

WITS
B/72


Knowledge and Method

Knowledge and Method

Knowledge and Method



Knowledge and Method



Edited by
Johann Mouton
Johan Muller

Knowledge and Method

Knowledge and Method

Knowledge and Method

HSRC SERIES IN METHODOLOGY

Series Editor: Johann Mouton

[Incorporating the HSRC Investigation into Research Methodology's Research Reports Series (REPORTS) and the HSRC Studies in Research Methodology (STUDIES)]

Published titles

- 1 Norval, A.J. 1984. 'n Teoretiese studie van die metodologie van kruiskulturele houdingsmeting [Reports No. 1]
- 2 Joubert, Dian. 1986. *Waardes: Navorsing, metodologie en teorie* [Reports No. 2]
- 3 Mouton, Johann (ed). 1986. *Social science, society and power* [Reports No. 3]
- 4 Maurer, K.F. & Retief, A.I. (eds) 1987. *Psychology in context: Cross-cultural research trends in South Africa* [Reports No. 4]
- 5 Van Straaten, Z. (ed) 1987. *Ideological beliefs in the social sciences* [Reports No. 5]
- 6 Retief, Alexis. 1988. *Method and theory in cross-cultural psychological assessment* [Reports No. 6]
- 7 Kruger, Dreyer. 1988. *The problem of interpretation in psychotherapy* [Reports No. 7]
- 8 Strauss, D.F.M. 1988. *Die grondbegrippe van die sosiologie as wetenskap* [Reports No. 6]
- 9 Mouton, J. et al. 1988. *Essays in social theorizing* [Reports No. 9]
- 10 Mouton, J. 1988. *The methodology and philosophy of the social sciences: A selective bibliography of anthologies* [Reports No. 10]
- 11 Mouton, J. & Marais, H.C. 1985. *Metodologie van die geesteswetenskappe: Basiese begrippe* [Studies No. 1]
- 12 Van Huyssteen, J.W.V. 1986. *Teologie as kritiese geloofsverantwoording* [Studies No. 2]
- 13 Snyman, J.J. & Du Plessis, P.G.W. (reds) 1987. *Wetenskapbeelde in die geesteswetenskappe* [Studies No. 3]
- 14 Mouton, J. & Marais, H.C. 1988. *Basic concepts in the methodology of the social sciences* [Studies No. 4]
- 15 Mouton, J.; Van Aarde, A.G. & Vorster, W.S. (eds) 1988. *Paradigms and progress in theology* [Studies No. 5]
- 16 Frost, M.; Vale, P. & Weiner, D. (eds) 1989. *International relations: A debate on methodology*
- 17 Nel, P. 1989. *Approaches to Soviet politics*
- 18 Mouton, J. & Joubert, D. (eds) 1990. *Knowledge and method in the human sciences*
- 19 Venter, F. 1990. *Regsaanvoorsing — aard, doel en metode*
- 20 Erasmus, P. 1991. *Antropologiese paradigmas en stedelike navorsing*
- 21 Louw, J. 1990. *Professionalizing psychology*
- 22 Van der Walt, J.L. 1992. *Fundamentele oopvoedkundige en die ontisiteit van opvoeding*
- 23 Burger, C.W. 1991. *Praktiese teologie in Suid-Afrika. 'n Ondersoek na die denke oor sekere voorname van die ouk*
- 24 Coertzen, P. 1991. *Gepas en ordelik*
- 25 Van Vuuren, P. 1991. *Argumente — Kriteria — Kritiek*
- 26 Van Vuuren, R. 1991. *Dialogue beyond polemics*
- 27 Lategan, B.C. (ed.) 1992. *The reader and beyond*
- 28 Joubert, Dian. 1992. *Reflections on social values*
- 29 Van Niekerk, A. 1992. *Rasionaliteit en relativisme. Op soek na 'n rasionaliteitsmodel vir die menswetenskappe*
- 30 Saunders, C. 1992. *Writing history. South Africa's urban past and other essays*
- 31 Snyman, J. (ed.) 1993. *Conceptions of social inquiry*
- 32 Rösen, J. 1993. *Studies in metahistory*
- 33 Mouton, J. & Lategan, B.C. 1994. *The relevance of theology for the 1990s*
- 34 Deist, F. 1994. *Ervaring, rede en metode in skryfuitleg*
- 35 Viljoen, H. (red.) 1995. *Metodologie en representasie*
- 36 Snyman, J. (red.) 1995. *Wetenskapbeelde in die geesteswetenskappe*
- 37 Stones, C.R. 1996. *Qualitative research approaches to psychotherapy process*
- 38 Nel, P. 1996. *Persuasion and science: a review and assessment of the rhetoric of inquiry*
- 39 Mouton, J. & Muller, J. 1998. *Knowledge, method and the public good.*

KNOWLEDGE, METHOD AND THE PUBLIC GOOD

Edited by
Johann Mouton
and
Johan Muller

Human Sciences Research Council
Pretoria
1997

CONTENTS

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

ISBN 0-7969-1823-6

Layout and design: Susan Smith
Cover design: Alta Benadie

Published by:
HSRC Publishers
134 Pretorius Street
0002 Pretoria
South Africa

Printed by:
HSRC Printers
230 Soutter Street
0002 Pretoria
South Africa

Introduction	Knowledge and method in a postmodern age <i>J. Mouton and J. Muller</i>	1
Chapter 1	Postmodernism and politics <i>J. Degenaar</i>	19
Chapter 2	Modernisation and ethico-political progress <i>R. de Kadt</i>	49
Chapter 3	Changing frontiers of academic discourse: Knowledge and power in the production of history in South Africa <i>M. Cross</i>	83
Chapter 4	Foucault, power-knowledge and the individual <i>J. Forrester</i>	113
Chapter 5	Who is Nelson Mandela? Thinking with Foucault on a South Africa without humans <i>J. Rossouw</i>	137
Chapter 6	A Foucauldian analysis of modes of surveillance in modern society <i>B. Olivier</i>	155
Chapter 7	Is modern science an ethnoscience? Toward postcolonial epistemology for science studies <i>S. Harding</i>	179

Chapter 8	Feminism and the changing boundaries of knowledge: Some theoretical issues <i>Z. Maharaj</i>	201	Chapter 17	The hermeneutical function of distanciation <i>K. Kelly</i>	405
Chapter 9	Feminist methodology and the reinvention of the wheel <i>J. Hoek</i>	227	Chapter 18	Applied psychology: Application of psychological knowledge or nominalist error? <i>C. Tredoux</i>	423
Chapter 10	Utopia and public policy <i>I. Sarakinsky</i>	243	Chapter 19	The methodological circle and the measurement of cognitive style <i>K. Durrheim</i>	437
Chapter 11	Political wisdom and rational method: Guidance from the classical philosophical tradition <i>P. Giddy</i>	267	Chapter 20	Research and the empowerment of teachers <i>M. Letseka</i>	451
Chapter 12	Humanizing the natural sciences: A methodological imperative for a society in transition <i>M. Botha</i>	295	Chapter 21	Learning in a language of exclusion <i>K. Ratele and P. Mokotedi</i>	469
Chapter 13	Technology, philosophy and the public good <i>J. Abrahams</i>	313	Chapter 22	Mainstreaming the alternative: Reflections on a lost opportunity in library and information science <i>A. Dick</i>	493
Chapter 14	Obscuring power: A critique of action research <i>V. Wedekind</i>	331			
Chapter 15	Otherness imposed, otherness redeemed: The politics of being Bushmen at Schmidtsdrift <i>J. Sharp</i>	355			
Chapter 16	Your facts or mine? Research as story-telling <i>D. Ruth</i>	381			

Changing frontiers of academic discourse: Knowledge and power in the production of history in South Africa

M. Cross

The purpose of this chapter is to draw attention to the conceptual vacuum "caused" by the end of the Cold War and the consequent epistemological crisis among South African historians in their endeavour to unravel more revealingly the past. In doing so, it will expose the academic discourses which dominate the production of history in South Africa. It is argued here that African history in South Africa has been approached with a series of preconceptions.

First, the preconception that only the body of ideas produced within the academy¹ through a sophisticated methodological and conceptual ritual is socially acceptable as historical knowledge. At best, this can lead to a hierarchisation of historical knowledge: "high knowledge" produced by the academy and "low knowledge" or popular knowledge based on the common sense of ordinary, non-professional people.² It is assumed, in this case, that there are degrees of knowledgeability or intelligibility of historical phenomena depending on the level of intuition and abstraction involved. At worst, it can lead to a dichotomy between historical knowledge generated by the academy and common sense, very often reduced to the conventional signifier "sources" of historical knowledge.

- Gilbert, A. 1990. *Democratic individualism*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Habermas, J. 1974. *Towards a rational society*. London: Heinemann.
- Habermas, J. 1988. *The theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon.
- Habermas, J. 1991. *Moral consciousness and communicative action*. London: Polity Press.
- Haferkamp, H. & Snelser, N. (eds). 1992. *Social change and modernity*. Berkeley: University of California press.
- Hampton, J. 1986. *Hobbes and the social contract tradition*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Heller, A. 1987. *Beyond justice*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Heller, A. 1990. *A philosophy of morals*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hobbes, T. 1966. *Leviathan*. London.
- Hobsbawm, E. 1994. *The age of extremes*. London: Michael Joseph.
- Kennedy, Paul. 1993. *Preparing for the twenty-first century*. New York.
- Kent, E. (ed). 1973. *Revolution and the rule of law*. New York.
- Klitgaard, R. 1993. Beginning at the end: An economic approach to university reform. *Theoria*, 81/82:165-183.
- Kornai, J. 1992. *The socialist system*. Princeton: PUP.
- Lukes, S. 1986. *Marxism and morality*. Oxford: OUP.
- Macpherson, C.B. 1962. *The political theory of possessive individualism*. Oxford: OUP.
- Marcuse, H. 1964. *One dimensional man*. London: Sphere.
- Mulhall, S. and Swift, A. 1992. *Liberals and communitarians*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Novo, A. 1983. *The economics of feasible socialism*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Rapaczynski, A. 1987. *Nature and politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rawls, J. 1971. *A theory of justice*. Oxford: OUP.
- Reich, Robert. 1992. *The work of nations*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rousseau, J.-J. 1973. *The social contract and discourses*. London: Dent.
- Sandel, M. 1983. *Liberalism and the limits of justice*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Sartre, J.P. 1976. *The critique of dialectical reason*. London: New Left Books.
- Sen, A. 1992. *Inequality reexamined*. Harvard/Russell Sage Foundation.
- Taylor, C. 1985. *Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 2. Cambridge: CUP.
- Taylor, C. 1989. *The sources of the self*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard.
- Taylor, C. 1992. Modernity and the culture of inwardness. In: A. Honneth et al. (eds), *Philosophical interventions in the unfinished project of Enlightenment*. MIT Press.
- Walzer, M. 1983. *Spheres of justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Widdavsky, A. & Clark, J. 1990. *The moral collapse of communism*. San Francisco: ICS.
- Xenos, N. 1989. *Modernity and scarcity*. London: Routledge.

Second, there is also the preconception that by virtue of its methodological rigour only the academy can claim a genuine authorship and the right to canonise historical knowledge. In this sense, the products of the academy have necessarily a status of knowledge and the products of non-professional people have not. Obviously, this is very limiting and retrograde particularly when it is dissected from the perspective of those who have refused to be silenced because their processes of knowing do not fall within the knowledge parameters imposed by the academy. Historians have shown some enthusiasm for the timely readjusting and refining of their theoretical and analytical tools within the parameters set by the academy to address the changing historical circumstances. They have however done very little to redress the constraints imposed by increasing professionalisation of production of knowledge within the academy. They have not come to terms with the silences which this professionalisation seem to legitimise. Neither have they accounted for the fact that the boundaries of formal analysis they proclaim and attempt to universalise remain too rigid and hierarchising.

The chapter contends that the production of historical knowledge takes place in different sites and under different dynamics. Particular "grammars" in these sites regulate the flow of information and meanings, and impose restrictions about what information is acceptable as knowledge and what knowledge is socially useful. It suggests that what is required is an analytical and interpretative framework with enough flexibility to account for the different frames of reference involved in the different contexts where the past is processed and made intelligible. For this to materialise, attention should be given to the informal processes of production of knowledge by students, workers and non-professional agents, i.e. the practices of knowledge production outside the academy or discarded by it as unscholarly.³ This is an issue that has been ignored and met with almost complete silence by social scientists, and disregarded by the canonisers of knowledge.

Put another way, the chapter is a plea for recognition of the fact that there are different epistemologies within and outside the academy and as such multiple locations of historical knowledge. These epistemologies lead to different degrees of knowing or different bodies of knowledge. It is not claimed that these bodies of knowledge have the same theoretical status. The important fact is that the recognition of these epistemologies represents a breakthrough or an important departure from the prevailing discourses of knowledge production. If particular attention is given to popular constructs of history, to the specific ways the past is processed and made intelligible by ordinary non-professional subjects, the gap between high knowledge and popular knowledge would certainly be reduced.

The academy can no longer claim monopoly of production of all historical knowledge but of a particular kind of knowledge. The culturally specific, shared set of norms or "grammar" which regulates the "debatibility of the past" needs to be extended beyond the boundaries of academic formal analysis to accommodate cases of other overlapping histories; to include those histories which have been ignored by social scientists as not satisfying inner-academic standards of criticism of sources.⁴ Therefore, there needs to be a radical review of the existing methods and processes of knowledge production as recognised by the academy.

Changing discourses in South African historiography

According to the methodological principles established by the academy, the production of historical knowledge requires a careful and critical examination of historical texts, conventionally known as historical sources. These texts may assume the form of written texts (documents) in predominantly literate societies or oral texts in predominantly non-literate ones as well as the form of objects, symbols and "social texts" such as songs, arts and performance,

which in Nietzsche's terms represent a "continuous sign-chain".⁵ To attach meaning to this variety of texts, several tasks have to be undertaken. First, it is necessary to define the different settings in which historical texts are produced — *location of texts* — and to understand the dynamics which determine and regulate their production — *the context of texts*. Second, it is necessary to unpack the nature of historical texts, deconstructing and decoding their different representational forms. Third, it is also necessary to abstract from their empirical appearance, uncover the relationships between the facts they contain and derive explanations or theory.

However, underpinning this apparently simple and technical procedure lies an important terrain of contestation, conflicting interests and struggles over control of power represented by knowledge. In South Africa, this contestation included changing the discourses, or more precisely the approaches, assumptions, concepts and practices which from time to time dominated the production of history. While shifting the frontiers of academic discourses, efforts were also made to reconceptualise the purpose, define and redefine the object of historical knowledge produced by the academy or, to use Bozzoli's terminology, the "audiences".⁶ Involved in this process were institutions and organisations which in South Africa control the production and dissemination of historical knowledge. These include universities (History Departments, African Studies Centres or Institutes),⁷ schools, newspapers, professional periodicals such as *Social Dynamics* and *Transformation*, magazines, archives and museums, the book trade and cultural institutions involved in film, theatre, research, maintenance of cultural heritage and teaching. Within these institutions and organisations progressive history production has been dominated by the white Left since the early 1970s. I shall refer to this particular tradition by the term "Radical Historiography".⁸

I shall briefly review the role played by Radical Historiography in this process. I shall explore the following main themes: (1) the advent

of neo-Marxist historiography in the early 1970s and its increasing influence on social studies; (2) the emergence of a radical/neo-Marxist school of thought in educational studies in the early 1980s; (3) theoretical metamorphoses within this school; and (4) the crisis of revisionism in the 1990s and the advent of what Laclau would call "post-Marxism". The aim is not however to rewrite this historiography. This has been done elsewhere.¹⁰ The aim is to textualise and dissect the main tenets of radical/neo-Marxist discourses and explore possible implications for history production.

The crisis of the apartheid system between 1976 and 1980 appears to have had the effect of radicalising an important sector of the liberal establishment, which began to contest the liberal view that apartheid must be explained in terms of an irrational racial logic.¹¹ As a result of this modernisation, whites would choose to be rich and mixed rather than poor and separate.¹² However, the inability of the liberal school to deliver a satisfactory solution to the crisis faced by South Africa since the 1970s — increasing oppositional struggles waged by the African National Congress (ANC), the growth of black trade union movements, the 1976 uprising, the explosion of youth and student movements — resulted in a deep crisis of identity among liberal academics, which culminated in the emergence of radical neo-Marxist theorists.¹³

For neo-Marxist theorists, the nature and the dynamics of the South African social formation could only be understood within the framework of a Marxist political economy. They drew on Marx's method of historical and dialectical materialism and on theories of social change produced by Marxist political economists.¹⁴ They concentrated on the functional linkages between capitalism and racial domination in terms of class analysis based on a conception of capitalism as a class-divided, exploitative and conflictual system.¹⁵ They regarded economic relations and structures as having an overwhelmingly determining effect on the social structures of society.¹⁶ The themes included issues such as periodisation, the state,

class fractions and alliances, class hegemony, imperialism and national capital, white workers, the role of gold, and the importance of economic and political factors in the capital accumulation process.¹⁷

Among the group of neo-Marxists was a new generation of historians with a viewpoint startlingly opposed to the "liberal" and Afrikaner nationalist traditions.¹⁸ These historians set themselves the task of challenging liberal and nationalist discourses by reviewing their approaches, and redirecting their modes of thinking about history, processes of construction and modes of representation of historical knowledge. To promote emancipatory ideals, radical/neo-Marxist discourses emphasised the centrality of Marxist categories of "class" and "class struggle" and the role of the working class, as analytical categories. Embedded in these discourses were popular signifiers such as "people's history", "history from below", "bottom up history", "popular history, and so forth. However, neo-Marxist theorists replaced the reductionist racial logic with a class logic which also led to another form of reductionism, class reductionism. The emphasis on class analysis in history production did not solve the problems posed by the complexity of South African society. Neither did the emphasis on and attention given to "privileged subjects" such as the working class and the trade unions.¹⁹

A major weakness thus remained the inability to grapple with non-economic factors in history and society such as subjectivity and culture.²⁰ The neo-Marxist school therefore faced the challenge of combining its strengths with sensitivity to the cultural and subjective dimensions of social life, human agency and action choices in real and complex historical situations.²¹ As Le Celeste points out, "the absence of the human dimension in this 'history without passion' invests it with an air of unreal lifelessness".²² What was required was a synthesis which combined structuralist and interactionist perspectives, material determination and human agency.²³ This was achieved during the second half of the 1970s.

A new approach emerged representing a shift from the 'economic' to social relations — relations between different racial, ethnic and cultural groups. Its general feature was the fact that it stressed the autonomy, the non-reductiveness, of race and ethnicity as social factors — the relative autonomy of ideology, politics, race, culture. This is what has been described as "writing history 'from the bottom up' or history from below".²⁴ This was followed by a tenable proliferation of Marxist-sounding "social history" works in the main liberal institutions (University of the Witwatersrand and University of Cape Town), supported by progressive publishers such as Raven Press and David Philip.²⁵ In the 1980s, neo-Marxism, particularly as applied to social history, became almost a standard paradigm in the main centres for African Studies and the History and Sociology departments of the English-speaking universities.²⁶ Garney quotes Charles van Onselen, director of the Wits African Studies Institute, as expressing his satisfaction with the victory of *Radical Historiography* in this way: "We've largely won our battle against the liberals. In the social sciences, we dictate the terms".²⁷

The most outstanding feature of this approach was the development of "people's" history, which had an increasing impact in the main fields of social inquiry, particularly history, sociology, political science and educational studies. "People's history" is one of the several signifiers appropriated by popular movements in Britain and South Africa and then given a theoretical meaning as a framework for production of a particular kind of history. This was followed by a call for people's history in 1987.

People's history is essentially anti-apartheid history, i.e. history written explicitly as a counter to the racist and elitist stereotypes and the reasons that have characterised the history propagated especially in government schools. It is "popular" history in that "it deliberately sets to bring the black underclasses into South African history, and for the same time is written primarily for a readership drawn from the black classes".²⁸ People's history is thus an alternative to the

nationalist, liberal and Marxist identities was at its climax, I was asked to make a choice between liberal and Marxist approaches, and I replied with the following comment:

It is not clear that there is any advantage in labelling different social scientists, whatever the labels (conservative, liberal, radical, Marxist, neo-Marxist, right-wing liberal, left-wing liberal, extreme-right-wing liberal or radical, or conservative, etc., etc.). Like many other labels, they probably conceal as much as they reveal. They tend to obscure the fundamental differences between those who think dialectically, and those whose thinking is criterion-based or categorical [refers to analytical philosophy of education]. Rather, it seems that *what is important for a social scientist is his/her ability to critically discern, select, and develop or use the theoretical tools provided by the different schools of thought which can, more easily and safely, lead to the intelligibility of social reality, without being arrested by unnecessary scholarly apartheid.*³²

The interpretation of this passage in the context of the objectives of this chapter is, in Laclau and Mouffe's words, that "there is not *one* discourse and *one* system of categories through which the "real" could speak without mediations".³³ To be or not to be Marxist in terms of identity construction or participation in a particular discourse represents a continuous process of making and remaking ourselves and ourselves in relation to others. Nobody is born "Marxist" or "socialist". This is a product of life-choices and contingencies. If current rethinking of traditional social theory is to be original in actually changing anything, it must do more than reinterpreting Marx in different ways. It has to set a whole new summative project which takes seriously the question of the construction of knowledge or at least the shifting of the frontiers of that canon. This is not to suggest that Radical Historiography should start again on a clean sheet or more precisely that class struggle and class struggle must be finally buried. Certainly the canon must include elements of continuity and elements of

perspective of the "Great Man" approach to history. It is the history of the "ordinary people", the oppressed and exploited masses, viewed not as simple objects of a particular intellectual activity but as active subjects of the very same activity. The main thrust of people's history is that it recognises, though sometimes it tends to overemphasise and reify, the "lived experience" of ordinary people.

However, what has become increasingly limiting in the neo-Marxist discourse is its almost complete inability to locate cultural phenomena in domains which do not follow strictly on the logic of class relationships and the social stratification determined by the changing South African political economy. This cannot account for the complex developments that have dominated history in the post-Cold War period, namely (1) the emergence of new subjects, the location of which is not within the boundaries of class — women, racial and ethnic minorities, ecological, gay and anti-institutional movements; and (2) the nature of struggles carried out by these subjects, which do not respond to the logic of class struggle. These are also part of a wider project of radical democracy. The discourses of Radical Historiography can no longer be restricted to the working community. Radical Historiography also needs to move beyond a defensive intellectual culture of criticism towards a creative, risk-taking intellectual culture which is dynamic, open and engaged. The risks are obviously greater since to bring in new identities means the project will entail many struggles, and perhaps a few celebrations, with the possibility of antagonism, contradiction and complexity.²⁹ Attempts to grapple with the phenomena related to the above developments culminated in the advent of a Post-Marxist discourse in South Africa, which has been seen by some critics as the emergence of "romantic populism".³⁰

Post-Marxism did not emerge as a case against neo-Marxism and class analysis,³¹ but as a warning against the limitations of class reductionism in analyses of social activities and discursive formations, which are not necessarily determined by the logic of class or class struggle. In 1985, at the moment when the antagonism dividing

regard, it has played an outstanding role in popularising or "democratising" historical knowledge and making it accessible to wider audiences. This is illustrated by the work done by the History Workshop project. This project could certainly widen the frontiers of the domain of history and cultural production, diminish the silences which have prevailed in this activity and mobilise new constitu-

It must be stressed however that little has been done to contest the "rules of the game", which have turned the academy into an exclusivist institution, claiming monopoly over the production of socially acceptable historical knowledge. I would contend that this is because its exercise is still based on a Eurocentric discourse which reduces the process of the generation of historical knowledge to the narrow and restrictive concept of *historiography*. Although it is recognised that a major breakthrough has taken place with the introduction of the concept of the *production of history*,³⁶ borrowed from social anthropology, I shall argue that the complexity of the processes whereby historical knowledge is generated are best captured by the dynamic concept of the *construction of historical knowledge*. The last two concepts are based on a radically different assumption: that there is a plurality of possibilities, sites and epistemologies in the process of the construction of historical knowledge. This is extremely important particularly when "the guild tradition... has seems to be the case with Radical Historiography]... over the scholar who is not vigilant, whose individual consciousness as a scholar is not on the guard against *idées reçues* all too easily handed down in the profession".³⁷

The Combining of History

In *The Combining of History*,³⁸ which, to my view, represents a watershed in contemporary historiography, Cohen writes:

discontinuity. In this regard, I would like to reiterate Laclau's observations about paradigmatic changes and epistemological breaks:
The surpassing of a great intellectual tradition never takes place in the sudden form of a collapse, but in the way that river waters, having originated at common source, spread in various directions and mingle with currents flowing down from other sources. This is how the discourses that constituted the field of classical Marxism may help to form the thinking of a new left: by bequeathing some of their concepts, transforming or abandoning others, and diluting themselves in that infinite intertextuality of emancipatory discourses in which the plurality of the social takes shape.³⁴

In addition, there is the need to recognise difference and the plurality of possibilities in a transformatory project in which class and class struggle may be one:

In intellectual history, the important epistemological breaks have not occurred when new solutions have been given to old problems, but when a radical change in the ground of the debate strips the old problems of their sense. This is what seems central to me today if one wishes to push forward the political debate of the left: it is necessary to construct a new language — and a new language means, as you know, new objects, new problems, new values, and the possibility of discursively constructing new antagonisms and forms of struggle.³⁵

What the review illustrates is that Radical Historiography has been very effective in constantly rethinking its conceptual practices and exploring new conceptual possibilities to account for the rapidly changing South African scenario. Most importantly, it has been able to draw on popular discourses of South African history and conceptualise the various and complex ways ordinary people process and make sense of their past, in dance, art, songs and so forth.

I did not feel inclined to enter anew the literatures on historiography: the theory of history, the philosophy of history, the varieties of history, historical imagination, the history of historical writing ... these were and are thematic fields that I think of when I hear the word "historiography" ... to me at the time, and still today, the realm of historiography so construed is reserved for an arena of *scholarly* practice on the reconstruction of the past. As a field of *scholarly* activity, "historiography" privileges the written document and the learned and scholarly literatures on the past developing over centuries. *It omits ... the practices of history outside the academy.*³⁹ [My emphasis]

He goes on to appeal for recognition of the "immense power created as people popularly process the past outside the work of the guild" [academy]. The recognition of this, he argues, will have dramatic consequences: (1) it will free "the student of other societies and other pasts from narrow understandings about the nature of history, historical evidence, historical writing, and what should constitute history";⁴⁰ (2) it will disclose "a far more spacious (clearly broad, yet sometimes unmapped)" and "challenging view of history — of the telling of the past — in which it is recognized that there are multiple locations of historical knowledge";⁴¹ and (3) it will open clear horizons about the forms and directions of historical knowledge. From this point of view, questions about history production become broader questions about "the shifting composition of 'audiences', about who is listening to whom, and about the struggles for control of vocabularies, grammars, and symbolic materials in the telling and writing of history".⁴² As he puts it, "Actual, and imagined, audiences work upon the productions of history in powerful ways, introducing critiques, rereadings, corrections, value, and meaning".⁴³ The new paradigm will also free historical inquiry from the limitations and constraints imposed by overemphasis on expert knowledge of written texts.

Historians and others interested in contact between literary and non-literary traditions can hardly live with the simplifications and reifications involved in the simplistic dichotomy of written and oral.⁴⁴

Or as Chartier puts it,

... what readers make of their readings in an intellectual sense is a decisive question that cannot be answered either by thematic analyses of printed production, or by analysis of the social diffusion of different categories or works. Indeed, the ways in which an individual or a group appropriates an intellectual theme or a cultural form are more important than the statistical distribution of that theme or form.⁴⁵

The model suggested by Cohen has dramatic implications for understanding the nature of academic discourses in the area of social sciences, particularly history. Firstly, it can liberate South African historiography from the limited analytical scope offered by its prevailing paradigms, e.g. social history or history from below.⁴⁶ It situates and adds a more operational framework to the mode of analysis suggested by the "people's history" and "people's education" movement.⁴⁷

Secondly, by bringing attention to silences and by liberating silenced voices, Cohen's model makes it possible to map out the interplay of academic discourses and non-professional discourses and to determine the nature of the struggles and dialogue between dominant and subordinate voices in the production, selection and presentation of historical knowledge.⁴⁸ South African educational historiography has privileged and celebrated the authority of "the written document"⁴⁹ in history production to almost mythical proportions.⁵⁰ Most importantly, the authority which regulates the selection and the uses of the written text is neglected. No attention has been paid to the complex ways in which, in Cohen's words, popular and institutional constructions of the past and political

suppressions of knowledge shape, distort and deform the processes of knowledge production.⁵¹

Thirdly, Cohen's model provides a more holistic basis than the existing historiographical paradigms for understanding how the various forces and audiences in society influence the formation and presentation of school knowledge as well as responses to this knowledge. It widens the scope of production of historical knowledge to include all kinds of settings beyond the formal and institutional structure of the academy. Indeed, the production of history and culture is not just a privilege of the academy but takes place in different kinds of settings: formal institutions of the "guild" — forums, seminars, exhibitions, festivals, parades, workshops, symposia, conferences, lecture series and publication projects; in several public institutions such as the library, the schools and curriculum, dinner dances, forms of radio broadcasting, labour unions and their organisers, film, television and newspapers; photography, and in memorials and commemorations, re-enactments, museum exhibitions, popular biographies, and advertising — i.e. in all institutional and popular processes with some bearing on the covering/uncovering, revealing or suppressing of historical and cultural knowledge.⁵²

Academics have an incredible capacity either to consider texts as having attributes which may not appear as evident to outsiders, or to ignore attributes which would have appeared to those same outsiders as being inextricably part of those texts. This is not only because to some extent they are a human mirror which reflects a particular configuration of social relations in society, but mainly because they have some bearing on the constitution of the same social relations. It is important to account for the complex relationships through which texts are constituted as sources of knowledge. Texts are not mere things; they represent dynamic relationships between people.

Reification or fetishisation of texts⁵³ tends to mask the actual power and social relations which determine the process of

production and presentation of historical and cultural knowledge. Therefore students need, for example, to understand the dynamics of "story-telling" to know what they can make of the story as it is told. They have to come to grips with fundamental questions such as: Who is presenting the text? What is presented in the text? What is not presented in the text? Why is it presented in that particular way? What is expected from the text? They must recognise that the subject of historical knowledge — the producer of knowledge — cannot be entirely separated from the object or the product and vice versa. Miller's concept of "objectification" is important to explain this aspect. He uses the term "objectification"

... to describe the dual process by means of which a subject externalises itself in a creative act of differentiation, and in turn reappropriates this externalization through an act which Hegel terms sublation ... This act eliminates the separation of the subject from its creation but does not eliminate this creation itself; instead, the creation is used to enrich and develop the subject, which then transcends its earlier state.⁵⁴

This means that there is no historical knowledge prior to the process through which it is created, though the process must take place in history and through the material and intellectual media given by history.⁵⁵ For example, in a study of uses of the past in Gola discourse, D'Azevedo does a fine job in illustrating the complex process whereby councils of elderly people arrive at socially knowledgeable constructs of the past or reconstitute past histories, which are then accepted as historical knowledge:

These histories, as we may call them, are constructed from the collective efforts of aged persons whose special skills are directed to arriving at a public consensus regarding the validity of past events and their meanings ...

In litigation proceedings, for example, an interesting transformation takes place in the uses of historical data. Here, it is necessary to justify one's actions by an appeal to precise

locations in time and space. In a matter involving land ownership each of the contestants is armed with a version of events in the past which are meant to validate his claim, and justification requires that a third party can be convinced of the reliability of one among a number of rival versions.⁵⁶

Beyond *The Combing of History*

Like any other conceptual innovation, the project suggested in *The Combing of History* raises however several problems. First, the production of history is conflated with "the making of history".⁵⁷ Every aspect of human activity becomes part of the "production of history". No distinction is made between the constitution of historical knowledge and the making of history. Where does one draw the line between the "processing of the past" — constitution of historical knowledge in its wider sense — and the process whereby the participants make their own history? In a more specific sense, "production of history" could refer to consciously articulated activities whereby people process the past to constitute historical knowledge in its different forms — common-sense or abstracted knowledge. In this process, people make use of different kinds of texts — oral, written, aesthetic — to make sense of the past.

Second, *production* as a concept refers to the first step of a complex process, which includes *distribution*⁵⁸ and *consumption*. With the professionalisation of history production, the distribution of knowledge has radically changed. A great deal of knowledge produced by the academy is for self-consumption or for the middle class. Particular kinds of knowledge and texts are selected to feed the masses. For those groups whose forms of production of history have not been recognised by the canonisers, history is made under conditions of estrangement. This means that the external is created under conditions which ensure that the producer is unable to fully utilise historical knowledge as an instrument for self-realisation. On the other hand, there is also a problem of inaccessibility of the immense body of knowledge produced by the academy.

Third, some remarks should be made about the validity of the concept *production* as an analytical category. Miller points out that a series of academic trends have led to an overwhelming concentration on the area of production as the key generative arena for the emergence of the dominant social relations in contemporary societies. This, argues Miller, has been accompanied by "a comparative neglect of consumption, together with a concomitant failure to observe the actual changes which have taken place over the last century in the balance of influence between these two forms of interactions with goods".⁵⁹

Production demands consumption. Consumption demands production. These processes are mediated through distribution. In the case of production of knowledge, there seems to be a close relationship between the creation of knowledge and the diversity of uses, functions and connotations of this knowledge in society and vice versa. Individuals are increasingly coming into relationship with objects — books, films, written documents, statues, emblems, furniture or cars — "not as producers who fail to recognize their products, but as consumers who have to determine their own development".⁶⁰ Production and consumption are all parts of a reality in which the three elements cannot be separated. To understand the parts one has to confront them with the *totality* and vice versa. This is an analytical puzzle that Marx was confronted with to understand the nature of capitalism. He solved the puzzle by identifying the main feature that characterised the *totality*, which he conceptualised as *commodity*.

Similarly, the key question about the construction of historical knowledge has something to do with the formulation of concepts that capture more effectively the dynamics of the processes of knowing. "Production" may be just one aspect of this. These concepts must take cognisance of the fact that within the academy or even in other epistemological sites, the production of historical knowledge is increasingly becoming production of *commodities*.

history that is shaped by particular cultural and political traditions, and such traditions exert a powerful influence upon educational and scientific pursuit and vice versa. The restrictive political and cultural traditions of the academy have been left uncontested by radical historians.

On the one hand, the notion of *historiography* implies that historical knowledge is possible only within the framework of literary practice. Drawing on Said, one can argue that the problem with the notion of *historiography* is that it tends to divide the subject of history into two elements: one which writes about, and another which is written about. The former has the power and authority to observe, study and conceptualise. For the latter, passivity is the presumed role. The former is a source of knowledge and a writer, and the latter is the source of information and a subject matter in need of investigation. As Said has noted, no dialectic is either desired or showed between the two parts.⁶³

On the other hand, the *concept of production* assumes that knowledge is a product.⁶⁴ As such knowledge is seen as a definite, limited and timeless body of ideas ready to be consumed, like any other goods. This leads to a static, petrified and reified conception of knowledge. Knowledge is thus constructed as an object or commodity subject to the same market forces which regulate the circulation or circulation of commodities. Leroke makes an important remark in this regard: "The danger of objectifying knowledge that is of constituting knowledge as an object that remains in social relations, like other objects, such as money and other artifacts ... is that it leads to the inability of conceptualizing knowledge as process."⁶⁵

He would rather argue that knowledge is a process,⁶⁶ characterised by dynamism and constant incompleteness. In this sense, the process whereby knowledge is generated are essentially processes of production of knowledge, which include constant searching for

These dominate processes of social self-creation in which they are directly constitutive of our understanding of ourselves and others. It is the "commodification" of knowledge and culture which underpins constructions of the past and suppressions of knowledge, and which shape, distort and deform the processes of knowledge production.⁶¹

Finally, in the contemporary world, consumption of knowledge is developing to such proportions that it can no longer be reduced to mere reproduction or completion of the process of production. With the reduction of the time spent in labour or actual production, the time spent in leisure and consumption has enormously increased. We confront ourselves more as consumers of knowledge than as producers, as such unable to connect the artifacts of knowledge — books, films, museums etc. — to the world of production. Consumption of knowledge has become an extremely important part of human activity and social engineering. It generates possibilities of sociability and cognitive order while engendering ideas of morality, ideal worlds, images and other abstractions and principles, which shape societies in different ways. Consumption of knowledge is used to create the context for social networks and leisure activities such as academic associations, film clubs, reading and debating forums, which have some bearing on the constitution of knowledge.

So far, the chapter has highlighted the constraints imposed by existing paradigms in history production (*historiography school*) and *production-of-history school*) to the process of contestation of prevailing practices within the academy. It has shown that success achieved conceptually and theoretically by radical historians in highlighting the question of the structuring and reproduction of apartheid social relations has been clouded by the failure to contest this theoretical and political concern with the contestation of academic foundations on which the project of Radical Historiography has been built.⁶² Particularly within the academy, institutional processes — of whatever kind — are part of a complex and diverse

fundamental resource through which society accesses more rational ways to process and make sense of the past for its self-realisation. Fourth, it would widen its constituencies as in its enterprise of generating socially useful knowledge, and it would be able to join efforts with a variety of agents beyond the boundaries of the profession.

Endnotes

1. By academy I do not mean just the institutional setting in which this particular intellectual practice takes place, but the whole academic and professional tradition binding all those involved in the pursuit of knowledge. It includes the library or archive of information commonly and, in some of its aspects, unanimously held. What binds the members of the academy together is a family of ideas, a unifying set of values proven in various ways to be effective, which provide the members with a mentality, a genealogy, an atmosphere, which allow them to deal with and to see historical phenomena in a particular way. It functions as a sort of guild community with its own internal traditions and peculiar ways of behaviour, learning and appropriation of knowledge. This somewhat unproblematic order of things is what this chapter is trying to question.

2. I shall use the term "popular knowledge" to refer to the forms of knowledge produced among ordinary non-professional people. This differs from the way it is used by some social historians, such as Lull Callinicos, who have appropriated the term to refer to the history written about and with the participation of ordinary people.

3. Note that the professionalisation of history has been accompanied by greater selectiveness and closure.

4. For details on this particular approach see Adjun Appadurai, "The past as a source resource", *Man*, 1981, 16:201-219.

5. Quoted by G.C. Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*, p. 198 (New York and London: Routledge, 1988).

6. See also "Intellectuals, audiences and histories: South African experiences", *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 46(7):237-263, 1990.

7. In this chapter I shall closely scrutinise major trends in the intellectual history of the universities in their role in the pursuit of historical knowledge. As Spivak has noted, "Universities are ... the primary centers of intellectual life in modern society. They are, therefore, a key center of criticism — criticism of

the truth, permanent covering and uncovering of reality, as meanings are created and recreated. Therefore, no discipline or academy can claim absolute knowledge of any phenomena. There can be only degrees of approximation to the truth or degrees of knowledge-ability. These depend not only on the intellectual and material instruments used in the process but also on the dynamics of power and social relations within the particular context where knowledge is constructed. Each context presents particular cultural and epistemological boundaries and principles of internal coherence which impact differently on the construction of knowledge. It is this dimension of power and social relations that the concept of *historiography* and the anthropological concept of *production of history* fail to address fully. To recognise this limitation is to question the terms of accreditation of knowledge within and outside the academy, an issue which does not fall within the scope of this chapter. Yet often the sense in which some scholars feel themselves to be members of the academy lies in a very unrigorous and problematic idea of what is "out there", beyond the frontiers of academic discourse. To use Said's words: "All kinds of suppositions, associations, and fictions appear to crowd the unfamiliar space outside one's own."⁶⁷

There is a strong rationale for a reconceptualisation of the projects of *historiography* and *history production* along the lines suggested in this chapter. First, it would certainly have major implications for the ways we think about, construct, disseminate, teach and transmit historical knowledge. Second, as has been pointed out, it would certainly disclose the relations of power, the relations of inclusion and exclusion, and the silences and "secrets" entailed in the struggles over control of historical knowledge. As Leroy has noted, this is not to envisage a situation where knowledge will be free from the corrupting nature of power; for knowledge and power are two sides of the same coin, i.e. mutually interdependent processes.⁶⁸ Third, it would re-insert the academy into the community, not as the sole proprietor of knowledge but as a

- the society, of the dominant trends in it, especially its politics, by sections of both the faculty and the student bodies" (S.M. Lipset, in H.W. van der Merwe and D. Welsh (eds), *Student Perspectives on South Africa*, p. 3 (Cape Town: David Philip, 1972).
- 8 Clarke *et al.* argue that the study of the culture of the academy which keeps the intellectual world in movement seems important for understanding how historical knowledge is integrated in society (Clarke *et al.*, "Sub-cultures, cultures and class", in Bennet *et al.*, *op. cit.*, p. 54).
- 9 The chapter shares the meaning attached to the term radical historiography by Windsor Leroke. This is how Leroke defines it: "in one sense, 'Radical Historiography' is used definitionally to refer to the emergence of a new theoretical paradigm in the South African social sciences. [This paradigm is marxist, in that it seeks to further the arguments of historical materialism] in another sense, the term refers to the heterogeneous character of this 'new theoretical paradigm', and its social research methods, which is comprised of labour historians, labour studies, Marxist Structuralists, socialist humanists, social historians, etc." (W.S. Leroke, "Social research and knowledge-construction in South African radical historiography", Sociology Department, University of the Witwatersrand, 1994, p. 38).
- 10 Bozzoli *op. cit.*; Frederick Johnstone, "Most painful to our hearts: South Africa through the eyes of the new school", *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, 16(1):2-26, 1982; Christopher Saunders, "Reflections on the state of South African history at the beginning of the 1980s", in D.I. Ray, P. Shinnie and D. Williams (eds), *Into the Seventies: Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Conference of the Canadian Association of African Studies*, pp. 233-240 (Vancouver, 1981); C. Saunders, "Towards understanding South Africa's past", *South Africa International*, 19(2), October 1988; Harrison M. Wright, *The Border of the Present: Liberal-Radical Controversy over South African History* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1977); K.R. Hughes, "Challenges from the past: Reflections on Liberalism and Radicalism in the writing of Southern African History", *Social Dynamics* 3(1):47, 1977; Basil A. Le Cordeur, "The reconstruction of South African history", Presidential address delivered to the tenth biennial conference of the South African Historical Society at the University of Cape Town, 15 January 1985; Shula Marks, "Towards a people's history of South Africa: Recent developments in the historiography of South Africa", in R. Samuel (ed.), *People's History and Socialist Theory*, 297-308 (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981); Shula Marks, "Review article African and Afrikaner history", *Journal of African History*, 3(1) 1962; Shula Marks, "Review article: Liberalism, social realities and South African history", *Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies*, (8) 1972; F. Johnstone, "Most painful to our hearts...." *op. cit.*; Frederick Johnstone, *Class, Race and Gold*.
- 11 *Study of Class Relations and Racial Discrimination in South Africa* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976); Anthony Amore and Nancy Westlake, "A liberal dilemma: A critique of the Oxford History of South Africa", *Race*, 14:107-136 (1972); and John W. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); P. Kallaway, "What happened to South African history", *Concept* (6), 1975; J. Lonedale, "From colony to industrial state: South African historiography as seen from England", *Social Dynamics*, (9), 1983; C. Bundy, "An image of its own past? Towards a comparison of American and South African historiography", *Radical Review*, 46/47, 1990; J. Bengh, "The Afrikaans historian and his work", *South Africa International*, 19(2), October 1988; L.M. Thompson, "Afrikaner nationalist historiography and the policy of apartheid", *Journal of African History* 3(1), 1962.
- 12 Liberals argued that this irrational logic would fall apart as a result of progressive modernisation of the economy. See for example L. Thompson, *The Political Mythology of Apartheid* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1985) and J. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy: The Origins of Segregation in South Africa and the American South* (Cambridge, 1982).
- 13 An idea borrowed from Norval, "Letter to Ernesto", *op. cit.*, p. 138.
- 14 See for example Harold Wolpe, "Capitalism and cheap labour-power in South Africa: from segregation to apartheid", *Economy and Society*, 1(4):424-456, November 1972; F.A. Johnstone, "Class conflict and colour bars in the South African gold mining industry, 1910-1926", in *Collected Seminar Papers* (University of London, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, October 1969 - April 1970); F.A. Johnstone, "White prosperity and white supremacy in South Africa today", *African Affairs*, LXIX (1970), pp. 125-140; Frederick Johnstone, *Class, Race and Gold: A Study of Class Relations and Racial Discrimination in South Africa* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976); Stanley Trapido, "South Africa in a comparative study of industrialization", *Journal of Development Studies*, 7 (1970); M. Legassick, "South African capital accumulation and violence", *Economy and Society*, 3(3):253-291, 1974; M. Legassick, "The making of South African 'native policy', 1903-1923: The origins of segregation", in *Collected Papers* (University of London, Institute of Commonwealth Studies, 1974).
- 15 F. Johnstone, "Most painful to our hearts...." *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9. For further details see for example Martin Legassick, "South Africa: Capital accumulation and violence", *Economy and Society* 3:253-291 (1974); S. Trapido, "South Africa in a comparative study of industrialisation", *Journal of Development Studies*, 7

- (1971); Harold Wolpe, "Capitalism and cheap labour power in South Africa: From segregation to apartheid", *Economy and Society*, 1:425-456 (1972).
- 16 S. Hall, "Race, articulation and societies structured in dominance", in UNESCO, *Sociological Theories: Race and Colonialism*, pp. 306-307 (Poole Sydenham Printers, 1980).
- 17 F. Johnstone, "Most painful to our hearts" ... *op. cit.*, p. 22.
- 18 These are well characterised by Bozzoli. See Bozzoli, *op. cit.*, pp. 240-242.
- 19 As Laclau and Mouffe point out, the era of "privileged subjects" — in the ontological not practical sense — of the anti-capitalist struggle has been superseded. No class or social movement can be taken *a priori* as progressive by virtue of its class nature. Its progressiveness depends upon its hegemonic articulation with other struggles or demands. It is a question that requires further elaboration within the declining world socialist movement. In this sense the assumption that in modern societies "the most fundamental groups are the social classes, and the major cultural configurations are class cultures" should be taken with some qualification.
- 20 Johnstone argues for example that "the historical and sociological significance of Afrikaner nationalism cannot be entirely grasped merely in these new and important terms of its class instrumentality" (Johnstone, *op. cit.*, p. 24).
- 21 *Ibid.*, p. 25.
- 22 Basil A. Le Cordeur, "The reconstruction of South African history ...", *op. cit.*, p. 2.
- 23 For a review of this trend see Saunders, 1981, *op. cit.*
- 24 K.R. Hughes, "Challenges from the past ... *op. cit.*, p. 45.
- 25 S. Marks and S. Trapido, "Lord Milner and the South State", *History Workshop Journal*, 8, 1979; B. Bozzoli (ed.), *Town and Countryside in the Transvaal* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1983); B. Bozzoli (ed.), *Class, Community and Conflict* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1987); Burman & Reynolds (eds) *Growing up in a Divided Society*, *op. cit.*; Alex Callinicos & John Ridd, *Southern Africa after Soweto* (London: Pluto Press, 1978), 2nd edition, M. Swilling & T. Lodge, "The year of the Amabutho", *Africa Report*, January-February 1986, M. Swilling, "Because your yard is too big: Soweto struggles, the local state and dual power in Uitenhage, 1985-1987" (unpublished paper, University of the Witwatersrand, 1988); M. Swilling, "Stayaways, urban protest and the state", *South African Review*, 13:125-136, 1986; J. Seekings, "Why was Soweto different? Urban development, township politics, and the political economy of Soweto, 1977-1984" (African Studies Seminar Paper, University of the Witwatersrand, 1988).
- 26 See the works in note 25 above.
- 27 Craig Charney, "Thinking of revolution: The new South African intelligentsia", *Monthly Review*, 38:16, December 1986.
- 28 John Wright, "Popularising the pre-colonial past: Politics and problems", *Perspectives in Education*, 10 (2):47, 1989/90. For more details see: L. Callinicos, *Gold and Workers* (Johannesburg: Ravan Press, 1980); *New Nation*, "People's History series", issue of 23 October — 5 November 1986, onwards; C. Hamilton & H. Webster, "The struggle for control over the voices of the past and the socialising role of pre-colonial history: Perspectives on the production of pre-colonial education materials", *Perspectives in Education*, 10(2):53-60, 1988/9; The History Commission, "What is History? A New Approach to History for Students, Workers and Communities" (Johannesburg: Scottsville Educational Division, 1987); L. Callinicos, "The People's History Workshop"; University of the Witwatersrand, February 1987, Report, *Perspectives in Education*, 10(1):84-86, 1988; Cynthia Kros, "The making of history in South African schools", *Perspectives in Education*, 10 (1):87-100, 1988; and Leslie Witz, "Write your own history" (Johannesburg: SACHED Trust/Ravan Press, 1988).
- 29 Similar argument is articulated by Rosalind Brunt in "The politics of identity", in Stuart Hall and Martin Jacques (eds), *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*, p. 158 (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1989).
- 30 Bozzoli, "Intellectuals ...", *op. cit.*, p. 261.
- 31 For that purpose see the debate on Post-Marxism: Ernesto Laclau & Chantal Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: The Thousand Press, 1985); Norman Geras, "Post-Marxism", *New Left Review*, May/June 1987; Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, "Post-Marxism without apologies", Ernesto Laclau, *New Reflections on the Revolution of 1968* (London: Verso).
- 32 M. Coza, "A response to Penny ...", *op. cit.*, pp. 163-164. To avoid misunderstanding of the article I added the following comment: "However, there are some labels which are conventionally accepted as terms of, reference of the different schools of thought. In this sense, the terms 'liberal', 'radical' or 'conservative' and others have a place. But before we stick on the labels why not open the parcels and check what sort of commodities are inside?" (*Ibid.*).
- 33 Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony ... op. cit.*, p. 3.

- 34 Laclau and Mouffe, *Hegemony ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- 35 Laclau, *New Reflections ...*, *op. cit.*, p. 162.
- 36 "Production of history" is a key concept in Cohen's work, which he defines as follows:
The production of history — a frame of reference that is intended here to augment the conventional senses of meaning of history and historiography — refers to the processing of the past in societies and historical settings all over the world and the struggles for control of voices and texts in innumerable settings which animate this processing of the past. This field of practice — *the production of history* — encompasses conventions and paradigms in the formation of historical knowledge and historical texts, the organizing sociologies of historicizing projects and events including commemorations, the structuring of frames of record-keeping, the culturally-specific glossing of texts, the deployment of powerfully nuanced vocabularies, the confronting of patterns and forces underlying interpretation, the workings of audience in managing and responding to presentations of historical knowledge, and the contentions and struggles which evoke and produce texts and which also produce historical literature.
David W. Cohen, *The Combining of History* (The Chicago University Press, forthcoming), Manuscript, *op. cit.*, pp. 425-426.
The concept of the production of history has a double meaning: how understandings of history are created and shaped, and how history itself is made.
- 37 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, p. 326 (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).
- 38 The title is a metaphor in which the "comb" represents simultaneously "the power to cover and usurp knowledge from inspection, but also the power to restore it in practice" (Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 427).
- 39 Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
- 40 *Ibid.*, pp. 37-38.
- 41 *Ibid.*, p. 38.
- 42 *Ibid.*, p. 376.
- 43 *Ibid.*, p. 425.
- 44 Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 403.
- 45 Roger Chartier, "Intellectual history or sociocultural history? The French trajectories", in D. LaCapra and L. Kaplan, (eds), *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1982), p. 30.
- 46 Introduced in the early 1980s by radical historians and sociologists education as a response to technocratic and technicist views of the education

- critis in South Africa, it has become almost institutional in the main liberal and progressive schools of education. For a detailed review see M. Cross, "Comparative Education, 22(3), 1986; M. Cross, "Education in South Africa: A historiography", in M. Cross, *Resistance and Transformation: Education, Culture and Reconstruction in South Africa* (Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 1992) 1984; Intro; and Peter Randall, "The role of history of education in teacher education" (Ph.D. Thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, 1989).
- 47 For details see M. Cross, "Youth culture and resistance in South Africa: A theoretical review", *Perspectives in Education*, 12(2), 1991.
- 48 One would certainly agree with Cohen that: "To take up the question of silence is at the same time to take up in a very specific way the general problem of how people handle and deploy knowledge. This is a complex moral and ethical ground" (Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 430).
- 49 This is associated with crude empiricism, 'white-centredness' in focus, and silence concerning African voices in their written or oral expression.
- 50 Given its ideological nature, historical debate is obviously dominated by struggles over control of voices and texts in the processing of the past. For example, the two competing views of Zulu history which led to a vociferous exchange of words between Chief Buthelezi and Shula Marks are part of these struggles.
- 51 Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 424.
- 52 Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 377 and p. 421.
- 53 This refers to the process whereby social groups are held to be unable to understand that texts (commodities) which they see as alien are actually of their own production.
- 54 Daniel Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*, p. 28 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1992). To some extent, Miller draws on Marx's concepts of *alienation* and *objectification* as opposed to self-affirmation: "The object that labour produces, its product, stands opposed to it as something alien, as a power independent of the producer. The product of labour is labour embodied and made material in an object, it is an objectification of labour." (K. Marx, *Early Writings*, p. 324, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975).
- 55 *Ibid.*, p. 28.
- 56 See Warren L. D'Azavedo, "Uses of the past in Gola discourse", *Journal of African History*, III, 1:31 (1962). For further details on these issues, see for

example I.M. Lewis, "Historical aspects of genealogies in Northern Somali social structure", *Journal of African History*, III, 1:35-48 (1962); William P. Murphy, "Oral literature", *Ann. Rev. Anthropol.*, 7:113-136 (1978); William P. Murphy, "Creating the appearance of consensus in Mende political discourse", *American Anthropologist*, 92(1) (1990); and Igor Kopytoff (ed.), *The African Frontier: The Reproduction of Traditional African Societies*, (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1987), ch. "The importance of being first".

57 Ironically, Cohen himself states that the concept 'production of history' has a double meaning: "how understandings of history are created and shaped, and how history itself is made" (Cohen, *op. cit.*, p. 426).

58 The term 'distribution' refers to the exchange relations which mediate the process of objectification, i.e. the expression of the relationships between goods and desires or human needs.

59 Daniel Miller, *Material Culture and Mass Consumption* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1992), p. 3.

60 Miller, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

61 *Commodification* is defined as the process whereby people are effectively reduced to objects, and objects in turn interpose themselves in relationships between people. The concept of commodification is used by Auslander, Hamilton, Michael Donovan, and Breckenridge, though without the necessary qualifications. See M. Auslander, "A trademark for Nc'wala: the politic of emblems, commodities, and 'cultural authenticity' in Ngoni historical consciousness", paper presented at the Institute for Advanced Study and Research in the African Humanities, Northwestern University, Evanston Campus, March 3, 1993. C. Hamilton, "A Positional Gambit: Shaba Zulu and the Conflict in South Africa" in J. Brown *et al.* *History from South Africa: Alternative Visions and Practices*, (Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1991. Keith Breckenridge, "Migrants, minelords and gold: The cultural politics of metallic money before the South African gold standard crisis, 1920-1933", Department of History, Northwestern University, 27 February 1993; and Michael Donovan, "Capturing the land: Kipsigis' narratives of progress", Department of Anthropology, New York University, 10 March 1993.

62 Leroke has persuasively highlighted the implications of the methodological and epistemological approach which underpins the processes of knowledge

54 The meanings attached to the metaphors "History production" and "knowledge construction" are central to the argument pursued in this chapter.

55 Leroke, 1994, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14.

56 Leroke pursues a similar argument to demonstrate "relations" or the presence of power relations in "construction":

The tenets of my argument are that (1) knowledge is not just a social process, but a textuality, located at this level of its textuality, re-constructed as a power relations process. That is, knowledge takes on a textual form (*ibid.*, p. 15).

57 *Ibid.*, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

58 For details see Leroke, *op. cit.*, p. 12. Drawing extendedly from that argument, that power produces knowledge, power is not the anti-relationship between knowledge and power relations, but two interdependent variables produce each other. I would argue that without the practice of power relations, neither are they produced, and without the production of knowledge (*ibid.*).