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ABSTRACT

Our research examines the role that race, racial identity and racism play in talk about student politics. In this article we examine white male and female students’ accounts for non-participation in student politics at a historically black university. Our analysis of talk in focus group discussions identifies a range of conceptual dichotomies. We link these conceptual dichotomies to deeply entrenched racially binarized narratives and show how recourse to them is used to articulate and legitimize decisions not to participate in student politics. We discuss the implications of the strategies employed by white students to...
account for non-participation in student politics and conclude the article by giving consideration to suggestions for alternate frames for doing whiteness in contemporary South Africa.
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The research upon which this article is based was conducted in 2010, years before the student-led Rhodes Must Fall and Fees Must Fall campaigns. It was conducted by the first author in part fulfilment of a Masters degree in Counselling Psychology at the University of Fort Hare (UFH) on the East London campus. The research was supervised by the second author who, at the time, was a lecturer based on the East London campus of the UFH. To understand what motivated us to do this research it is necessary to understand something about the context in which the research was undertaken.

In 2001 the National Plan for Education proposed a number of mergers of universities and colleges in South Africa (DoE, 2001). Among these was a proposal to merge the East London campus of Rhodes University (RU) with the UFH. Transformation of racially segregated higher education colleges and universities was one of the objectives of the proposal to merge higher education institutions. RU is a historically white university while the UFH is a historically black university. In South Africa, one consequence of a history of politically motivated funding disparities of higher education institutions is that the historically white universities are privileged relative to the historically black universities. Thus, the transformation of higher education through the merging of historically segregated college and university campuses was not just a means to achieve racial diversity, but also a way to address histories of structural and material dis/advantage.

Both authors arrived at the UFH East London campus after the merger in 2005. While neither of us experienced the events leading up to the merger, we did witness subsequent unfolding events and the talk about those events. A number of authors have written on the attitudes and perceptions of academic staff toward the mergers of higher education institutions (e.g. Hay & Fourie, 2002; Mapesela & Hay, 2006; Reddy, 2007; Robus & Macleod, 2006). This literature makes for interesting and informative reading. However, we were interested in emergent student responses to the merger. In particular, we were interested to understand what we viewed as white students’ retreat from participation in student politics. We wanted to understand why white students chose to do this at precisely the moment in which collaboration and solidarity with an expanded student body was possible.

The seemingly intransigent phenomenon of racial segregation in post-apartheid South Africa has been interrogated from the vantage point of quantitative (e.g. Durrheim & Dixon, 2001; Foster, 2005; Goldschmidt, 2003; Schrieff, Tredoux, Dixon & Finchilescu, 2005) and qualitative (e.g. Hook & Vrdoljak, 2001; Robus & Macleod, 2006; Steyn, 2005, 2009; Truscott, 2010; Wambugu, 2005) research.
Across these empirical and critical epistemologies, a range of factors have been identified that play a role in entrenching racial segregation in South Africa. For example, mainstream social psychologists have identified inter-group behavioural patterns underpinning racial segregation in post-apartheid South Africa, while critical social psychologists have criticised the use of essentialist discourses in terms of their capacity for reifying notions of racial difference.

Locating our study within the domain of critical social psychology, we sought to examine white students’ accounts for non-participation in student politics. In the light of this positioning of the research we sought to engage with ideas put forward by postcolonial scholars. We were interested to engage with critiques of whiteness and cultural hegemony and to think through how this shaped ideas about self and other. Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) is a key text in the postcolonial literature, and it renewed interest in the critical writings of Frantz Fanon (1967). Fanon was particularly scathing of white hegemony, calling for a “new political subjectivity, a new life” for whites (1967, p.101). However, in contemporary South Africa, as Gibson (2008) notes, white hegemony persists in the identity-making practices of many of us.

Steyn (2005) critiques discursive strategies employed by white South Africans. In *White Talk*, Steyn (2005) argues that the dominant racial representations that whites draw upon in contemporary South Africa attempt to ‘fix’ groups in relation to each other. Steyn and Foster (2008) argue that this re-entrenches social hierarchies that have traditionally supported white hegemony. The reification and fixing of raced identities is the antithesis of Said’s (2003) model of cosmopolitan subjectivity. Cosmopolitan subjectivity is characterized by the continually decentred subject. A subject stripped of the superficial solace afforded by a unitary identity. In the South African context this might translate into the embracing by whites of a more fluid, open, destabilized conception of self, a self that is able to resist and interrogate the artificial coherence and constrained parameters imposed by existing dominant racialized discourses shaping identity.

**METHOD**

In this study, talk about participation in student politics was used as a vehicle for sampling ‘white talk’ (Steyn, 2005). At the time, the racial composition of the Student Representative Council (SRC) at the UFH was homogenous in terms of race (i.e. exclusively black student leaders). In our view this allowed for an interesting exploration of the discursive strategies that white students were likely to employ to explain their retreat from student politics.

Purposive sampling was used to recruit 12 white UFH students, 9 males and 3 females. Their age ranged between 19 years and 34 years. We divided the participants into two smaller groups in order to conduct focus group discussions. We assumed that, in racially homogenous focus group discussions, the participants would be
candid in the expression of their views on student politics. Talk in the focus group discussions was prompted by a number of open-ended questions that were designed to tap participants’ appraisals of student politics on campus and to elicit participants’ accounts of their engagement, or lack thereof. In order to focus discussion, the SRC was used as a point of reference in the questions.

The analytic tool implemented in this study was discourse analysis. Discourse analysis is a critical and politicized form of enquiry. Our discourse analysis drew on some of the key strategies for doing a discourse analysis outlined by Parker (1992, 2004). This involved identifying and analysing the objects constituted in talk; the subject positions that emerge from the way in which objects are constituted; the cultural resources drawn upon to characterise and evaluate actions; the kinds of power relations that discourses reproduce.

Parker (2004) argues that discourse analysis in psychology should study the way in which texts are constructed, the functions they serve within specific contexts, and the contradictions that run through them. The focus on discourse is particularly appropriate to the scope of this research as it seeks to examine the strategic functions of student’s discursive constructions in talk about non-participation in student politics. It is important to state that, in this study, in seeking to analyse white students’ talk, we do not aim to vilify individuals as racist. What we do aim to do is to examine the discursive strategies circulating within a particular speech community.

ANALYSIS

Data collection was driven by a set of open-ended questions designed to tap into some of the discursive strategies that the participants drew on in accounting for non-participation in student politics. Preliminary analysis of the focus group texts revealed numerous conceptual dichotomies. A closer examination indicated that these conceptual dichotomies constructed a pattern of racial bifurcations. In this section we present extracts from the focus group discussions to illustrate how they work to construct ‘white students’ accounts for non-participation in student politics.

The first extract is an excerpt of an account given by a female student about a SRC event that took place at a local nightclub. The speaker makes reference to the presence of weapons such as knives and guns. The speaker’s statements do not indicate that anyone was actually harmed at the event. However, the mention of guns and “knives being pulled” works to construct a scenario in which the threat of violence existed.

Extract 1: “There were knives being pulled”

WFS3 I never actually went but I gave it [the ticket] to one of my black friends who is not at the university. And guns were taken into the club. There were knives being pulled and, like, I’ve never been exposed to anything like that.
There may be a variety of explanations for the threat of violence described in Extract 1 (above). For example, the speaker alludes to the fact that attendance at the event was not limited to individuals who were registered students at the university. However, rather than exploring the various interpretative options that the scenario suggests, the speaker makes recourse to racial constructs.

The speaker explains that she gave her ticket to the event to one of her “black friends”. We argue that this identifier (black friends) is employed for the purpose of stake inoculation. Arguably, the assumption is that racists don’t have black friends. Therefore, this identifier works in the same way that saying “I’m not racist but” does. Being aware of this, we assume that what follows is likely to be problematic, and it is. The speaker goes on to describe the threat of violence. Read in the context of a situation where all of the leaders of the SRC are black students, who represent a mainly black student body, and are attending an event that white students (such as the speaker) have opted out of, the interpretation that is suggested to the reader is that the threat of violence described in this scenario can be attributed to the presence of black people at the event. In the context of histories of colonialism and apartheid where segregation and subjugation was often justified as a means to protect white people from black people, this interpretation is not a stretch of the imagination for most white South Africans.

In Extract 1 the speaker’s utterance ends with the statement, “I’ve never been exposed to anything like that”. We argue that this closes off any doubt about the intended interpretation. In relation to the threatening black crowd, the speaker positions herself as a member of a social group that, by comparison, is non-violent. Importantly, while the threat of violence at a SRC event that the speaker describes in this extract might be viewed as exceptional, the speaker’s analysis of the event links the threat of violence occurring in a single event to an assumption that this is characteristic of a broader pattern of behaviour of a particular social group. Across the two focus group discussions we identified numerous occasions where similar references were made. In relation to these references, the speakers then positioned themselves and their social group as living in fear of the threat of violence that they assume black people pose. This is illustrated in Extract 2 (below).

Extract 2: “You are terrified of the blacks”

WMS1 You know what it all comes down to? I mean, white people are terrified. And I don’t care, I don’t care if you are the richest or the poorest white guy in the world, you are terrified of the blacks.

In Extract 2 the speaker claims that both rich and poor whites (we assume that the masculine identifier is being used as a universal signifier that includes white females) are terrified of “the blacks”. It is interesting that the speaker sees the necessity of differentiating between rich and poor whites. This is possibly because representations
of violent crime in the news media often portray crimes such as theft of private property involving physical violence as having an economic basis. Arguably, this interpretative frame suggests that it’s only the rich whites that should be afraid of only the poor blacks. While there are many problems with this interpretative frame, the problem that it poses to the speaker is that it requires differentiating “the blacks” in terms of economic status and, following the logic of only poor people posing a threat to rich people, having to admit that there’s a possibly that not every black person is dangerous and not every white person feels threatened.

Later on, in the same focus group discussion, the speaker quoted in Extract 2 draws on the black threat/white fear narrative illustrated in the first two extracts to justify non-engagement with student life outside of lectures. An excerpt of this part of the discussion is presented in Extract 3.

**Extract 3: “Just keep under the radar”**

WMS1 Um, with the general gist of the violence that carries on in this country. Ah, I think a lot of the white people who actually come here [the UFH] are fairly scared that, if they open their mouths, they are actually gonna get killed. And so I think, I think that is a good reason why guys just keep under the radar most of the time. My job is to go to my lectures and get out alive, that’s all I want.

In Extract 3 the speaker offers a sensationalized construction of fear in which attending the UFH is described as potentially life threatening. This construction draws on, and reifies, a discourse of black threat/white fear. A discourse that Hook and Vrdoljak (2001) argue concretizes divisive constructs that place black and white within an oppositional framework. This framework perpetuates derogating and racially stereotyped notions of black people and, in the extract above, exonerates white students from any responsibility for contributing to student life outside of lectures.

At the UFH, the reluctance of some sectors of the student body to be involved in student life outside of lectures has been challenged. In 2015 there were student protests on university campuses across the country. For many students attending historically white universities, these protests were something of a novelty. By contrast, at the UFH (and some other historically black universities), student protests are a familiar phenomenon. This is because the structural inequalities introduced by colonialism and apartheid have been perpetuated in the post-apartheid era. In the past few months, commentators on the recent student protests have highlighted the increasing deficit in university funding (Bozzoli, 2015). While the funding shortfall is beginning to be felt by students attending historically white universities, students attending historically black universities have been feeling the effects of inadequate funding for years. We understand that this is partly due to the current
funding formula for universities in South Africa which does not take into account historical discrepancies in funding, and partly because historically black universities don’t have the same access to the alternate income streams that historically white universities do. Whatever the cause of the funding crisis and the factors exacerbating it across different university campuses, one of the strategies of student protests against financial exclusion is to disrupt lectures. Our understanding of this strategy is that it is intended to disrupt the academic programme and, in doing so, to prevent students who are less affected by fee hikes or shortfalls in the National Student Financial Aid Scheme (NSFAS) funding from continuing with their studies while their peers are excluded for financial reasons. At the UFH, student protests against financial exclusion occur annually during the registration period. In Extract 4 participants share their views on the protests against financial exclusion.

**Extract 4: “We’re paying to be here”**

**WMS4** We’re paying to be here. If we strike, we screwed ourselves. I’m sorry, but I’m not into that. I would rather just do what I have to do and get out of here as quickly as possible.

**WMS6** You here to study, not fight. Why put your neck on the line when you just here to get an education?

The statements in Extract 4 must be placed in context. Tuition fees at the UFH are considerably lower than other universities. For example, in 2015 the tuition fee for study toward a BA degree at the UFH was R17 425 on the Alice campus and R23 370 on the East London campus. This can be compared with the 2015 tuition fee for the same degree at Rhodes University, which was R37 200. Hugely discounted tuition fees are a significant factor in students’ decisions to study at the UFH, as it puts a university education in closer reach of less privileged students. Nevertheless, these discounted fees are more affordable for some students compared to others.

As students’ financial standing is linked to historical and structural race-based inequality, it stands to reason that white students at the UFH are likely to be in a better position to pay their university fees. Black students, by comparison, are more likely to be dependent on financial aid. NSFAS is intended to provide assistance to students who have academic potential, but who cannot afford university fees. At the UFH, this is the situation of the large majority of the student body. While NSFAS subsidies provide access to higher education to financially needy students, the subsidy is often received late (after academic registration has closed) and also does not cover the full tuition fee. This means that most students start the academic year under tremendous pressure to find money to cover the costs of initial payments and outstanding amounts resulting from funding shortfalls. Students who have the financial means to pay their tuition fees and are not dependent on NSFAS funding, do not share this anxiety. Therefore, when the first speaker in Extract 4 says “We’re
paying to be here” he is identifying himself, and his social group, as having the ability to pay tuition fees out of pocket rather than being dependent of NSFAS funding. The speaker argues that participating in strike action is counter-productive (“If we strike, we screwing ourselves”). If we put aside the imperative to acknowledge histories of structural dis/advantage, then this argument might seem reasonable. After all, why would someone not make use of a service that they had already paid for?

In 2015 the Fees Must Fall campaign has highlighted the fact that there is a growing shortfall in the funding of higher education institutions and that this shortfall has resulted in increases in tuition fees that are above the general rate of inflation. The result is that tuition fees are becoming increasingly unaffordable to students who have historically had the means to pay. Thus, in the light of recent events, the views expressed by participants in Extract 4 appear to be extremely short-sighted. Furthermore, a recent observation by Dr Sizwe Mabizela (2015), the Vice Chancellor of Rhodes University, is that in order for a student to qualify for NSFAS funding, family income cannot exceed R180 000 per year. This means that students must come from families who are desperately poor in order to qualify for NSFAS funding. As Mabizela points out, this disadvantages students from middle-income families. Mabizela’s observations are particularly pertinent to the situation of the participants in this study. According to Trusott and Marx (2011, p.484), East London is “colloquially known as ‘slummies’, reflecting the working-class identity of the town”, and describe the white students attending the UFH as “whites for whom privilege does not extend beyond race”. As the participants in this study don’t qualify for NSFAS funding and will find it increasingly difficult to afford rising tuition fees, it is hard not to see that the affordability of higher education is an urgent issue that affects them too. We suggest that it is perhaps a history of the conflation of whiteness with capital that explains the participant’s reluctance to identify with students protesting over the affordability of higher education.

The last extract in our analysis is a statement made by a female student. Female students, we observed, appeared to be more sympathetic towards student protests and the role that SRC leaders play in championing key issues affecting students. We have included this extract because we think that it provides insight into the implications of a politics of location for student political solidarity.

At the time that we were collecting data for this study, student protests were occurring at the UFH against the poor state of student residences. By the time that students had begun to protest, the poor state of student residences had come to the notice of the Minister of the Department of Higher Education and Training, who appointed a task team to investigate the matter. The report on the findings of the task team described the conditions of student residences at some of the historically black universities as appalling, unhygienic and not suitable for human habitation (DHET, 2011). Extract 5 is an excerpt from discussion on the topic of the protest.
Extract 5: “SRC, Let’s go look at other things, don’t strike”

WFS2 I know they very active in helping with the residents and everything, but they start striking and stuff immediately. And you, like, ‘Well let’s see what we can do, let’s rather fix the residences’, you know, ‘SRC, let’s go look at other things, don’t strike’.

In Extract 5 the speaker acknowledges the validity of students taking issue with the state of the university residences and the involvement of the SRC in championing the cause. However, the speaker does not agree with the way in which the students and the student leaders responded to the issue. In our analysis of the statements in this extract we both agree with these observations of the account given in Extract 5. However, we each interpreted the reason that the speaker did not agree with the way in which students and student leaders responded to the matter in slightly different albeit related ways. After some discussion we realized that it was difficult for us to agree on which interpretation to foreground. Therefore, in the remainder of our analysis we have decided to present each interpretation and to leave it to the reader to decide.

We begin by presenting the more critical interpretation. In Extract 5 the speaker suggests that the strike action was premature and/or misplaced. The speaker argues that she would have responded differently. In particular, that rather than protesting against the poor state of the residences, she would have suggested action more directly related to having the residences repaired. The speaker’s suggestion asks us to believe that the protesting students had embarked on strike action without first considering alternate and possibly more suitable modes of response. The speaker suggests an alternate response and suggests that it is more appropriate than the seemingly inappropriate response of the students. Conceptualizing responses as appropriate or inappropriate simultaneously suggests different subject positions. Rational subjects suggest appropriate responses, while irrational subjects are likely to respond inappropriately. Arguably, this binary plays into a construction of blackness as posing a threat of violence that has already been established in participants talk. However, it also plays on colonial and apartheid era imaginaries in which whites are change agents who introduce progress for the sake of Africa’s salvation (Fanon, 1967). In these imaginaries whiteness is articulated through notions of reason and rationality, against which blackness is cast as relating to nature: wild and untamed.

In addition to the racist discourse that the speaker’s statements suggest, constructing the protest as the irrational response of an unreasonable group of people also requires bracketing off histories of structural dis/advantage. This brings us to the second interpretation of the statements in Extract 5. When the speaker suggests that student leaders should have investigated “other things” first, we interpret this to mean that, in her opinion, the student leaders did not first attempt to raise their concerns with university officials responsible for the residences. We also read into this that the
speaker assumed that if they had, that the university would have responded and the residences would have been repaired. However, and this is contrary to the speakers assertions, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that university officials were aware of the state of the institutions infrastructure. We also assume that the poor state of the student residences at historically black universities is as a result of ongoing funding shortfalls. We also surmise that it is likely that the students who were living in the residences and who were faced with the daily realities of the poor state of these facilities would have made these same assumptions. Arguably, if university officials are aware of the poor state of the student residences but allow the conditions in which students are living to continue to deteriorate because of a lack of funds to remedy the situation, then the decision to embark on protest action appears to be a reasonable response. Protest is a spectacle that makes discontent visible and legible as such.

We argue that the speaker’s naiveté is characteristic of a particular mode of whiteness that is an outcome of a history of race-based structural dis/advantage. Specifically, that only a member of a social group that was the beneficiary of the National Party’s apartheid era policies could assume that the South African government could be relied upon to respond to the needs of its citizens. The speaker’s oversight is significant in the light of the fact that it is quite likely that it is this very history of race-based structural dis/advantage that makes the current failure to improve the lives of black students so outrageous, and thus prompting the protests. After all, the history of political protest in South Africa is inextricably linked to protest against apartheid policy and practice.

CONCLUSION

In our analysis of the data collected from focus group discussions with white students attending an historically black university, it emerged that white participant’s talk was shaped by conceptions of race that are the remnants of South Africa’s colonial and apartheid past. We argue that rather than examining the assumptions underpinning these conceptions of race, students drew on them strategically in order to justify their withdrawal from participation in student politics. Significantly, it also meant not having to acknowledge their relationship to the legacy of apartheid. In the light of these findings we would like to conclude by making reference to Hook’s (2010) notion of white woundedness that draws on Edward Said’s (2003) model of cosmopolitan subjectivity. Hook (2010) describes a wounded self as one that is willing to acknowledge a relationship with the past and undergo a process of painful ‘puncturing’ in which previously negated and potentially damaging facets of one’s identity can become functionally assimilated. We argued that some of the core tenets of narrative theory provide a framework for thinking about the usefulness of this. Within the narrative model (White, 1997), hegemonic discourses are deconstructed.
and critically problematized in terms of their functioning as culturally myopic prescriptives that constrain lived experience and narrow possibilities for scripting expanded notions of subjectivity. In narrative terms, the malignant metanarratives of race that dominate constructions of identity in South Africa can be understood as The Problem Saturated Story (White, 1997) of our identity, which needs replacing by an alternative, counter-hegemonic narrative. Hook’s (2010) conception of a white woundedness which evades simplistic definitions of identity in terms of race might represent a useful point of departure in this activity of identity re-authoring.
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NOTE

1. WF at the start of an extract indicates that the utterance was made by a White Female student while WM indicates that the utterance was made by a White Male student. S1, S2, S3 and so on indicates which participant in the focus group discussion is speaking.
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