *Selected Interviews and other writings: 1972-1977* (pp. 134-145). Essex: Harvester Press Ltd.
- Foster, D. (1999). Racism, Marxism, Psychology. *Theory and Psychology*, 9 (3), 353-366
- Frederickson, G. (2002). *Racism: A Short History*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Gandhi, L. (1998). *Post Colonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gergen, K.J. (1992). Toward a Postmodern Psychology. In S. Kvale (Ed.), *Psychology and postmodernism* (pp. 17-30). London: Sage.
- Grobler, J.E.H. (1996). *South African History: Apartheid and Resistance 1948-1976*. Goodwood: National Book Printers
- Harrison, D. (1981). *The White Tribe of Africa*. Johannesburg: Macmillan.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., & Walkerdine, V. (1984). *Changing the subject: Psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Hook, D. (2004a). Governmentality and technologies of subjectivity. In D. Hook. (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 239-272). Lansdowne: UCT Press.
- Hook, D. (2004b). Foucault, disciplinary power and the critical pre-history of psychology. In D. Hook. (Ed.), *Critical Psychology* (pp. 211-238). Lansdowne: UCT Press.

- Hossain, S.A. (2000) *Scientific Racism in Enlightened Europe: Linnaeus, Darwin and Galton*. Retrieved July 7, 2003, from <http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/biology/b103/f00/web/hossain.html>
- Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Jansen, J.D. (Ed.). (1991). *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical perspectives across the disciplines*. Braamfontein: Skotaville Publishers.
- Kennedy, V. (2000). *Edward Said: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Kvale, S. (Ed.). (1992). *Psychology and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Lea, S. (1996). 'That ism on the end makes it nasty': talking about race with young white South Africans. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 26 (3), 183-190.
- Levett, A., Kottler, A., Burman, E. and Parker, I. (Eds.). (1997) *Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis In South Africa*. London: Zed Books.
- Loomba, A. (1998). *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London: Routledge.
- Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructive discourse analysis: Extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 32, 17-25.
- Macleod, C. and Durrheim, K. (2002a). Foucauldian Feminism: the Implications of Governmentality. *The Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 32 (1), 41-60.
- Macleod, C. and Durrheim, K. (2002b). Racialising teenage pregnancy: 'culture' and 'tradition' in the South African scientific literature. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 25 (5), 778-801.
- Michael, M. (1996). *Constructing identities: the Social, the Nonhuman and Change*. London: Sage.
- Miles, R. (1989) *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Sage.
- Mishra, V. and Hodge, B. (1993). What is Post(-)colonialism. In P. Williams & L.Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 276-290). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Moulder, J. (1991). Africanising the Predominantly White Universities in South Africa: Some Ideas for a Debate. In J.D. Jansen (Ed.), *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical perspectives across the disciplines* (pp. 111-126). Braamfontein: Skotaville.

- Myers, K. and Williamson, P. (2002). *Race Talk: the perpetuation of racism through private discourse*. Retrieved June 18, 2003, from <http://www.socqrl.niu.edu/forest/SOCI270/RaceTalk.htm>
- Nicholas, L. (1994). Racism in higher education in South Africa: Challenges to student counsellors. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, 22 (1), 119-125.
- Nkomo, M. (1991). Epistemological and Disciplinary Transformations in a Post-Apartheid South Africa. In J.D. Jansen (Ed.), *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical perspectives across the disciplines* (pp. 309-321). Braamfontein: Skotaville.
- Parker, I. (1990a). Discourse: definitions and contradictions. *Philosophical Psychology*, 3 (2), 189-204.
- Parker, I. (1990b). Real things: discourse, content and practice. *Philosophical Psychology*, 3 (2), 227-233.
- Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse Dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology*. London: Routledge.
- Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond attitudes and behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1995). Discourse Analysis. In J.A. Smith, R. Harre & L. van Langenhoven (Eds.), *Rethinking Methods in Psychology* (pp. 80-92). London: Sage.
- Ralekhetso, M. (1991). The Black University in South Africa: Ideological Captive or Transformative Agent? In J.D. Jansen (Ed.), *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical perspectives across the disciplines* (pp. 101-110). Braamfontein: Skotaville.
- Ramphela, M. (1994a). Equity: Reality factors and their implications. In B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Changing by Degrees? Equity issues in South African tertiary education* (pp. 91-100). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Ramphela, M. (1994b). Equity policy: A framework of questions. In B. Kaplan (Ed.), *Changing by Degrees? Equity issues in South African tertiary education* (pp. 13-20). Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press.
- Rhodes University Planning and Quality Assurance Office. (2001). *IQR Self-Assessment Report*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Rhodes University. (2002). *University Calendar*. Grahamstown: Rhodes University.
- Richardson, L. (1998). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials* (pp.345-371). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

- Rostron, B. (2000, December 22). The heart of whiteness. *Mail and Guardian*, p.30.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shefer, D. and Foster, D. (2001). Discourses on women's heterosexuality and desire in a South African local context. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*, 3 (4), 375-390.
- Solomos, J. and Back, L. (1996). *Racism in Society*. London: Macmillan.
- South African Advertising Research Foundation. (2004). *All Media and Products Survey (AMPS)*. Retrieved November 6, 2004, from <http://www.saarf.co.za>.
- South African Department of Education. (2001). *The Transformation and Reconstruction of the Higher Education System*. Retrieved June 27, 2002, from http://education.pwv.gov.za/Policies%20an..../transformation_and_reconstruction%20he.html
- South African Department of Education. (2004). *Higher Education Management Information System (HEMIS) for state subsidised universities & technikons*. Retrieved October 27, 2004, from <http://education.pwv.gov.za/index.asp?src=docu&xsrc=repo>
- South African Government Communication and Information system. (2001). *South Africa Yearbook*. (7th Ed.) Cape Town: Government Printers.
- Spivak, G.C. (1993). Can the subaltern speak? In P. Williams & L.Chrisman (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 66-111). New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Terre Blanche, M. and Durrheim, K. (1999). Social Constructionist Methods. In M. Terre Blanche & K. Durrheim (Eds.), *Research in Practice* (pp. 147-172). Cape Town: UCT Press.
- United Nations Development Program. (2003). *South African Development Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- University of Fort Hare. (2004). *Prospectus 2004*. Port Elizabeth: Cadar.
- Vilikazi, H. and Tema, B. (1991). Universities and the Black Revolution in South Africa: Inside the White Power Structure. In J.D. Jansen (Ed.), *Knowledge and Power in South Africa: Critical perspectives across the disciplines* (pp. 127-140). Braamfontein: Skotaville.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Britain: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Young, R.J.C. (2001). *Postcolonialism: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

APPENDIX A:
CONSENT FORM



RHODES UNIVERSITY

East London Campus

Psychology Department

I, the undersigned hereby acknowledge that I give my consent to take part in the research on transformation in Higher Education undertaken by Donovan Robus of the Psychology Department of Rhodes University, East London. I am aware that my participation will be recorded on audio cassette.

I have been informed that I will remain anonymous and that anything that is said in the research interview or focus group discussion will be treated with utmost confidentiality.

I have also been informed that I may be called upon for a follow up interview should this be deemed necessary by the researcher.

Signature

Date

APPENDIX B:
CORRESPONDENCE



RHODES UNIVERSITY

East London Campus

Psychology Department

18 February 2003

Dear Doctor Woods,

I am currently registered for a Masters Degree in Psychology at Rhodes University East London. On September 16th 2002 the Rhodes University Higher Degrees Committee approved the proposal for my research. The title of the project is "Discourses surrounding race, equity, disadvantage and transformation in times of rapid social change: Higher Education in Post Apartheid South Africa."

The purpose of the research is to investigate how the various stakeholders in the process of the incorporation of Rhodes University, East London into the University of Fort Hare make sense of the process, account for it from their perspective and express their understandings of the transformation process. The research does not aim to evaluate the process of incorporation but rather to understand how those who are directly involved with and affected by the transformation account for and make sense of the experience. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants

Should you have any queries please feel free to contact me.

Many Thanks

Donovan Robus

Psychology Masters Student
Psychology Department
Rhodes University
East London
E-mail: e9640526@campus.ru.ac.za
Tel: 072 259 7826



RHODES UNIVERSITY

East London Campus

**Psychology
Department**

18 February 2003

Dear Professor Swartz,

I am currently registered for a Masters Degree in Psychology at Rhodes University East London. On September 16th 2002 the Rhodes University Higher Degrees Committee approved the proposal for my research. The title of the project is "Discourses surrounding race, equity, disadvantage and transformation in times of rapid social change: Higher Education in Post Apartheid South Africa."

The purpose of the research is to investigate how the various stakeholders in the process of the incorporation of Rhodes University, East London into the University of Fort Hare make sense of the process, account for it from their perspective and express their understandings of the transformation process. The research does not aim to evaluate the process of incorporation but rather to understand how those who are directly involved with and affected by the transformation account for and make sense of the experience. Informed consent will be obtained from all participants

Should you have any queries please feel free to contact me.

Many Thanks

Donovan Robus

Psychology Masters Student
Psychology Department
Rhodes University
East London
E-mail: e9640526@campus.ru.ac.za
Tel: 072 259 7826

APPENDIX C:
DATA REFERENCES

DAILY DISPATCH ARTICLES AND LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

- (2001, March 7). Rhodes upbeat over higher education plan. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 3.
- Carlisle, A. (2001, March 7). Varsity heads in favour. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 3.
- (2001, December 31). For and against Unitra. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 6.
- (2002, February 12). No Title. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 7.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, February 13). Ft Hare leaders reject merger proposals. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 3.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, February 14). Union rejects Unitra closure. *Daily Dispatch*. p.3.
- (2002, February 19). University heads seek meeting with Asmal. *Daily Dispatch*. p.8
- (2002, February 21). Teachers Union against proposal to close Unitra. *Daily Dispatch*. p.2.
- Mzimba, S. (2002, May 21). Stofile warns Asmal on Unitra changes. *Daily Dispatch*. p.2.
- (2002, May 30). Asmal to reveal new tertiary policy today. *Daily Dispatch*. p.4.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, May 31). Asmal plans to close Unitra. *Daily Dispatch*. p.1.
- (2002, May 31). Quota system considered for tertiary sector. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 3
- Carlisle, A. (2002, June 1). EL needs Rhodes presence-Holbrook. *Saturday Dispatch*. p.1.
- (2002, June 1). Co-operation is key say university heads. *Saturday Dispatch*. p.1.
- (2002, June 4). Welcome Fort Hare. *Daily Dispatch*. p.8.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, June 12). Rhodes EL, Fort Hare set for handover. *Daily Dispatch*. p.6.
- (2002, July 23). Rhodes EL students look to G'town. *Daily Dispatch*. p.4.
- Green, V. (2002, August 7). Fort Hare - the struggle goes on. *Daily Dispatch*. p.3.
- (2002, August 19). UFH plans for city campus. *Daily Dispatch*. p.5.
- Carlisle, A. (2002, October 1). Building an urban university. . *Daily Dispatch*. p.3.
- (2002, December 27). Rhodes EL reduces fees for 2003. . *Daily Dispatch*. p.2.

(2003, February 4). Full Ft Hare campus for EL. *Daily Dispatch*. p.3.

(2003, May 9). Fort Hare, only for those who can pay? *Daily Dispatch*. p.12.

(2003, May 27). Why, Ft Hare? *Daily Dispatch*. p.10.

(2003, May 28). Viva, the new Fort Hare in East London. *Daily Dispatch*. p.8.

(
2003, June 10). Ft Hare not a sacrificial lamb . *Daily Dispatch*. p.7.

(2003, August 28). Noted academic hails new UFH campus. *Daily Dispatch*. p.8.

(2004, May 26). EL Tutors not paid. *Daily Dispatch*. p. 12.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS

Rhodes University. (2004). *News and announcements*. Retrieved March 10, 2004, from www.ru.ac.za/news/newsfeed/index.php

University of Fort Hare. (2004). *News*. Retrieved March 10, 2004, from www.ufh.ac.za

