



Hans Erik J. Stolten

History and Ideology in Apartheid South Africa: Learning from Progressive, Intellectual Engagement

(A more complete description of this research project can be found on my personal website: <http://www.jakobsgaardstolten.dk/> | Research Projects | Monograph on South African historiography).

(Part of the Introduction, Chapter 1.3, in the current book manuscript, elaborates in depth on theory and methodology over more than 100 pages. It can be found on my website: <http://www.jakobsgaardstolten.dk/> | Book Manuscripts | Monograph on South African history writing. This document will require user name "visitor" and password "laia").

The broader objective of this research is to produce new knowledge of the importance of history for politics and ideology through a rethinking of the classical conflict between the liberal and radical schools of thought inside South African historiography.¹ This is mainly done by examining a wide range of the most important analyses made on relations between race, class and identity in South African history. A more specific aim is to investigate, which of the main historical-ideological schools that came closest to the historical truth in its analyses. Even if I do not expect that a definite answer to this question can be found, it provides an impetus to the search for meaning in history. Although the approach is eclectic, the solution of the project will involve a more complete recording and prioritisation of the history debate than seen before.

This project is far away from any kind of established, intellectual knowledge-power. Contrarily, it is grappling more or less helplessly with apparently outdated concepts. One problem arising from this research is, if the classical, left-ideological insurgency has come to an end, or if it still has some potential.² It seems like the historical debate between left and right has just died out without any real conclusion. Even then, issues from the debate keep cropping up again and again.³

Were those socialist notions, which served as an ideological inspiration for many South African historians, defeated once and for all at the end of the 20th century? Did socialist solutions and explanations cease to function, because they were plain wrong and unnatural; because the opposition was too strong; because they were inadequately formulated; or because they belong to the future? Should we regard the radical school's historians as idealistic utopians, while the liberals were the useful realists? If so, was the dispute unimportant? Did it promote or undermine quality of research and professional values? Why can't we just forget the left's agenda?

Building on my earlier research,⁴ this project will require additional textual analysis, extension of the field of study, plus some rewriting and analytical elaboration. It will both deepen and broaden the investigation and transform the research into a relevant book manuscript.

My methodological approach to this task is that it is fully possible to demarcate and analyse a central ideological clash between historians and simultaneously provide a broad and readable overall picture of the history debate. This project is dealing with ideological turning points, intellectual breakthroughs, central academic personages, and fundamental institutions in the international world of history writing. It pursues the making of intellectual history. The large bibliography build for this project in the form of my online research databases testifies that this project will complement, not duplicate other research.

The problem

Numerous attempts have been made to isolate and characterise the basic elements in the specific South African social order during the segregation and apartheid periods.⁵ From the beginning of the 1970s to the end of the 1980s, these attempts took the shape of a scholarly discussion, whose participants, to a large extent, split into two principal camps: the liberal school and the radical-revisionist school.⁶

Roughly simplified it has been the liberal stance, that apartheid has injured the free potentialities of modern capitalism in South Africa and has thereby limited both economic growth and political freedom.⁷ The bearing of the radical school is, basically, that the racial system has been beneficial to the ruling class, the South African capitalists, and that it operated with economic functionality and with political rationality over a long period of time.⁸

The project poses these broad-spectrum questions: what was it that made history a master tool in the struggle against late apartheid? Why did South African historians write as they did, what effects did their writings have, and how does the history views of the 1970s and the 1980s differ from those of previous and later periods? Why is it that this epoch is considered a golden age for the profession?

It maps the profession: to what extent, how, and by whom were historical research results from this debate used in the political struggle during apartheid? How did the historians relate to that kind of applied history? Did the close interaction between academia and civil society influence their professional integrity? In what ways have they justified their viewpoints and actions as historians?

Perhaps constructive historical models can be created by merging methods and ideas from the history discipline and development research. Some of the questions raised during work on this project point in that direction. How close is the connection between societal development level and authoritarian rule? Is economic growth created mainly during periods with market liberalism or during periods with protectionism and government economic intervention? Do the radical demands of popular movements promote productivity, competitiveness and purchasing power through a dialectic process, or does forced social stability promote growth at certain stages of development? Which are the most important factors in the interplay between economic necessity and political agency? Under which conditions is a nation state respectively strengthened or weakened by people-driven development? Are moral condemnations of alleged historical crimes meaningless, and is one obliged to present alternative historical development models, if one persists? These questions lie implicitly in the cross-disciplinary and international South African historian's debate, even though the responses to some extent fall outside of the framework of this study.

Is it possible, or even desirable, to revitalise the dialectical, ideological dynamism of the great debate? Can it by comparison against the post-apartheid situation be determined if the forms of the history debate have become poorer - i.e. if changes in the practices of the social sciences would be preferable? For instance, unconventional angles probably need to be appreciated more than hitherto. The contributions that skilled amateurs made to the history debate during apartheid helped provoke ruptures and movements towards paradigm shifts. The connection between these contributions, popular political activity, and historical research is still a rather poorly researched field within historiography. This angle will be included in my study, where it is significant for the main paradigmatic conflict.

My research will argue that history has not ended; that the Marxist discussions of the 1970s and '80s have a persistent, progressive significance; and that the historic right-left debate has continued relevance. However, it is my hypothesis that a wakeup call to mainstream academia has to come from outside the academic world.

Post-Cold War perspectives on the debate will be considered. My expectation is that the ways of viewing progressive history – together with attitudes to the left-right debate as such – have been influenced deeply by the disappearance of the “communist threat”.

Exactly how did intellectual developments in the West affect the struggle against apartheid in South Africa? The end of Marxist knowledge-power in South Africa cannot be fully understood without grasping the political weakness of Western university Marxism in the advanced capitalist countries. And a new progressive, intellectual wave will hardly come about without developing an understanding, locally and internationally, of what was lost with the end of the moment of western Marxism in South Africa. Even if the influence from Soviet-Marxism on the ANC and other popular movements were studied by both apartheid ideologists and liberals, the question of why it left so few lasting imprints, has not been answered. Were most of the radical-revisionists actually progressive liberals taking a detour, using neo-Marxism as career instrument?

The ability of new trends and theories around the history profession and related disciplines to relieve/replace former, ideologically informed theories will be tested. Post-structuralism;⁹ localism;¹⁰ identity history and ethnicity;¹¹ oral history;¹² history of religion;¹³ health history;¹⁴ reconciliation history;¹⁵ Africanism;¹⁶ and governmental nation building history and African renaissance,¹⁷ etc. will be considered and their relation to earlier writings will be analysed. From where did they come? Are they superior to the stereotypes of the great debate? Are they genuine advances, offering better historical insight? The movement towards a new pervasive hegemony of converging trends in South African historical research will be criticised.

Despite much research, the fundamental question of the debate remains open: was apartheid organised mainly around race or class? Or in other words: can it be decided, if ethnic/cultural or if social relations are the most important for identity creation and for the discrimination of others?

Relevance and premise

The time has come, I think, for the South Africans (and for the world) to take another look at the images and myths of their era of repression in the new light that their liberation has turned out to be more of a neo-liberal victory than the national democratic revolution that many had expected. From the perspective of the radical intellectuals: did a revolution actually take place?

From a definition of historiography as the history of historical writing or simply as the writing of history, there is an obvious need for historiographical research in South Africa. Despite of many short articles and chapters that touch on historiographical matters, less than a handful of syntheses in book length are available, and most of these are outdated.¹⁸ Newer analyses have been narrow in scope or limited in size.¹⁹

During recent years, I have visited universities in the United States, including Columbia, Yale, Boston, and Harvard. I was confirmed in my impression from earlier research stays in South Africa and England that there is an all time present veneration for, and interest in, this field of inquiry, but little ongoing research.

This project is designed to support Danish, South African, and international research equally, and for that matter, it could be viewed as a continuation of the international, academic solidarity, which flourished during late apartheid. My stubbornness in the pursuit of this project has been encouraged by a number of people involved in the game, even if they do not necessarily agree in my arguments.²⁰

Converging tendencies can be traced in the South African history debate and some debaters consider that the rightwing/leftwing controversy has rendered itself superfluous.²¹ I doubt very much that we are beyond the radical-liberal debate. This debate is a reflection of some of the most basic societal divisions. And – despite great developments in the areas of political representation and formal equality of rights – class contrasts have not changed fundamentally in South Africa. For that reason, issues from the left-right debate keep popping up all the time. These problems diffuse into academia, even if Marxism today is typically used in an indirect, muted way.

Of one reason or another, important, historical questions have been left aside lately. Was the truth-value of the liberal project obvious already from the early apartheid reforms of the 1970s - or did the democratic breakthrough succeed only due to the popular movements' militant threat of revolution? Logically, what at the present stage could be interpreted as the odd, common victory of the freedom movement and the liberal forces, ought to raise the need for the positions to be summed up. Instead, the debate has just disappeared.

In the last instance, a continued exploration of liberal and radical theories of change, and of the discussion between their agents, also prior to 1994, is a necessary prerequisite for deciding whether expectations to the outcome of popular struggles have been fulfilled. It seems to be a difficult matter to decide if those anti-apartheid activists, whose main motive power was social indignation, fought in vain. Can historical studies help to measure that?

To determine this problem in satisfactory detail, one will have to develop methods, which can hold together surveys of popular, pre-1994 expectations with post-apartheid, socio-economic developments and compare the results with central theories and predictions of the liberal and radical traditions respectively.

The pace of post-apartheid transformation of the history profession has been slow. This causes pain among black people and makes it less easy for South Africa to fulfil its role as an African country. The history of the way in which opinion-forming scholars have involved themselves in the left-right debate could be a source of inspiration for as long as social dispute inside nation states has not become obsolete.

Methodology

How does one compare historical writings in a meaningful way and how can their importance be measured? When this kind of topic is attacked; typically styled and of central interest to the discipline, the risk is exhaustion of the problem, reporting trivial changes in previous research.²²

This project will take the form of an examination of works from opposing “history movements” or “trends in history writing,” mapping their characteristics through analyses of their interpretations of a highly particular social development known as segregation/apartheid. The resultant book will present itself as a relatively broad, debating analysis, rather than as a traditional, narrow, impersonal university thesis. The book will be written on the basis of proper basic research and commonly accepted principles of source-criticism.²³ It will include a representative selection of works from the competing historical paradigms, suitable for illustrating the disputes between them and this material will be handled in a fair and comprehensive manner through comparative analyses based on the conventional hermeneutic circle.²⁴ Rules of good scientific practice, including those referring to triangulation and analytical induction, will be regarded.²⁵

It goes without saying that the aim is to construct an accurate picture of the historical reality - in this case the making of history - on the basis of facts. In dealing with historiography, this is both harder and easier than in other kinds of history writing in the sense that the subject could seem more “indirect”, not being so much “what really happened” out there in the “societal historical reality”,²⁶ but rather what other historians have been writing about that reality.²⁷ This implies that secondary literature often functions as the historiographer’s primary sources,²⁸ but it also indicates that conclusions can only with caution be drawn on the history of the wider world, but should principally be on the historical texts analysed.

The eclectic method used cannot involve all of the perspectives that are relevant to understanding the issue in its entirety and in all its externalities, so there can be no expectation that the eclectic approach will produce a perfect response. The expectation is rather to demonstrate specific but complex relationships and connections between phenomena of the empirical reality, present angles and contexts of comprehension, take advantage of conceptual interdisciplinary, as well as identify gaps in the existing knowledge. Despite some philosophical reservations, methodological eclecticism is used in this study to combine and integrate knowledge from different subject-areas and disciplines by way of methods described as conceptual interdisciplinarity.²⁹ The rationale is that an assembly of several theories will improve existing theoretical understandings of the complexity of empirical relationships. Postmodernist dangers are lurking in the corners of this methodology. Using it uncritically could lead to the establishment of a lack of systematic explication of chosen criteria; to a patchwork of unconnected theories unprincipled put together; it could create illogical incoherence of data. The knowledge integrated when using this methodology is often not new knowledge, in the sense of never thought about before. It is based on already known forms of thought; therefore, results could be unoriginal, not leading to new insights. However, these weaknesses are outweighed by the fact that the eclectic methodology is anti-reductive in its view of knowledge creation. The strength of the approach is that it better uncovers shortcomings and inadequacies in existing explanations. Since it looks at science as an unfinished process, it is constantly striving to uncover additional layers and dimensions.

Part of writing historiography is to extract those assumptions and theories that have guided previous work. When doing this, the author exposes himself to all kinds of discursive and epistemological clashes and his daring analyses is frequently curtailed by warnings of dangers like dogmatic totalisation,³⁰ blind essentialism,³¹ and narrow reductionism.³² And undeniable; being unaware of that kind of temptations increases the threat of getting caught by a simplistic teleology. An opposite risk, however, lies in the self-protective, multicausal approach, avoiding all theoretical commitment,

throwing in a variety of explanations, and eventually arriving at the “combination of factors” kind of conclusion - failing to weight or prioritise causal explanations. Thus the claims of some historians to be objective (if understood as neutral) are always a mere pretence.

My point of departure is that historical research is never value-free. My overall theoretical foundation is in classical historical materialism.³³ This implies a preference for structuralist reasoning, a high priority for causal explanations from a class or interest point of view prioritised after relative importance, and a dedication to the use of history for the sake of social progress.³⁴ My investigation forms part of an ideological discussion on history in which I have a position.

Since many of the works do not communicate or relate very well to each other, the reviewed works will not be scrutinised only from one single, more or less unambiguous perspective, but rather from a long range of shifting criteria tailored to meet the uniqueness of the works and authors evaluated, such as their significance for the understanding of political history, their civil society value, their importance for identity creation, their capacity to explain key structures, their display of accurate knowledge on historical events, their theoretical coherence, their literary qualities, the impact of certain biases in the work, the way the works have been used by authorities, etc.

On the middle level of abstraction, through a diversified process, I will let me inspire by a rather arbitrary selection of theories and methods derived from both theory of history,³⁵ textual analysis,³⁶ paradigm theory and knowledge sociology,³⁷ African studies methods,³⁸ identity studies,³⁹ fieldwork techniques,⁴⁰ political science,⁴¹ economics and economic history,⁴² social history,⁴³ cultural studies,⁴⁴ gender studies,⁴⁵ and historical anthropology.⁴⁶ Even if many would probably regard it as quite fitting for this kind of investigation, which deals with qualitative interpretations, constructions of meaning, and contents of notions; discourse analysis,⁴⁷ other postmodernist inspirations,⁴⁸ and social psychology,⁴⁹ will be applied only sceptically and reluctant, and in small doses. I find the linguistic prominence and non-materialistic approach to facts and historical reality found in some parts of discourse theory rather useless. Perhaps, the ambiguous expansion of discourse theory is due to the fact that it is approached by both used-to-be structuralist Marxists, who are reluctant to give up the primacy of “the social” and by conventional, liberally disposed scholars, who restrict themselves to the text itself. Masked ideological struggles therefore take place inside the theory.

Despite the reservations made above, I agree partly in some postmodernist readings and accept that they have enriched the universe of critical analysis. The referential focus on how texts relate to each other; the will to deconstruct accepted discourses; the structural focus on conventions on what can be said or not; the analytical focus on categories used for text-understanding; the focus on from where the power to define what can be seen as reality comes; the resemblance with the concept of ideology; the focus on the social position of sources; the awareness of processes of struggle between interpretations; the exposure of tendency via comparative analysis; the translation between different meaning systems; the questioning of the researcher’s objectivity; and the kind of eclecticism that enables one to select elements from different perspectives and theories and to discard others, are all analytical angles, I will make use of.⁵⁰

Another theoretical inspiration has been Habermas’s theory of communication; however I do not see it as a superior tool for analysing ideological discussions.⁵¹ His idea of equal communication, free of power-relations, is attractive and seems ideal for establishing freedom of expression in academic and public rooms, but has, unfortunately, little to do with real world historical-ideological struggles.

Also Bourdieu’s work has been considered in length, as it will appear from my manuscript’s theoretical introduction, but in my interpretation, he’s venture ends up being muddled and contradictory. Bourdieu’s project - a practical “transcendence” of the objectivist/subjectivist antinomy - appears unconvincing to me.⁵² The claim from some followers, that habitus enriches the objectivist perspective by specifying a non-reductionist theory of agency, cannot be fully sustained, I think. Could it be that some intellectuals, themselves constantly devoted to the use of text and language in settings of relative, academic freedom, simply come to overestimate and generalise communication as a societal factor and thereby gets a distorted overall picture?

An easy, one-and-for-all solution to distinguish between tendencies in history writing does not exist. Regardless of the present popularity of discourse theory, there are only vague tendencies towards

clarifying the connotations of “*the politics of historical interpretation*” as Hayden White calls this relation.⁵³

To find out more about why skin colour, more than social inequality, for most of the time seems to have been, and once again seems to be, the most important consideration in social studies on South Africa, continues to be an important aspect of my research. Many liberal, race-related history-analyses take their departure in some kind of social psychology. For many Marxists, on the other hand, the exact determination of human agency in history - the role of the individual – remains relatively unsettled.

Norbert Elias’s figurational sociology seeks not to reduce processes into static elements, separating human actors from their actions. The practitioners of this theory are often inspired by the ideal that the usual barrier in humanities between micro/psychological and macro/state is removed. The main weakness of this perspective is the use of surface phenomena and individual behaviour as the most substantial parameters.

Modern social constructivism shows some of the same weaknesses. Instead of assessing facts on their truth-value, social constructivism turns to the pragmatic philosophy that considers knowledge only in relation to the actions that it enables. Hence, to make any claims to explain how the world has worked is tantamount to perpetuating a kind of intellectual fraud. I fail to see, why seeking the historical truth should necessarily reduce a critical view on the creation or use of knowledge.

I am, after careful consideration of a whole range of spectacular theories, stuck with Marxian materialism as the general, theoretical inspiration for my analysis.

I have viewed the diverging historical schools within the South African context as expressions of “history ideologies”, which more or less openly reflect interests, mindsets, and political trends within the surrounding, contemporary society. The products of the historians are therefore appraised while keeping in mind (a) the underlying, internal intellectual architecture, (b) the institutional and disciplinary framework within which knowledge was produced, and (c) external political influences.

My understanding of historical materialism is built partly on G.A. Cohen’s interpretation of its key terms and concepts.⁵⁴ One implication is that it is impossible to understand how structures are reproduced except through human action. Similarly, it is not possible to comprehend practices, except as they are conditioned by structures, themselves the product of past practices.

Many of the reviewed works deal with the relationship between race and class. The meaning and relative importance of identity, class, ethnicity, race, nation, religion, and gender will therefore be a recurrent theme. After Foucault, Said, Orientalism, and post-colonialism,⁵⁵ it is common knowledge that European portrayals of Africa have often been part of constructing “the other”, where the exotic representations of “them” are designed by Westerners to promote a positive image of themselves through contrasting. Africa and Africans still seems to have a special role here by being constructed as the extreme opposite to the European model of progress. The hierarchical ranking of groups means that many of the discussions must be about the criticism of different forms of power.⁵⁶

In this connection, one must also be aware of African studies methods and their history, which over the last 50 years have showed a transition from an open-mindedness about the potential for African states to deliver education and other public services, and a believe on the ability of the social sciences to apprehend African realities, towards a rather deflated sense of what African area studies can contribute with and doubts on the extent to which the social sciences are capable of explaining complex phenomena.⁵⁷ Many Africanists may have thrown the baby out with the bath water during this process. So much time has been spent embracing African subjectivities and connectivities that some of the fundamentals of political economy have been forgotten.

How do you actually know when discussions within the humanities can be characterised as new research results? The main purpose of my research is not the operationalising or testing of one specific theory by proving the validity of clearly defined variables, but rather to create broad, reliable, and multidisciplinary new knowledge of how history has been used in South Africa. The texts and other sources analysed will be chosen after their estimated importance for the history debate, partly on the basis of my pre-knowledge after ten years of experience in this area of research.

Academic trends have to be identified according to their use of ideas and concepts, and my principal method for creating an understanding of the history debate is numerous discussions on suppositions, agendas, importance, and limitations. When placing and grading the text material, I have used a method deduced from Dan O'Meara's work.⁵⁸ This entails a general effort to identify subjects and research areas together with archetypal authors according to their main focus on basic categories and relationships (the ontological aspect); an exposure of unconcealed as well as concealed explanatory models used under the concept/framework deployed in the writings (the epistemological aspect); and a disclosure of the political and research policy connotations of the analysed texts (the normative aspect).

Some researchers have regarded other societal trends, nationalism, for instance, for just as central for politics as liberalism and Marxism.⁵⁹ Basic characteristics indicate that the demarcation used in this project is more essential, even if considered antiquated by some. No Marxist tradition exists inside the liberal school and no liberals favour consequent, Marxist historiography, while there are Africanists, feminists, localists, postmodernists, and different kinds of nationalists inside both of the main directions. Obviously, this is not a coincidental detail. It reflects that, in the last instance, capitalist and socialist conceptions of the ideal society are incompatible and antagonistic. The fact that the main battle in practical politics for the time being seems to be fought between conservative liberals and reformist social democrats does not change this, but only raise the question of how to characterise reformism.

I will use argument analysis intensively (the practice of breaking down an argument through extraction of elements in structure, claim, instance/evidence, patterns, authority, relevance, acceptability, sufficiency, etc.).⁶⁰ Another tool is framing analysis, which will be used when focusing on how institutions and publishing houses inevitably select and structure information within specific value-determined frameworks.⁶¹

Some consideration will be laid on the authors' treatment of what I consider key elements in the history debate such as:

- Rationalities of growth, economic dysfunctions, and redistributive models.
- Correlations between class relations, race attitudes, gender, and culture.
- Processes of industrialisation, proletarianisation, and urbanisation held together with criteria for social success.
- Rural processes, including transitions from pre-capitalist to modern agriculture, land distribution and migration.
- Their identification of other essential, underlying societal factors, including ethnicity, identity and the creation of mentalities.
- Statutory regulations reflecting white, political domination and open, official racial segregation in institutions, laws and procedures.
- The background of protest and the shifting forms of popular social and political expression.
- Use of principal theories of history and of historical and social science methods.
- Intellectual and practical pressure from academic structures, apartheid society, and movements.

Plus a great deal of other textual and conceptual elements which should not be classified or generalised prematurely.

The sources

The scholarly debate constitutes in itself a large, but nevertheless limited source material. As a foundation for the research project, a database with more than 6500 partly annotated references to history and social science studies on South African issues has been built, including dissertations, unpublished university working papers, conference papers, government documents, research reports, interviews, journal articles, book chapters, source collections, monographs, internet debates, films, and several other types of sources. The literature has been obtained over several years from a wide range of international research libraries, archives, document collections, university centres,

government departments, organisations/NGOs, and personal contacts. As a supplement to the reading of texts and sociological analysis, I will carry out a limited interview survey among concerned researchers. Normal e-survey methods will be used.

At least one year of actual research and experimental writing remain before this project is ready for publication.

(A present draft manuscript amounting to more than 550 pages can be found on my website: <http://www.jakobsgaardstolten.dk/> | Book Manuscripts | Monograph on South African history writing. This document will require user name "visitor" and password "laia"). Follow the link from the list of Contents to the chapter: List of applied literature. Specific searches on selected sub-items are also possible through my website: | Databases, Queries | My online databases / blogs | LitSA).

(This document contains little more than 20000 characters, not counting spaces or notes. Full endnotes serve as a bibliography).

¹ For the need of such a revitalisation of the debate, see Rich, Paul, "Is South African Radical Social History Becoming Irrelevant?", *South African Historical Journal*, Vol. 31, 1994, Journal of Southern African Studies 20th-Anniversary Conference, University of York, September 1994: Paradigms Lost, Paradigms regained? Southern African Studies in the 1990s; Cobley, Alan, "Does Social History Have a Future? The Ending of Apartheid and Recent Trends in South African Historiography", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, JSAS, September, 2001.

² For general international debates on this theme see Francis Fukuyama, *The end of History and the Last Man*, London, Hamish Hamilton, 1992; Francis Fukuyama, "Jeg fik ret: Demokratiet sejrer" ("I was right: Democracy prevails"), interview in Danish newspaper *Politiken*, 12 March 2011; Noberto Bobbio, *Left and Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction*, University of Chicago Press, 1997 (org. title: *Destra e sinistra*); Gayil Talshir, "The phoenix of ideology", *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 107–124, June 2005.

³ Hans Erik Stolten, article in Danish, "Universitetsmarxister, græsrodspopulister og intellektuelle realister i Sydafrikas nationaldemokratiske revolution" in *Kontur - Tidsskrift for Kulturstudier*, Aarhus Universitet, 2009.

⁴ Some of which has actually been noticed by colleagues lately; see for example a 15 pages review article exclusively on my edited book from 2007, brought in *History & Theory*, Volume 49, Issue 2 (pp. 266-280), May 2010.

⁵ M. Legassick and G. Minkley, "Current Trends in the production of South African history", *Alternation, International Journal for the study of Southern African Literature and Languages*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 1998.

⁶ For a classical liberal work see Monica Wilson and Leonard M. Thompson (eds.), *The Oxford History of South Africa*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1969-71. For a classical radical work see F.R. Johnstone, *Class, Race and Gold. A Study of Class Relations and Racial Discrimination in South Africa*, London, Kegan Paul, 1976.

⁷ Ralph Horwitz, *The Political Economy of South Africa*, London, 1967; Merle Lipton, *Capitalism and Apartheid. South Africa, 1910 - 1984*, London, Gower/Temple Smith, 1985/86.

⁸ Jack W. Cell, *The Highest Stage of White Supremacy*, Cambridge University Press, London, 1982; Mats Lundahl, *Apartheid in theory and practice: An economic analysis*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1992, pp. 155-160.

⁹ Aletta J. Norval, "Social Ambiguity and the Crisis of Apartheid", in Ernesto Laclau (ed.), *The Making of Political Identities*, London: Verso, 1994.

¹⁰ Vivian Bickford-Smith, Elizabeth Van Heyningen, and Nigel Worden, *Cape Town in the 20th Century*, 1999.

¹¹ Gerhard Maré, *Brothers Born of Warrior Blood. Politics and Ethnicity in South Africa*, Ravan, 1992.

¹² Paul la Hausse, "Oral history and South African Historians" in *Radical History Review*, Vol. 46/7, 1990.

¹³ Norman Etherington, "Recent Trends in the Historiography of Christianity in Southern Africa", *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 2, 1996.

¹⁴ Randall M. Packard, , *White Plague, Black Labor: Tuberculosis and the Political Economy of Health and Disease in South Africa*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1989.

¹⁵ Anthony Holiday, "Forgiving and forgetting: the Truth and Reconciliation Commission" in Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee (eds.), *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*, Cape Town, Oxford University Press, 1998.

¹⁶ Ralph A. Austen, "'Africanist' Historiography and its Critics: can there be an autonomous African History?" in Falola, Toyin (ed.), *African historiography. Essays in honour of Jacob Ade Ajayi*, Harlow: Longman, 1993.

¹⁷ Rob Sieborger et al., *Turning Points in History*, Textbook series commissioned by SA Department of Education, STE Publishers, 2004.

¹⁸ Christopher C. Saunders, *The making of the South African past: major historians on race and class*, Cape Town, David Philip, 1988; Smith, Kenneth Wyndham, *The Changing Past: trends in South African historical writing*, Johannesburg, Southern Book Publishers, 1988.

¹⁹ Allison Drew, (ed.), *South Africa's Radical Tradition, A Documentary History*, UCT Press, 1996-97; Daryl Glaser, *Politics and Society in South Africa: a critical introduction*, SAGE Publications, 2001; Paul, Maylam, *South Africa's racial past the history and historiography of racism, segregation, and apartheid*, Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2001; Merle Lipton, *Liberals, Marxists, and Nationalists: Competing Interpretations of South African History*, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2007.

²⁰ Among others, who can be contacted: Dorothy Woodson, Yale University; Peter Limb, Michigan State University; Christopher Saunders, University of Cape Town; Merle Lipton, University of Sussex; Henning Melber, Dag Hammarsköld Foundation.

²¹ David R. Howard, "Paradigms Gained? A Critique of Theories and Explanations of Democratic Transition in South Africa" in Howard, David R. and Aletta J. Noval (eds.), *South Africa in Transition: New Theoretical Perspectives*, pp. 182-215, London, Macmillan, 1998.

²² My general approach to the art of project formulation will emerge clearly from this PP-presentation: <http://www.jakobsgaardstolten.dk> | Teaching Notes | Notes on study techniques.

²³ Widely accepted interpretations of these principles can be read in Torsten Thurén, *Källkritik*, Almqvist & Wiksell, 1997; Helge Paludan in Mads Mordhorst and Nielsen, Carsten Tage, *Fortidens spor, nutidens øjne: kildebegrebet til debat*, Roskilde Universitetsforlag, 2001, p. 76.

²⁴ Sebastian Olden-Jørgensen, *Til kilderne! Introduktion til historisk kildekritik*, Gads Forlag, 1994/2001, p. 28.

²⁵ Martin W. Bauer and G. Gaskell, *Qualitative Researching with text, image and sound. A practical handbook*, Sage Publications, 2000, chapter. 19.

²⁶ Wilhelm Dilthey, "Kritik der Historischen Vernunft". From *Meaning in history: W. Dilthey's thoughts on history and society*, H. P. Rickman (ed.), London, George Allen & Unwin, 1961.

²⁷ Henry Kozicki (ed.), *Developments in Modern Historiography*, London, Macmillan Press, 1993.

²⁸ Skocpol, Theda, *States and social revolutions: a comparative analysis of France, Russia, and China*, Cambridge University Press, 1979, p. xiv.

²⁹ L. Salter and A. Hearn, *Outside the lines: Issues in Interdisciplinary Research*, McGill Queen's Press, Montreal, 1996, p. 9.

³⁰ The concept of "totalisation" is often connected, by non-Marxists, with concepts like "grand narrative". It is regarded by many as oppressive. The concept should not be confused with the ideological construct "totalitarianism".

³¹ Essentialism is the view that, for any specific kind of entity, there is a set of characteristics or properties all of which any entity of that kind must have. In Platonic idealism, an essence of forms or ideas is permanent and unalterable.

³² Reductionism is usually related to a certain perspective on causality. In a reductionist framework, phenomena can be explained completely in terms of other, more fundamental phenomena.

³³ Marx / Engels / Lenin, *On Historical Materialism. A Collection*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1972; G.A. Cohen, *Karl Marx's Theory of History. A Defence*, Oxford University Press, 1978/84; Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

³⁴ H. Wolpe, "The Liberation Struggle and Research", *Review of African Political Economy*, Vol. 32, 1985

³⁵ George Steinmetz (ed.), *The Politics of Method in the Human Sciences: Positivism and its Epistemological Others*, Durham, Duke University Press, 2005.

³⁶ Jeremy Hawthorn, *Cunning passages: new historicism, cultural materialism and Marxism in the contemporary literary debate*, Interrogating texts, London, Arnold, 1996; Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 2004.

³⁷ Thomas Kuhn, *The structure of Scientific Revolutions*, University of Chicago Press, 1962; Hayden White, "The Politics of History" in Hayden White, *The Content of the Form*, pp. 58-82, Baltimore/London, 1986; Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, Symposion - det lilla forlaget, 1996 (Swedish edition); Mark Sanders, *Complicities: The Intellectual and Apartheid*, Philosophy and Postcoloniality Series, Durham and London, Duke University Press, 2002.

³⁸ Toyin Falola and Christian Jennings, (eds.), *Sources and Methods in African History: Spoken, Written, Unearthed*, University of Rochester Press, 2003.

³⁹ Calhoun, Craig, *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1994; Hamilton, Carolyn, "Historiography and the Politics of Identity in South Africa", Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town, 1997; Reddy, Thiven, *Hegemony and Resistance: Contesting Identities in South Africa*, Race and Representation, Aldershot, Ashgate, 2000.

- ⁴⁰ Janet Ewald, "Foxes in the Field: an Essay on a Historical Methodology", *African Studies Review*, Vol. 30, No. 2, Atlanta, 1987; Jan Vansina, "Fieldwork in History", in Adenaike, Carolyn Keynes and Jan Vansina (eds.), *In Pursuit of History: Fieldwork in Africa*, pp. 127-140, Heinemann, 1996.
- ⁴¹ Peter Vale, Larry A. Swatu, Bertil Odén, and Tiomothy M. Shaw (eds.), *Theory, Change and Southern Africa's Future*, International Political Economy Series, 2001; M. Janet and Bradford S. Jones, *Timing and Political Change: Event History Modeling in Political Science*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 2003.
- ⁴² Seekings, Jeremy and Nicoli Nattrass, "Apartheid Revisited: Analysing Apartheid as a Distributional Regime", Graduate school of Humanities with the Centre for African Studies Seminar, University of Cape Town, 2000.
- ⁴³ Marks, Shula, "Towards a Peoples History of South Africa", in *Journal of History*, Vol. 7, No. 4, 1974; William Beinart and JoAnn McGregor, (eds.), *Social History and African Environments*, Ohio University Press, 2003.
- ⁴⁴ Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger (eds.), *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge University Press, 1983; Mamdani, Mahmood, *Beyond Rights-Talk and Culture-Talk*, David Philip, 2000.
- ⁴⁵ Morrell, Robert (ed.), *Changing Men in Southern Africa*, Pietermaritzburg, University of Natal press, 2001; Kevane, Michael, *Women and development in Africa: how gender works*, Boulder, Colorado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2004.
- ⁴⁶ Fredrik Barth, *Ethnic groups and boundaries: the social organization of culture difference*, Bergen, Universitetsforlaget, 1969; Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History*, Berkeley, UCP, 1982; Adam Kuper, "The academic frontier: history and social anthropology in South Africa", *African Studies*, spec. issue, Vol. 56, No. 2, Witwatersrand University Press, 1997; Don Kalb and Herman Tak (eds.), *Critical Junctions: Anthropology and History Beyond The Cultural Turn*, New York: Berghahn Books, 2005.
- ⁴⁷ Aletta J. Norval, *Deconstructing apartheid discourse*, London, Verso, 1996; Ian Parker, Ann Levett, Amanda Kottler, and Erica Burman, "On discourse, power, culture and change" in *Culture, Power and Difference: Discourse Analysis in South Africa*, University of Cape Town Press, 1997. .
- ⁴⁸ See critiques in Clifton C. Crais, "South Africa and the Pitfalls of Postmodernism", *South African Historical Journal*, Vol. 31, 1994; Paul Maylam, "Dead Horses, the Baby, and the Bathwater: 'Post-theory' and the historians practice", South African Historical Society, Paper presented at the Biennial Conference UWC 11-14/7, Bellville, 1999; Willie Thompson, *Postmodernism and History*, Theory and History Series, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- ⁴⁹ Peter Lambley, *The Psychology of Apartheid*, London, Secker and Warburg, 1980.
- ⁵⁰ Even if I most often disagree, there is a lot to be learned from postmodernist South African writers such as Aletta J. Norval, Thiven Reddy, Ann Levett, Robert Turrell, and Mark Sanders.
- ⁵¹ Steven Best, *The Politics of Historical Vision: Marx, Foucault, Habermas*, The Guilford Press, 1995, p. 145.
- ⁵² Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge University Press, 1977, p. 233 (Originally 1972).
- ⁵³ Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987, ch. 3, "The Politics of Historical Interpretation", p. 58.
- ⁵⁴For an introduction to Cohen's framework, see "Forces and Relations of Production" in John Roemer (ed.), *Analytical Marxism*, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 11-22.
- ⁵⁵ Edward Said, *Orientalism: western conceptions of the Orient*, London, Penguin Books, 1995 (originally 1978): "My contention is that Orientalism is fundamentally a political doctrine willed over the Orient because the Orient was weaker than the West". See also M.E. Baaz, "Introduction – African identity and the postcolonial" in Maria Eriksson Baaz and Mai Palmberg (eds.), *Same and Other. Negotiating African Identity in Cultural Production*, Uppsala, NAI, 2001; Ato Quayson, *Postcolonialism: theory, practice or process?*, Polity Press and Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- ⁵⁶ Saul Dubow, *Scientific Racism in Modern South Africa*, Cambridge University Press, 1995; Daryl Glaser, *Politics and Society in South Africa: a critical introduction*, SAGE Publications, 2001.
- ⁵⁷ Paul Nugent, "Engaging Africa: Past, Present and Future", keynote speech at the 25-years jubilee at the Centre of African Studies, University of Copenhagen, February 2010, unpublished..
- ⁵⁸ For more on this method, see Dan O'Meara, "Theoretical Appendix" in *Forty lost Years: The Apartheid State and the Politics of the National Party, 1948-1994*, Ravan Press and Ohio University Press, 1996, p. 426.
- ⁵⁹ Merle Lipton, *Liberals, Marxists, and Nationalists: Competing Interpretations of South African History*, Palgrave, Macmillan, 2007.
- ⁶⁰ Peter Phelan and Peter Reynolds, *Argument and evidence: critical analysis for the social sciences*, London, Routledge, 1996.
- ⁶¹Erving Goffman, *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Northeastern University Press, 1986; Paul D'Angelo and Jim A. Kuypers (eds.), *Doing News Framing Analysis: Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives*, New Youk, Routledge, 2010.