Journal of Documentation

Disciplinary documentation in Apartheid South Africa: A conceptual framework of documents, associated practices, and their effects

Marc Richard Hugh Kosciejew

Received 12 October 2013
Revised 26 December 2013
Accepted 5 January 2014

Disciplinary documentation in Apartheid South Africa

A conceptual framework of documents, associated practices, and their effects

Marc Richard Hugh Kosciejew
Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences, University of Malta, Msida, Malta

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to argue that information is an important effect of documentation. It is in this way that documentation studies distinguishes between concepts of and practices with "information" and "document": that is, documentation studies helps illuminate how information is created, stabilized, and materialized such that it can emerge and, in turn, how it can then be controlled, deployed, enforced, entrenched, managed, and used in many different ways, in various settings, and for diverse purposes.

Design/methodology/approach – This paper presents a conceptual framework on documentation, drawing upon the work of Bernd Frohmann , Michel Foucault, Bruno Latour, Hannah Arendt, @@and Ian Hacking, and applied to a case study of Apartheid South Africa.

Findings – Apartheid's documentation helped achieve apartness at the macro and micro levels of society: on the macro level, the creation and subsequent separation of different racial and ethnic identities were drafted, adopted, and turned into law through legislative documents; on the micro level, these identities were reinforced through routines with personal documents and public signs. This documentation functioned as a documentary apparatus, providing a tangible link between individuals and their official racial and ethnic categories by creating a seamless movement of documents through various institutions; further it helped transform these racial and ethnic identities into lived facts that disciplined and controlled life.

Originality/value – By examining documentation, one can present a fresh and unique perspective to understanding the construction of various things, such as the construction of identities. This conceptual framework contributes to Library and Information Science (LIS) by illuminating the central role of documentation in the creation, stabilization, materialization, and emergence of information. By using Apartheid South Africa as a case study, this paper demonstrates how this framework can be applied to shed new light on different kinds of phenomena in diverse contexts; consequently, it not only contributes to and extends parts of the scholarship on documentation studies within LIS, but also presents new directions for other academic disciplines and multidisciplinary analyses and research.

Keywords South Africa, Classification, Apartheid, Documents, Documentation, Identity

Paper type Research paper

This paper argues that information is an important effect of documentation. It is in this way that documentation studies distinguishes between concepts of and practices with "information" and "document": that is, documentation studies helps illuminate how information is created, stabilized, and materialized such that it can emerge and, in turn, how it can then be controlled, deployed, enforced, entrenched, managed, and used in many different ways, in various settings, and for diverse purposes. Documentation,

The author would like to gratefully acknowledge the strong support and scholarly stewardship of Dr Bernd Frohmann. The author would also like to acknowledge and thank Dr Michael K. Buckland, Dr Grant Campbell, Dr Pam McKenzie, and Dr Amanda Grzyb for their valuable academic interest.

Journal of Documentation
Vol. 71 No. 1, 2015
pp. 96-115

0022-0418
DOI 10.1108/JD-10-2013-0130

in other words, helps transform information into tangible entities that can be employed to shape, guide, and discipline its particular contextual setting. Murat Karamuftuoglu notes that, although concepts of information and documentation have distinct but significant roles to play in information science (Karamuftuoglu, 2009, p. 2020), there is a continuing "debate about whether "information" or "document" is the primary object of study in information science is a complex and multifarious one" (Karamuftuoglu, 2009, p. 2019). This paper posits that the two objects of study can be complementary and therefore need not necessarily be viewed in a competitive or contradictory manner.

Thus, in order to help show the significance of documentation for library and information science (LIS), particularly its crucial role in stabilizing and materializing information – that is, one of its major constitutive effects – this paper presents a conceptual framework in which to situate further discussions of the distinctions and relationships between "information" and "document". Drawing upon the work of Bernd Frohmann, Michel Foucault, Ian Hacking, Hannah Arendt, and Bruno Latour, this paper contributes to the growing scholarship and research on documentation by providing fresh theoretical directions and useful conceptual tools in which to better understand the roles and effects of documentation.

Further, this paper applies this framework to a specific historical case study of Apartheid South Africa in which to help demonstrate, and emphasize, the power of documentation's constitutive effects over the actual lives and realities of both individuals and an entire society and country. This framework, for example, helps show how Apartheid's documentation helped establish and entrench official racial and ethnic identities by creating a strong tangible link between South Africans' and the state's strict racial and ethnic classifications that were used to control and discipline their entire life trajectories. This paper is not concerned with a historical account or review of this racist era and regime or the scholarship on it; instead, its approach is situated within documentation studies, critically analyzing the pivotal role played by documentation in the construction, control, and discipline of official racial and ethnic identities and, consequently, the maintenance of apartness. Thus, in addition to LIS, this paper also contributes to a multidisciplinary constellation of other academic fields and interests, including political science, history, identity theories, and representations, and African studies, by presenting and offering novel theoretical perspectives and directions involving documentation in which to approach and analyze their domains.

Apartheid's documentation

White and black people lived in South Africa for centuries before Apartheid's documentation helped transform their skin colours into unique cases that, in turn, helped constitute their lives. But Apartheid's documentation helped construct new and unique official identities based upon different skin pigmentations, transforming individuals into racialized and ethnicized bodies to be classified and placed in clearly defined and demarcated spaces. Apartheid's documentation was a complex assemblage of interrelated metrological chains connecting each document to the next. As a document moved from one institutional setting to another, from one context to another, it linked to more documents, thereby accumulating mass and inertia. Although a single document may have been more or less important depending on its context, it nevertheless remained a critical link to the overall functioning of the entire assemblage. The loss of one document could sever important connections with other documents and

other practices. Each document's place in the whole assemblage – where and how it was linked and related to other documents – lent it a force and power, as did the practices surrounding it, including its production, circulation, presentation, and deployments. The accumulation of documentary mass and inertia stabilized, materialized, and in turn articulated Apartheid's official racial and ethnic classifications into the defining facts of South Africa's racist society.

Documentation studies and its relation to LIS

Documentation studies – an important branch of LIS – has received renewed attention in recent years. A growing recognition of the importance of documentation has been emerging in many academic disciplines. Scholars are turning towards documentation to better illuminate and understand various kinds of phenomena. The annual conferences of the Document Academy (DOCAM), for example, demonstrate the increasing appreciation for and interest in documentation in LIS and many other scholarly disciplines, as well as a diverse array of artistic fields and professional practices. These international conferences – which originated as a co-sponsored effort by the Programme of Documentation Studies, University of Tromsø, Norway, and the School of Information, University of California, Berkeley – attract an interdisciplinary network and audience of scholars, professionals, researchers, public and private actors, artists, and graduate students "who are interested in the exploration of the concept of the document as a resource for scholarly, artistic, and professional work" (DOCAM, 2013). Bernd Frohmann observes that this turning towards documentation is of "keen interest to the DOCAM conferences, which are dedicated to multiplying studies of documentary practices and to strengthening theoretical work on the concept of the document" (Frohmann, 2008, p. 366). Documentation "has become a hot topic, not only in anthropology but in other areas of the social sciences" (Frohmann, 2008, p. 365).

But the concept of information tends to be privileged within LIS. Many LIS analyses and approaches tend to neglect the centrality of documentation to information, instead concentrating on the uses, retrieval, organization, and management of information or the information seeking behaviour or practices of individuals and groups, and so on, without much consideration for the roles, effects, and contingencies of documentation. Indeed, many LIS scholars and practitioners tend to focus on the information contained within documents rather than the documents themselves. Information tends to be elevated to a point where documentation is seemingly unimportant.

Vesa Suominen argues that when compared to just information science, "documentation studies has the merit of better comprehending the various stages of existence of its objects. Documentation studies, by the very notion of documentation and document, refers to material objects, which are the result of material production that also have economical aspects […] and which for these and other reasons also have juridical and political, and – last but not least – semiotic aspects" (Suominen, 2007, pp. 244-245). Documentation studies call our attention and focus to the central role, place, and materiality of documents and documentary practices in diverse settings, institutions, and relationships, instead of "some abstract ideal information understood as knowledge or content of mind" Suominen, 2007, p. 245). While this paper does not dispute the significant parts played by information, it argues for a stronger emphasis on documentation in LIS studies because documentation helps information to stabilize and emerge as something informative and meaningful; in other words, in order to better situate and understand (concepts of and practices with) information, it is crucial to analyze its documentation.

This paper therefore takes up Bernd Frohmann's argument that documentation has constitutive effects. Frohmann deflates the idea that information is more important than documents, arguing instead that "information […] exists only as an *effect* of the ontologically primary elements: documents and documentary practices. It has, therefore, only a secondary or derived ontological status; it is an effect of the relative stability of documentary practices. Once practices stabilize, information can emerge" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 18, emphasis added). Information, on its own, is an abstract concept with little factual value; rather, it is the labour, work, and material practices involved in documentation that transform abstract information into fact. Thus, in order to understand documents, it is necessary to "investigate how documents are produced, the uses to which they are put, their zones of circulation, and the effects produced by practices with them" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 18).

This paper also argues for Frohmann's declaration that "an emphasis on documentary practices expands the range of cultural sites in which documentation contributes to both knowledge production and to stabilization of various other cultural phenomena" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 242). Approaching and analyzing Apartheid's documentation can be seen "as a work of cultural extension" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 99); through documents and their associated documentary practices, racial, and ethnic identities were materialized, routinized, standardized, disciplined, and enforced. A South African's identity was linked to the overall documentary apparatus of the Apartheid state; thus, the racial inscriptions and statements of these documents became informing through the disciplined practices associated with them. Since documentation has constitutive effects, it can, consequently, shape and influence society in diverse ways in different times and contexts. Frohmann states that the importance of history to documentation studies should not be marginalized, especially because "documentary effects are historical phenomena" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 246). Although he outlines four possible research directions for further work on documentation studies, the most pertinent of the four for this paper's purpose is "the many different ways documents become integrated into various cultural practices, that is, mapping documentary practices as resources for the production of different sorts of effects" (Frohmann, 2004a, p. 240). The following paper takes up this particular direction in order to explore how racial and ethnic identities are constructed and materialized for the purpose of achieving, entrenching, and preserving a racist political economic system.

Attention to documents and practices with documents "reveals how it is that particular documents, at particular times and places and in particular areas of the social and cultural terrain, become informative" (Frohmann, 2004b, p. 405). Information is a contingent phenomenon, dependent on its particular historical and cultural context for its legitimacy and significance. Frohmann's analysis of scientific documentation reveals how "even scientific information [considered factual and universal] depends for its emergence on culturally specific, historically determined, and institutionally disciplined [documents and] documentary practices" (Frohmann, 2004b, p. 405). Ideas of what it meant to be a particular skin colour within South Africa were materialized into official identities, affecting one's quality of life and opportunities based on the informativeness of this contextually contingent documentation.

Frohmann sheds more light on the different contextual contingencies of documentation. He argues that "when it comes to documents, it is certainly the case that very specific sorts of investigations require very specific sorts of definitions, but it would be a mistake to brandish a definition for a specific context and propose it as

settling what counts as a document in every situation" (Frohmann, 2009, p. 294). There are different kinds of documents and documentary practices that are contextually contingent; that is, documentation in one particular time and place may not be considered so in another time and place. Because of different contextual contingencies, it is not always helpful to try to develop rigid definitions or fixed and unchanging meanings of and for documentation; and because different documents do different things in different times and places, it is not always useful or necessary to apply a rigid definition to every single (potential) document in the same, fixed fashion. He argues that "there is no reason to suppose that the stories we tell will be the same, which is another way of saying that there is no reason to suppose there will be one, unified theory of documents and documentation. But that is not to say that theoretical resources can't be used to elaborate the stories" (Frohmann, 2009, p. 297). There exists different documentation theories that can be applied to different cases or analyzes; for example, one could approach documentation by analyzing its communicative effects or one could approach documentation by analyzing its constitutive effects. Frohmann also suggests that if we want to extend documentation to new and different situations that upon first glance may not appear to have anything to do with documentation, "we can also use specific tactics, such as beginning with a clear case of a thing we agree is a document, or an activity we agree is an instance of documentation, and then introduce new cases by analogy, similarity, and resemblance" (Frohmann, 2009, p. 296).

The banality of documentation

Documents and their associated documentary practices are mundane but ubiquitous features of contemporary institutions and life. It is difficult to imagine organizing these complex and diverse things without documentation. Annelise Riles observes that "the ability to create and maintain files is the emblem of modern bureaucracy" (Riles, 2006, p. 5). Different documents have different functions requiring different practices depending on their specific context; for example, a courtroom transcript functions differently, and involves different practices, than a restaurant menu. Regardless of its particular function, documentation is a pervasive feature of contemporary institutions, agencies, infrastructures, organizations, and life.

Documentation played a central role in Apartheid South Africa by helping to ensure the racist ideological mission of separation at both the macro and micro levels of life. On the macro level, the creation and subsequent separation of different racial and ethnic identities were drafted, adopted, and turned into law through legislative documents. On the micro level, these identities were further reinforced through mundane and daily routines with personal documents, maps, and signs. This macro and micro documentation, functioning as a complex documentary apparatus, provided a tangible link between an individual and his or her racial and ethnic categories, thereby transforming these categories into reality. This transformation was facilitated by the seamless movement of documents through various governmental ministries, security institutions, bureaucratic agencies, businesses, and cultural and social agencies. As the documents made their way through the system, one's racial and ethnic identity became a fact controlling their life trajectory. South African historian W.A. de Klerk states, "never in history have so few legislated so programmatically, thoroughly and religiously, in such a short time, for so many divergent groups, cultures and traditions, than the nationalist Afrikaners of the second half of the twentieth century"

(De Klerk, 1976, p. 241). Nelson Mandela explains that "what had been more or less de facto was to become relentlessly de jure. The often haphazard segregation of the past three hundred years was to be consolidated into a monolithic system that was diabolical in its detail, inescapable in its reach, and overwhelming in its power" (Mandela, 1994, p. 111). Although De Klerk and Mandela do not explicitly acknowledge or refer to it as such, documentation played a central role in this legislative agenda of apartness.

Apartheid's documentation helped determine and direct life. The regime established a complex and intricate documentary apparatus involving many different kinds of macro and micro documents, each requiring different types of documentary practices, in order to help connect the Apartheid system together; establish as much segregation, in as many activities and spheres, as possible; maintain easy access to a captive and cheap black labour force; permit and legitimate racist oppression; and ensure as much compliance as possible on a day-to-day basis. For example, while the Pass Laws were macro documents that rigidly defined and determined a black person's rights within South Africa, an unaccounted-for passbook – a micro document mandated by, and connected to, these Pass Laws – justified and ensured harsh censure or punishment for the unfortunate black person without this micro document. The Pass Laws mandated the passbook's creation and issuance which, in turn, connected each black South African to their official racial and ethnic identity. This macro and micro document were therefore important links in Apartheid's documentary chain, connecting to other macro and micro documents generating powerful agency for each one.

When discussing Apartheid South Africa, however, one typically concentrates on its history or its political economic structure or its security apparatus or its foreign relations or its cultural and sporting aspects or its ideological discourse. One also usually thinks about the regime's tactics of oppression. While all of these atrocities frequently occurred during this era – and, indeed, were some of the most brutal and shocking aspects of life under Apartheid control – they were guided and influenced by things much less obvious but nonetheless very important: documentation, that is documents and documentary practices.

Most discussions on Apartheid South Africa invariably include one or another of its documents. To discuss Apartheid South Africa without any reference to, or acknowledgement of, any of its documentation would leave an incomplete picture of what the system really looked like, how it functioned, how parts of its authority and power were created and maintained, and how it successfully survived for nearly half a century. Despite its crucial role, this documentation's bureaucratic and daily banality has made a close documentary analysis of it a relatively unexplored area of research. Bowker and Star (1999), for instance, show how Apartheid classified South Africans according to racial and ethnic characteristics and illuminate some of the documentation involved, such as racial identity cards for whites and other light-skinned individuals, and passbooks for blacks; however, it would not be possible for Bowker and Star to discuss Apartheid's classifications without its documentation, especially because it is the documents and documentary practices involved that materialized these classifications, attaching them to South Africans. But the focus of Bowker and Star's work is on the classifications, not on the documentation. I expand upon Bowker and Star's work by emphasizing the centrality of documentation.

Those discussions that involve one particular document or another tend to concentrate on a textual analysis rather than a documentary analysis of the document. The focus therefore tends to be on the information of the document, rather than the

documentary apparatus as a whole. A documentary analysis traces, examines, and analyzes what the document is doing, where it is embedded, how it is used, who uses it and for what ends, to what other documents and institutions and actors it is connected, what other documents it produces, what actions and relationships it allows or prohibits, and so on. A documentary analysis does not aim to undermine, negate, or neglect the information of a document. When engaging in a documentary analysis of Apartheid South Africa, therefore, it is not that the information is unimportant but rather that the information is dependent upon documentary apparatuses, institutions, and practices.

A taxonomy of Apartheid's documentation

Apartheid's documentation helped partition the country institutionally, politically, economically, spatially, and socially. These documents determined one's life trajectory: from their education to employment opportunities to political, economic, and social participation. These documents further managed daily life: from walking down a street to entering a building to using a bathroom. Even the pleasurable side of life, from enjoying a drink to shopping to having sexual intercourse, was governed by these documents. Apartheid's documentation can best be presented as a taxonomy of four main categories: legal and political, personal, spatial, and social. The first category provided the legal and political framework of not only the Apartheid system, but its entire documentary assemblage. At the apex of this documentary apparatus was the Population Registration Act, which racially and ethnically partitioned and ranked individuals with obsessive zeal and commitment. The second category helped enforce the Population Registration Act by mandating personal documents for every South African. Best known among them were the passbook, required of every black South African, and the racial identity card, required of every white and light-skinned South African citizen. The third category provided for spatial separation of the country. The Group Areas Act and its maps spatially separated South Africa according to the official racial and ethnic categories mandated by the Population Registration Act. The fourth category is social documentation. The Separate Amenities Act and its signs divided social space, separating society along racial and ethnic lines.

South Africa's legislative documents inscribed apartness on a macro level, thereby exercising sweeping powers over the nation in every sphere of activity. Apartness configured all political institutions, public agencies and infrastructures, private businesses, and property. On a micro level, apartness was inscribed in everyday life through documents that cluttered the landscape and that were mandated to be carried on one's person at all times. Although racism exists throughout the world, South Africa's state-sponsored version made it unique. Its racist and discriminatory practices were designed and implemented on a deliberate and comprehensive scale unseen elsewhere.

Distinctions between documentation and classification

Let us now return to the earlier discussion of Bowker and Star's analysis of Apartheid's classification system. Some individuals, admittedly, did not fit neatly into any of Apartheid's racial and ethnic categories. People of mixed-race heritage did not fit into a pure white or pure black group. Apartheid's documentation, however, constructed a special kind of "catch-all" identity for these individuals: the coloured group. There is a distinction between documentation and formal classification: the latter is a product of the former. Apartheid's documentation did not help the formal classification system;

rather, the formal classification system was dependent upon this documentation. The formal classification of individuals was itself a significant documentary practice, partitioning, and sorting South Africans, thereby permanently linking them to their official racial and ethnic identities.

The Population Registration Act's inscriptions were based upon strict Aristotelian definitions and delineations (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 204). By Aristotelian definitions and delineations, the authors mean the "precise, exclusive [racial and ethnic] categories aspired to by [the] Nationalists" (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 204). But the authors show that this Aristotelian approach to race and ethnicity was based on stubborn idealism, because South African reality could not always match up with Apartheid racial and ethnic perfection. They discuss the inherent tension within this documentation's classification system between the strict Aristotelian categories and individual cases that defied clear classification. The focus here is coloured South Africans whose racial and ethnic identity was unclear and ambiguous. If one was half-white and half-black, how could they be placed within a classification system that privileged pure categories over mixed ones? How could one's unclear racial identity so confuse and confound the system that they remain in classificatory limbo for an indefinite period? And, most importantly, how could one be properly documented if they were not clearly white, black, or Indian?.

Bowker and Star discuss how Apartheid's classification system was not entirely Aristotelian because it also relied upon prototypical approaches to help determine the proper classification of those South Africans in the racial and ethnic borderlands. They state that "an Aristotelian classification works according to a set of binary characteristics that the object being classified either presents or does not present […] [and at] each level of classification, enough binary features are adduced to place any member of a given population into one and only one class" (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 62). But many classifications are not clear-cut, tending to be much fuzzier than they may at first appear. An object that might be considered a chair might not have any binary features in common with another object that also might be considered a chair. It is still possible, however, to name a group of objects that people would agree to call chairs but which have no two binary features in common (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 62). The authors state that "prototype theory proposes that we have a broad picture in our minds of what a chair is; and we extend this picture by metaphor and analogy when trying to decide if any given thing that we are sitting on counts. We call up the best example, and then see if there is a reasonable direct or metaphorical thread that takes us from the example to the object under consideration" (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 62). While there may be a rigid classification system of objects that strictly and technically define and classify the objects, there can also be times in which it is approached by interpretation or assumption. For instance, "looking at a picture of a Maine coon cat, a nonexpert will say that this is a picture of a cat, while an expert might call it either a Maine coon cat or a vertebrate" (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 63). The nonexpert interprets this animal as belonging to a population of cats; the expert, however, further refines it by applying this animal's proper, Aristotelian category of Maine coon cat.

But Apartheid's classification system also allowed for more prototypical approach classifications, using an amalgam of appearance, acceptance, and repute to perform the sorting process, particularly in situations that required on-the-spot visual judgments (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 201). The very existence of individuals of mixed-race and ethnicity showed the fuzziness of Apartheid's racial and ethnic categories and the difficulty in trying to classify them according to these strict Aristotelian categories.

To be classified as belonging to any of these racial and ethnic categories meant that both formal considerations (the Population Registration Act's specific inscriptions) and informal considerations (appearance, acceptance, and repute) could be taken into account in determining one's racial and ethnic identity. Coloured South Africans consequently lived in a particularly precarious situation because of the insidious power of this prototypical category open to various assumptions and different interpretations that could, in turn, change their documentation and therefore their lives. Because of the allowance for prototypical approaches in some cases, even those individuals classified as a pure race and ethnic group could also be questioned if their appearance, acceptance, or repute were suddenly called into question.

An individual's racial and ethnic classification would not be changed or altered to fit their actual reality; rather, reality would be changed – or torqued (Bowker and Star, 1999, p. 27 and p. 195) – to fit the documentary classification system through both its formal and informal considerations. If Apartheid's documentation determined one was a white person, then they would be classified and documented as a white person. It would not matter whether the person believed themselves to be a white person or even if they wanted such an official designation. Documentation helped make people fit their classification.

Although they discuss some of Apartheid's documents – particularly the passbook – their main focus is on the classification system itself, not the important roles played by Apartheid's documentation in materializing these racial and ethnic categories. This paper extends their focus on classification, arguing that Apartheid's documentation helped make the classification system possible, materializing its official racial and ethnic identities by transforming its categories into fact. The classification system, for instance, required Apartheid's documentation – including all its documents, documentary practices, and institutions involved – to disseminate, circulate, routinize, stabilize, and normalize the racial and ethnic categories applied to every citizen. It was this documentation that provided a tangible link from an individual's classification to their political rights, economic opportunities, and social privileges. If one were classified as a coloured person, they would be issued a racial identity card that linked the classification to them. If the authorities had problems classifying the person, there would be no temporary documentation to use while their case was being adjudicated. In a society where documents were important features of everyday life, not having any personal documents was tantamount to being politically, economically, and socially paralyzed. Even daily movements were restricted due to a lack of documentation. Apartheid's documentation therefore made no allowance for the potential of individuals falling between the cracks. One had to fit their proper racial and ethnic category, and be issued the corresponding, proper documents to operate within society; otherwise they would have to remain in a state of racialized purgatory until their case was resolved.

The idea of classifying individuals on the basis of racial and ethnic differences is also explored in Sam Kaplan's work on the role of documentation within the former French colony of Cilicia. He shows how the official documents produced, used, and circulated between the colony and centre (Paris), created facts about the colonized people, and how, in turn, the entire colonial documentary apparatus controlled and dominated the lives of the colonized people. Kaplan discusses various documentary practices that placed the colonized peoples' identities into defined physical and cultural roles. These official documents "identified the community's physical characteristics, economic activities, moral inclinations, and historical origins and diffusion"

(Kaplan, 2002, p. 348). These inscriptions on the physical, personal, and cultural features of the nonwhite colonial subjects were "considered essential in establishing authority in a foreign environment" (Kaplan, 2002, p. 349); these documents and documentary apparatus became a disciplinary instrument, able to control the subjected, nonwhite, colonial population. This process mirrors Apartheid's documentary apparatus in the sense that it made South Africans malleable to Apartheid's policy of separation.

Apartheid's documents, like those of the French military officers, "intended, first of all, to identify the particular people's racial specificity and, secondly, to create static legal collectivities which were clearly delineated and therefore available for administrative action" (Kaplan, 2002, p. 349). The point was to make people fit racial and ethnic categories that were forever bounded, implying that these categories were found objects, things that were not assigned but rather natural and innate. By showing that these categories were inherent, the Apartheid regime – or in Kaplan's case, the French colonials – could justify its domination over nonwhite South Africans on the basis of nature. Apartheid's documentation twisted this domination further because it aimed to categorize all South Africans, not just the dominated nonwhites.

Apartheid's documents were also similar to the French colonials' reports in that "all these reports provided the documenters with powerful rhetorical devices for conceptualizing another society, and they devoted these devices to the singular task of spelling out the discontinuities between the different communities, all the while defining hierarchical relations between them" (Kaplan, 2002, p. 348). The goal and success of Apartheid was to construct a fixed racial and ethnic hierarchy based on the documentation of skin colour. Finally, the French "officers not only encoded social groups into racial categories, but also, in the process, imposed a nationalist mode of representations on the ethno-religious identities in the Ottoman Empire" (Kaplan, 2002, p. 349). Apartheid's documentation also enforced a nationalist identity onto South Africans. These documents determined one's nation based on their ethnic make-up, which prevented black unity in opposition to Apartheid. Since the black population was partitioned along ethnic lines, black South Africans were forced to live apart from each other. The union of the various black ethnicities became nearly impossible because of these ethnic divisions. Yet, while setting up different white nations – the Afrikaner nation and the English nation – Apartheid's documentation also (contradictorily) aimed to construct, to varying degrees of success, a single, white civic nationality for Afrikaners and English to help encourage white unity in the face of the perceived black threat and, thus, in support of the Apartheid system.

Let us now turn to a conceptual framework of documentation in which to situate our discussion of the construction of Apartheid's official racial and ethnic identities. The theoretical tools offered by Foucault, Latour, Arendt, and Hacking, will help to further illuminate the roles and effects of Apartheid's disciplinary documentation.

A conceptual framework of documents, associated practices, and their constitutive effects

Discipline was needed to transform Apartheid's official racial and ethnic identities into stabilized facts. Foucault's ideas on disciplinary instruments and institutions help illuminate this disciplinary power of Apartheid's documentation. He discusses the disciplinary power of surveillance with reference to techniques used in disciplinary institutions, such as workshops, factories, and schools, arguing that "the perfect

disciplinary apparatus would make it possible for a single gaze to see everything constantly. A central point would be both the source of light illuminating everything, and a locus of convergence for everything that must be known: a perfect eye that nothing would escape and a centre towards which all gazes would be turned" (Foucault, 1977, p. 173). A disciplinary apparatus ensures a centralized surveillance system where all orders emanate, all activities recorded, and all offences judged. It resembles a pyramid, with the central point gazing down from the top, and increasingly smaller surveillance elements reporting back to the top, thereby ensuring surveillance happens at every level.

This idea of "hierarchical observation" can be applied to Apartheid's documentation insofar as Apartheid's macro and micro documents are concerned. The central point of the documentary apparatus was the macro documents themselves, namely the Population Registration Act, Pass Laws, Group Areas Act, and Separate Amenities Act. These macro documents were the cornerstones of both Apartheid ideology and governance, establishing, and instituting Apartheid as a politico-economic system. They also created many micro documents that ensured their inscriptions were being followed, adopted, and enforced at every level. Apartheid's documentary apparatus thus resembled a pyramid, with its macro documents gazing down from the top and its micro documents ensuring that apartness was successful at each descending level. As Foucault argues, the power of hierarchical observation "is not possessed as a thing, or transferred as a property; it functions like a piece of machinery. And, although it is true that its pyramidal organization gives it a "head", it is the apparatus as a whole that produces "power" and distributes individuals in this permanent and continuous field" (Foucault, 1977, p. 177).

Apartheid's documentation provided Pretoria with the surveillance it needed to maintain, extend, and entrench its control over South Africa. Admittedly the white regime had both the police and the military at its disposal to deploy across the country in order to physically ensure its control; however, each document also helped Pretoria observe and monitor the population, determining and controlling each person's actions and behaviours. Each document functioned as a tool of surveillance that helped ensure, not only order and control by the white regime, but also the racial and ethnic partitioning of the population.

Disciplinary documentation also has real effects on individuals because they help shape individuals' identities through the meticulous recording of personal information. Foucault states that this documentation makes the individual a case (Foucault, 1977, p. 191). Once an individual's intimate details are documented, the individual becomes an analyzable case that can be shaped, controlled, and disciplined, thus becoming a unit of knowledge. The practice of documenting an individual as a case allows for that case to be described, judged, measured, and compared to others (Foucault, 1977, p. 191).

A document further places an individual within a documentary regime allowing for the comparing and contrasting of cases. Within a documentary regime, a document, and documentary practices, "place individuals in a field of surveillance, and also situates them in a network of writing: it engages them in a whole mass of documents that capture and fix them" (Foucault, 1977, p. 189). This documentary regime generates the inertia of documents, creating the need for more detailed documents, the maintenance and updating of registers, the transcription of information from one document to another, the circulation of documents throughout the regime's system, the accounting of documents, the transmission of documents' information to centralized points of control, and the comparison of these documents during meetings of officials

(Foucault, 1977, pp. 189-190). It is through this documentary regime that the individual is disciplined into a docile body, or, in Apartheid South Africa, a racialized body.

Latour argues that documents – or immutable mobiles – can imbue a person, group, or regime with the power to dominate and control because of their ability to capture, record, and transform things into manageable cases. By turning things into paper, one can exercise control over that very thing, defining it, determining its possibilities, directing its trajectory. His observation of the biology laboratory's documentation helps illuminate this point. He states that "I was struck, in a study of a biology laboratory, by the way in which many aspects of laboratory practice could be ordered by looking not at the scientists' brains, at the cognitive structures, nor at the paradigms, but at the transformation of rats and chemicals into paper" (Latour, 1983, p. 3). Latour observes a documentary transformation that turns something, in this case rats and chemicals, into documents to be analyzed, consulted, and used for research. These documents thus help constitute the rats and chemicals across diverse spatial and temporal contexts: the documented rats and the documented chemicals are deployed, circulated, consulted, and used in various settings, by different actors, for diverse purposes. The laboratory's documentation consequently has constitutive effects: it helps transform rats and chemicals into analyzable, manageable cases, and they imbue the scientists, researchers, students – indeed, the laboratory itself – with the power and authority to make scientific statements and facts.

Apartheid's documentation functioned like Latour's biology laboratory. It transformed South Africans into documents. Their racial and ethnic identities were inscribed into documents that, in effect, turned each person into analyzable cases that were then grouped and placed together into separate categories for further examination. It was not necessarily the actual person that was studied, but the person's personal document, whether it was a racial identity card or a passbook. A black person may be sent to a jail cell for indefinite imprisonment, removed to a faraway homeland for permanent displacement, or forced to labour on a white or Indian farm as some sort of punishment. But it was his passbook that determined these fates. The passbook controlled these outcomes, not the black person himself. The relevant Apartheid authorities would consult and examine the passbook in order to determine the person's fate.

What else is involved in the transformation of people into paper? Documentation is clearly involved; however, what else is going on here? Documentation invariably involves the construction of what Latour calls a paper world, or what I would call a documentary world, in which things not only are documented, but become documents within a world of other documents. A paper world helps facilitate domination. Whether it is a rat's disease, a South Pacific island, or an individual's racial and ethnic identities, a paper world is built up around it, making it possible for that very thing to be translated across time and space and controlled and disciplined.

But in order to dominate, that is, be authoritative and powerful, what else is needed? Bernd Frohmann argues that institutional setting helps imbue a document with the power to influence, guide, and decide courses of action (Frohmann, 2001). An institution not only produces, deploys, and uses particular documents, but, in so doing, it also generates the authority needed for the document to be taken seriously. The informativeness of a document's statements "only emerges in the world as an *effect* of institutionally legitimated material practices with occasioned inscriptions or utterances such that specific statements and sets of statements gain more or less stability, and endure over time as resources for a wide range of social practices"

(Frohmann, 2001, p. 6). Latour also recognizes the central role of documents in a bureaucratic or institutional setting. He argues that while the " 'cracy' of bureaucracy is mysterious and hard to study […] the "bureau" is something that can be empirically studied, which explains, because of its structure, why some power is given to an average mind just by looking at files: domains which are far apart become literally inches apart; domains which are convoluted and hidden, become flat; thousands of occurrences can be looked at synoptically" (Latour, 1983, pp. 25-26). He continues, "once files start being gathered everywhere to insure some two-way circulation of immutable mobiles, they can be arrayed in cascade: files of files can be generated and this process can be continued until a few men consider millions as if they were in the palms of their hands" (Latour, 1983, pp. 25-26). In a Latourian sense, therefore, documents cascaded over South Africans, establishing separate paper worlds on and about every person. Yet these paper worlds did not stand on their own or function independently of one another; in fact, each paper world was intricately connected to all other documents like the connections of separate parts and pipes forming a machine.

Latour refers to such connections as a complex metrological chain. The term metrology refers to the "gigantic enterprise to make of the outside, a world inside which facts and machines can survive" (Latour, 1987, p. 251). A metrological chain piles up massive amounts of papers, records, and documents within complex bureaucratic systems, which enforce the standardization, routinization, repetition, and normalization of these documents, thus giving them authority. Latour states that it is the disproportionate number of associations gathered to make a statement a hard fact, which, in turn, give that fact its authority (Latour, 1987, p. 139).

Foucault's discussion of the power of networks helps to further illuminate the power of metrological chains. Like Latour, Foucault explains that power circulates and functions in the form of a chain in which individuals move between its threads and, consequently, always undergoing and exercising this very power (Foucault, 1980, p. 98). He states that:

> power must, I think, be analyzed as something that circulates, or rather as something that functions only when it is part of a chain. It is never localized here or there, it is never in the hands of some, and it is never appropriated in the way that wealth or a commodity can be appropriated. Power functions. Power is exercised through networks, and individuals do not simply circulate in those networks; they are in a position to both submit to and exercise this power. They are never the inert or consenting targets of power; they are always its relays. In other words, power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them (Foucault, 2003, p. 29).

Power moves. It is not necessarily located in one particular place or another; rather, it moves across and through a network. Latour argues that the power of a metrological chain can construct one's identity because questions surrounding identity cannot be solved without labour, resources, and various actors. Latour states that "without superimposing passports to fingerprints to birth certificates to photographs that is without constituting a *file* that brings together many different paper forms of various origins" (Latour, 1987, p. 252) one's identity would be called into question. He states that "*You* might very well know who you are and be satisfied with a very soft answer to this absurd query, but the policeman, who raises the question from the point of view of a centre, wants to have a harder answer than that" (Latour, 1987, p. 252). In Apartheid South Africa, a black man might know his name and who he is; however, the white police officer knows nothing about him except that he must check, process, and

stamp the black man's passbook in order to let him cross the street, enter a building, or exit a black area. Apartheid's documents, like the passbook, served as major links in Apartheid's metrological chain of great inertia, strength, and force.

Power flowed through Apartheid's documentation. Each actor functioned as Apartheid's relays, whether they submitted to or exercised this racist power. An average mind of an average race classification bureaucrat in Johannesburg was given significant power over all South Africans in her city through the mandatory consultation and examination of various personal documents, namely the racial identity card and the passbook. She may not have been terribly intelligent or financially well-off, but she was an important relay of Apartheid's power. Recall Foucault's statement that "power passes through individuals. It is not applied to them" (Foucault, 2003, p. 26). Apartheid's documentation helped the system's power flow through this particular bureaucrat, permitting her to help enact, and enforce apartness by authorizing her to determine an individual's official racial and ethnic identity with the stroke of a pen or the push of a keyboard button. It is this materiality of Apartheid's documentation – from their physical and electronic formats to the institutions and relations surrounding them – that allows power to flow through this woman to control one's life. As Latour reminds us, documentary practices, or paper shuffling, are "the source of an essential power, that constantly escapes attention since its materiality is ignored" (Latour, 1983, p. 26). By shuffling these documents, she could know about all South Africans in Johannesburg; each individual and population group was flattened out through Apartheid's documentary apparatus, allowing all people to be looked at synoptically at one specific centre of calculation, in this case, one of Johannesburg's race classification bureaus. Through documentation, the race classification bureaucrat decided the fate of thousands as if they were in the palm of her hand.

Documentation consequently help one to dominate. Latour argues that "a man is never much more powerful than any other – even from a throne; but a man whose eye dominates records through which some sort of connections are established with millions of others may be said to *dominate*. This domination, however, is not a given but a slow construction and it can be corroded, interrupted or destroyed if the records, files and figures are immobilized, made more mutable, less readable, less combinable or unclear when displayed […] The 'great man' is a little man looking at a map" (Latour, 1983, p. 26).

This domination, however, is not a given. If Apartheid's documents were not coordinated and connected, that is if the macro and micro documents did not align with one another, confusion about racial and ethnic identities would have emerged, and white domination would have been jeopardized. Also, if documentary practices also did not align – if passbooks were filled out differently in different parts of the country, or racial identity cards haphazardly completed, or signs hung in some places but not in others – then white domination would have been damaged because of such poor management and optical inconsistency. Thus, again, documentation allows for domination "by working on papers alone, on fragile inscriptions which are immensely less than the things from which they are extracted, it is still possible to dominate all things, and all people. What is insignificant for all other cultures becomes the most significant, the only significant aspect of reality. The weakest, by manipulating inscriptions of all sorts obsessively and exclusively, become the strongest" (Latour, 1983, p. 26). Apartheid's documents were less than the actual human beings that they chained to official racial and ethnic identities; however, the documentary practices of the Apartheid authorities extracted only the racial and ethnic details of each person

in order to dominate every person and group. Documentation, in turn, became an informing and important aspect of the Apartheid regime, transforming race and ethnicity into the only significant factors of a person's life. In effect, the weakest – white South Africans by virtue of their minority status –manipulated documentation in order to dominate.

The disciplinary power of bureaucratic documentation is also explored in Hannah Arendt's philosophical work on evil. In *Eichmann in Jerusalem* Arendt presents the concept, or what she refers to as the lesson, of "the fearsome, word-and-thought-defying *banality of evil*" (Arendt, 1963, p. 252). Evil or the practice of evil, according to Arendt, can be a dull affair in which regular and unimportant bureaucrats engage in mundane and routine institutional practices that result in unspeakable systemic horrors. She discusses the important role played by institutions, including their documentation, and bureaucratic staff in implementing Nazi ideological initiatives and establishing, facilitating, and maintaining Nazi concentration and death camps. For example, she notes how Hitler's word was helped transformed into law through documentation: "the Führer's order for the Final Solution was followed by a huge shower of regulations and directives, all drafted by expert lawyers and legal advisers" (Arendt, 1963, p. 149). A Latourian paper world of legal documents was created around and for Hitler's oral pronouncements by various legal institutions and actors; additionally, this diabolical paper world was like a shower cascading over the Nazi bureaucracy and its accomplices and victims. Arendt notes that "the resulting legal paraphernalia [documentation], far from being a mere symptom of German pedantry or thoroughness, served most effectively to give the whole business its outward appearance of legality" (Arendt, 1963, pp. 149-150). In other words, this documentation helped materialize Hitler's diabolical ideas, transforming them from words into legal and administrative procedures and practices, resulting in the Holocaust.

This creation and use of files helped direct, enforce, and ensure that the Final Solution was successfully implemented and followed across the entire Nazi institutional enterprise. This documentation functioned like a metrological chain helping to connect this complex killing machine together. Bureaucrats within this system functioned like relays of power by working with and referring to these documents as they moved throughout the chain, across the system, affecting the course of history. In a Foucauldian sense, these individuals did not possess power on their own, but served as relays in which power circulated and moved.

For example, Arendt discusses how Adolph Eichmann considered himself "a law-abiding citizen […] he not only obeyed *orders*, he also obeyed the *law*" (Arendt, 1963, p. 135). She explains how Eichmann did not believe that he had any specific responsibility for the Final Solution's resulting evils: "as far as Eichmann was concerned the documents clearly showed that […] he had next to nothing to do with what happened" (Arendt, 1963, p. 218). He considered himself just an efficient bureaucrat following administrative procedure, complying with the law, and carrying out his job. Eichmann argued that he was just an office worker, adhering to prescribed conduct with respect to the Nazi institutional system, pushing papers required by his mundane office job; he did not view himself as a perpetrator of genocide. Indeed, "what for Eichmann was a job, with its daily routine, its ups and downs, was for the Jews quite literally the end of the world" (Arendt, 1963, p. 153). These documents and the practices with them enabled a bureaucrat like Eichmann, who was indeed "by no means unique […] [and] much less intelligent and without any education to speak of" (Arendt, 1963, p. 149), to play a considerable role in the deportation and murder of

millions of people. He was not unique. He was just another bureaucrat looking at documents. Yet this Nazi documentation helped transform him into a powerful man who, in turn, assisted in realizing death and destruction. Nazi documentation, in other words, imbued him with the authority to control and dominate millions of people as if they were in the palms of his hands.

Nazi documentation consequently helped in the construction, emergence, materialization, and stabilization of horrific ideas about racial and ethnic ideology and identities. In *The Social Construction of What?* Hacking further explores how ideas are constructed through assemblages. He states that an idea is a classification of a kind of thing, be it an inanimate object, activity, or person. It is not necessarily the thing itself that is constructed; rather, it is the idea of the thing that is constructed. An idea is contextually contingent, or as Hacking argues, "ideas do not exist in a vacuum. They inhabit a social setting. Let us call that the *matrix* within which an idea, or a concept or kind, is formed". But which ideas and kinds stick "depends less on their intrinsic merits than on the network of interested parties that wish to attach these labels" But does a description always make a difference in something's reality? Does a man or woman change their behaviour because of being described as homosexual? Does the springbok change its actions because it is described as a springbok? Does a flu virus change its course because it is described as a flu virus? Hacking states that there is a difference between how people and things are described. He argues that what nonhuman things are doing, such as camels, mountains, and microbes, do not depend on our descriptions; however, "human action is more closely linked to human description than bacterial action is […] the microbes' possibilities are delimited by nature, not by words. What is curious about human action is that by and large what I am deliberately doing depends on the possibilities of description" (Hacking, 2002, p. 108). He continues that "all intentional acts are acts under a description. Hence if new modes of description come into being, new possibilities for action come into being in consequence" (Hacking, 2002, p. 108). Descriptions are, in part, materialized and made possible by documents. Although nonwhite people had been discriminated against since the dawn of white settlement in South Africa in the 1660s, it was in 1948 that new descriptions of being nonwhite – particularly black – came into being. Apartheid's documentation articulated rigid, formal racial, and ethnic descriptions that helped construct a new reality for each different skin pigmentation, new possibilities for acting, newly expanded or restricted opportunities and chances, and new sliding scales of racialized freedoms, rights, and privileges.

Comparing the roles and possibilities of two descriptions of restaurant servers – a fast food cashier and a garcon de café – Hacking notes that "as with almost every way in which it is possible to be a person, it is possible to be a *garcon de café* only at a certain time, in a certain place, in a certain social setting" (Hacking, 2002, p. 109). Applying Arendt's analysis, Eichmann was considered a law-abiding citizen in a certain time, place, and setting (the Nazi period in Europe) and a criminal in another context (the post-war world) (see Arendt's discussion of Eichmann's dim realization that Nazi laws and orders – documentation – turned them all into criminals, pp. 148-150). Thus, it was only possible to be a certain idea of a civilized white person and an uncivilized black person at a certain time (the Apartheid era), in a certain place (South Africa), in a certain social setting (South African society). The ideas of white and black, as well as other skin colours, are very different in today's South Africa than its recent past.

But Hacking asks, "what could that mean? What could it mean in general to say that possible ways to be a person from time to time come into being or disappear?"

(Hacking, 2002, p. 107). It means that kinds of people change depending on the matrix in which they operate. His discussion of a glove illuminates the construction of kinds of people like the woman refugee. He states that "the concept "glove" fits gloves so well is no surprise; we made them that way. My claim about making up people is that in a few interesting respects multiple personalities (and much else) are more like gloves than like horses. The category and the people in it emerged hand in hand" (Hacking, 2002, pp. 106-107). Like a glove is made to perfectly fit a hand, the designation of a poor, uncivilized black person was made to perfectly fit the dark-hued uneducated person living in poverty. Thus, a kind of racialized person in South Africa "came into being at the same time as the kind itself was being invented" (Hacking, 2002, p. 106). The construction of new racialized ideas and categories of different skin colours went hand in hand with the establishment of Apartheid. Each different category perfectly fitted each of the different skin pigmentations. To be sure, nonwhite South Africans had been considered sub-human for centuries, but the official descriptions of each different skin colour – inscribed within the Population Registration Act – emerged with the institutions of this racially obsessed political economic system. It simply was not possible to be a white kind of person before Apartheid, for that kind of person was not there to be officially designated. Of course there were white South Africans before Apartheid, but the official idea and category – or kind – of white person did not exist.

An idea also involves interaction between the person and the associated idea. For example, the idea of a woman refugee is an interactive kind because she will learn she is a certain kind of person and then respond accordingly; she thus interacts with that kind (Hacking, 1999, p. 32). This interaction is only made possible within the matrix in which both person and kind operate. Hacking argues that "the matrix can affect an individual woman. She needs to become a woman refugee in order to stay in Canada; she learns what characteristics to establish, knows how to live her life. By living that life, she evolves, becomes a certain kind of person (a woman refugee). And so it may make sense that the very individuals and their experiences are constructed within the matrix surrounding the classification 'women refugees'" (Hacking, 1999, p. 11). Ideas and kinds matter; because one is classified as a certain kind, their experiences are changed by being so classified. Interaction can either be positive or negative. Positive interaction is when a person accepts, adopts, or adapts to their classification. Negative interaction occurs when a person rejects, resents, or distances themselves from their classification. Either way, both require some form of response to the kind, meaning that, even if one rejects it, they are still interacting with the associated kind.

Apartheid's racial and ethnic categories were interactive kinds. A coloured person's racial identity card, working in conjunction with racialized public signs, would link them to their racial identity; thus they would interact with their identity by not being able to enter a whites-only neighbourhood or black township, work in a white environment, shop in a whites-only mall, study at a coloured school, or pray at a black church. Apartheid's documentation helped facilitate interaction between racial category and person because, through documents, South Africans became chained to their racial categories. It was the production, dissemination, circulation, inscription, and continual use of these documents that helped ensure South Africans interacted with their assigned racial category on a daily basis.

Hacking reminds us that the "idea of making up people […] applies not to the unfortunate elect but to all of us. It is not just the making up of people of a kind that did not exist before: […] each of us is made up. We are not only what we are, but what we might have been, and the possibilities for what we might have been are

transformed. Hence anyone who thinks about the individual, the person, must reflect on this strange idea of making up people" (Hacking, 2002, p. 100).

Fugues, or the emergence and disappearance of Apartheid's disciplinary documentation

Hacking's concept of mad travellers, or fugureurs, helps shed light on the uniqueness of Apartheid and its disciplinary documentation. Why fugue? Why Apartheid? Fugues are strange and unexpected trips that often occur in states of obscured consciousness (Hacking, 1998, p. 8). Fugues "have been known forever, but only in 1887, with the publication of a thesis for the degree of doctor of medicine, did mad travel become a specific, diagnosable type of insanity" (Hacking, 1998, p. 8). This formal document, produced within a recognized and legitimate educational institution by a scholarly community of students, professors, and advisors, helped establish fugue as a formal medical diagnosis and identity to be classified, examined, monitored, treated, documented, and institutionalized.

Hacking argues that knowledge about ourselves can change "how we think of ourselves, the possibilities that are open to us, the kinds of people that we take ourselves and our fellows to be. Knowledge interacts with us and with a larger body of practice and ordinary life. This generates socially permissible combinations of symptoms and disease entities" (Hacking, 1998, p. 10). As fugue became increasingly articulated in many different settings, it became more entrenched as a credible and factual medical problem. New medical knowledge about fugue consequently helped create a new kind of medicalized person – the fugureur – with specific kinds of symptoms and issues. This new medical knowledge also determined and disciplined special medical practices, influenced certain institutions, and informed various scholarly journal papers, conferences, and studies. New kinds of possibilities, therefore, were opened up to those individuals diagnosed with fugue, in addition to physicians and researchers working with fugureurs. Thus "enter the fugue epidemic of the 1890s. It is elegantly constrained. We know exactly where and when the diagnosis of fugue begins, and we can watch it peter out. Here we have one diagnosis that is extinct and yet, in certain respects, curiously up-to-date. It resembles recent epidemics in that it is important only at a time, in a locale, it has a vogue, spreads, decays, and the world passes on to next year's affliction" (Hacking, 1998, p. 12). Once fugue lost its vogue – that is, once articulation began to decrease and then stop – fugue, as a medical diagnosis and identity, diminished and then disappeared.

Like mad travelling, different skin colours have been known forever, but only in mid-to-late-twentieth century South Africa did they become a special approach to organizing human and material relations. Informal segregation had been practiced in the country for many decades, but only in the Apartheid system did apartness become the defining principle of life and society. Enter Apartheid. But Apartheid needed its documentary assemblage in order to move the country away from segregation towards apartness, and maintain it. Apartness had a vogue as a traditional way of life; its documentation informed nearly every aspect of political, economic, recreational, cultural, and social life. Its documentation helped construct racialized and ethnicized kinds of South Africans, obliging each individual to live and interact with their official kind on a daily basis. After Apartheid's formal demise in 1994, these official identities, so peculiar to the documentation of this time and place, were no longer formally articulated, and consequently officially disappeared (although in many respects they

continue to this day to scar and stain the political economy, society, and mindset of South Africa).

Further implications of disciplinary documentation

By examining documentation, one can present a fresh and unique perspective to understanding the construction of various things, such as the construction of identities. Documentation helps make information informing, or to borrow from Frohmann, information is the effect of documentation. The preceding conceptual tools offered by Foucault, Frohmann, Latour, Arendt, and Hacking, provide a useful framework in which to further analyze and understand the important roles, practices, and constitutive effects of documentation. This framework contributes to LIS by illuminating the central role of documentation in the creation, stabilization, materialization, and emergence of information. Its aim, therefore, is to help show some of the complementary, and crucial, relationships between concepts of, and practices with, "information" and "document". By using Apartheid South Africa as a case study, this paper demonstrates how this framework can be applied to shed new light on different kinds of phenomena in diverse contexts; consequently, it not only contributes to and extends parts of the scholarship on documentation, but also presents new directions for other academic disciplines and multidisciplinary analyses and research.

Who we are, what we are, what we can be, what we could be, and where we are going, depend in large part on how documentation, and the information it constitutes, controls and disciplines our official identities. In light of recent, and ongoing, racially and ethnically motivated atrocities and conflicts – including the genocidal distinction between Hutu and Tutsi in 1990s Rwanda, the ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia, the increasingly violent sectarianism of the Arab Spring, the ethnic and tribal bloodletting following Kenya's disputed 2007/2008 elections, increasingly contentious policies in many (western) countries over citizenship, immigration, surveillance, and profiling issues, and many other past and present cases that the breadth of this paper cannot cover here – a better understanding of disciplinary documentation is of timely importance. Using Apartheid South Africa as a foundation for understanding documentation will help open the door to more research and reflection not only for LIS studies on concepts of and practices with information, but also on the disciplinary apparatuses of other political, economic, cultural, religious, and social documentation of human beings.

References

Arendt, H. (1963), *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*, Penguin Books, New York, NY.

Bowker, G.C. and Star, S.L. (1999), *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

De Klerk, W.A. (1976), *The Puritans in Africa: A Story of Afrikanerdom*, Penguin, Harmondsworth.

DOCAM (2013), "The annual meeting of the document academy", http://site.uit.no/docam13/ (accessed 27 December 2013).

Foucault, M. (1977), *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Vintage Books, New York, NY.

Foucault, M. (1980), *Power/Knowledge: Selected Writings and Other Interviews*, Pantheon, New York, NY, pp. 1972-1977.

Foucault, M. (2003), *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France*, pp. 1975-1976, Picador, New York, NY.

Frohmann, B. (2001), "Discourse and documentation: some implications for pedagogy and research", *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, Vol. 42 No. 1, pp. 13-26.

Frohmann, B. (2004a), *Deflating Information: From Science Studies to Documentation*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Frohmann, B. (2004b), "Documentation redux: prolegomenon to (another) philosophy of information", *Library Trends*, Vol. 52 No. 3, pp. 387-407.

Frohmann, B. (2008), "Documentary ethics, ontology, and politics", *Archival Science*, Vol. 8 No. 3, pp. 365-380.

Frohmann, B. (2009), "Revisiting 'what is a document?' ", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 65 No. 2, pp. 291-303.

Hacking, I. (1998), *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA.

Hacking, I. (1999), *The Social Construction of What?*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Hacking, I. (2002), *Historical Ontology*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Kaplan, S. (2002), "Documenting history, historicizing documentation: french military officials' ethnological reports on cilicia", *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 44 No. 5, pp. 344-369.

Karamuftuoglu, M. (2009), "Situating logic and information in information science", *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, Vol. 60 No. 10, pp. 2019-2031.

Latour, B. (1983), "Visualisation and cognition: drawing things together", *Knowledge and Society Studies in the Sociology of Culture Past and Present*, Vol. 6, pp. 1-40, available at: www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/21-DRAWING-THINGS-TOGETHER-GB.pdf (accessed 11 October 2013).

Latour, B. (1987), *Science in Action*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Mandela, N. (1994), *Long Walk to Freedom*, Little, Brown and Company, New York, NY.

Riles, A. (2006), *Documents: Artifacts of Modern Knowledge*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, MI.

Suominen, V. (2007), "A structural approach to the history of documentary contents: documentation studies for librarianship", in Skare, R., Lund, N.L. and Varheim, A. (Eds), *A Document (Re)turn*, Peter Lang, Frankfurt, pp. 243-264.

About the author

Dr Marc Richard Hugh Kosciejew is a Lecturer of Library, Information, and Archive Sciences within the Faculty of Media and Knowledge Sciences (MaKS) at the University of Malta. He received his MLIS and PhD in Library and Information Science (LIS) from Western University (formerly the University of Western Ontario) in London, Ontario, Canada, and his BA (Hons) in Political Science at the University of Toronto (Trinity College). He has published and presented on various topics in the disciplines of LIS, political science, history, and African studies. In 2007 he conducted research in North Korea (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) on the secretive Communist state's library system, becoming one of the first English speakers to present and publish on this specific topic. His 2009 articles are some of the first publications to directly discuss and critically analyze the libraries, specifically the national Grand People's Study House, of the so-called "hermit kingdom". Dr Marc Richard Hugh Kosciejew can be contacted at: mkosciej@gmail.com