Colour-line: The Petrifaction of Racialization and Alterity at the University of Stellenbosch

Fazil Moradi*

Abstract

This paper investigates 'black' (minority) student experiences and living conditions at an Afrikaans-speaking historically white university, the University of Stellenbosch (SU). It is an empirical attempt to unearth the present conditionality of minority students that make up 14 per cent of the enrolled students at SU. Thus it involves social (under-)development and is a move away from the individual as unit of analysis per se and includes assessment of the social processes that condition a racialized dividing-line between different groups and at once prolong group affiliation/belonging. The main focus is on the following themes essential to the dispute on educational transformation in South Africa: racialized skin colour and stereotypes, access to language and education, and segregated spaces and economic reality. I apply qualitative research interview and utilize the post-colonial approach to argue that minority students constantly encounter the reinstatement of a racialized system of difference that excludes and positions them as marginalized subjects. It is argued that these experiences are due to the corporeal schema and cultural characteristics that delineate membership at SU, which make minority students more resistant and at once more ambivalent about the pursuit of education as a self-realization process, and more importantly an investment for future life, which constitute the main force for almost all of the minority students.

Résumé

Cet article étudie l'expérience des étudiants « noirs » (minoritaires) dans une université de langue afrikaans historiquement « blanche » : l'Université de Stellenbosch (SU). C'est un essai empirique consistant à mettre en évidence les conditions de vie actuelles des étudiants minoritaires qui représentent 14

* Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology, Advokatenweg 36 06114 Halle, Email: moradi@eth.mpg.de

pour cent des effectifs de SU. Il inclut l'évaluation des processus sociaux qui conditionnent une ligne de partage racialisée entre les différents groupes et prolonge en même temps l'affiliation à un groupe d'appartenance. L'accent est mis sur les thèmes suivants, relatifs au débat sur la transformation de l'éducation en Afrique du Sud : la couleur de peau et les stéréotypes raciaux, l'accès à la langue et à l'éducation, les espaces ségrégationnistes et la réalité économique. La démarche des entrevues de recherche qualitative et l'utilisation de l'approche postcoloniale cherchent à montrer que les étudiants des minorités rencontrent constamment le retour d'un système raciste de différenciation qui les exclut et les considère comme des sujets marginalisés. Cet article soutient que ces expériences sont dues au schéma corporel et aux caractéristiques culturelles qui définissent l'appartenance à SU ; ce qui rend les étudiants minoritaires plus résistants mais plus ambivalents quant à la poursuite de l'éducation en tant que processus d'autoréalisation.

Introduction

The remarkable co-existence of the stirring but imaginary appeal to the lost 'past', and the invariable struggle to re-install the unimaginable past in the present is not wholly impossible at the University of Stellenbosch (SU). The apartheid government took the racializ(ing)ed colonial discourse to be self-evident, and that every 'race' is endowed with fundamentally different capabilities. In this vein, education under the auspices of apartheid not only racially segregated South Africans but systematically implanted an already naturalized discourse of insurmountable differences among races (Clark & Worger 2004). The intense reciprocal relationship between educational institutions and the apartheid state's primordialistic notion of national and cultural identity policies constituted and perpetuated the racializ(ing)ed system, which only encouraged obedience and relentless inequality. Hence, the apartheid educational system wilfully reproduced South Africans as irremediably different from each other and especially from the 'purity' of the white-washed Afrikaner. The Bantu Education Act of 1953 and the Extension of the Universities Act of 1959 uncompromisingly required racialized social groups to attend not only segregated and exclusive but strictly controlled campuses in the Bantustans, ('black African homelands') (Alexander 1989: chap. 1; Dubow 1995; Murphy 1992). The so-called Bantu education kept the racialized South Africans' aspirations within acceptable limits, and fabricated different races, cultures, linguistic communities, and thus assembled a doxa of the same (Molteno 1984; Rich 1990).

According to Lalu (2007:58), the institutional taxonomy and essentialism, which is rather a taboo in academic culture in South Africa today, still persist: 'the taxonomic ordering of universities in South Africa remains blinded in its role in producing racialised subjects'. The education allegedly started to disintegrate as an apartheid dominion since the occurrence of a radical alarming

emergency; the dawn of a student-based 'Black Consciousness Movement' shed a strong light on the deliberate (symbolic) violence of these racialized colleges. Essentialism, i.e., Afrikaner superiority and subjugation of the rest, enjoyed the status of an axiom. It was declared that the main philosophy of these colleges was the implantation of docility and the preservation of racial socialization, which only served the power position of the newly born Afrikaner (Biko 1978; Mmusi 1987; Ranug 1986). Such radical awareness and/or movement fundamentally disturbed the roots of the imposed and embraced axiom. Nevertheless, the 'political turn' (transformation from apartheid to de(racialization) segregation) involves essential transformations in the politics of representation of the South Africans and emphasizes an open and democratic society based on 'human dignity, equality and freedom' (Chap. 2, Bill of Rights; see also Ministry of Education 2002:13). Yet the turn, which has inevitably paved the way for the black subjects to enter the historically Afrikanerized SU, remains an inconvenient reality that disturbs the institutional settings of SU, and therefore it is produced as only an aphorism unwarranted of respect.

Thus, the primary aim of this article is restricted to the assessment of the present living conditions and experiences of 'black' students (henceforth referred to as minority students) from South Africa enrolled at SU. Although the majority of the so-called students of 'colour', which constitute another minority group, equally share the broader inequalities and racial discrimination and conditionality, they are still privileged in terms of language (Afrikaans) and other social activities. In fact, students of 'colour' make up the interface between the 'white' and the 'black' colour, but there is a desire within the group, which is to be seen and identified with the white colour since it is made the ideal that every student should aspire to. Yet, the existing conditions of the black students differ in ways that I will reveal in this text, which is to unearth the continuity of racialization and naturalized racial apartness at SU. The engaging effort is not a black-non-black dichotomy, but a matter of empirical emphasis and/or ethics to unravel the inevitable impacts of the division embedded in the educational labour which remains entangled and structured by the racialized/coloured institutional settings of SU. Moreover, I will attempt to disaggregate several essential dimensions of the manner in which the reassertion and redeployment of the racial practices of the 'past' and the educational difficulties are being negotiated by minority students, enrolled at SU due to the 'access' afforded by the re-configuration of educational and social programmes. A combination of semi-structured interviews and a post-colonial approach are applied to examine the following question: How do minority students negotiate experiences of imposed marginality, racialization, and racial exclusion and segregation at a historically White (Afrikaans) university, the University of Stellenbosch?

The Setting: The Historical and Present Context of SU

In his inaugural lecture in 2002, Chris Brink (2007:135), former vice chancellor of SU, stated that the history of SU '[s]hould be considered by anybody trying to understand' it. Indeed, the role of history and historiographical assumptions are significant in order to approach certain (dis)countinuties of the present state of SU. The institution was formally founded in Stellenbosch as an independent university in 1918 and it was developed to protect the 'purity' of Afrikaners through a policy of complete separation. Brink contends that it thus became the place where Afrikaans 'turned from a local patois into a language of literature and science' (2006:1). It is almost the only educational institution that produced both the architects of apartheid and their marginalized antagonists. The wilful architects were, among others, Daniel François Malan (1874 -1959), the first apartheid prime minister (PM); Hendrik Frensch Verwoerd (1901-1966), professor of Sociology and Social Work and later a leading PM of apartheid; Balthazar Johannes Vorster (1915-1983) PM of apartheid and later Chancellor of the SU; Pieter Willem Botha (1916-2006) Chancellor of SU, PM, and later President of the apartheid government. Brink indicates that rectors of the SU 'were, typically, prominent members of the Afrikaner Broederbond' (2006:1-2): a covert organization associated to the National Party from 1948 through 1990 (Jemison 2004; O'Meara 1983:64). Daniel François Malan claimed Stellenbosch as a place from which 'the Afrikaner *volk* can best realise its ideals and exercise the largest influence … Stellenbosch therefore stands for an idea' (cited in Brink 2006:20). Thus, the 'idea' implied to essentialize and conflate the political, national, cultural, religious and the racialized skin colour into one homogenized unit.

Webb and Kriel (2000:39-40) assert that 'In nationalist apartheid thinking the Herderian equation explicitly included race: race (skin colour) + language = nation/volk'. In addition, the Calvinist doctrine of election was also produced as supportive of 'the spiritual, biological, and cultural superiority of the "elect" Afrikaner culture' (Jemison 2004: 80). Balthazar Johannes Vorster (1966-1978) assertively declared that, '[W]e as Whites in South Africa have a special duty towards the whole of Africa … We are the only White people that are of Africa. I make bold to say: no-one understands that soul of Africa better than we do' (cited in Barber & Barratt 1990:143). I contend that the primordialistic cultural and racial belonging that formed the colonial era and apartheid governmentality in particular is still an enduring dilemma in the country in general and at SU in particular (see Alexander 2001:471, 2004, ff; Berger 2003; Huschka & Mau 2006; Freund & Padayachee 1998). According to Johann Rossouw, SU as the main territory of apartheid cannot dispel its apartheid commitment as an outdated and outmoded doctrine. He lucidly describes SU, which is plainly relevant, as a space where autocracy and patriarchy are central

elements of organization and order, which hold the post-apartheid discourse of human rights and freedom and multiculturalism at bay (2006).

In its current context, SU is expected to provide students with their educational interest independent of social and cultural backgrounds. The composition of student corps of the year 2008, that continue to be measured according to race (skin color), were 68 per cent 'white', 16 per cent 'coloured', 13 per cent 'black', and roughly two per cent 'Indian' students (SU Annual Report 2008). In the SU Annual Report of 2010, which emphasize SU as the 'creator of hope', the composition is still measured according to colour, the student corps being 67 per cent white, 14 per cent black, 16 per cent coloured, and two per cent Indian. In the 2008 report it is also clearly indicated that SU should be 'significantly different and significantly better', and be a 'home for all' of the enrolled students. It is worth noting that none of the reports include faculty members, which according to my observation is a way to avoid criticism, since among the Humanities and Art and Social Sciences the department of Sociology and Social Anthropology appeared as the only department that had employed a Christian-oriented 'black' lecturer, who has now become a devoted priest. It has also offered the well-known scholar Achille Mbembe a position; this has been rather translated as a matter of appearance and SU reputation and academic status in the continent. Overall, the ten faculties of the SU continue to be completely dominated by the so-called whites and with some positions reserved for the so-called coloureds. However, the established ethos of SU, qua racialization and deliberate structural classification and control, is desperately taken as the best means of governing and shaping the enrolled students and not least the faculty members. In other words, the ethos has become the main rationale, which does not seem to signify an immediate rupture from the unsettled teleological template of the alleged past, to which minority students must adhere if they desire a 'better' future.

Method

Participants

Nine months of the academic year of 2008 at SU were designed for observing, communicating, (re-)interviewing, and participating with the minority students as they attempted to establish an 'African Students' Association' to facilitate and protect their rights and further their educational interest. Attending and sitting with the students in class, observing their numerical and spatial distribution inside lecture halls, listening to their demands and communication with the teachers, playing football and having lunch with them, attending organized events such as their respective congregations in townships constituted my first-hand data. Participants included eight (four females and four males) undergraduate, postgraduate and PhD students from different faculties (natural

science, social sciences and law) and linguistic communities. The focus on the participants' shared experiences in the light of Frantz Fanon's analysis of the colonial discourse and practice and other post-colonial theorists allow for an appealing assessment that would otherwise remain veiled. The participants' selected pseudonyms will be applied to protect their personal identity.

Theoretical Framework

The persistence of the already racialized skin colour and stereotypes and the educational configuration at SU reflects the continuation of the colonial discourse formidably analyzed by post-colonial scholars, in particular Frantz Fanon. The urgency of Fanon's analysis of the corporeal differences is a valid way to make sense of the inevitability of the racialized condition at SU. Nonetheless, the age of neo-liberal globalization and the prevailing technology control, and mobility (Appadurai 1996; Bauman 1998) does not appear to indicate any fundamental change as racialization, racial exclusion, and discrimination remain pertinent. The power relations have but been reshaped and/or appropriated by relentless currents of the 'post-modern' age. Edward Said notes that the post-modern technology has only reinforced the colonial racialized stereotypes and the already-existing frontiers (cited in Bhabha 2004:66). It is such a continuity of manufactured knowledge and/or social action and behaviour, where one group deliberately intends by means of their actions to impose their own doxa on another group that constitutes the focal point of this paper.

Fanon's observations overtly bring forth the racialized skin colour and associated stereotypes: 'Dirty Nigger!', or simply 'Look! A Negro!' (2008:89). His multifaceted historical-geographical perspective on everyday racism unravels a controlled and self-regulating system of 'Manichaean division' (Fanon 2006:24). Such a regulatory system constantly reminded the 'black' man of being naturally different and thus s/he was clearly informed about their designated position, as Fanon (2008:17) put it, 'You, stay where you are'. Fanon indefatigably stresses that the burden of the Africans has been that of the fixed skin colour. Black skin colour signifies visibility of a marker of difference and subordination: 'I am a slave not to the "idea" others have of me, but to my appearance… I am fixed' (Ibid 95). During the fifteenth to the twentieth century, physical composition – skin colour, eye, nose, lip and body shape, hair texture – culture and religion were constructed and produced as natural markers of racial difference that overlapped in structural taxonomies (see Eze 1997). The French *Encyclopédie* and the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* have dogmatically stressed black skin colour as the sign of an '[u]nhappy race: idleness, treachery… cruelty… stealing… profanity… debauchery… They [Africans] are strangers to every sentiment of compassion, and are an awful example of the corruption of man when left to himself' (Eze 1997:94).

The fabrication of the incommensurability of races, cultures and spatiality based upon the social and natural sciences and literary configurations (Fanon 1965:121 ff; Said 1993) constituted the prevailing 'racialized regime of representation' (Hall 1999:257) and/or a naturalized regime of truth about 'Other/self'. The established corporeal schema mechanically takes the rigid function of colonial stereotypes as a field of identification that delegates the African to a different world and species: 'the black man… has no culture, no civilization and no "long historical past"' (Fanon 2008:17). Therefore skin colour is seen as an [ID]entification marker par excellence, that essentializes and reveals the overall characteristic intrinsic to the Africans. Moreover, it renders a distant geography associated with not only different but an inferior 'race'.

Said (2003:54) maintains that 'imaginative geographies' were constructions that turned distance into difference through a series of spatializations. They served to reduce/homogenize and demarcate 'the Other/the same': i.e., calibrating a gap between the two by 'designating in one's mind a familiar space of "theirs" and a strange space of "ours"' (Ibid.). Said's analyses unpack the stereotypes, objectification, and colonial assumptions that are inherent in the representations of an imagined Other/self. His central idea is that knowledge about the Other/self is generated through imagined constructs that stereotypically set up the Other against the self.

Consequently, the 'Black Subject' was mummified and manufactured as the antithesis of the civilized, since 'the white world is the only decent one' (Fanon 2008:94). Such appropriated differentiations justified the hostility and pillaging and at once fostered a sense of distinctive self/Other ID(entity). Language has been essential in such a colonial formation: 'All colonized people ... position themselves in relation to the civilizing language: i.e. the metropolitan culture'. Language has also been essential in the assemblage of narratives that repeatedly reproduced the Manichaean compartments of the colonial interstice. What is emphasized in such systematic and violent process of enunciations is the skin colour that independent of the language ability and the command of cultural codes of conduct was articulated to function as an 'essentializing tag'. For example, the great philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1997[1775]:37) did not doubt such conjured/fixed definition of Other/self: 'This fellow was quite *black*… a clear proof that what he said was stupid' (emphasis added).

Bhabha notes, that '[a]n important feature of the colonial discourse is its contingence on the concept of "fixity" in the ideological construction of otherness' (2004:95). Such disentanglement permits one to discern the distinguishing features with regard to violence that marked the idea of the 'West' and the 'Rest' (Hall et al. 2004:184 ff). Hall reiterates the notion of the West as (id)entity and the most advanced type of society linked with the embalming of the 'Rest' (Ibid.). Nevertheless, he charts that racial and negative stereotyping

as a historical and social/political construct has characterized Western representations of Africans for centuries (Hall et al. 2004; see also Doh 2009:47 ff.). The stereotype produces discriminatory and phantasmatic knowledge, and is the sign of and dependent on the presence of difference, which is also its main objective. This indicates that stereotype, while a historical myth, as an identification marker frames and represents an interface between the Other/self. In following Fanon, Bhabha argues that skin colour constituted a 'signifier of discrimination' and as such it was constantly accentuated and appropriated in a manner that served 'in the exercise of the colonial power' (2004:113). In addition, Hall (1999:257-8) presents three crucial aspects of stereotyping: (a) stereotyping creates space for the essentialization/homogenization/naturalization of difference; (b) it constructs and detaches the normal ('us') from the pathological ('them'). In doing so, it excludes and marginalizes 'them' to facilitate the symbolically fixed frontiers of 'imagined communities'; (c) stereotyping emerges in a space of 'gross inequalities of power'. Consequently, the materialization of an unyielding binary paradigm (dominating/dominated) is inevitable. The dominating holds the power of representation and articulation of the dominant doxa. In this vein, the binary dichotomy illustrates at the same time power relations and a violent hierarchy: 'we are not dealing with … peaceful coexistence … but rather with a violent hierarchy. One of the two terms governs' (Derrida cited in Hall 1999:258). Hence such violence based relationship give the governed a settled definition and an extremely controlled field of movement.

Minority Students' Conditionality and Encounters at SU

The State of Normalcy

The systematic institutionalization of apartheid, as the immediate succession of colonial governmentality, in South Africa and its systematic racial stratification culminated in the absorption of racial classification as an axiomatic representation of the Other, Africans/self, Afrikaners (see Mkhondo 1993; Soudien 2001:101, 105). Derrida (1985:291) in his critique of the apartheid regime maintains that it appropriated natural human features such as 'colour, blood, birth' as evidence of racial segregation. The racialized differentiation qua regime of representation/ truth permeated fundamental social institutions and hence South Africans conceived of and approached each other accordingly, which only reinforced the axiom.

Minority students' definition of their situation reveals a dominant institutional ethos that perpetuates racialization as a state of normalcy and an instrument of self-affirmation. Their everyday practices are entangled in the narratives and tropes that instrumentalize social and cultural difference, which they have unwillingly come to accept, reiterate, and chronically retire to.

Akhona:

> Whether Stellenbosch University promotes my blackness or academic interest, I do not know. I do not think so. Of course the institution has its own agenda, but when it concerns me then I must say that I am treated on the basis of my appearance. But I am also responsible for my own life, maybe they do not want me to be educated. My God, if you just could be inside my black skin for only one single day at this place, then you will be able to understand. Do you get what I mean?

Skin colour is emphasized but as an established indicator of difference and fixity. The observations/experiences confirm skin colour as a stigma that dehumanizes, excludes as racially Other, magnifies difference, and admonishes equal entitlements. Participants are forced to have an inordinate respect for all that is established, which regulates the students. This can be conceived of as means of prolonging the history of apartness and securing the hegemonic position and self-definition. As Memmi put it, 'racial affirmation is an instrument of self-affirmation' (2000:97, emphasis retained). One central theme in their narratives is the absence of equality that facilitates to retain the unequal order of positioning that only accentuates 'Afrikanerness' as the prevailing standard, which brings forth mechanisms of confinement. This is when the homogenized groups constitute a structural dyad: the Afrikaner is good-natured, necessary, and universal because minority students are culturally poor and thus have to stay at the designated position and not violate the limits. Their presence is engulfed in a web of asymmetrical relationships that only prolong the colour/dividing-line.

The participants maintain that the lecturers retrieve apartheid thinking in their interaction, reject counter-argument, and are more comfortable with a dominant position. There is a conventional stigma by which they are viewed, and bigotry is experienced to prevail in the lecturers and majority students' gaze. Hence, they draw a line between their own different experiences of subjugation and the way it is experienced by the SU authority, which translates the situation as a state of normalcy and so disregards the inevitable violence that keeps minority students at distance. Such awareness has fostered diverse resistant behaviours as reactions to the perceived normativity, i.e., the regulatory system. It also discloses the sense of simultaneity of the incompatible experiences (socialization from home and the unavoidable racial socialization at SU) of 'we' and 'they-belonging', a condition that inescapably entails reproduction/reinforcement of the Manichaean repertoire, as it is articulated within the institutional boundaries.

Tshepo:

> Black students are forced to fit into the Afrikaner and Afrikaans set up. This is disastrous because many of the black students do not make it to their graduation and they only become statistics. This is what they want

> here because the university does not see it as an immediate problem. If
> you fail your studies then you have to blame the colour of your skin,
> and if you go against the rules then you are public enemy number one.

The fixity of the racialized frontiers at SU renders minority students' cultural
and social life as diametrically opposed and intrinsically incongruent with the
established ethos. Hence, minority students do not see the regulatory structure
of the university to facilitate procedures and a policy that could possibly
accommodate their educational necessities. The university's strong rules and
education structure that immediately reprimand is constantly reiterated. This
condition destabilizes the will/courage of the many of the minority students to
continue their studies, which, to utilize Fanon's remark, 'becomes more and
more indecisive, more and more phantom-like' (2006:24). The side-effects of
the ethos of SU are many dropouts, deterioration of the students' self-esteem,
and suicide attempts. According to Koen et al., (2006:404), 'on average about
25 per cent of students leave higher education institutions annually in South
Africa because they are excluded on academic and financial grounds'. Such
experiences locate the majority of the minority students in a position where
they remain ambivalent about holding on to the Afrikanerized limits that radi-
cally confront their own and their families' expectations. Lindisizwe asserted
that 'we carry our bags when we come here; of course we have a purpose to
be here. But it is not easy to reach the day when we can finally show our
families the first cheque we receive from our jobs'.

In an informal conversation, Tshepo decidedly uttered that minority students'
living conditions are a very sad reflection of the persistence of the apartheid
mentality, and that his activism and criticism of the Afrikaners' cultural and
social hegemony has not produced the desired effect. There is, however, an
absence of commitment to transformation, since SU formally conceals the
systematic fortification inequalities under the banner of multiculturalism, which
rather maintains racial and cultural difference. Accordingly, SU has failed to
take diversity into account, i.e., equality and equal access to education have
neither been incorporated in the institutional culture nor promoted.

I met with Mandla for the interview in his small room, where he slept,
studied, had his meals, and occasionally met with friends. Having unravelled
the racialization and discriminatory setting of the 'past' and its poignant
continuation, he emphasized SU as a much contested territory. He continued
to reveal the dominant state of normalcy (ethos) at SU, which he thinks is
conditioned to perpetuate the racialized regime of representation and Afrikaner
ascendancy that concurrently classifies and dreadfully confines minority
students' human capabilities. For Mandla, the idea of multiculturalism at SU is
but a pretext: 'The focus is believed to be on the so-called multicultural education
and affirmative action, which excludes the question of race and ignores the

racial demands of SU that tells you to adapt to its white rules or leave'. Multiculturalism or cultural transformation of SU, then, is a 'post'-apartheid attribute that conceals its present identity and explains capacities that it deliberately contains. Mandla's astute remark clearly demonstrates the incessant policy of either/or: minority students are left with two options: either adapt to the existing space of subjugation or seek another place. The social and educational environment of SU is embroiled in distinctions that disrupt and render minority students' life-world entirely invisible. An important instrument that regulates such invisibility and command is the 'authorized' Afrikaans language, which is used to structure the conditionality of the students' sense of individuality and group identity/belonging. The language dilemma becomes an exclusionary force that embodies the techniques and/or processes by which SU secures its authority in the eyes of the students it governs.

The Ubiquity of Afrikaans

In 2002, the South African government in order to root out the tradition of apartheid governmentality obliged the 'Historically White Universities' (HWU) to accommodate the new 'rainbow nation' and its educational policies. Hence, it required that HWU submit language strategies that ensured transformation and equal access to education (Ministry of Education 2002:13). The government's transformation plans remain to be implemented, as the question of language rights and promotion remains a national dilemma (Van der Waal 2002).

At SU, the transformational plan has proved inefficacious and resulted in the appropriation of multiculturalism to make possible the hegemonic language planning which only extends the monolingual and homogenous tradition of SU (Bognitz 2010; Mabokela 2001). Although the university formally maintains itself to be a bilingual (Afrikaans and English) institution, the practicability of active bilingualism is still considered problematic: 'The University of Stellenbosch is committed to the use and sustained development of Afrikaans as an academic language in a multilingual context' (Stellenbosch University Language Policy 2002:1). Since the university is viewed as an Afrikaner territory with roughly 55 per cent of Afrikaans-speaking students that include students of 'colour' (SU Annual Report 2008), Afrikaans is compellingly protected and not seen as a barrier that would impede minority students' academic progress and institutional participation. In the Stellenbosch University Vision Statement for 2012, the significance of its '*special duty*' to '*exercise a large influence*' is clearly stressed: 'It [SU] is an *active* role-player in the development of South African society; it has a campus culture that welcomes *a diversity of people and ideas*; and it promotes *Afrikaans* as a language of teaching and science in a multilingual context' (2012:9, emphasis added). In this context, Afrikaans is tremendously accentuated and becomes the force of enlightenment and change.

As such, it refers to the cultural logics of apartheid accumulation that targets displacement, which induces subjects to respond fluidly.

Brink's lucid account unpacks the *taaldebat* (language debate) at SU as a 'political campaign' (2006:chap. 3): the debate is the undertaking that connects Afrikaans to the Afrikaner's cultural, social, and political history. In this vein, the historian Herman Giliomee does not attempt a synthesis but tautology and hence refers to the post-apartheid South Africa as 'the single greatest danger to Afrikaans' (cited in Brink 2006:62). Giliomee's conformist mission unearths Afrikaans as essential to the Afrikaner historical and cultural (ID)entity. Therefore, it is to be kept on an equal level with English, which he stresses as an immediate threat: '*If Stellenbosch University* is to *verengels* [Angliscise] any further, then it is *Ichabod for Afrikaans*' (Ibid. 71, emphasis retained). He authoritatively contends that the institutional language policy of Afrikaans universities has to instrumentalize Afrikaans as the primary language: 'This institutional language policy should be clearly laid down and be non-negotiable. Academics should be informed that any deviation will be regarded as a serious misdemeanour' (Ibid: 68). As a result, Afrikaans is not a mere language but wistfulness for roots or a reservoir of culture, which sets and controls the symbolically fixed frontiers and to which all other South African languages are to submit. In fact, SU has endorsed such patterns of calculation as constructive principles in the rigorous development of Afrikaans.

Education is merely made possible through Afrikaans provided that English is appropriated for raising questions, if at all, and perplexing synopses: 'Afrikaans is by default the language of learning and teaching at undergraduate level, while English is used to a greater extent at the postgraduate level' (Stellenbosch University Language Policy 2002:3). It is the maintenance of unilingualism that is at stake, although the promotion of bilingualism is ambiguously manifested in the Language Policy. In fact, the bilingual regulation (Afrikaans and English) dates back to the implementation of language-in-education policy of apartheid government, which required African students to learn through Afrikaans (Heugh 2003, study II). Thus, the policy functioned as a political strategy to preserve the social and political structures, which implied, except from eliminating other languages, to inculcate a subaltern space for the Africans. The political move came to form the basis of an enormously significant event, namely the revolt against 'Bantu Education' by thousands of Soweto school children on 16 June 1976, who refused to be taught in Afrikaans (Alexander 1989:25; Thörn 2010, part. II). Yet, SU continues to view education as a technology of cultural homogeneity and hegemony; subsequently, it recreates and systematically contributes to the persistence of the polarization.

Phumlani:

> As an unergraduate student, one has to learn Afrikaans first. Of course the language of instruction was Afrikaans and it was my problem number one … I really struggled. I failed a couple of subjects, not that I was not able to learn, but I had to learn the language first before I could land in the academic thinking … I know that this place was never accessible to us.

While SU formally advocates legislation for the sake of transformation and educational support of formerly disadvantaged people, in the classrooms it aims at restricting their language rights, i.e., access to education. The *taalbeleid* (language policy) formally stresses the 50 per cent regulation, but all of the undergraduate participants hold that some teachers are not fluent in English and hence lecture in Afrikaans and others with a bilingual capacity remain faithful to Afrikaans. It happened, as I observed, that the T-option (bilingual) resulted in segregated classes: whenever necessary, the Department of History arranged a separate class for the Afrikaans-speaking students and one for the non-Afrikaans, otherwise Afrikaans had the command.

Language continues as a site of resistance and predictable discrimination: through language control and coercion access, to education is made highly difficult and as a consequence, some of these students fail/quit their studies and leave SU. Derrida writes that, 'even if we could do without any institutions … schools … disciplines and curricula language would still be important' (cited in Egéa-Kuehne 2001:201). The protection of Afrikaans as both language and culture reveals inequity of prestige and positionality. The adaptation and instrumentalization of Afrikaans empowers the dominating group in their confidence to speak in/for their language, and entangles minority students, who are to embrace its immediate authority. The condition re-positions minority students in the historical discourse of cultural relativism: that is, unlike your language, our language (Afrikaans) is the language of teaching and science. What is completely ignored here is the post-apartheid context. Mabokela maintains that, 'using Afrikaans as a medium of instruction is like pouring salt into an open wound' (2001:70). The strict imposition of Afrikaans disconnects minority students from learning and participation and, to paraphrase Derrida (1998:1), during their studies at SU, they become individuals cultivated by Afrikaans and hence are subjected to the indisputable Afrikaner culture. This impenetrable rift entails a continuity of strict colour-coded partition, where the minority students' social and cultural world is de-authorized, devalued, and unequivocally Otherized.

In a recent study of student activism in contemporary South Africa, Koen et al., (2006:411) identify racism and language policy as a problematic condition that has historically constituted student protests in the country. They affirm

that 'black' students' struggle for equal access to and involvement in institutional culture and governance at HWUs is still an enduring and unrecognized conundrum (see also, Spreen and Vally 2006; Sikwebu 2008). Moreover, the shared experiences of the participants reveal the intractability of monoculturalism and monolingualism as they unfold the articulated obligation that delineates and clarifies their responsibility instead of rights.

Segregated Spaces and Economic Distress

The sociological analysis of socialization and of how people within a certain social boundary (society) develop a sense of belonging, memory, and shared capital is highly important in this context. Social relations within and between various groups of people tend to devolve and not least enhance social and cultural capital and influence the way they see the Other/self. For example, residential segregation at SU restrains the development of interpersonal relations, public and private facilities, and it is a major barrier to equality, interaction, and well-being of the segregated. But SU also conveys a mode of reference, thinking, acting, and feeling that operates at once in the present and the past that claims the present. Bourdieu (1990:56) stresses that '[I]n each of us, in varying proportions, there is a part of yesterday's man who inevitably predominates in us, since the present amounts to little compared with the long past in the course of which we were formed and from which we result'.

Residential racial segregation or the geographical colour-line, another liability dimension, continues to inscribe racial stratification and isolation rather than free interaction between students. As Mandela cogently put it, 'to be an African in South Africa means that one is politicized from the moment of one's birth. An African child is born in an Africans Only hospital, taken home in an Africans Only bus, lives in an Africans Only area and attends Africans Only schools, if he attends school at all' (2000:109). The continuity of geographical and social segregation is still an astonishing reality in the allegedly post-apartheid South Africa (see Comaroff & Comaroff 2005; Haferburg & Ossenbrügge 2003). The historically drawn frontiers are the most obvious reality in Stellenbosch, where the dividing colour-line entirely separates the Afrikaners' high security complexes from Africans and other South African groups forced to dwell in the townships with very marginal social and economic circumstances. The prototypical, segregated urban space as it was rendered during apartheid follows clearly distinguished areas designed for spatial division of population groups. Stellenbosch is exemplary here, with its Cape-Dutch white-washed architecture delineating not only the geographical centre, but the ordered urban space for the privileged Afrikaner minority, whereas the margins of the town are marked by informal settlements where Africans and another South African group, so-called 'coloured', reside. The division of the urban environment is significantly

compatible with the spatial separation of students in the university residences, strictly following traditional and patriarchal values with regard to background of members and composition of inmates. It is not only residential racial segregation that is reproduced on different levels of spaces in the urban setting, but suspicion is raised against anyone who intends to cross the colour-line.

Lindisizwe:

> You have cases where black students are arrested at night without any reason … Then, arrest a white student too, because they are around all the time. I have never heard of a white student to be arrested even when they physically abuse black students ... They think, if you are black and walk at the middle of the night at the white areas then you are looking for something to steal. This is racism; this is discrimination, I do not care what they say.

The colour-line distinctly clarifies the frontiers that separate Afrikaners' space from the 'Rest'. Since the geographical and social division is already in place, it does not require minority students' recognition; as Said (2003) put it, '"they" become "they" accordingly' (p. 54). That is, minority students, like other student groups, are forced to internalize the dominant racialized doxa, which declares the importance of a contained life within the frontiers of one's own 'race'. As a result, they eat together, walk together, talk and debate with each other, sit in classrooms close to each other, and arrange student parties together. They are also pushed out of their social and educational rights, and are locked within segregated enclaves.

Phelisa:

> I know that if you as a black person apply for student residence then Goldfields [student residence] will be the first suggestion. This has been so for a very long time. There is still a quota system here … but the black ones do not remain in the white residences.

Resistant behaviour against social and racial residential segregation that results in appalling and exclusionary conditions takes an overtly political character. In fact, minority students' criticism of language policy and cultural constellation is not inadvertent. SU as a familiar and at once an unfamiliar space guides students to internalize the doxa of the sameness: for example, racialization has been reshaped/appropriated as an 'Ontological Security' (Giddens 1991:35 ff), to condition students' social and psychological make-up. It constitutes the only legitimized philosophy of Other/self. The participants identify the geographic frontiers as endowed with the social, cultural, and economic ones that circumscribe their sense of identity, security, location and mobility.

At the beginning of the academic year of 2008, I observed an overwhelming minority students' criticism of the existing 'Manichaean' compartments. The main focus was to establish an 'African Student Association', which never came into existence, since the Student Representative Council (SRC) and SU did not promote what they saw to represent a deliberate act of violence against the authoritative ethos. Their demands were equal treatment; academic support in order to achieve academic excellence; equal participation and involvement in the SRC; and reasonable financial support as they can easily take part in the social and cultural activities. Nonetheless, they are segregated not only in respective student or private residences, but in the access to equal material resources, mobility, food, transportation, language, culture, and the entitlement that is the domain of the majority (Afrikaner) group.

Phelisa:

> White students … come mostly from rich families and can afford everything. They can go to expensive restaurants; they have nice cars; they go to pubs and discotheques; they have big parties; they travel to other parts of Western Cape; and they have a wine tasting tour, which are foreign to most of the black students.

The established frontiers with real economic consequences define the life-world of the students and by distinguishing their capacities and group affiliation it forms a doctrine that inscribe in each group a unique identity. The doctrine, which becomes habitus is, then, intended to instinctively guide the students to embrace and practice the university's set of core evaluations and racialized social norms of conduct. In so doing, it effortlessly normalizes the doctrine, which regulates the division, positions, and separates the extremely affluent; whose reality instantly excludes minority students.

Lindisizwe:

> I cannot go and buy text books when I do not have enough food to eat. I need to survive … I face not one or two problems but many. I also want to enjoy my studies and courses and have fun and drink beers and have *braai* [barbeque] with my friends every Friday and Saturday.

The governing body of SU instead of transforming the systematic conditioning that encapsulates minority students' entitlements, reiterates the discourse of individual inability and family background of the students to learn and to keep pace with their respective studies. The relationship as one of co-ependence (dominance-subjection) refers to a reconstitution of the minority student. It informs them, as Fanon (2004:16) revealed, to rather 'get ready to do the *right* thing' (emphasis added). Nevertheless, differences in cultural orientation are measured as an explanatory factor that have an inevitable impact on minority students' gravity toward education in general and their educational motivation

and outcome in particular. The (apartheid) assumptions render the dominant culture advanced and as the only way to achieve academic success, i.e., it is the way to do the 'right thing'. The social world at SU is compartmentalized and the fact of belonging to a 'race' determines one's position/location. As Phumlani restores the voice of the oppressed, 'There is a fundamental need for a financial and educational system that can really accommodate black students, especially those that have been impoverished and deprived of academic life for years'.

Conclusion

The negotiated experiences show the various forms that SU can take to marginalize and exclude minority students from involvement in the institutional culture and its governing bodies. The existing regulation as a structured endeavour that contrives the latent-manifest continuum is essential to take account of, since the various forms of racial exclusion disrupt minority students' academic, individual and social life. The trajectory of the authority of SU and the significance of the racial discourse inevitably relies on the importance of alterity and domination. Therefore, it continues to be self-regulative since the domination and racial differences between the constructed antagonistic groups continuously collapses into racialized categories that further the exploitation of minority students. This is acknowledged by minority students, who reproduce and at once strenuously challenge the normalized compartmentalization, since they engage directly and mostly within the boundaries drawn by the respected colour-line and hence live it economically, socially and above all educationally. Therefore, the implacability is what the excluded students face when they venture the thought or move to disturb the fixed ethos.

Nonetheless, the desire to reproduce and stabilize the apartheid legacy of producing fixed identities is camouflaged with the rhetoric of multiculturalism and the new 'democratic' dispensation, which also continuously curtail minority students' academic interest and critical thinking/empowerment. This is sociologically significant and appealing. That is, the apartheid racial socialization and systematic segregation cannot be transformed by merely using the language of the abstract 'rainbow nation' to argue that the new (de)racialized discourse will easily replace the apartheid edifice. While the colour-line at SU regulates the social interactions and relationships and reproduces the biological racism of the colonial/apartheid era, it enforces a dominant racialized cognition that is imposed on both, the majority and minority students. For the latter group, SU as an essentially challenging and discontinuous location/situation is cumbersome and extraneous. For example, they are faced with a disintegrating world of either/or: as Lindisizwe puts it, 'believe in us [lecturers at SU] and you will do well', otherwise you will remain unaware of how to do the right thing.

References

Abdi, A. A., 1999, 'Frantz Fanon and Postcolonial Realities: A Temporal Perspective', *Wasafiri* 15 (30): 52-54.

Alexander, N., 1989, 'Language Policy, Symbolic Power and the Democratic Responsibility of the Post-Apartheid University', D.C.S. Oosthuizen Memorial Lecture, Rhodes University.

Alexander, N., 2001, 'Prospects for a Nonracial Future in South Africa', in *Beyond Racism: Race and Inequality in Brazil, South Africa, and the United States*, edited by C.V. Hamilton, L. Huntley, N. Alexander, A.S.A. Guimaraes &W. James, Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 471-489.

Alexander, N., 2004, 'The politics of Language Planning in Post-apartheid South Africa', *Language Problems & Language Planning* 28 (2): 113-130.

Appadurai, A.,1996, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Barber, J. & J. Barratt, 1990, *South Africa's Foreign Policy: The Search for Status and Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauman, Z., 1998, *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Berger, E., 2003, 'The Right to Education under the South African Constitution', *Columbia Law Review*, 103 (3): 614-661.

Bhabha, H. K., 2004, *The Location of Culture*, London and New York: Routledge.

Biko, S., 1978, 'Black Consciousness and the Quest for a True Humanity', *Journal of the African Activist Association*, 8 (3): 10-23.

Bognitz, S., 2010, 'Contesting Tongues: The Politics of Language Rights and Claims at an Afrikaans-medium University in South Africa', Master's Thesis, Halle-Wittenberg: Martin-Luther-Universität, Germany.

Bourdieu, P., 1990, *The Logic of Practice*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brink, C., 2007, 'Preface to Stellenbosch University Self-evaluation Report for the HEQC', in Chris Brink, *Anatomy of a Transformer*, edited by A. Botha, Stellenbosch: Sun Press, 135-143.

Brink, C., 2006, *No Lesser Place: The Taaldebat at Stellenbosch*, Stellenbosch: Sun Press.

Clark, N. L. & W. H. Worger, 2004, *South Africa: The Rise and Fall of Apartheid*, Harlow: Pearson Education.

Comaroff, J. L. & Comaroff, J., 2005, 'Reflections on Liberalism, Policulturalism & ID-ology. Citizenship and Difference in South Africa', in *Limits to Liberation after Apartheid: Citizenship, Governance and Culture* edited by S. Robins, Oxford: James Currey, 33-56.

Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, No. 108 of 1996, Available at: http://www.info.gov.za/documents/constitution/1996/a108-96.pdf. Accessed: 10-09-2010.

Derrida, J., 1985, 'Racism's Last Word', *Critical Inquiry*, 12 (1): 290-299.

Derrida, J., 1998, *Monolingualism of the Other; or, the Prosthesis of Origin*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Doh, E. F., 2009, *Stereotyping Africa: Surprising Answers to Surprising Questions*, Bamenda: Langaa RPCIG.

Dubow, S., 1995, 'Mental Testing and the Understanding of the "Native Mind"', in *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa*, S. Dubow, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 197-245.

Egéa-Kuehne, D., 2001, 'Derrida's Ethics of Affirmation: The Challenge of Educational Rights and Responsibility', in *Derrida & Education*, edited by G. J. J. Biesta and D. Egéa-Kuehne, London and New York: Routledge, 186-208.

Eze, E. C., 1997, *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*, Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Fanon, F., 2008 [1952], *Black Skin, White Masks*, New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F., 2004 [1963], *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, F., 2006, 'Racism and Culture', in *The Fanon Reader*, edited by A. Haddour, London: Pluto Press, 19-32.

Freund, B. & V. Padayachee, 1998, 'Post-Apartheid South Africa: The key patterns emerge', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 33 (20): 1173-1180.

Giddens, A., 1991, *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Haferburg, C. & J. Ossenbrügge, eds., 2003, *Ambiguous Restructurings of Post-apartheid Cape Town: The Spatial Form of Socio-political Change*, Münster: Lit Verlag.

Hall, S., D. Held, D. Hubert, K. Thompson, eds., 2004, *Modernity: An Introduction to Modern Societies*, Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

Hall, S., 1996, 'The after-life of Frantz Fanon: Why Fanon? Why now? Why black skin, white mask?', in *The Fact of Blackness: Frantz Fanon and Visual representation*, edited by A. Read, London: Bay Press, 12-37.

Hall, S., ed., 1999, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, London: Sage Publication.

Heugh, K., 2003, *Language Policy and Democracy in South Africa: The Prospects of Equality within Right-based Policy and Planning*, Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Huschka, D. & S. Mau, 2006, 'Social Anomie and Racial Segregation in South Africa', *Social Indicators Research*, 76 (3): 467-498.

James, G. W., 1990, 'Apartheid, the University, and Change in South Africa', *American Association of University Professors*, 74 (3): 20-23.

Jemison, E. L., 2004, 'The Nazi Influence in the Formation of Apartheid in South Africa', *The Concord Review* 15 (1):75-103.

Kant, I., 1997 [1775], 'This Fellow was Quite Black…A Clear Proof that what he said was stupid', in *Race and the Enlightenment: A Reader*, edited by E. C. Eze, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 38-64.

Koen, C., M. Cele & A. Libhaber, 2006, 'Student Activism and Student Exclusions in South Africa', *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26 (4): 404-414.

Kohn, M., 1995, *The Race Gallery: the Return of Racial Science*, London: Jonathan Cape.

Lalu, P., 2007, 'Apartheid's University: Notes on the Renewal of the Enlightenment', *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 5 (1): 45-60.

Mabokela, R. O., 2001, 'Selective Inclusion: Transformation and Language Policy at the University of Stellenbosch', in *Apartheid No More. Case Studies of Southern African Universities in the Process of Transformation*, edited by R. O. Mabokela, and K. L. King, London: Bergin & Garvey, 59-72.

Mandela, N., 2000, *Long Walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela*, London: Abacus.

Memmi, A., 2000, *Racism*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minneapolis Press.

Ministry of Education, 2002, *Language Policy for Higher Education*, Available at: http://www.education.gov.za/content/documents/67.pdf. Access date: 10-11-2010

Mkhondo, R., 1993, *Reporting South Africa*, London: James Curry.

Mmusi, S. O., 1987, 'Language Planning and Policy and its Associated Problems in Black Education in South Africa', Master's thesis, Carbondale: Southern Illinios University, Department of Linguistics.

Molteno, F., 1984, 'The Historical Foundations of the Schooling of Black South Africans', in *Apartheid and Education*, edited by P. Kallaway. Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 45-107.

Murphy, J. T., 1992, 'Apartheid's Legacy for Black Children', *Phi Delta Kappa*, 73 (5): 67-74.

O'Meara, D., 1983, *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism 1934-1948*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rich, P., 1990. 'Race, Science, and the Legitimization of White Supremacy in South Africa, 1902-1940', *The International Journal of African Historical Studies*, 23 (4): 665-686.

Rossouw, J., 2006, 'The Disgrace of a Guilty Afrikaner: On Chris Brink's *No lesser place*: The Taaldebat at Stellenbosch, LitNet. Website: http://www.oulitnet.co.za/taaldebat/rossouw_brink.asp Access date: 24-02-2010.

Said, E. W., 2003, *Orientalism*, London: Penguin Books.

Said., E. W., 1993, *Culture & Imperialism*, London: Chatto & Windus.

Sikwebu, D., 2008, 'A Search for Post-apartheid Collective Identities: Ethnic Student Organisations at a South African University', *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 6 (2&3): 107-133.

Soudien, C., 2001, 'Culture, Race, and Ethnicity in Education', in *Ethnicity, Race, and Nationality in Education: A Global Perspective*, edited by N. K. Shimahara, I. Z. Holowinsky and S. Tomlinson-Clarke, Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 99-128.

Spreen, C. A. & S. Vally, 2006, 'Education Rights, Education Policies and Inequality in South Africa', *International Journal of Educational Development*, 26 (4): 352-362.

Stellenbosch University *Annual Report 2010*, Available at: http://www.myvirtualpaper.com/doc/stellenbosch-University/annual_report_2010_english/2011062303/10.html#26, Access date: 28-09-2011.

Stellenbosch University *Annual Report 2008*, Available at: http://www.sun.ac.za/university/jaarverslag/verslag2008/pdfs/eng/report_vicerector_teaching.pdf, Access date: 02-11-2010.

Stellenbosch University *Language Policy 2002*, Available at: http://www.sun.ac.za/university/Taal/dokumente/LangPolFinal2002.pdf Access date: Access date: 08-10-2010.

Stellenbosch University *Vision Statement for 2012. A Strategic Framework for the Turn of the Century and Beyond*, Available at: http://www.sun.ac.za/university/StratPlan/stratdocs.htm, Access date: 02-11-2010.

Statistics South Africa, 2004, *Census 2001*, Pretoria: Statistics South Africa. Available at: http://www.statssa.gov.za/census01/html/RSAPrimary.pdf, Access date: 11-03-2010.

Vally, S., 2007, 'Higher Education in South Africa: Market Mill or Public Good?', *Journal of Higher Education in Africa*, 5 (1): 17-28.

Van der Waal, K., 2002, 'Diverse Approaches in a South African Debate on Language and Diversity in Higher Education', *Anthropology Southern Africa*, 25 (3&4): 86-95.

Webb, V. N. & M. Kriel, 2000, 'Afrikaans and Afrikaner Nationalism', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 144: 19-49.