

Gender, Research and Knowledge Production: The Struggle Ahead

Mpilo Pearl Sithole

Abstract

This article deals with the fundamental problem of gender inequality as it manifests itself in the sphere of knowledge production. It examines the analytical tools that social scientists especially, have used in order to examine the phenomenon of gender inequality in social life portraying the manner in which these have been entrapped in the difficult dilemmas bedevilling the desired virtue of gender equality in the society at large. The article thus begins with a re-examination of the conceptual entrapment of gender relations within social hierarchies in order to show how our analytical tools have served these hierarchies rather than challenge them. For instance, post-modern orientations are guilty of trivialising gender equality discourse at the service of cultural diversity.

This analysis is done to ultimately pinpoint the concomitant issues of gender inequalities in intellectual voice and knowledge production. The article outlines the specific issues in this conundrum: the privatisation of gender inequality in opposition to the discourses that seek to intervene; the positivist orientation of our conceptual framework together with the intrinsic alienation of morality in social science discourse on the one hand, and yet the integration of ideology and practice in the manner in which gender inequality manifests itself on another hand. The article concludes by proposing a redefinition of conservatism, the need to track the modernisation of gender inequality and the need to re-conceptualise gender inequality.

Keywords: gender inequality, gender relations, intellectual voice, alienation, conservatism

Introduction

In this article I venture into the challenging exercise of attempting to unpack the issue of the persistence of gender inequalities. It is an exercise which has been attempted by other social analysts before¹, but which has not been done to a point of finding convincing and telling explanations that would yield an angle of a solution or a proper advocacy orientation towards gender inequality, rooted in convincing theory. I also do this exercise because I am jealous; I am jealous of the fact that the question of racism and racial inequality, although far from laid to rest, has received unquestionable conviction from analysts and society alike that it is unjustified and must be eliminated. Sexism is identified as a vice in our society, but gender inequality is not entirely rebuked. I suspect that there is still, in certain circles, a fundamental conviction that gender inequality is natural and justified in some sense. Even where people enforce equal human rights they are inclined to window dress the continued inequality with references to ‘harmless hierarchies’, where men and women are necessarily positioned in social ideologies that take their cue from nature or religion.

Racial inequality is seen as unfair both in terms of its practical consequences – as when it is linked to material inequality between different groups – but also in terms of its ideology². Gender inequality on the other hand is seen as unfair when linked to material inequalities but the ideologies that underpin it as a belief system still enjoy some sacred attributions. Howell and Melhuus (1993) articulate quite succinctly the manner in which this sacredness is not only based on religiosity but also embedded in social ideology on kinship. Thus, while we can accuse analysts of ignoring gender in their studies the extent to which the social actors omit engendering the

¹ From the rather blunt assertions of Evans-Pritchard (1965: 54-55) on the universality of women’s inferiority and men’s superiority to the more sophisticated articulations of possible ideological bases for this (see Henrietta Moore 1988), social scientists have pondered the pervasiveness of gender inequality.

² A quick look at classic writings by and biographies of freedom fighters in South Africa would immerse any reader in sufficient detail and qualitative experiences of material and ideological issues surrounding racial discourse and racism (see Biko’s *I Write what I Like*, 1978); see also Mandela’s *Long Walk to Freedom* (1994).

subject matter within the social spaces that are studied begs attention. The ideology of racial inequality is often challenged once access to material capacity and management is achieved by the formerly lower category in the hierarchy (usually Black). However this is not the case when it comes to gender inequality – women’s performance materially or in capabilities does not redeem them of the ideology of inferiority even if they may belong to a category of a ‘highly performing population’³. Thus when people talk of BEE brothers in South Africa⁴, they mean exactly that, since the BEE sisters can only mean secondary citizens within that category of the population. This article seeks to explore why this fundamental ideologically-founded inferiority, continue unabated in gender when it seems to have the scope to be alleviated in the same way that it has happened with regard to the racial category.

Gender Inequality and Negotiated Rationality: A Theoretical Point of Departure

Modern social life is fundamentally a rational and moral phenomenon. It is rational because cross-communication between individuals and between groups is possible based on specific constantly sought criteria of common understanding. Such criteria are based on tangible mutual perceptions of values that we deem fit for our communal existence. It is however this latter

³ Howell and Melhuus’s (1993: 51) observation that feminist discourses have gone through phases of ‘the “discovery” of male bias; making women visible, and the emergence of gender relations as a basic conceptual premise’ is not simply a descriptive observation, but a deeper reading on conceptual block (i.e. a failure to leap from analysis of fact to changing the moral discourse behind the circumstances).

⁴ In South Africa racial economic redress facilitated through policies on Broad Based Black Economic Empowerment has brought about the concept of ‘BEE individuals’ who are seen as individuals that have benefited from these policies and their economic agility is attributed to these policies. However, popular discourse is very gendered when it comes to this concept and reflects men as the primary beneficiaries. Hence there is talk of ‘BEE brothers’.

fact (of mutuality of values) that facilitates a leap from what is an ‘objective type of rationality’ to a ‘subjective rationality’ that beckons us to *negotiate* at a rather abstract level what our values are. Thus by the time we speak of ‘hospitality’, ‘respect for human rights’, ‘human integrity’ or ‘simply good and bad behaviour’, we are operating at a different level of ‘rationality’ – certainly not the pragmatic empirical rationality based on colour, smell or taste. It is this ‘subjective rationality’ or ‘negotiated rationality’ that I call ‘morality’ – the negotiated values that inform our communal existence⁵. It is important to start at this grand level of generality when one is to talk about gender and research in this century because a lot has happened and not happened when it comes to this subject matter.

In its many guises feminism has appealed for the recognition of the generality of a merger between rationality and morality against forces that want to see women’s inferiority and subjugation as natural. The culture-nature debate in the writings on gender (as raised and debated by Evans Pritchard 1965, Moore 1988, and others like Strathern 1987 who introduces the issue of subjectivity in this debate) has in fact been about to what extent do humans wish to pretend that an aspect of their relations is instinctual with no need for the attribution of value. The diversity in which women’s subjugation has been manifest in ideologies and praxes in many countries leaves us convinced that indeed there is wide variety of ways in subjugation can take place⁶. We must still ask what is natural about this sphere of human relations that we seek to abandon our habit of ‘negotiated rationality’ and hope that some ‘instinctual prescripts’ might guide us in relations between men and women⁷. What other part of our social life do we know to be guided

⁵ I have articulated this more clearly in another article, ‘Science versus Indigenous Knowledge: A Conceptual Accident’, published in *Ingede: Journal of African Scholarship* (2005) 1,1: 1 - 5. Available at: www.ingedej.ukzn.ac.za.

⁶ In fact work on masculinities seems to indicate even sharper the relevance of social conditioning in gender, even if the universality of dominance and subjugation between men and women respectively has not been fully explained (see Cleaver 2002).

⁷ My own previous work has shown the mix of material association between sex and activities on the one side and the flexible social thresholds ascribed by ideology (Sithole 2000: 106-141).

by such ‘instinctual prescripts’ that we imagine are part of ‘nature’ and what can we learn from those parts of our social life? What other part of our social relations is simply dependent on our *natural instincts that are presumably pre-determined and formulaic*, and yet entrusted with self-management? Should we treat gender relations differently than from those social relations that we *actively engineer*? If there are measures to this what measure of instinct is to be allowed to govern gender relations and what is the threshold at which negotiated reason (by which I mean ‘morality’) should take over? The only other sphere that I know of which has the same challenges is parenting which fortunately enjoys a fair amount of acceptance as being culture-specific and not nature-specific.

Many studies on gender have proven that the incidence of femininity and masculinity (and the concomitant roles such as motherhood and fatherhood) is different in different societies (see the collection by Richter & Morell 2006, for example, on fatherhood). If this historical fact is anything to go by it seems that the sphere of gender relations is proving itself to be under the influence of multiple social influences or social and cultural moralities. As it has already been mentioned here there has been some pondering on the questions related to the universality of women’s subjugation as well. Admittedly, definite answers have not been forthcoming. However it would be putting the cart before the horse and it would be downright tautologous to suggest that because subjugation is to some degree universal (even if its character varies) then women are indeed inferior. Nothing is more circular: women are subjugated because they are inferior; they are inferior because they are everywhere subjugated.

This article puts forward the argument that women’s continued subjugation is a historical fact that is sustained by the logistics of failing to deal with the privatisation of subjugation and the private attribution of differentials of status within the life cycle of each woman in different communities and societies (Liebenberg 1997; Sithole 2000 – to cite work on the Xhosa and the Zulu). The making of this argument is rather a snapshot in need of further elaboration. Yet, the point being made, I now move on to demonstrate that this is also embedded in the tools and methods of social analysis which have failed to critically scrutinise and address the structural issues related to gender inequality. I shall also champion appropriate solutions. Much culture-consciousness raising with regard to gender has taken place. The discourse on feminism and the debates about the extent to

which female subjugation are ideological or practical have been useful. However, a stage of stagnation has been reached thanks to the positivism of our approaches to analysis (making us shy away from the very fact of negotiability of our social life) and the sterility of our methods in tracking the modernisation of gender inequality – both ideologically and practically. Howell and Melhuus (1993) hint at this sterility of our analytical tools specifically with regard to gender and kinship; but it is not a new observation as Archie Mafeje (1975) and myself (Sithole 2006) have observed a similar dilemma in scientific studies on religion.

The Privatisation of Gender Inequality

The context painted above is important because it puts forward the fundamental premise of this article – rationality and morality are intertwined and the post-modern block of separation of the two (suggesting sacredness of different cultural moralities) inhibits constructive advocacy on common issues in different societies. This is the fundamental reason why gender inequality is not significantly challenged – it is privatised conceptually and it is privatised practically.

There are two problems in the manner in which we have analysed gender relations over time: The first is that as researchers and theorists we have not broken the positivist glass ceiling on analysis of human relations. They are being researched, engaged and discussed over a wide front. Yet, the private and more relational domains of gendered existence and gender inequality have lack a conceptual and methodological framework of analysis. It has not been engaged. For as long as this is the case issues such as gender inequality will continue to take place in spite of numerous efforts to ‘add women’ in non-traditional women spaces. The dilemma is that we only see subjugation in the numbers of reported cases of domestic violence, in the numbers of underpaid women, in the number of girls and boys going to school and in the number of women and men in parliament. Even though we challenge inequality in ideology we are limited by the fact that part of the ideology gives us status – in a kind of divide and rule fashion. This limits our criticism of the Mr/Miss/Mrs dilemma; it limits what we say about the commercialisation of *ilobolo* because through it we gain status within the community; it limits what we say about what positions women occupy in

parliament and whether they are taken seriously⁸. We do not sufficiently deal with the ideological subjugation of women. Both in academe and advocacy we have tended to conflate the critique of the practical and ideological subjugation of women as a proxy for the more fundamental issues related to the rationalised manipulation of placements and positioning of women.

The second problem is that we love of our ‘oppressors’. Unlike the struggle in terms of race we actually cannot afford a co-ordinated programme of action that is directive. If our conceptualisation of the problem has just been shown to be conflating ideology and practice, the argument here is that our strategy seems to subjugate gender relations to personal circumstances. When we fought against racial oppression it was clear that while we identified certain proponents of racism we challenged them by reference to clear principles of non-racism. That is why documents such as the Freedom Charter were so important in South Africa⁹. In that formulation agency was

⁸ The common wisdom is that if women challenge their treatment in parliament, they will be ousted in favour of many other women who will be ‘behaved’ who would be willing to deal with the ‘more serious issues’ on the table than critical reflections on internal issues in parliament.

⁹ The non-racialism of the Freedom Charter is instructive in this regard: ‘We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know:

- That South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the people;
- That our people have been robbed of their birthright to land, liberty and peace by a form of government founded on injustice and inequality;
- That our country will never be prosperous or free until all our people live in brotherhood, enjoying equal rights and opportunities;
- That only a democratic state, based on the will of all the people, can secure to all their birthright without distinction of colour, race, sex or belief;
- And therefore, we, the people of South Africa, black and white together equals, countrymen and brothers adopt this Freedom Charter;
- And we pledge ourselves to strive together, sparing neither strength nor courage, until the democratic changes here set out have been won.

(Cf. The Freedom Charter as adopted at Kliptown, 26 June 1955: <http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=72>.)

clear – ‘black’, ‘white’ ‘our people’; in addition the stakes were also clear – ‘land’, ‘democratic state’, and ‘will of all the people’. With gender inequalities we have international declarations that denounce sexism and gender inequality but we hardly articulate non-sexism within the context of kinship and love relationships. By excluding these critical perspectives from the private domain, we enable the continued existence of gender inequality. It is precisely our lack of contextual stock-taking of these issues in private life that defeats the non-sexist agenda, not the genderism that we have created out of necessity and on which we should be capitalising now.

Both of these problems (the positivist glass-ceiling and the strategy that conflates principle and circumstance) require much more sophisticated methods of dealing with gender inequality than we have employed over the last fifty-odd years in the propagation of gender equality and feminism.

Why am I raising this issue – the privatisation of gender relations? It is because I think that we have reached a point of fundamental stagnation on the issue of gender inequality. I think as women researchers we need to look at both the intellectual tools and methods according to which we deal with gender and the manner in which these have failed to infiltrate and impact our society. The problem is that we have not only been subjected to divide and rule as a consequence of the privatisation of our circumstances, but we have subjected ourselves to division as a consequence of the different conceptual approaches to feminism. Western feminism, African feminism, womanism, and the plain denial of gender inequalities have all helped to confuse, in a post-modernist paradigm, the experience of subjugation of women by both ideology and in practice. Yet inequalities and even violence against women are real and not simply imagined. All the varieties of feminism (see Hendricks & Lewis 1994) add up to a body of knowledge that confirms the existence of a general problem of gender inequality as observable and in ideology. There is therefore a need for dealing with issues in a way that advances the gender struggle strategically within specific contexts. However the conceptual entanglements have been real and have been hindering this by preventing us from engaging the real issues involved.

Feminism has grappled with the way it must conceptualize itself in the face of various other inequalities (see Dietz 2003; Oyewumi 1997; and Todes *et al.* 2010 in the context of development), but there is an urgent need for it to redefine itself in relation to pragmatic issues of gender integrity on a case-by-case and contextual basis. On the other hand we have seen feminism

cling on to unhelpful post-modernist questioning of the experience of inequality. Dietz (2003) gives a detailed account of the various strands of feminism that have emerged in recent times. *Difference feminism* predicates all its arguments on the basic assumption that men and women are different, but that they need to be treated equally. *Diversity feminism* concentrates on investigation of gender experiences within diverse cultural contexts with the view to solve the question of value judgments around imbalances, injustices or subordination between men and women. The question is: do women in various cultures perceive the same practices as oppression and subordination? *Deconstruction feminism* wonders whether the experiences of males and females in various contexts warrant that they be classified into men and women in accordance with sex at all, even within the same cultural context. Men and women are socially constructed, yet, we need to see them as individuals. Can we classify them into categories according to some generic experience of maleness and femaleness?

Feminism has not only studied differences in gender in different cultural settings, but it has gone ahead to suggest that there are societies where gender does not exist, and it being declared a culturally specific construct – a Western construct in Oyeronke Oyewumi's view (1997). Feminism needs to challenge itself to review this question. It is not the question of the specificity of gender inequality that must be reviewed, but it is rather a more fundamental question – when it assumes that some cannot comprehend the cultural predispositions of others because of cultural existential exclusivity that a review is necessary. This, I argue, is where feminism shoots itself in the foot and allows itself to be privatised by other politicised spheres, i.e. the intellectual politics of different regions. The intellectual politics of different regions exists but it is not mutually impermeable. To pretend that it is mutually impermeable is to give in to the privatisation of inequalities.

What we do not realise, and it is because it has taken time for people generally to realise, is that the bigger the social scales of setting public morality the better it is to deal with minimum standards. Human rights are the minimum standards set to guide human relations, but gender has to set basic minimums both in the arena of practice (which the arena of advocacy deals with) and in the more politically contentious arena of ideology (constant negotiability of the latter being a basic minimum) upfront. I say this because I have spent much time looking at how African schools of thought have been

side-lined in mainstream knowledge production (see Sithole 2009) – but it seems as though when one embarks on that, people expect one to automatically agree with everything in them – as if they are homogenous and do not represent a variety of diverse positions.

Disguised Conservatism

This is another issue or strategy of maintenance of gender inequalities that has not sufficiently been challenged – the freezing of ideology. When it comes to the criticism of especially cultural ideology, people want to suggest a fundamental cultural logic that is not changing with circumstances and which must be understood despite the circumstances. Thus when we lament the commercialisation of *ilobolo*, conservatives would like to understand that it was not meant to be like that in its original logic and it should be continued ‘merely because it was not meant to be like that in its original context’. When we challenge some of the contextual issues in the Bible that are making it possible for people to legitimise inferiority we are told of blasphemy and we are prevented to actually audit which issues are holy and which are contextual stories in the Bible. The old generations are the ones that had the right to set cultural standards and we should not be chopping and changing anything. This is at odds with the manner in which societies evolve, develop and change as they become culture-conscious. In this regard we need to redefine conservatism as:

- When people prevent critical reflection on issues in a way that recognises the culture-consciousness of the society;
- When people preserve values and practices in accordance with binary thinking derived from Western thought or binaries that ‘other’ people in a way that gives them legitimacy and superiority;
- When people challenge everything just for the sake of the challenge without putting forward any alternatives – i.e. in a bid to appear radical without committing themselves to the hard work of crafting solutions.

It is the conflation of all of these aspects of conservatism that have created the kind of stalemate that we have now achieved in gender

intellectual discourse and advocacy. It is also the location of gender issues at the crossroads of this stalemate that impacts negatively on gender studies – e.g. the separation of labour out of the domestic environment; the pitting of African paradigms versus Western paradigms; and the sheer need to be systematic, making us unfortunately positivist rather than pragmatic. Thus the conservatism that is described above results in (strange) radical paradoxes and contradictions in intellectual discourse. Instead of regarding African culture(s) as vibrant and dynamic, people assume a certain stagnant and freezing of the African intellect – as something that has always been operated on and affected but which has not produced anything for itself. To mention just a few brief examples:

- Defiance by women (such as was done by *iNgcugce*¹⁰ in KwaZulu-Natal against King Cetshwayo) has not been seen as feminism but merely interesting history;
- *Ilobolo* (bridewealth) has been cast as either commercial or cultural without articulation of how people really feel about it;
- Boundedness to indigenous knowledge can be seen as preventing certain groups from being associated with scholarship; and of course;
- Women's issues are locked into their being mainstreamed without the appropriate attention in depth –we are for instance hesitant to talk about gender change management which would imply the changing of our socialisation of boys, asking male workers about their home responsibilities, and reconceptualising our notions of marriage and family.
- The discourse on HIV and AIDS has shown us that the work environment can be a sphere that concerns itself with one's health (a 'private' matter) without plumbing one's individual choices – with people being encouraged to do HIV tests at work and being made to

¹⁰ *iNgcugce* was a regiment of young women during the time of King Cetshwayo in KwaZulu. This regiment was instructed by the king to marry a regiment of much older men as reward to the latter, in their post-military service. *iNgcugce* refused to obey the instructions of the king and for that they were killed (see Canonici & Cele 1998).

contribute to public moral responsibility by being seen to do something, even personal, about HIV and AIDS such as taking a test.

- Much lip-service is given to male equality in the taking on of homework and domestic chores, yet, no programme has asked every male manager, including the president, to change their baby's nappies in public.

It is clear that there are many central concerns with regard to gender inequality which are addressed in scholarship (and in public). Yet, what I have tried to bring to the fore in this section is that it is accompanied by a certain conservatism. This conservatism is an example of bad faith since it always stops short of engaging the real issues in life- and culture-changing ways.

Issues of Practice and Ideology

Issues of ideology and practice have to be seen as related in dealing with gender inequality. However the manner in which they are dealt with has to be sensitive to what I have called the privatisation of gender above. In so far as practice of gender inequalities is concerned the privatisation has to be made an issue in itself (because this is where choice and agency can be targeted), and in so far as the ideology of inequalities debate of generic issues can be posed to societal cultural conscience. The double-day for women continues with different adaptations taking place in different class categories and these can be challenged at the level of practice – the conscience of men and women as persons. However the structural and ideological orientation of society is such that the workplace and the home are theoretically unrelated and have different centres of authority. This has to be challenged at the level of labour policies and advocacy work directed at changing men and women's association of themselves with the domestic sphere and the role of provision.

This means that if we propose that it is possible to negotiate gender values for our polities and within our societies we need to confront the contextual challenges of ideology and practice in which we operate. Thus context should not be reified to a point where it dictates that some contexts cannot be contended with. Dealing with different contexts is about the ability to rationalise and review values and this ability is universal. This however

does not mean dogmatism – we should be able to outline short term and long term options. Ideological options are not something that many societies have been able to consciously negotiate without a certain degree of nostalgia for habit. Thus if patriarchy as seen in inheritance patterns is to some extent embedded in patrilineal ideology (see Sithole 2000: 116-130) one has to be frank about the feasibility of changing patrilineality, where the first steps may be to suggest a will for both boys and a will for girls to inherit equally as an ideal situation.

The gender issue is becoming sterile around recognition of inequality, recognition of equal rights and attempts at gender mainstreaming. But the persistence of gender inequality and the manner in which it is adapting with modernity remains an issue that we are not directly tracking. Whether we are talking about gender in the context of migration, gender in the professional sphere, gender and poverty, the issue of subjugation remains – with different levels of cultural justification of subjugation and even violence. In order for those societal institutions that are supposed to do something about this but that do not do much it might be useful to talk about gender change management in organisations and especially in requesting those in power to set goals for themselves.

No Conclusion in Sight: The Struggle Ahead

In line with the issues discussed above as disguised conservatism there are practical issues related to who our superior philosopher and knowledge generator is – the White male. This is a situation related to our crossroads – the Western-other binary; the labour-domestic sphere binary; and the positivist-cosmology binary. The White male is thus the ultimate philosopher and strategist because he traditionally occupied the first elements of these binaries. This is a situation that is going to take time to transform.

Whilst this is the ideological propaganda stifling academe, the practical challenges manifest themselves as well to support and in the manner supported by this propaganda. The first practical challenge is that we wait for the endorsement and validation of this group (academe exuding the Western, production, positivist values) without taking forward our own issues and validating ourselves. Of course when I say ‘this group’ I mean the institutionalised ideologies that privilege it.

All other categories (of the population) come next and a few years ago, we had statistics to be very coy about as reflected in a report jointly written by the Human Sciences Research Council, The National Research Foundation and the Department of Science and Technology (2005):

Research on the aging of publishing scientists in 2001 pointed to the alarming trend that an increasing number of scientific articles published by South African scholars are being published by authors over the age of 50 years Whereas 18% of all articles produced by SA scientists in 1990 were published by authors over the age of 50, this percentage increased to 48% in 2002 ... (p.17).

Further analysis shows that these trends are not identical across scientific fields, but that the situation is worse for the medical and health sciences ... and the humanities and social science (p.17).

... the contribution of female authors to scientific production has increased slightly over the 13-year period from 16% in 1990 to 22% in 2002 (p.17).

... The total contribution of black authors (African, Coloured and Indian) increased from only 4% in 1990 to 11% in 2002 (p.18) (see Report on *Human Resources for Knowledge Production: 2005*).

This shows that transformation towards gender and racial equality in the knowledge production domain has been slow. If this remains the case when positivist measures are used (such as these statistics), the challenge remains insurmountable when qualitative issues such as occasionally documented by affected academics based on experience. (See Vilakazi 1978; Magubane 1971; and Sithole 2009) We need to challenge the official trend setting scholarly bodies with regard to their initiatives in changing this situation as well as the criteria they use to:

- accredit journals;
- to rate researchers;
- recognise innovation;
- to encourage people of various backgrounds to enter the knowledge production scene.

This must be done with clear recognition of the need for change management and not just the mainstreaming of women, especially Black women while the general institutional cultures remain ideologically unchanged. The environment needs to be changed in terms of:

- permeability of the politicised spheres of knowledge production so that there is equality in knowledge generation;
- frank debates on the positivist ceiling and the emergence of scholarship from varieties of indigenous knowledges;
- the equal competitiveness of varieties of scholarship towards advocacy.

The contextually-differentiated privatisation of women's subjugation (the subtle nature of subjugation) – at home, within organisations – requires a multi-pronged and yet decisive approach targeting socialisation, institutional cultures, and domestic environments and contexts.

At the same time we need to take the struggle forward by creating our own forums of discussion, knowledge generation and sustaining academic conversations. This must be called a struggle not just to be polemical but because there are real challenges related to it:

- the current unchanged bureaucratic regimes will continue to give resources in uncritical (and possible gender insensitive) ways to the forums accredited in specific ways and that continues to function in gender exclusive ways – journal regimes and specific forms of defining excellence are additional examples;
- we will not necessarily be rated as excellent producers of knowledge in our lifetime (and perhaps it is a sacrifice that must be made provided that we subject ourselves to the rigor of science in being reviewed by the peers that understand the necessary dynamism); and
- it will be a struggle to organise the those people critical of the system – to be located and to work within the system because we have to deal with being validated by the same system, while we aim at transforming it from within.

The separation of ideological inequalities and pragmatic realities is artificial but problematizing them, can be a starting point in making people strategise on a short term without losing the long term vision of change. Critical analysis and knowledge production must be at the forefront of that struggle.

References

- Biko, S [1978] 2004. *I Write What I Like*. Johannesburg: Picador Africa.
- Canonici, NN & TT Cele 1998. Cetshwayo kaMpende in Zulu Literature. *Alternation*, 5,2: 72 - 90.
- Cleaver, F 2002. *Masculinities Matter! Men, Gender and Development*. Cape Town: David Phillip.
- Dietz, MG 2003. Current Controversies in Feminist Theory. *Annual Review of Political Science* 6:99 - 431.
- Evans-Pritchard, E 1965. *The Position of Women in Primitive Societies and Other Essays in Social Anthropology*. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Freedom Charter as adopted at Kliptown, 26 June 1955: Available at: <http://www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=72>.
- Hendricks, C & D Lewis 1994. Voices from the Margins. *Agenda: A Journal about Women and Gender* 20:61 - 75.
- Howell S & M Melhuus 1993. The Study of Kinship. The Study of Person. A Study of Gender. In Del Valle, T (ed): *Gendered Anthropology*. London: Routledge.
- HSRC, NRF & DST Report 2005. *Human Resources for Knowledge Production in South Africa*. Conference organised by Ministry of Science and Technology and Ministry of Education, 23 - 24 June 2005. Presenters: De la Rey, C, *et al*. Unpublished.
- Liebenberg, A 1997. Dealing with the Relations of Inequality: Married Women in a Transkei Village. In McAllister, P (ed): *Culture and the Commonplace: Anthropological Essays in Honour of David Hammond-Tooke*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Mafeje, A 1975. Religion, Class and Ideology in South Africa. In Whisson, MG & M West (eds): *Religion and Social Change in Southern Africa: Anthropological Essays in honour of Monica Wilson*. Cape Town: David Philip Publisher.

Mpilo Pearl Sithole

- Magubane, B 1971. A Critical Look at Indices used in the Study of Social Change in Colonial Africa. *Current Anthropology* 12,4-5: 419 – 445.
- Mandela, N [1994] 2002. *Long Walk to Freedom*. London: Abacus.
- Moore, H 1988. *Feminism and Anthropology*. London: Polity Press.
- Oyewumi, O 1997. *The Invention of Women: Making an African Sense of Western Gender Discourses*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Richter, L & R Morell 2006. *Baba: Men and Fatherhood in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Sithole, MP 2000. *Identity and Social Change in Msinga District of Northern KwaZulu-Natal*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Cambridge University.
- Sithole, MP 2004/ 2005. Science versus Indigenous Knowledge: A Conceptual Accident. *Ingede: Journal of African Scholarship* 1,1: 1 - 5. Available at: www.ingedej.ukzn.ac.za
- Sithole, MP 2006. Has Social Science Been a Religion? The Dilemma of Sociological Analysis of Religion. *South African Review of Sociology* 37,2.
- Sithole, MP 2009. *Unequal Peers: The Politics of Discourse Management in the Social Sciences*. Pretoria: Africa Institute of South Africa
- Strathern, M (ed) 1987. *Dealing with Inequality: Analysing Gender Relations in Melanesia and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Todes, A, P Sithole & A Williamson 2010. Including Women? (Dis)junctures Between Voice, Policy and Implementation in Integrated Development Planning. *Urban Forum* 21:69 - 84.
- Vilakazi, A 1978. Problems in African Research and Scholarship. In Argyle, J & E Preston-Whyte (eds): *Social System and Tradition in Southern Africa: Essays in Honour of Eileen Krige*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Mpilo Pearl Sithole
School of Built Environment and Development Studies
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Sitholep3@ukzn.ac.za