



K. G. TOMASELLI

A CONTESTED TERRAIN

STRUGGLE THROUGH CULTURE

A CONTESTED TERRAIN
STRUGGLE THROUGH CULTURE

INAUGURAL LECTURE

delivered in the University of Natal, Durban
24 September 1986

by

PROFESSOR K. G. TOMASELLI

B.A. (Hons), M.A. (Dramatic Art) (Wits), Ph.D. (Wits), MBKS

Director of the Contemporary Cultural Studies Unit

PIETERMARTIZBURG
UNIVERSITY OF NATAL PRESS
1987

© 1987 University of Natal

ISBN .0 86980 545 2

Typeset in the University of Natal Press
Printed by Multicopy, Pietermaritzburg

A CONTESTED TERRAIN Struggle Through Culture

It seems that the *Financial Mail* had advance notice of this lecture. In its 'Did you hear ...' column, the magazine lampooning the title 'Struggle Through Culture', states: "that should really have them rolling in the aisles".¹ Perhaps the writer expects me to offer an impression of Pieter-Dirk Uys impersonating P. W. Botha?

The study and delimitation of culture during the twentieth century has been a hotly contested terrain. Scholars, activists and politicians have exploited the term for different purposes. The history of cultural studies is a history of the mobilisation of the term and what it means. Contemporary cultural studies itself initially arose from the literary debates around the 'high' - 'low' culture dichotomy.

Literary value as a site of social contestation

Literary scholars of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries like Matthew Arnold, T. S. Eliot and F. R. Leavis responded to the political turbulence, moral disorder and social anarchy of the underclasses by attributing these to the break down of cultural values - "the best that has been thought and known in the world".²

Subsequent generations of literati cleansed this once *new* tradition's political/cultural concern and objectified culture as an object, something to be found in a book, or on a stage, something disconnected from the political idea of 'a centre of authority'.³ In South Africa, the champions of the New Criticism of the fifties were, thirty years later, defending it as 'traditional criticism'.⁴ By suppressing the history of New Criticism, contemporary scholars present this approach as timeless and inevitable. Forgotten is the acrimonious struggle by which this critical method first obtained legitimation here and elsewhere. As Michael Vaughan observes: "traditional criticism"

focuses attention upon a personal relation to literature'. The vital and necessary connection it once had with larger realities has been severed, as has its capacity for cultural mobilisation.⁵ The dominant tradition ranked certain kinds of literature as elite culture. Challenges to this stultifying paradigm were to be one of the stimuli of cultural studies as a formalised academic course during the 1950s at the University of Birmingham and the mid-1980s at the University of Natal.

The 'problem' of culture

The concept of culture is problematic. For some English-speaking South Africans, culture is exemplified by 'doing', for example, 'going to the theataah'. For others, it is relegated to non-political aspects of Afrikaner Nationalism. In its *volkekunde* guise, culture has been corrupted into a pseudo-scientific justification for apartheid and racial prejudice in general. This is a far cry from Edward Tylor's original definition on which anthropology is built: "that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom and other capabilities acquired by man [sic] as a member of society".⁶ It is in the face of these and other more pertinent definitions of the concept, that the content of 'culture' is a contested terrain.

The 'contemporary' variant of cultural studies foregrounds structuralism. *Structuralism* holds that individuals can only live and experience conditions in and through categories, classifications and frameworks of culture.⁷ In contrast is the *culturalist* position which derives from a different set of theoretical premises — no less concerned with questions of struggle, class, subordination and power. Where structuralists argue that people make history, but under conditions which are not of their own making, culturalists aver that people are active agents in the making of their own history. The former is pessimistic, assuming that individuals are bearers of the structures that speak and place them; the latter is optimistic as people are said to be able to create emancipated social structures through communality of experience. An example will help to illustrate the divergences between the two approaches. The South African English press has for many decades called for the resignation of the Minister of Police at times when this institution has brutally suppressed popular uprisings. The assumption is that a more 'humane' incumbent would behave differently. This is unlikely, because the discourse of policing in this country endorses violence as a structural response. Conversely, the pessimistic evaluation of 'Bantu Education' which was *de rigeur* among liberal academics a decade ago could not have envisaged the way in which school pupils and their parents have taken the initiative in the struggle for a democratic edu-

cation. Here, clearly, is an example of the culturalist's view of working class culture as 'a whole way of life' engaged in a dialectical struggle with opposed ways of life, despite the seemingly indestructable structures of State and Economy.

Despite the sometimes acrimonious debate in the literature between the two approaches to cultural analysis, like yin and yang, they need each other; and have developed virtually to spite each other. Like squabbling twin siblings, the two approaches developed at more or less the same time, from the same root, in response to the same social processes. Or as Richard Johnson's landmark statement expresses it: "*Neither structuralism nor culturalism will do!*"⁸

CULTURE: A DEFINITION

The Contemporary Cultural Studies Unit here, at the University of Natal, has adopted the following working definition of culture:

Culture is the ensemble, or 'bundle', of meaningful practices through which self-defined groups within or across social classes express themselves in a unique way, or locate themselves within an identifiable web of significations. It is the process which informs the way meanings and definitions are socially constructed and historically transformed by people themselves. Cultures are distinguished in terms of differing responses to the same social, economic and environmental conditions. Culture is not a static or even a necessarily coherent phenomenon: it is subject to change, fragmentation, reformulation. It is both adaptive, offering ways of coping and making sense, and strategic, capable of being mobilised for political, economic and social ends.⁹

The Unit: Towards a democratic, interdisciplinary practice

The open management of the Unit has exposed elements of our working which are normally concealed from academic and community scrutiny. Our encouragement of students pursuing different, indeed sometimes competing, theories may be disconcerting to unsuspecting visitors. These kinds of disagreements have been crucial to the development of cultural studies as a whole. Academic prejudice against interdisciplinary research is the very antithesis of Marx's own project which was to unravel the totality of processes that gear and drive economy and society. That Marx only looked at one aspect of domination, labour, does not mean that other sites of repression do not exist.¹⁰

The preference within the Unit on the apprehension of 'reality' is to study

this as a set of relations, as a social construction multiply mediated through language, the media, sense perception and the hidden dimensions of consciousness. These processes are argued to intersect with and arise out of the relations of production. Students pursuing a referentialist approach which sees a concrete reality 'out-there' are encouraged to pursue this theoretical inclination by debating it against others. Theoretical advance occurs in the disagreements, conflicts and interstices between conceptual frameworks and paradigms.¹¹ As you can imagine, the task of having to legitimate a new object of study that was derived in a different society at a different stage of capitalist development with a different class structure and history was bound to elicit scepticism and questioning when applied to a South African context.

To understand the contemporary nature of cultural studies, we first need to examine its historical imperatives.

THE GENESIS OF CULTURAL STUDIES:

European responses to Stalinism, Fascism and National Socialism

The coincident rise of Nazism in Germany, Fascism in Italy, Spain and Portugal, and Stalinism in the Soviet Union provided a context for the germination of what in the mid-1950s was to be called 'cultural studies'. The general field thus owes its genesis to the reactions of different scholars working in distinct historical conjunctures to particular political, social and economic conditions. These conditions were themselves the result of massive forces which reconstructed entire societies and their relation to other societies during the early twentieth century.

The most influential group of academics to address the rise of authoritarianism as an explanation for the demise of democracy (whether in the communist or Western senses) was the German Frankfurt School. The School set out to explain why Marx's prediction of the proletarian revolution had failed in the West. They were appalled at the political direction taken in Germany and dismayed at the repressive form of economic socialism that was developing in the Soviet Union.

The Frankfurt School explained the acquiescence of the masses to the effect of the 'culture industry'. By this they meant the, then, modern mass media of print, radio and cinema. 'Consumed' on a large scale, this industry provided a centralised mechanism for socialisation but at the same time created an illusion of individual freedom of choice. The one-dimensional uncritical minds resulting from the commodification of art were thus harnessed to serve the very interests they believed they were opposing. 'Culture' was argued to emerge from the organisational basis of society: the bundle of ideas,

mores, norms and artistic expressions which cohered into the "inheritance and practice of intelligence and art".¹² Monopoly capitalism and mass media made accessible the previously class-isolated oppositional bourgeois culture to mass society, thus depriving politics of the essential dialectic necessary to critical development and 'two-dimensional' man.¹³ Political decisions became technical choices on how best to manage the prevailing system.

Most members of the Frankfurt School offered extremely pessimistic accounts of mass society, though other German scholars counter-argued that the new 'cultural' technologies – while repressive in application – could also provide the means for art to enter the domain of politics in a form in which it could be produced and appropriated by the masses.¹⁴ This more optimistic argument developed in three directions:

- first were the durable ideas of Jurgen Habermas, whose theory of communication connected Marx's method of economic analysis with the Frankfurt School's reading of Freud to provide a theory able to account for class in relation to culture and communication;¹⁵
- second was the development of an *avant garde* art. It was argued that if this form of expression was injected into the masses, made possible by mechanical reproduction, it would provide a cutting edge for resistance. (This idea of Walter Benjamin¹⁶ was later problematically developed by the British journal, *Screen*);
- the third though later exhortation, was the engagement of the mass media (proposed by Hans Enzensberger and a host of Third World cultural scholars/activists).¹⁷

These options, however, remained outside the Frankfurt School whose adherents argued that the revolutionary potential facilitated by *avant garde* art could still be coopted by commercial interests.¹⁸

Writing before the Frankfurt School was the Italian, Antonio Gramsci, whose work was circulated in Europe only after World War II and translated into English as late as 1971.¹⁹ He rekindled the embers of Western critical thought which was becoming sceptical of the emancipatory potential of Eastern socialism. Gramsci explained the failure of the working class revolution in terms of the concept of *hegemony*, where the ruling classes are able to induce the masses to consent to their subordination. Whereas the 'critical theory' of the Frankfurt School as a whole endorsed the negative reading of

the technological rationalisation of our social and moral lifeworld,²⁰ Gramsci was the first Western socialist after Lenin to approach ideology from a positive and strategic point of view. It was not for nothing that the Steyn Commission into the South African mass media ranted and raved about the incorporation of Gramsci's ideas in anti-apartheid discourse by black journalist trade unions such as the Media Workers Association of South Africa.²¹ Gramsci's theoretical intervention had been delayed due to his incarceration by the fascist Italian government during the 1930s. His thought was many decades ahead of his time, and his influence on contemporary cultural studies in the late 1970s and early '80s has been dramatic. I will return to Gramsci once I have completed connecting the threads of the earlier history of cultural studies.

'THE AMERICAN WAY':

Voting patterns, public opinion and administrative communication studies

In contrast to the Frankfurt School's mainly pessimistic and conflictual historical materialist analysis of the 'culture industry', was the very strong influence that behaviourism and positivism had on communication studies in the United States after 1950. American adherents of the Frankfurt School and members of the School who had relocated to America during the Second World War between the 1930s and '60s, remained outside the mainstream of communication research. Their ideas were incompatible with the discipline of communication as it was then perceived.²² This mainly took the form of communications 'effects' research which drew inspiration from Shils-Parsons' structural-functionalist sociology, Pavlovian stimulus-response experiments and telecommunications modelling of electrical signals – the linear Communicator-Medium-Response (C-M-R) equation.²³ Conceived in terms of 'administrative research' – the interpretation of results that support the *status quo*²⁴ – thousands of descriptive, technicist and ahistorical studies assumed a pluralistic society held together by norms and social consensus. The media were seen to reinforce the values and norms that contributed to the consensus. The pre-eminent question was how to deliver specific audiences to advertisers. Social context, then, was understood in terms of Gallup-type voting patterns and Neilson audience ratings.²⁵

Mass society theory: 'superior', 'mediocre' and 'brutal' cultures

Administrative research was itself a development of mass society theory which was dominant in America between the 1930s and late 1950s. Where the debate in Britain was between literary and cultural theorists, in the United

States it was the domain of sociologists. The emphasis was on social organisation and where the Frankfurt School's reference to 'mass society' was negative, Shils enlisted a positive reading in support of the American liberal-pluralist position.²⁶ By theorising mass society as a move from the periphery to the centre of social, political and cultural life, then – provided its polyglot nature remained – the theory was functional for liberal democracy. Shils' assumption was that following the First World War, large aggregations of people living over an extensive territory have been able to enter into relatively free and uncoerced association, that the "new society is a mass society precisely in the sense that the mass of the population has become incorporated into society."²⁷

Shils wrote of three levels of culture reproduced by three corresponding ranks of intelligentsia: 'superior', 'mediocre' and 'brutal'. The fastest growing, he argued, is 'brutal' (eg. horse racing, boxing, comics etc), followed by 'mediocre' (reproductive, operates in the genres of superior culture) cultures which for the first time in history infiltrated all levels of the new mass society. 'Superior' culture, previously the domain of academics, artists and musicians, has in universities now degenerated into 'mediocre' culture because, says Shils, "the supply of high talent is limited . . . as the numbers expand, modern societies are forced to admit many persons whose endowments are such as to permit only a mediocre performance in the creation and reproduction of cultural works".²⁸ Shils's position came under fire from numerous scholars. Raymond Williams' critique of elite cultural theory charged a stereotypical view of the 'masses': "there are in fact no masses; there are only ways of seeing people as masses."²⁹

Some American theorists argued that high culture is a culture but that low or popular culture is a dangerous mass phenomenon. Herbert Gans in particular, took issue with this latter position, reintroducing the concept of struggle into the debate. His basic argument is that what differentiates high culture from popular culture is the struggle between groups over the allocation of resources and power. He redefined culture in terms of class taste and the educational attributes of their publics: 'high culture' is the domain of educated people; 'popular culture' of the poorly educated. Gans' egalitarian perspective allows him, in the tradition of American social science, to then offer two policy alternatives: first, 'cultural mobility' would provide every American with the economic and educational prerequisites for choosing high culture; and second, 'subcultural programming' would encourage all taste cultures, high and low.³⁰

Administrative research directed little effort into the study of messages, their content, context, or structure whether of 'high' or 'popular' culture by

either sociologists or media scholars. Attempts were made to include various kinds of feedback loops into the C-M-R model, but these efforts did little to relieve the essential determinism of administrative research. The result was that American communications analysis became little more than an adjunct to powerful vested interests which through the American military permeated into a global ideology working with architects of foreign policy to ensure American hegemony over markets, resources and raw materials.³¹ Anyone, any group or nation which located itself outside the 'consensus' was assumed to be 'deviant'. Thus 'deviancy' research became big business as well. It was, however, expected that such 'outsiders' — and particularly nations — would be inexorably absorbed to the cultural centre through the proselytization of the 'democratic creed'³² according to the Gospel of American business. Such was the ideological power of the C-M-R model, that even communications scientists were unable to account for 'deviant' or different readings of the same messages. This kind of research, though still dominant in American communication and journalism departments, lacks explanatory power and cannot be absorbed into social theory.³³

Content analysis: skimming the surface of hidden depths

The first major theoretical shift in the American approach was the advent of content analysis which broke with the determinism of the C-M-R model. Instead of taking media messages for granted and as unproblematic reflections of social norms and values, content analysis examined messages as structured mediation of wider social norms and values.³⁴ While this perspective still assumed the inevitability of capitalist social relations, it placed a greater emphasis on content in relation to underlying social processes. In an analysis of *Dallas*, for example, individual characters, the roles they enact and their interpersonal conflicts are argued to provide cultural indicators which reference hidden processes beyond the text itself. The television programme, *Dallas*, for example, is not primarily about the way people live in Texas; rather, it reveals and legitimates struggles between competing social roles and values within capitalist societies. The wider, more abstract processes identified, however, were rarely examined in terms of the conflictual and contradictory nature of capitalism. In South Africa, content analysis rarely proceeds beyond technicist statistical comparison of specific categories of representation found in the media.³⁵

From media effects to questions of context

While American scholars continued with their media-centric and linear

models of communication, variously known as 'hypodermic', two-step and multiple-step flow, gatekeeping, uses and gratifications, attitude and cognitive models,³⁶ British and some European scholars inverted the American media—society equation to the society—media relation. Media institutions and messages were to be understood as intentional products which arose in history from social, political, economic and historical processes. These processes and productive forces provided the motive for specific kinds of technological developments, network designs, electrical and electronic configurations serving specific financial interests within ruling hegemonies. The positivist C-M-R model provided the ideological rationale for curtailing and preventing the sale of interactive communication technologies such as radio and television for home use.³⁷ In the case of almost every communication technology invention (except film) the military was involved and the apparatus invented in advance of conceptualisation of content.³⁸ The interrelationship between monopoly capitalism and military invention provided the key to *post-hoc* media content which was, and is, designed to endorse the West's aggressive military posture, to retain, if necessary, coercive control over external markets and resources, and to limit democratic feedback within the system.

An understanding of media institutions, media—society relations and their social effects (rather than only psychological) required an analysis that explored beyond the text. Such analyses identified the text merely as one kind of relation embedded in a variety of other relations, each interacting with the other. Where the C-M-R scholars argued that media content was a 'reflection' of reality, and content analysts drew attention to abstractions beyond the immediate appearance of the text, it was contemporary cultural studies which reconceptualised the content of media in terms of dynamic sets of internal systems of signs interacting with, and responding to conditions in society. Interpretation of these signs was now argued to depend on class position, class ideologies, and the nature of the encounter between individual viewers/readers/listeners and the medium. Preferred readings intended by the manufacturers/producers of media technologies and contents were not axiomatic. While generally, it was argued that the media produce a dominant reality³⁹ through naturalising codes used by the media — that is, they produce apparently 'natural' recognitions⁴⁰ — it also became clear that oppositional readings could not always be prevented. A recent example in South Africa was the booklet on the African National Congress published by the Bureau of Information which was intended to objectify the ANC as 'terrorists' and 'the enemy' at a time when the whole world, the majority of South Africans and the English-language press were calling for the unbanning of the Congress.⁴¹

The booklet was a 'sellout' amongst ANC sympathisers in Soweto.⁴² Neither American behaviourism/positivism nor the Frankfurt School (with the possible exception of Habermas) would be able to explain this kind of anomaly adequately: how to account for struggle, domination and the moment of active resistance in opposition to preferred readings.

CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL STUDIES AND STRUGGLE

Contemporary cultural studies inserted itself into this theoretical hiatus. The 'creative partnerships' that developed resulted in significant conceptual connections. Two examples will illustrate this. Richard Hoggart, the founder of the Birmingham Centre, had a literary background and his seminal book, *The Uses of Literacy*, was a major paradigmatic break in the study of popular English literature. It owes more to the historiographically descriptive methods of socialist-humanist historians (or 'culturalists') such as Edward Thompson and Christopher Hill who do not have literary backgrounds, than it does to 'New' or 'traditional' literary criticism. For them, 'culture' replaced 'consciousness', was coupled to 'class', and argued to be a conformity in 'experience'.

Working more or less in the same locus is Raymond Williams, a literary scholar, who married a specific 'totality' interpretation of historical materialism with analyses of literature, advertising, communication systems and television. While Williams draws on the methods of both social-humanist history and structuralism, the culturalism of Hoggart, Thompson and Hill lays greater emphasis on concrete studies of resistance among the underclasses than on theoretical elaboration. Ideology is not for them a major theme.⁴³

Central to both the historians and literary scholars is the concept experience. 'Culture' is the set of symbolic forms by which ordinary people codify their quotidian experience. Thompson, in particular, is unable to offer causal explanations that do not derive from experience; his method cannot examine individuals-through-time and assumes a pre-existing subject interacting with a social environment.⁴⁴ Theoretical lacunae in this strand of cultural studies make it difficult to explain the differing experiences of an otherwise coherent group of people, or to account for the reasons why resistance to oppression has so often failed. It is this pattern of historical defeat that led to the theorisation of ideology in the first place.⁴⁵ Culturalism continues to interrupt the more recent structuralist-oriented strand of cultural studies, fostering a vigorous dialogue and the development of more sensitive methods and theory.

The first paradigmatic break within the field of contemporary cultural studies itself occurred with the publication of the Birmingham Centre's

Policing the Crisis: mugging, the state and law and order. Written under the leadership of the Centre's new Director, Stuart Hall, this study drew on the work of European social theorists and applied a media-based analysis of mugging, the state and law and order through the employment of criminological concepts such as the discourse of policing, ideologies of crime, methods of social control and theories of the state. The study moved concern away from the elaboration of culture from within texts and artifacts of a society to the relationship between texts and their contexts. This more recent approach located cultural studies as a site of convergence for the analysis of culture from a number of very different perspectives, each deriving from earlier Marxist theory.

The rediscovery of communication, culture and ideology, categories neglected in classical Marxism,⁴⁶ was to provide the joint thrust towards more adequate explanations which mobilised existing concepts in other disciplines, particularly the structuralist theory of ideology developed by Louis Althusser.⁴⁷ He too sought to 'theorize' the defeat of the proletariat in Central Europe. However, like the Frankfurt School before him, Althusser tended to assign people as passive victims of class ideology, outside of a self-determining consciousness.

The importance of Althusser for contemporary cultural studies and particularly in the South African situation, was his redefinition of the 'individual agent'. Where the American scholars considered the individual as a 'unitary field', Althusser argued that human consciousness is divided. In other words, the 'personality' of individuals is most appropriately thought of as a bundle of socially articulated 'I's'. The political question that arises is how to unify the variety of ideological 'I's' under the sign of an over-arching identity. Two points need to be considered here: the abolition of absolute meaning in language; and Jaques Lacan's argument that the production of meaning occurs unconsciously – in other words, ideology is a discourse which produces multiple meanings which pre-exist the individual. The struggle of the individual between the socially constructed 'I's' and the grid of significations that is ideology was developed further by contemporary cultural studies theorists who mobilised Gramsci's ideas on culture and ideology.

Contemporary cultural studies: culture and ideology as codes

Contemporary cultural studies starts with society as its focus, branching out through various disciplines which deal with contexts into a study of media in the broadest sense (the 'texts' of, eg., press, publishing, broadcasting, cinema, advertising, speech, and various other signficatory patterns of

communication, dress style and behaviour). Culture is a web of interacting levels of meaning through which a particular social order is communicated, explored, reproduced and experienced.⁴⁸ The legitimisation of particular social orders as effected via language and the media acting in concert with other institutions of society (schools, the family, the church, business etc) identifies one element of the field. As such, cultural studies has shifted media analysis from a mechanistic study of 'effects' to questions of context. In broad terms, therefore, the Unit is basically concerned with the relationship between texts and their contexts and the nature of the encounter of individuals, groups and classes with these texts.

'Culture', previously a static, descriptive and functionalist concept in ethnography, early anthropology, sociology and literature, was infused with a dynamic property which for the first time was able to account for so-called 'deviant cultures' and sub-cultural 'readings'.⁴⁹ Culture now provided a vehicle for the explanation of the active and deliberate production of counter-meanings by groups of people responding to structurally imposed political, economic and social conditions. Such groups, while mostly located within classes, often took on a trans-class profile with the establishment of political alliances drawing in a variety of classes and class fractions.⁵⁰ Resistance is the principle of historical change and thus pivotal in cultural analysis (including culturalism), whether it be the resistance of Afrikaners of all classes to British imperialism after the 1830s or the resistance of the popular black classes to the forms of oppression devised by English-dominated capital in conjunction with Afrikaner Nationalism to suppress black labour during this century.⁵¹

Antonio Gramsci's work became central to contemporary cultural studies if the concept of resistance was to be adequately explained. Gramsci infused the field with a strategic imperative and provided explanations on lacunae inherited from economistic Marxism in the 1960s and '70s. Two pitfalls common in socialist writing were addressed by Gramsci. First, economic reductionism (which reduces all social activity to movements in the economic base); and second, class reductionism (which collapses all social conflict to the capital versus labour contradiction). He also sought the explanation for the acquiescence of the masses to their subordination. He found the answer in the concept of 'organic' ideology in which he identified four levels: philosophy, religion, common sense and folklore. Philosophy is the most systematic form. Liberal humanism is in this sense the philosophy of the Western bourgeoisie. Apartheid is in a much more restricted sense the philosophy of racial capitalism in South Africa. Philosophy, however, cannot penetrate the consciousness of ordinary people. Religion thus bridges the gap

between a philosophical system and individuals. The Afrikaans churches were deployed at this level to legitimise apartheid during the 1960s. In contrast, numerous English-language churches are now providing sites of resistance to the organic ideology of apartheid.

Common sense represents the precipitated elements of philosophy that form the consciousness and ground for experience of ordinary people. These are the terms with which they experience and make sense of the world and a given social structure. An example is the discourse of 'total strategy' which provides its own terms designed to ensure the support of whites to the continuation of apartheid. Racial prejudice as a relatively unsystematic set of beliefs and practices also moves on this level. Popular folklore is in the basket of contradictory beliefs collected from a variety of world views. The 1938 re-enactment of the Great Trek together with the intensive media coverage of the event generated a whole new mythology about the 'unity' of Afrikaners and their 'unique' position in South Africa. This event substituted for the original conflict-ridden migration of the previous century and purged the 'national' shame of defeat in the Anglo-Boer War, 1899-1902.⁵²

People who provide leadership are termed 'organic intellectuals' by Gramsci. The intellectual function can be performed by anyone who deploys ideology in such a way as to win the consent of the people to the dominant intellectual-moral order. This was the role of the Broederbond and FAK in the thirties and of the SABC between 1960 and the present. In opposition to this Afrikaner orientation are, of course, counter political movements led by such intellectuals as Steve Biko, Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo and the AZAPO and UDF leaderships. Ideology can thus be mobilised within and across classes for both domination and resistance. Gramsci's contribution, then, was to emphasise the positive formative aspect of ideology; he showed how ideology moves on different levels, from an academic plane of logical discrimination to a largely emotional level of belief and superstition. He emphasised the political role of 'intellectual' institutions (like the media) in the winning of consent and the maintenance of hegemony. Certainly his greatest contribution was to have shown a way between the pessimism of structuralism and the optimism of culturalism.

By inserting semiotics/semiology into the debate, scholars like Stuart Hall and Richard Johnson were now able to explain how meaning emerges not as an absolute and fixed prior interpretation, but how it results from struggles in language, in media signs and codes in which all classes in the social formation are engaged. Thus the media (signs, codes and technology) provide an arena for class struggle.

The arena of class conflict: the struggle for the sign

Societies in conflict are marked by a struggle between different discourses. Ultimately, the struggle for meaning is predicted on the struggle for the sign.⁵³ Where governments try to rule through a balance of coercion and consent, the media become crucial in the job of ideological regulation, a remarkably under-analysed area in South Africa.⁵⁴ In South Africa, the government has attempted to capture the entire discursive field: "That is the reality" being the phrase most often used by P.W. Botha in his 1986 advertising campaign to try to retain the support of white readers and the international investment community. But previously incontestable meanings no longer persuade apartheid critics. Discursive authorizations and repetitions no longer convince. Every time the State President sinks in the Rubicon, he is struggling to find a code in which his preferred meaning will be the dominant, most frequently decoded as far as his diminishing right-wing electorate is concerned. Detractors on both sides of the ideological spectrum have penetrated the 'naturalness' of the National Party code and have deconstructed the common sense on which it is based. Meanings which had previously concealed their historical determinations and consciousness of struggle have been cracked open by anti-apartheid, though not necessarily, anti-capitalist media practitioners. Even the commercial English language press is beginning to accept that the processes of history override most of the claims by the State that it is moving away from apartheid. The contradictions are pinprick sharp and National Party language is facing a crisis of legitimation.

The State President is faced with the impossible task of having to encode several, differing, preferred readings into communication: one for the National Party voter, one for the neo-fascist and para-military cliques, one for Progressive Federal Party voting whites, one for the Houses of Delegates and Representatives; one for Chief Buthelezi, one for Mr Enos Mabuza; one for the Matanzimas, Mangopes and Mphephus, one for English-dominated capital, another for Afrikaans-dominated capital and one for Whitehall and the American State Department; and none for the UDF, ANC, SACP, AZAPO or PAC. Which meaning will prevail will depend on both State responses and the nature of struggle that is developing. Since October 1984, the State's preferred reading has been successfully contested, so much so, that it has had to take control of 'unrest' reporting in the media and dramatically increase its use of coercion.

Culture as strategy

Apart from the Birmingham strand of cultural studies, and parallel para-

digms such as culturalism, Armand Mattelart and Seth Siegelau (working from France), and a host of class oriented media scholars working in Britain, Eastern Europe and South America drawing on historical materialist conceptions of history have sought to explain the structural connections between culture and multinational 'cultural industries'.⁵⁵ Their emphasis is a strategic and dialectical reworking of the Frankfurt School. Unlike New Criticism and mass society theory, they argue that 'mass culture' is both a site of negation of popular culture – defined in opposition to 'mass' or hegemonic culture – and a site of mediation where class contradictions manifest themselves.⁵⁶ Then there is the work of the mainly American and Western European scholars of the 'information society' who draw connections between 'mass culture', the political economy of telecommunications and electronics, and multi- or trans-national ownership which is seen more and more to dominate cultural production as well as offering savings by fracturing the production process between a host of Third World countries where labour can be ultra-exploited, raw materials remain cheap, production costs low and the comprador bourgeoisies collaborate with the metropolises in de-nationalising their own countries.⁵⁷ Technology and computers, far from liberating people as earlier American communications theorists argued, tend rather, according to these scholars, to reproduce asymmetrical relations of power.⁵⁸

Finally, the work of Frans Fanon, Paulo Friere, Amilcar Cabral and other Third World scholars invests the term 'culture' with a strategic component in the working class offensive against imperialism. Fanon, for example, argues that culture will take concrete shape around the struggle of the people, not around signs, poems or folklore which supposedly disconnect leisure time from work periods.⁵⁹ Culture is not for them a pre-determined model offered by the past, it is not a state of being, but a state of becoming.

CULTURE: THE 'PASSPORT' TO (GROUP) SURVIVAL

The definition of culture, as a reality that lies in the future as a perpetual creation, but shaped by the revolutionary idea of total societal transformation,⁶⁰ is not that far removed from the way Afrikaners themselves mobilised politically through culture – then defined as a distinctive way of life – in the first half of this century. So well did they accomplish their task with – until recently – such single-minded determination, that English speakers were accused of lacking 'culture' (a sort of absent patriotism), while the State set about manufacturing a variety of repressive black 'cultures' through education and the media designed to induce blacks to concede to their political and economic subordination. The last time English speakers had as ruthlessly

mobilised through culture was during the time of Lord Milner's repressive rule, mainly in the Transvaal. Since then, English cultural mobilisation has been through commerce, and the objectifying of Natal as 'the last outpost of the British Empire'!

If culture is the way people codify their experience and sets the parameters of their encounter with social and physical processes, it is not difficult to see why certain kinds of class and group responses prevail in the face of evidence suggesting the futility of particular, repeated and often violent self-defeating actions. The code becomes absolute and flexible to pre-determined degrees only within a particular culture. In South Africa, for example, 'reform' can go so far but no further. In Habermas's terms it might be argued that the National Party is trying to freeze the dialectic that is threatening the existing order. If language 'creates' our world, then one strategy open to the state is to appropriate the hostile liberal discourses of foreign apartheid critics and turn them to tactical advantage. 'Reform' is one of these discourses, 'democracy' and 'negotiation' are others. The State, however, is losing the semiotic battle. Embedded in their 'positive', 'neutral' and 'civilising' discourse is a deepset historically derived racism which is no longer able to escape detection. The new language employed by Cabinet Ministers which substitutes overt racial references with the discourse of 'group character', 'protection of minorities' and 'own' and 'general' affairs is an attempt to displace the hidden racist and class agendas. Compare the bumbling attempts of National Party politicians on television to legitimise this kind of discourse against the assured and confident oratory of the neo-facist spokesmen. So flustered is the government that it is even trying to manufacture emotional folk art (folk lore or what Shils might, in this instance appropriately call 'brutal culture') in the form of the Bureau of Information's ill-fated 'Song For Peace', which at another level in ideology, is attempting to construct a common sense in which race is backgrounded as far as liberal discourse is concerned, but is foregrounded where decoded by white conservatives. While race remains the dominant factor in delimiting the 'us/them'⁶¹ power relation, class — for the moment — remains the determining factor. Is race really the bottom line, or will the 'economic in the last instance' really prevail as Louis Althusser tells us? If so, precisely which economic imperative will force a class realignment in South Africa? Even the multi-national companies are beginning to panic. This is not surprising. The system that once encouraged them, is now threatening them.

Culture, national suicide and the 'enemy' of language

Kultuurpolitiek — an evocative word if ever there was one — draws in a

nationalism (economics and politics) and a culture (spiritual and intellectual)⁶² which provides a "passport to continued existence".⁶³ Where cultures incorporate nationalisms and the fear of cultural (therefore national, therefore physical) extinction, overt conflict is inevitable. Most Afrikaner written analyses of culture, whether Afrikaner or otherwise define an 'us/them' camp. 'Us' is the insiders (white) 'nationalism'; 'them' is the (black) outsiders, rhetorically known as 'groups', 'peoples' 'self-governing communities' and 'own affairs' who live in 'national states', 'homelands' and now 'city-states'. At the broader level, the 'us' are pitted against an evil and merciless enemy, the communist 'them'. And since the day that the rhetoric of 'total war' infiltrated our language, a concealed war fought at every level of the state, the commando ethic again become the fall-back response.

The perjorative connotations attached to the term 'culture' in the South African context result from the repressive nature of its mobilisation through history by a variety of oppressive rulers (British, Dutch-Afrikaner/Afrikaner) of the sub-continent since the early 1800s. Current attempts by mainly Afrikaans speaking academics to establish a new object of inquiry, known as 'intercultural' or 'intergroup' communication/relations will remain barren while the implicit assumption places whites on the 'inside' and everybody else on the 'outside'.⁶⁴ This separatist assumption contradicts the mainstream of cultural research done elsewhere which is not concerned with how to 'administer' or control 'outsiders', but which is geared to learning about other cultures and incorporating appropriate elements of those cultures into the observing culture or by drawing sub-cultural groups into a pluralist mass society. By semantically collapsing all Afrikaners into one 'nation', intercultural/intergroup relations research axiomatically prevents communication or understanding between groups and cultures. The academic/political lexicon developed to manage this type of research has an in-built racism, a set of minimally flexible pre-determined responses. That is why Frederick van Zyl Slabbert is able to define 'reform' in terms of what it is not: "Reform does not really mean finding out from others who suffer from the lack of it what they find objectionable about Government policy, but finding new ways of fitting them into old Government policies".⁶⁵

In the present period of crisis in South Africa it is of the utmost importance for South Africa's historical understanding that language, media and communication be analysed from the perspective of the social, economic and political relationships that are the fabric of our society. Indeed, our seeming inability to do this is itself a symptom of the crisis.⁶⁶ This is one of the tasks that the Unit has set itself.

Closing remarks

As the history of the various approaches that fall under the broad heading 'cultural studies' shows, it is necessary for popular democratic movements struggling for the liberation of South Africa to contest the terrain of culture, to re-appropriate its positive popular meaning, to exorcise immolating nationalisms that Afrikaner Nationalism has injected into the South African variant of the concept and to activate its strategic potential as a semiotic mechanism offering ways of coping, adapting and making sense. Contesting the preferred meaning encoded in the texts/media of the ruling classes remains a fundamental engagement still to be made by the oppressed in South Africa. This is the agenda behind the Birmingham project with regard to British life, as it is with regard to the Third World cultural workers. These theories, particularly contemporary cultural studies and the socialist-humanist historians, offer a strategic grid, a series of cautions and warning lights against economic Marxism and the dangers of fascist/authoritarian co-options which result in the suppression of democracy and repression of the people. They provide ways of reorganising society, of dealing with contending nationalisms and of understanding the ideological motors of vested interests.

To return to my opening remarks, the history of the general field of cultural studies has paralleled instances of unbridled authoritarianism and national repression on scales seldom previously experienced. While the content of cultural studies has mainly dealt with the negative consequences of such repression, the field itself has imbued the victims of class, cultural and racial oppression with a positive integrity, with coherent images of themselves and with strategic directions in the development of democracy.

That is the theoretical legacy of cultural studies and the mandate that faces the Contemporary Cultural Studies Unit of the University of Natal today.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to the following for their critical comments on earlier drafts of this paper: Ruth Tomaselli, Hilston Watts, Eric Louw, Alex Holt, Christo Doherty, Mark Allison-Broomhead, Ian Steadman, and Veronica Baxter. Thanks also to Johan Muller for his critique of many of the ideas contained in this paper.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

The list of references has been divided into two parts. In the first part are included South African and other examples which illustrate the argument presented in the text. For major references of a theoretical nature, readers are directed to the second part, under the heading "Additional References Consulted".

- 1 *Financial Mail*, 19 September 1986, p. 134. This bemusement with regard to the strategic value of culture was repeated by an SABC Radio Today interviewer who asked me "Why on earth would anybody want to struggle through culture?" Broadcast on 25 September 1986.
- 2 Bennett, 1982, "Theories of Media, Theories of Society" in Gurevitch et al, 1982, p. 35
- 3 Arnold, 1966
- 4 Visser, 1984, pp. 2-8; see also Glenn, I. 1984: "University and Literature in South Africa: Who Produces Symbolic Value?", *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 2, pp. 20-24; and Green, M. 1984: "The Manifesto and the Fifth Column", *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 2, 9-19.
- 5 Vaughan, 1984, pp. 46-7
- 6 Tylor, E. B. 1924: *Primitive Culture*, Brentano, 7th edition
- 7 Johnson, 1979a
- 8 Ibid. p. 54
- 9 Tomaselli, 1985a, p. 8
- 10 The point is Habermas', 1978
- 11 See, e.g., Clarke, Lovell et al's attack on Althusser. See also Bennett's retort: "The Not-So-Good, the Bad and the Ugly", *Screen Education*, No. 36, pp. 119-130. Also see Hall's critique of *Screen* in Hall, Hobson et al: "Recent Developments in Theories of Language and Ideology: a critical note", pp. 157-162. In the South African context, see Tomaselli 1985b, on the conflicting approaches between and within communication and media studies departments; and *Critical Arts* Vol. 3 No. 2, 1984 for a discussion on conflicting approaches to the teaching of English literature.
- 12 Held, 1980
- 13 Marcuse, 1968, pp. 26-7
- 14 Benjamin, 1979
- 15 Habermas, 1974; 1979; 1984
- 16 Benjamin in Curran, 1977, pp. 219-253

- 17 Enzensberger, 1976; also see Mattelart and Siegelau, 1979 and 1983
- 18 Quoted in Slatter, P., 1977: *The Origin and Significance of the Frankfurt School*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, p. 141
- 19 Gramsci, 1971
- 20 Muller et al, 1986, p. 4
- 21 Republic of South Africa. *Report of the Steyn Commission of Inquiry into the Mass Media*. RP 89/1981. While Steyn used Gramsci to swipe at so-called revolutionary media in South Africa like the 'black' and English language presses, he failed to realise that his own position was also that of an organic intellectual, not for the working classes, but for the Afrikaner bourgeoisie. For further information on how Steyn responded to Gramsci see Tomaselli, K. G. and Tomaselli, R. E. 1982: "'How to Put Your House in Order': Read All About it in Steyn Commission II", *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 2, pp. 1-22.
- 22 Switzer, L. 1985: "'Ferment in the Field?' Review Essay", *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 3, p. 57
- 23 Shannon, C. E. and Weaver, W. 1949: *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago. Their model is repeated in nearly every communication text book with additional adaptations, modifications, feedback loops and so on, but the model remains deterministic and uni-dimensional.
- 24 Smythe and Van Dinh, 1983, quoted by Switzer, 1985, *op. cit.*, pp. 62-64. Examples of 'administrative research' in the South African context include an entire issue of *Communicare* on 'Organisational Communication', Vol 3 No 2, 1982; Venter, C. 1980: "The Role of the South African Research Foundation in Communications Research", *Communicare*, Vol 1 No 1, 34-40; Muller, P. "The Media and Security Forces: is a joint strategy possible?" *Communicare*, Vol 5 No 1, 29-33.
- An interesting challenge to market-oriented 'administrative research' is Willem de Klerk's "Waar Kommunikasieleer die Bal Misstaan", *Communicare*, Vol 4 No 1, pp. 70-71.
- 25 This kind of research activity aids the centralization of power and often masks democratic alternatives.
- 26 Shils, 1957; 1962, 1968
- 27 Shils. 1968, p. 1
- 28 Ibid. p. 13
- 29 Williams, 1961, p. 189. One local attempt to apply Williams to a Third World context is Roelofse, K. 1979: "Raymond Williams: onder weg na die derde wereld", *Communicatio*, Vol 5 No 2, 29-31. This author misleads, however, for he discusses Williams as if he is an existentialist, rather than pursuing a specific kind of Marxist approach.

- 30 Gans, 1974
- 31 See, eg., Lerner, D. and Schramm, W. (eds.) 1967: *Communication and Change in Developing Countries*. East-West Centre Press, Honolulu; Schramm, W. 1964: *Mass Media and National Development*. Stanford University Press, Palo Alto. The large research institutes which undertook this kind of research did work for the United States Defense and State Departments, particularly by providing advice on how Third World governments friendly to the United States could use communications to overcome communism.
- 32 See, e.g., Guback, T. 1969: *The International Film Industry*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington; Mosco, 1979; 1983; Schiller. 1983.
- 33 In contrast, numerous American departments of cinema and literature have been at the forefront of introducing social theory and concepts of contemporary cultural studies into their courses. Journals such as *Wide Angle*, *Jump Cut*, *Enclitic*, *Cultural Critique* and *Diacritics* led the way. Few of the ideas developed in these journals and departments have found their way into communications, journalism or even television syllabi in United States universities.
- 34 Content analysis was developed by George Gerbner at the Annenberg School of Communication, Philadelphia. His publication, *Journal of Communication*, led the field in content analysis. See also Gerbner, G., Holsti, O. R., Krippendorf, K., Pauley, W. J. and Stone, P. J. 1969: *The Analysis of Communication Content*. John Wiley, New York. The critical sophistication of Gerbner's formulations have, however, been applied by others in an often technicist manner.
- 35 South African examples of decontextualised content analyses which ignore contexts are Oberholtzer, A., Puth, G. and Myburgh, J.T. 1982: "The Portrayal of Sex Roles in South African Television Advertisements", *Communicare*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 29-34; Gerber, A.M. 1980: "Die Evaluering Van Steve Biko in die *New York Times*", *Equid Novi*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp. 55-61. For a technicist view of how to make content analysis 'work' see Conradie, D.P. 1986: *Inhoudingsontleding: 'n Novorsingsprosedure vir die bestudering van Kommunikasieboodskappe*, Geleentheidspublikasie, Nr 34. See also attempts at using factor analysis such as Puth, G. 1976: *Die Inhoud en Gehalte van 'n Steekproef Suid-Afrikaanse Rolprente voor die Instelling van Televisie*. Instituut vir Kommunikasienavorsing, Verslag Nr Komm 10.
- 36 For examples of media 'effects' research in South Africa, see Jordaan, P.C.J. 1979: "Navorsing wat deur die RGN Onderneem Word oor die Invloed van Televisie op die Suid-Afrikaanse Gemeenskap", *Communicatio*, Vol. 5 No. 1, pp. 27-29; Barnard, H.J. 1976: "Kommunikasienavorsing van die RGN", *Communicatio*, Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 10-12, 14; Finn, S.M., Weich, H.M. and Rensburg, R.S. 1984: *Professional Persuasion*. Butter-

worth, Pretoria. The HSRC produces numerous research documents on 'media effects'.

For uncritical examples of gatekeeping studies in South Africa see Herbst, D. A. S. 1972: "Political Communication and the 'Gatekeeper'", *Communications in Africa*, Vol 1 No 4, 19-23. Also see de Wet, J. C. 1985: "Gedagtes oor die Weermag en die Nuusmedia Tydens Weermag-optredes", *Communicatio*, Vol 11 No 1, 55-59, who works within a highly deterministic C-M-R model.

- 37 One exception were early radio transceivers. These were later controlled through airwave licensing agreements between the broadcasting companies.
- 38 Williams, 1974; Schiller, 1983
- 39 Fiske and Hartley, 1978
- 40 Hall, S. 1981: "Encoding/Decoding" in Hall et al, 1981, p. 132
- 41 Bureau of Information, 1986: *Talking with the ANC*. Government Printer, Pretoria.
- 42 See *Sunday Star*, 15.6.1986, p. 6: "Govt's ANC propaganda may have backfired".
- 43 Hoggart, 1957; Thompson, 1968; Hill, 1975
- 44 Hugo, W. 1986: A Critique on the Subject of Culture and Consciousness that is Timeless. Unpublished essay. Dept of Education, University of Witwatersrand
- 45 Muller et al, 1986
- 46 For writings on communication see de la Haye, 1979
- 47 Althusser, 1971a; 1971b
- 48 Williams 1981, p. 13
- 49 Terni, P. quoted in Hall, 1981, p. 135: "By the word *reading* we mean not only the capacity to identify and decode a certain number of signs, but also the subjective capacity to put them into creative relation between themselves and with other signs: a capacity which is, by itself, the condition for a complete awareness of one's total environment.
- 50 See O'Meara, 1983; Tomaselli, 1985a, p. 8
- 51 Examples of the culturist approach in South Africa include Bozzoli, 1979 and 1983; Bonner, P. 1981: *Working Papers in Southern African Studies Vol 2*. Ravan, Johannesburg. Van Onselen, C. 1982: *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886-1914. 1. New Babylon* Ravan, Johannesburg; and Van Onselen, C. 1982: *Studies in the Social and Economic History of the Witwatersrand 1886-1914. 2. New Nineveh*. Ravan, Johannesburg.

For examples of a contemporary cultural studies orientation, see

Haines, R. and Buijs, G. 1985: *The Struggle for Social and Economic Space: Urbanization in Twentieth Century South Africa*. Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Durban-Westville, Westville, especially pp. vi-xvii; 89-269. See also some chapters in Davis, D. and Slabbert, M. (eds.) 1985: *Crime and Power in South Africa*. David Phillip, Cape Town; and Tomaselli, K. G. 1984: Ideology and Cultural Production in South African Cinema. Ph.D Thesis, University of Witwatersrand.

- 52 See Wilkens, I. and Strydom, H. 1980: *The Super-Afrikaners: inside the Afrikaner Broederbond*. Jonathan Ball, Johannesburg, pp. 95-105. Much of this section is drawn from Muller et al, 1986.
- 53 Volosinov, 1973
- 54 Exceptions are Bozzoli, B. 1981: *The Political Nature of a Ruling Class: Capital and Ideology in South Africa 1890-1933*. Routledge and Kegan Paul; a series of three books forthcoming under the series title ADDRESSING THE NATION, to be published by James Currey and R. Lyon on the South African media, and Tomaselli, K. G., Williams, A., Steenveld, L. and Tomaselli, R. E. 1986: *Myth, Race and Power: South Africans Imaged on Film and TV*. Anthropos, Bellville.
- 55 See, eg., Murdock, G. 1982: "Large Corporations and the Control of the Communications Industries", in Gurevitch et al, pp. 118-150; Mattelart and Siegelau, 1979; 1983.
- 56 Mattelart, 1983, p. 24
- 57 Mosco, 1979; 1983; Mattelart et al, 1984; Murphy, 1983
- 58 Mattelart, 1983, p. 19
- 59 Despite the idealist and sometimes naive position taken by Fanon with regard to economic analysis, he remains an important founder of the growing body of theory on indigenous expressions of African culture.
- Culturalists working on labour issues in South Africa appear to have assumed that work- and leisure-times are separate. They have worked with trade unionists to produce a number of worker performances. See *SA Labour Bulletin*, Vol 9 No 8, 1984. Their conception of culture, seems to have little in common with that propounded by Fanon, Freire and Cabral. See Harvey, R. 1985: "Working Class Culture?", *SA Labour Bulletin*, Vol 10 No 2, pp. 63-74 for a critique of this conventionalist position. This kind of approach rejects semiotic performance theory, structuralism or theoretical development in advance of actual creations. See Sitas, A. 1984: Culture and Production: the contradictions of working class theatre in South Africa. Unpublished paper presented at History Workshop, 1984, University of Witwatersrand. The paper was subsequently published in a modified form in *Africa Perspective*, New Series 1/2, 1986, pp. 84-110. 'Experience' defines both the object and method of inquiry, where the author him/herself, his/her experience is very intrusive. See Johnson,

- 1979, p. 215 for further critical comment on this kind of analysis.
- 60 Hountondji, p. 24
- 61 Allison-Broomhead, M., Chetty, A., Daran, D and Prinsloo, J. 1986: The Visual Role of the 'Rubicon' Speeches as Part of the 'Reform' Strategy. Paper presented at the 1986 Association for Sociology in Southern Africa Conference, Durban
- 62 D. F. Malan, quoted in Moodie, 1975, p. 150. See also Malan, D. F. 1959: *Afrikaner-Volkseenheid: my ervarings op die pad*. Nasionale Boekhandel, Cape Town.
- 63 Afrikaans student leader quoted in *The Star*, 6.8.1986
- 64 See, eg., Groenewald, H. J. and Wepener, M. 1983: "Etnosentrisme en Interkulturele Kommunikasie", *Communicatio*, Vol 9 No 1, 2-8; Marais, H. C. and Dreyer, L. 1982: "HSRC Investigation into Intergroup Relations: the programme and its financing", *Communicare*, Vol 3 No 1, 3-7; Kotze, D. J. 1968: *Positiewe Nasionalisme*, Tafelberg, Cape Town; Piek, B. 1981: "Die Rol van Interkulturele Kommunikasie in Nasionale Ontwikkeling", *Communicare*, Vol 2 No 2, 48-59; Main Committee - HSRC Investigation into Intergroup Relations, 1985: *The South African Society: Realities and Future Prospects*, HSRC, Pretoria; Weich, H. 1982: "Intercultural Communication and the House Journal: a case study", *Communicatio*, Vol. 8 No. 1, 29-34. Fourie, P. 1982: "Interkulturele Probleme in Beeldkommunikasie", *Communicare*, Vol. 3 No. 1, 60-73, is a rare exception to the above. While much less deterministic and more dynamic, Fourie nevertheless works within the policy framework of American and local communication research.
- 65 *Daily News*, 25.4.1986: "PW has nothing to replace apartheid"
- 66 Muller et al, 1986, p. 2; Marais, H. C. 1986: "On Communications and Intergroup Relations", *Communicare*, Vol 5 No 1, 64-65

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES CONSULTED

Authors and dates cited under "Notes and References" above are provided in full hereunder, with additional sources consulted.

- Adorno, T. 1973: *Negative Dialectics*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London
- Adorno, T. et al, 1950: *The Authoritarian Personality*. Harper, New York
- Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M. 1979: 'The Culture Industry: enlightenment as a mass deception', in Curran, J., Gurevitch, M. and Woollacott, J. (eds.): *Mass Communication and Society*. Arnold, London

- Althusser, L. 1971: *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New Left Books, London
- Althusser, L. 1971: *For Marx*. Allan Lane, London
- Arnold, M. 1966: *Culture and Anarchy*. Edited by J. D. Wilson. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Barrett, M., Corrigan, P., Kuhn, A. and Wolff, J. 1979: *Ideology and Cultural Production*. Croom Helm, London
- Benjamin, W. 1977: 'The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction' in Curran, J., Gurevitch, M. and Woollacott, J. (eds.): *Mass Communication and Society*. Arnold, London
- Bozzoli, B. (ed.) 1979: *Labour, Townships and Protest*. Ravan, Johannesburg
- Bozzoli, B. (ed.) 1983. *Town and Countryside in the Transvaal*. Ravan, Johannesburg
- Cabral, A. 1983: 'The Role of Culture in the Liberation Struggle', in Mattelart, A. and Siegelau, S. (eds.): *Communication and Class Struggle. 2. Liberation, Socialism*. IMMRC, Bagnolet, pp. 205-211
- Clarke, J., Critcher, C. and Johnson, R. 1979: *Working Class Culture: studies in history and theory*. Hutchinson, London
- Clarke, S., Lovell, T., McDonnell, K., Robins, K. and Seidler, V. J. 1980: *One-Dimensional Marxism: Althusser and the politics of culture*. Allison and Busby, London
- Cohen, S. and Young, J. 1982: *The Manufacture of News: deviance, social problems and the mass media*. Constable, London
- Davis, H. and Walton, P. 1984: *Language, Image, Media*. Blackwell, London
- De La Haye, 1979: *Marx and Engels on the Means of Communication: the movement of commodities, people, information and capital*. IMMRC, Bagnolet
- Dunbar Moodie, T. 1975: *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*. California University Press, Berkeley
- Eliot, T. S. 1948: *Notes Towards the Definition of Culture*. Faber, London
- Enzensberger, H. M. 1976: *Raids and Reconstructions: essays on politics, crime and culture*. Pluto Press, London
- Fanon, F. 1965: *A Study in Dying Colonialism*. Monthly Review Press, New York
- Fiske, J. and Hartley, J. 1978: *Reading Television*. Methuen, London
- Freire, P. 1970: *Cultural Action for Freedom*. Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass.

- Gans, H. J. 1974: *Popular Culture and High Culture*. Basic Books, New York
- Gramsci, A. 1981: *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. Lawrence and Wishart, London
- Geertz, C. 1975: *The Interpretation of Cultures*. Hutchinson, London
- Gurevitch, M., Bennett, T., Curran, J. and Woollacott, J. 1982: *Culture, Society and the Media*. Methuen, London
- Habermas, J. 1974: 'The Public Sphere', in *New German Critique*, (Fall), pp.49-55
- Habermas, J. 1979: *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Heineman, London
- Habermas, J. 1980: *Toward a Rational Society*. Heineman, London
- Habermas, J. 1984: *Theory of Communicative Action*. Beacon Press, Boston
- Hall, S., Hobson, D., Lowe, A. and Willis, P. 1981: *Culture, Media, Language*. Hutchinson, London
- Hall, S., Critcher, S., Jefferson, A. and Clarke, J. 1978: *Policing the Crisis: mugging, the state and law and order*. MacMillan, London
- Held, D. 1980: *Introduction to Critical Theory*. Hutchinson, London
- Hill, C. 1975: *The World Turned Upside Down*. Penguin, Harmondsworth
- Horkheimer, P. 1972: *Critical Theory: selected essays*. Seabury, New York
- Hoggart, R. 1984: *The Uses of Literacy*. Peregrine Books, Harmondsworth
- Houndtonji, P. J. 1983: *African Philosophy, Myth and Reality*. Hutchinson, London
- Jacobs, N. 1968: *Culture for the Millions? Mass media in modern society*. Beacon Press, Boston
- Johnson, R. 1979a: 'Histories of Culture/Theories of Ideology: notes on an impasse', in Barrett, M., Corrigan, P., Kuhn, A. and Wolff, J. (eds.): *Ideology and Cultural Production*. Croom Helm, London
- Johnson, R. 1979b: 'Three Problematics: elements of a theory of working-class culture' in Clarke, Critcher, *op. cit.*, pp. 201-237
- Lacan, J. 1968: *The Language of Self: the function of language in psycho-analysis*. John Hopkins, Baltimore
- Leavis, F. R. 1930: *Mass Civilization and Minority Culture*. Minority Press, London
- Louw, P. E. 1983: 'Habermas: a new theory of praxis through communicative action?', *Communicatio*, Vol 9 No 1, pp. 9-14

- Main Committee: HSRC Investigation into Intergroup Relations, 1985: *The South African Society: realities and future prospects*. HSRC, Pretoria
- Mattelart, A. and Siegelau, S. 1979: *Communication and Class Struggle. 1. Capitalism, Imperialism*. IMMRC, Bagnolet
- Mattelart, A., Delcourt, X. and Mattelart, M. 1984: *International Image Markets: in search of an alternative perspective*. Comedia, London
- Moodie, T.D. 1975: *The Rise of Afrikanerdom*. California University Press, Berkley
- Mosco, V. and Herman, A. 1979: 'Communications Technology and Marxist Theory: a survey and an agenda', Red Feather Institute for Advanced Studies in Sociology, Transforming Sociology Series, No 59
- Mosco, V. 1983: 'Critical Research and the Role of Labor', *Journal of Communication*, Vol 33 No 3, pp. 237-248
- Muller, J., Tomaselli, K. G. and Tomaselli, R. E. 1986: *The Lineage of Contemporary Cultural Studies: a brief historical examination*. CCSU Seminar Paper No 4, University of Natal, Durban
- Murphy, B. 1983: *The World Wired Up: unscrambling the new communications puzzle*. Comedia, London
- O'Meara, D. 1983: *Volkskapitalisme: class, capital and ideology in the development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934-1948*. Ravan, Johannesburg
- Parsons, T. 1951: *The Social System*. Free Press, New York
- Rosenberg, B. and White, D. M. 1957: *Mass Culture: the popular arts in America*. The Free Press, London
- Schiller, H. 1976: *Communication and Cultural Domination*. Sharpe, New York
- Schiller, H. 1969: *Mass Communication and the American Empire*. Kelley, New York
- Schiller, H. 1983: 'The Communication Revolution: who benefits?', *Media Development*, Vol 30 No 4, pp. 18-20
- Shils, E. 1957: 'Daydreams and Nightmares: reflections on the criticism of mass culture', *The Swanee Review*, Vol 65 No 4
- Shils, E. 1968: 'Mass Society and its Culture', in Jacobs, *op. cit.*, pp. 1-27
- Shills, E. 1962: 'The Theory of Mass Society', *Diogenes*, 39
- Therborn, G. 1980: *The Ideology of Power and the Power of Ideology*. Verso, London
- Thompson, E. P. 1968: *The Making of the English Working Class*. Merlin, London

- Tomaselli, K. G. 1985a. *Contemporary Cultural Studies and the University of Natal*. CCSU Seminar Paper No 5, University of Natal, Durban
- Tomaselli, K. G. 1985b: 'Media Education and the Crisis of Hegemony in South Africa', *Media Information Australia*, Feb/March 1985, pp. 9-20
- UNESCO, 1982: *Cultural Industries: a challenge for the future of culture*. UNESCO, Paris
- Vaughan, M. 1984: 'A Critique of the Dominant Ideas in Departments of English in the English-Speaking Universities of South Africa', *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 2, pp. 45-51
- Visser, N. 1984: 'The Critical Situation and the Situation of Criticism', *Critical Arts*, Vol 3 No 2, pp. 2-8
- Volosinov, V. N. 1973: *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Seminar Press, New York
- Williams, R. 1961: *Culture and Society*. Penguin, Harmondsworth
- Williams, R. 1974: *Television Technology and Cultural Form*. Fontana, London
- Williams, R. 1980: *Problems in Materialist Culture*. London
- Williams, R. 1961: *The Long Revolution*. Chatto and Windus, London
- Williams, R. 1977: *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press, London