

## Chapter Six

---

# *The University of Namibia: Genesis, Founding, Development*

*André du Pisani and Hans-Volker Gretschel*

*A university in Namibia will have the special duty of acting as an instrument for the consolidation of national unity.*

Namibia: Perspectives for National Reconstruction and Development (1986: 532)

*I see the University of Namibia as a centre of higher learning, served by dedicated men and women of quality, and producing graduates determined to uplift the standard of living of our people.*

HE Dr Sam Nujoma, Founding Chancellor (UNAM, 1992)

### Introduction

This exploratory chapter attempts to craft a reflective institutional case study of the University of Namibia (UNAM). The case study is presented in three sections. The university is analysed first as a contested space in a colonial/anti-colonial nationalist context, in order to provide an intellectual framework for the following historical reflection. Secondly, the institutional and intellectual legacies of the main antecedents to the present University of Namibia, i.e. the Academy for Tertiary Education (1980–1989) and the United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN) in Lusaka (1976–1990), are outlined with specific reference to the political contestation surrounding curriculum reform. Thirdly, the founding of the University of Namibia (1992) and attempts at curriculum transformation (especially since 1995) are profiled.

This chapter ends with a few conclusions about how institutional configuration and memory in a transitional period shaped the founding of a new African university.

## Contestation and Coloniality

### Contestation

We start from an understanding that universities are contested spaces and that such contestation is by and large good for the character of such institutions. In an admirable offering on the University of Namibia, Harlech-Jones (2001: 129), suggests that contestation derives from the fact that universities 'are prestigious'. He continues in similar vein: 'They are prestigious for at least two reasons:

- ▶ They create, articulate and validate knowledge, by which societies advance in power and prosperity. In addition, that knowledge provides an important point of reference in the contentions that characterise all societies.
- ▶ Universities formally confer their prestige upon their graduates, who thereby gain economic and social advantages.'

Harlech-Jones suggests that universities are also sites of contestation within themselves, not only because factors external to them impact upon them, but because of the nature of their staffing, containing as it does, a significant component of the national intelligentsia. Moreover, they embody interests, and have the means to mediate and pursue these, within a national and international context.

There is also the vexed question of university autonomy. Our view is that autonomy constitutes an actualising condition that facilitates the carrying out of key functions of the university: knowledge creation, critical discourse, community building and socially engaged education.<sup>1</sup> Inadequate resources, poor facilities, dispirited morale and political interference, among other factors, all undermine the realisation of university autonomy.

Harlech-Jones (2001: 130) offers a compelling argument that 'the dominant motif in recent years has been that of *authenticity*.' The search for authenticity has been conditioned by the colonial past and by the specificities of the University's history, for UNAM 'developed from other institutions that were closely associated with the ideological struggle that preceded Namibia's independence.' To this must be added that the founding of UNAM almost coincided with the founding of the new independent state. Thus, from its inception, the new university inevitably became a political project of the state.

### Coloniality

The debate about colonisation and post-coloniality, as Stuart Hall (1996: 254) reminds us, inevitably takes us into a 'power-knowledge field of force'. For purposes

of understanding, critique and deconstruction Hall posits that we need to explore colonisation as a 'system of rule and exploitation', as well as, 'a system of knowledge and representation.'

The anti-colonial nationalism of the South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) of Namibia, in common with many other liberation movements, attached several distinct connotations to the term 'nationalism'. In one context, nationalism represented the struggle for independence. In another context, it sought to communicate the feeling of a common culture; a culture capable of transcending ethnic identity. It is in this context that the first quotation that frames this chapter needs to be seen.

Mindful of the fact that there are indeed several definitions of nationalism in the literature, it appears that these definitions can usefully be grouped by conceptualising nationalism as a project that attempts to make territorial boundaries and cultural boundaries coincide. Following from this, nationalism can be understood as either the project of adjusting territorial boundaries to (perceived) cultural ones, or creating a culture within given state boundaries.

As shown in the work of Kunkler (2000: 2), 'SWAPO's anti-colonial nationalism was not occupied with the question of how to adjust territorial boundaries to cultural ones. This was rather the project of the apartheid state homeland and reserve policy, which attempted to define "culturally homogeneous" entities within the colonial state and to subsequently confine these cultural entities to assigned geographical territories.'

SWAPO's anti-colonial nationalism was an attempt to create a common culture within given territorial boundaries. Understood as such, SWAPO's nationalism represented a cultural and political redefinition of the Namibian people, which in the words of Kunkler (2000: 2–3), 'sought to portray it as one homogeneous entity, tied by a common cultural history and a common destiny. This redefinition casts SWAPO in the role of a "cultural entrepreneur" that attempted to "reinvent" a historical communality among the Namibian people(s) and projected a common destiny into its future.' Following on from Kunkler, it is possible to see SWAPO as having reinvented an imaginative, common, cultural past and crafted it into a common future. The projected university for Namibia was key to a project of 'invented authenticity', informed by cultural and political redefinition. However, as indicated above, the cultural definition of nationalism did not apply to some of SWAPO's uses of the concept, especially when it highlighted the function of nationalism to achieve political liberation, independence, social revolution and/or unity among the people for the sake of national resistance.

## Antecedents to the University of Namibia

### The Academy for Tertiary Education (1980–1989)

The former Academy, the immediate predecessor to UNAM, was a site of political struggle. Since its very founding in 1980, the Academy for Tertiary Education found itself at the centre of a tension between two contending forces. The first was external to the Academy, in the form of SWAPO and the former Lusaka-based United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN). In this grouping, nationalism was an essential element of *political* resistance rather than a *cultural* notion. The second force was the white central government in Namibia with its political project that attempted to adjust political boundaries to coincide with ethnic and cultural space.

This tension deepened, as will be shown later, since SWAPO and those associated with the UNIN, viewed the Academy as a perpetuation of the hated and inferior system of Bantu Education. At the same time, black Namibians in particular, had high expectations that the Academy, as the first institution of higher learning in the region, would address the obvious deficits of apartheid education.

Within the Academy, these tensions characterised much of its institutional life as the management attempted to refute both justified and unjustified criticism from UNIN (see below). At the same time the institution had to respond expeditiously and actively to national human resource needs. Consequently, the Academy introduced a raft of new academic programmes and other forms of training, but viewed in retrospect, the contested legitimacy of the institution and the absence of critical self-reflection, resulted in a failure to consolidate most of its academic programmes.

Following the promulgation of the *Academy Act* of 1985, with the following objectives: to 'reconstitute the Academy for Tertiary Education, established by Act 13 of 1980, with a greater degree of autonomy and under the name of "the Academy"; to extend its powers in order that it may organise portions as a university, college, technikon, institute, or similar body and that it may itself award degrees, diplomas and certificates; to provide for management and control of its affairs; and to provide for incidental matters', three relatively autonomous institutions were spawned: a college, a technikon and a university under a single management.

The *Academy Act* of 1985 did not usher in significant institutional or academic transformation. Notwithstanding the fact that the university component had the authority to establish new faculties and departments, it continued with the previous structural configuration that had its origins in neighbouring South Africa. There were five faculties: Arts, Science, Economics and Management Science, and

Education and Health Sciences. The admission criterion for undergraduate study was that of South Africa, namely, Matriculation Exemption. This ignored the reality that very few black Namibian scholars actually passed with Matriculation Exemption.

While there were constructive debates within the Academy on, for example, its governance structure, such debates rarely departed from a robust analysis of the socio-economic and political realities in the country. Consequently, meaningful structural and curriculum reform did not materialise. Few changes were made to the content of the curriculum, while the reality that the newly-founded university component found itself in a developmental and African political and cultural setting, did not seem to resonate with management. One illustration of this was the opposition to attempts to Africanise the curriculum for English. In the case of English, two subjects were offered in the curriculum, namely English I, II and III and English Literature in Africa I, II and III. This and other attempts, could conceivably be seen as designs to protect the white South African curriculum from contamination from black Africa. In this respect, the curriculum was literally drawn in black and white.

This did not mean, however, that no change was possible. In the case of History, for example, one reads in the 1987 Yearbook of the Academy, that History II included a topic on the 'History of Southern Africa to 1945.' In 1989, this topic was re-formulated as follows: 'Southern Africa – the period to 1945: the Colonial era.' With respect to History III, the 1987 formulation reads: 'History of South Africa after 1881 – inclusive of South Africa's place in the British Commonwealth up to 1961.' The 1989 formulation changed to: 'History of Southern Africa after 1945: De-colonisation.'

But curriculum changes were mostly cosmetic and most doggedly persisted to offer philosophical and ideological support to a colonialist mindset.

The schisms within the Academy reflected those within society: the management was white and Afrikaans, while a minority of the members of the academic staff and most of the students pushed for reforms. As in the wider society, the Academy had to develop responses to the inevitability of transformation. In this context, the Academy generated a document entitled: 'Scenario for Academy 1989–1991.' This interesting document, crafted only a year away from formal independence, was remarkably naive and ill-informed about the likely political transformation after independence. In the 'Statement of Intent' of 22 February 1989, the Academy committed itself and its staff to 'the principles of democracy, tolerance and dignity', and declared that: '... Teaching staff will continue to adapt syllabi, curricula and

teaching methods in order to empower students with a knowledge that shapes commitment and critical insight. (Participatory learning and decision-making will be firmly embodied in the principles of the institution)'. Notwithstanding this and other strategic plans, curriculum reform stagnated. The institution appropriated the language of socially engaged education and critical thinking, without delivering on any of these commitments.

By 1986 each of the three branches of the Academy had its own head, who functioned under the general oversight of the Rector and the Council. The tertiary education branch initially had an agency relationship with the University of South Africa (Unisa), which provided almost all of the tutorial material and also did the examining. While the teacher-training curricula were developed by the Academy itself, they were modelled on the curricula delivered to white students in neighbouring South Africa. Consequently, the language of politics that informed these and other curricula was that of exclusion and differentiation. The point of reference was white apartheid South Africa.

In 1986, after a change in the legal status of the Academy, the university was formally instituted as a component of the Academy, as were the other two branches. For reasons advanced earlier, SWAPO and other progressive forces in Namibia never recognised the legitimacy of the Academy. In 1986, for example, the comprehensive *Namibia: Perspectives for National Reconstruction and Development*, that was published under the aegis of UNIN in Lusaka, was extremely critical of the Academy and noted that 'not all the African high school graduates remain in the country because of their disgust with the system; and that the Academy's entrance examinations are definitely biased in favour of the whites who are more likely to serve in South Africa than Namibia' (1986: 518).

The Academy also carried a specific political imprint: it was meant to contribute towards strengthening a nascent black middle class. Such a class, in turn, was important for the viability of South Africa's policy of controlled change in Namibia. This policy was based on the notion that political boundaries had to coincide with cultural ones – the very antithesis of SWAPO's political project. Teacher training was informed by Christian Nationalism, the primary ideological font from which apartheid drank. The majority of the staff members were white, even if many of them were Namibian. Relatively few of the academics held PhDs. Moreover, to quote Harlech-Jones (2001: 132), 'the different academic disciplines were organised into clusters, with a number of relatively junior staff teaching a number of subjects under a head of section and the overall tutelage of Unisa.' South African universities and technikons were the principal sources of academic staff recruitment. In

addition, there were few black Namibians with advanced qualifications inside the country. Even fewer stood ready to associate themselves with a project that carried a clear political imprint. From 1980 to 1988 the medium of instruction was Afrikaans.

As in neighbouring South Africa, Afrikaans was perceived as ‘the language of the oppressor’ and as a device to frame a privileged system of knowledge and representation. For these and other reasons, it was hardly surprising that the liberation movement, SWAPO, as well as other progressive forces inside the country, viewed the Academy with a considerable degree of scepticism that bordered on hostility.

UNAM’s *First Five-Year Development Plan* (1995–1999) makes another justified criticism of the Academy: that it did not provide training for the indigenisation of key areas for the scientific and technological management and development of the Namibian infrastructure and economy:

It is disturbing, therefore, that the University component of the Academy did not have Departments of Fisheries and Marine Biology, Geology, Mining Engineering, Architecture and Town Planning, or a Faculty of Agriculture and Natural Resources. For tertiary level training in these fields, there was over-dependence on institutions in the Republic of South Africa, which served to perpetuate the dependency syndrome (UNAM, 1995: 3).

Apart from the factors outlined above that detracted from the credibility and legitimacy of the Academy, there was also the much longer and more complex legacy of apartheid education itself. While these factors fall outside the scope of this exploratory paper, they nonetheless provide part of the context for an understanding of why the Academy became a site of struggle, especially from the mid-1980s.

As the 1980s advanced, the SWAPO-aligned Namibian National Students’ Organisation (NANSO), inspired by their South African counterparts, became politically more organised on campus after a successful campaign to gain formal recognition from the Academy authorities.

In retrospect, it would not be an exaggeration to argue that youth activism reached its apogee during the mid-1980s. It was especially significant and symbolic that the Academy became an important site for part of the struggle. The political link between NANSO and SWAPO, the primary liberation movement, was not lost on the leadership of the latter, nor on the informed public at large. The SWAPO leadership in exile, while fortified by student opposition to South African rule, was

nonetheless, less enthusiastic about the development of internal leadership and home-grown critiques (Leys & Saul, 1995: 66).

Many members of the academic staff worked closely with NANSO, while the pro-independence sentiments of others inevitably led them to become active in the wider political field. For example, some members of the academic staff joined the NPP 435 interest association that actively campaigned for independence. There were much-publicised visits to UNIN in Lusaka, and in 1987 and 1988 a number of senior members of the academic staff participated in high-level conferences in Zambia and Sweden.

From the Academy, its political setting and intellectual legacy, the focus now shifts to the other antecedent: UNIN.

### The United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN) (1976–1990)

The United Nations Institute for Namibia (UNIN) was established in Lusaka, Zambia, in 1976. UNIN concentrated on training middle-level administrators through a three-year diploma course in Management and Development Studies in the fields of agriculture, law, economics, history, politics and education. In addition, two-year post-diploma courses were offered in Magistrates' Training and Teacher Training. Secretarial courses were offered at the certificate level. From the time of its inception, over 1 200 Namibian students attended the Institute and by the end of 1985, over 900 received diplomas in Development Studies and Management, and Teacher Training/Upgrading, and certificates in Magistrates' Training, and Secretarial Services (Duggal, 1996: 519).

In addition to training, the Institute was involved in research into various political, legal and socio-economic aspects of Namibia, which it was hoped would assist in the formulation of policies and programmes for an independent Namibia. For example, various policy papers were produced on the karakul industry, transport and communication, language policy, and education and culture.

At the time, SWAPO was a significant source of skilled human resources. The 1985 *Political Programme* of SWAPO, published in Angola, explicitly pronounced its commitment to profound socio-economic transformation of Namibian society, particularly through human resource development at institutions of technical and higher learning. The human resource development assistance provided by the United Nations Commissioner for Namibia under the Nationhood Programme for Namibia covered a wide range of training, including field training.

UNIN was viewed by some as a 'university-in-waiting' for Namibia's independence. As early as 1980/81 various academic papers appeared written by persons who had an association with UNIN. Christian Rogerson, for example, explored 'A Future "University of Namibia"? The Role of the United Nations Institute for Namibia' in *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, while Mose Tjitendero (now Speaker of the National Assembly) considered policy options for basic education as early as 1982. Chamberlain, Diallo and John interrogated a language policy for Namibia: *English as the Official Language: Perspectives and Strategies* in a 1981 study published by UNIN. It was also at UNIN that key recommendations of the 1991 *Presidential Commission on Higher Education* (see our subsequent discussion) were hatched, such as dividing the Academy into three autonomous institutions.

In 1986, UNIN published its influential and comprehensive study titled: *Namibia: Perspectives for National Reconstruction and Development*. In it was contained a vision for a future university in Namibia. This vision posited that a university in Namibia 'will have the special duty of acting as an instrument for the consolidation of national unity' (1986: 532). Moreover, the university 'should not become an ivory tower, isolated from society. The research projects of the university must be related to the needs of the country and directly linked to the ministry responsible for national planning. Furthermore, it should be linked to the existing industries to help them improve and develop their technology, and to maximise their production and efficiency' (1986: 532–3).

The same publication saw as 'immediate priorities' in terms of the university programmes, the establishment of faculties related to teacher education, management training, and training in agriculture and in mining. Other areas to be considered in the longer term, included medicine, engineering and architecture. It was also envisaged that the university would offer two types of academic courses: (1) degree courses lasting three or four years depending on the qualifications of the candidate, and (2) certificate or diploma courses lasting for one or two years depending also on the candidate's qualifications (1986: 534).

Notwithstanding its imprint, UNIN disbanded with the advent of Namibian independence in 1990. What is worth noting, is that two members of the UNIN staff subsequently became members of the UNAM Vice-Chancellor-designate's transitional team, where they became influential for a period of about two years. One became Dean of Studies, while the other was the Strategic Planner.

## From Academy to the University of Namibia

### The Presidential Commission on Higher Education (Turner Report) 1991

With the achievement of national independence in 1990, the Academy found itself facing an uncertain future. The appointment of the Presidential Commission on Higher Education in January 1991, under the chairpersonship of John Turner, an educationist from the United Kingdom, was the first definitive indication that the new government intended to restructure the higher education sector. Composed of Namibians (one of whom was a senior and respected academic from the university component of the Academy) and foreigners, (who, apart from the Chair, included two other senior academics from the region), the Commission took evidence widely and produced a voluminous report by September of that year.

The key recommendation in respect of institutions of higher learning was that there should be a university as well as a separate polytechnic. Although the recommendations of the Turner Report were fairly predictable, they were important, and some of them were to shape the institutional design and governance of the new university.

These recommendations included among others, a *Draft of the National University of Namibia Act, 1991* that subsequently informed *The University of Namibia Act, No. 18 of 1992*. The Report recommended that higher education should be expanded by distance and open learning, through the development of extension programmes for local communities, and through a programme of pre-entry or bridging and access courses to prepare students for entry into higher education. Further, all certificate, diploma and degree courses should be designed on a modular basis which incorporates the principle of credit accumulation. The education structure for higher education should be based on a post-IGCSE (Cambridge International General Certificate Secondary Education) system of diplomas and four-year degrees, and there should be a statutory National Research Council of Namibia under the Office of the Prime Minister. Appropriate transitional arrangements should be made for students who studied at the Academy to change to the new University of Namibia programmes.

Several detailed recommendations were also made in respect of staffing, the governance of the University, academic programmes, research, postgraduate studies, library services and access and entry. While not all of the recommendations were subsequently implemented in the new University, a great many were. And one of the most important political decisions, that to some degree defined the province of the 1991 Turner Commission, was the appointment of a Vice-Chancellor-

designate by President Nujoma, at the time when the Commission began its work. This person was Dr Peter H Katjavivi, an Oxford graduate and former SWAPO Member of Parliament.

### Transitional Planning Team (TPT)

Katjavivi appointed a transitional planning team (TPT) to assist him in fashioning the new university. Key members of the TPT came from UNIN, or alternatively, had an association with it. The TPT was based on the politics of loyalty and of intimate liaison. With little experience of university management among its members, this team became the focus of intense debate and media interest over the next 18 months.

A selected reading of local print media, showed that the issues that featured in media reports on the proposed university, included, amongst others:

- Generous monthly salaries paid to the team members.
- The composition of the TPT, with two Namibians out of six – one of whom subsequently became the first Registrar of the University.
- The near-absence of transparency, particularly in respect of the recommendations of the Turner Report (*The Namibian*, 13 and 15 November 1991).

Insecurity deepened because the Turner Report recommended that in view of the provisions of the new *University of Namibia Act*, all members of the Academy staff should be deployed temporarily – for a period of two years – pending an evaluation of their qualifications and competencies. Suspicions were further aroused at the Academy by the hostile language that characterised the first draft master plan for UNAM, prepared by the transitional team. Harlech-Jones comments graphically (2001: 136):

The first draft master plan deplored ‘the poverty of the quality of staff’, dismissing their qualifications and experience as ‘scant teaching experience,’ and in many cases as ‘Bantustan experience.’

Members of the Academy responded strongly in various forums. For, as Harlech-Jones reminds the reader: ‘All in all, it was not an auspicious beginning to a relationship between two parties who would soon have to work together in the same institution.’

The TPT took over on 1 September 1992, and one of its first actions was to remove or marginalise most of the Academy’s senior management and replace them with the consultants of the TPT. All the Academy committees were disbanded and replaced by interim committees chaired by the consultants or other newly

appointed staff. The Senate and its attendant committees were suspended, to be replaced by a management committee chaired by the Vice-Chancellor. Compared with that of the former Academy, the system of governance was both more centralised and more personalised.

The politics at the time, as well as the pressure on the new management to produce a two-year priority work plan, meant that the governance of the new university largely vested with 'the chosen few' – the members of the Management Committee, most of whom were not trained in management. It was, in a literal sense, 'governance by committee'. Another imperative was that of appointing more black academic staff members, although ironically – in view of the provisions of affirmative action – few of the new appointees were Namibian, simply because there were few qualified black Namibians available.

### Institutional reform and the curriculum (1995–2002)

Apart from recruitment and appointments, the new management was preoccupied with two other principal concerns: institutional reform (see the 'Two Year Priority Programme' of UNAM, published in November 1993), and the curriculum. Given the focus of this book, only the latter is briefly discussed.

By 1995/96 the University introduced a four-year Bachelor degree programme in the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. The new curriculum was not only informed by Namibian socio-political and economic realities, such as the changing over of the school system to the Cambridge International General Certificate Secondary Education (IGCSE) model (Gretschel, 2001: 111–128), but was launched on the basis of the following values and considerations:

- 1 Broad-based flexible education that is sensitive to market needs and labour mobility. Thus, a decisive break with narrow, canonical understandings of knowledge.
- 2 An understanding that curriculum design and renewal take place within a significantly shorter time frame than was hitherto the case.
- 3 Promotion and encouragement of interdisciplinary work and intra-faculty co-operation.
- 4 Catering in the first year of study for those students with rural backgrounds and limited competency in the English language.
- 5 Introducing a broad and inter-disciplinary foundation in the Humanities and Social Sciences, with choices of majors at the beginning of the second year of study, after a firm foundation had been laid in the first year.

Informed by these values and considerations, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences hoped to educate students who could think critically and independently, and in ways that emphasised the relationship amongst seemingly different forms of knowledge and disciplines. It was led by a specific concern to ensure a relevant and academically responsible Africanisation and Namibianisation of the curriculum.

Curriculum reform, according to Harlech-Jones' (2001: 138) analysis, was not only 'necessary' but also 'desirable'. Harlech-Jones (*ibid.*) typifies the process as follows:

It was also an excellent opportunity to kindle the academic dialogue within and across faculties so as to raise the academic discourse among a rather demoralised group of lecturers and professors. It was a fine opportunity to revitalise the university, but the occasion was squandered by the unsuitability of the 'foreign consultant' appointed to lead the effort – he was a member of the former transitional team. Since large numbers of IGCSE-qualified entrants were expected in 1996, action and dialogue quickened, but it was too late for substantial cross-disciplinary and inter-faculty co-operation.

Since the introduction of the modularised four-year Bachelor degree programmes in 1995/96, within trimesters, the University has most recently embarked on yet another exercise aimed at reforming the curriculum. As from the 2003 academic year, the University will semesterise all its curricula. Ironically, the former Academy had a semester system. This major undertaking has not been spawned by former colleagues of the Academy, but by academics from East and West Africa.

## Conclusion

This brief account has shown how institutional configuration and memory shaped curriculum design and how the University of Namibia grew out of the former Academy for Tertiary Education and to a lesser degree from the United Nations Institute for Namibia. Not unlike the new Namibian state, the University of Namibia had to master its own transition to become a credible education provider at tertiary level. Given the history of Namibia's most recent colonial experience, it was almost inevitable that the new university would become an important string in the bow of the new state's project of national reconciliation and nation-building.<sup>2</sup>

The curriculum has undergone several reviews, but redefinition of the underlying philosophy and thinking has not always resulted in true curriculum transformation. However, the University now has a curriculum in the Humanities and Social Sciences that is modularised and socially engaged with a more inter-disciplinary character, and an openness to the African, and specifically Namibian,

context. These are clear advances beyond the colonial and anti-colonial past. There is evidence, as elsewhere in the region, of a nascent debate on 'outcomes based education' and 'market relevance'.

Finally, this chapter has shown how a triple inheritance – South African, West European and African – has conspired to give the University of Namibia its own unique character and contradictions. It is this complex inheritance and the values that underpin it that should form the basis for learning about the imagination needed to carry the University of Namibia into the future.

## Endnotes

- 1 For our purposes, drawing on the writings of Norman Fairclough, 'discourse' is understood as a systematic, internally consistent body of representations, 'the language used in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view.' (1995: 56).
- 2 The politics of 'national reconciliation' derives its rationale and legal force from, among other sources, *The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia*, notably as provided for in Article 141. This Article reads: 'Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, any person holding office under any law in force on the date of Independence shall continue to hold such office unless and until he or she resigns or is retired, transferred or removed from office in accordance with law.'

## References

- Academy Act No. 13 of 1985. Windhoek: Government Gazette.
- Academy for Tertiary Education. 1987. *Yearbook 1987*. Windhoek.
- 1988. *Annual Report, Department of German*. Mimeo. Windhoek.
- 1989a. *Yearbook 1989*. Windhoek.
- 1989b. *Scenario for Academy, 1989–1991*. Mimeo. Windhoek.
- Anderson, B. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Aventrup, R. 1989. 'Expert Meeting on the Draft Proposal for a Senior Secondary Syllabus for SWAPO Schools'. Lusaka, 15–16 February 1989 (unpublished paper).
- Duggal, N.K. (ed.). 1996. *Namibia: Perspectives for National Development and Reconstruction*. Lusaka: UNIN.
- Gretschel, H.V. 2001. 'Education in Namibia.' In I. Diener and G. Olivier (eds.): *Contemporary Namibia: The First Landmarks of a Post-Independent Society*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan Publishers/IFRA.

- Hall, S. 1996. 'When was the Post-Colonial? Thinking at the Limit.' In L. Curti and I. Chambers, (eds.): *The Post-Colonial in Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*. London: Routledge.
- Harlech-Jones, B. 2001. 'The University of Namibia.' In I. Diener and G. Olivier (eds.): *Contemporary Namibia: The First Landmarks of a Post-Independent Society*. Windhoek: Gamsberg Macmillan/IFRA.
- Kiljunen, K. 1981. 'The Ideology of Liberation.' In R. Green, K. Kiljunen and L. Kiljunen (eds.): *Namibia: The Last Colony*. Essex: Longman.
- Kunkler, M. 2000. *Between the Self and the Other: Anti-Colonial Nationalism Revisited*. Masters thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Leys, C. and Saul, J. (eds.). 1995. *Namibia's Liberation Struggle. The Two-Edged Sword*. London: James Currey.
- Leys, C. 1984. 'A National University for Independent Namibia.' Unpublished mimeo, p. 77. *The Namibian*. 13–15 November 1991. News report by Kate Burling.
- Turner, J.D. 1991. 'Higher Education in Namibia Report of a Presidential Commission.' Windhoek: September 1991.
- University of Namibia. 1992. 'The University of Namibia Act No. 18 of 1992.' Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1993a. *Two Year Priority Work Programme*. Windhoek: Strategic Planning & Development Unit, UNAM.
- 1993b. *Installation, Inauguration and Graduation Ceremonies*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1993c. *University of Namibia Annual Report*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1995d. *University of Namibia Annual Report*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1995e. *First Five Year Development Plan (1995–1999)*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1996a. *University of Namibia Annual Report*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1996b. *Prospectus, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- 1999. *Prospectus, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences*. Windhoek: UNAM.
- Wood, B. (ed.). 1988. *Namibia 1884–1984: Readings on Namibia's history and society*. London: Namibia support committee in co-operation with UNIN.
- Rogerson, C.M. 1980. "A Future University of Namibia?": The Role of the United Nations Institute for Namibia.' In *The Journal of Modern African Studies*, 18 (4): 675–683.
- SWAPO of Namibia. 1985. *National Integrated Educational System for Emergent Namibia. A Handbook of the Educational Programme of SWAPO of Namibia*. Luanda, Angola.

SWAPO of Namibia. 1989. 'Draft Proposal for a Senior Secondary Syllabus for SWAPO Schools.' Mimeo. UNIN Collection, UNAM. Windhoek.

Tjitendero, M.P. (n.d.) *A Namibia University*. Mimeo. Lusaka: UNIM.

Tjitendero, M.P. 1985. 'Upgrading Education for Women.' Unpublished research report. Private Tjitendero Collection.

UNIN Namibiana Series S06 10-2-4. Archives of the UN Institute for Namibia. Department of Education and Teacher Training. Lusaka: 1979-1986.

UNIN Namibiana Series A NAM 371.122 Mbu: Mbuende, E.A. 1986. *Teacher Education for an Independent Namibia: Problems and Prospects*. Lund, Sweden: University of Lund.