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People know what they do; frequently they know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what they do does (Foucault, in Dreyfuss and Rabinow 1982:182).

Introduction

We begin this chapter with an incident that highlights the complexity of spatiality in higher education and the need for discussion about spatiality and transformation.

Mashudo1 was one of our undergraduate students who came to Wits from Limpopo province. Limpopo is largely rural, and Mashudo came from a traditional Tshivenda-speaking community. Hilary was working with a colleague in her colleague’s office when Mashudo knocked on the door. He found them working together side by side in front of her desk. A third chair was covered in books and papers. Mashudo looked around and sat down in the only available seat - the colleague's desk chair (Figure 1).

Mashudo appeared to be embarrassed and uncomfortable. It was clear that he knew that in the context of the University, this was not culturally appropriate, but for him it would have been rude to remain standing in a position higher than his 'seniors'. We understood that he had to 'get down to our level'.

The colleague then spoke to him; she asked if he wanted to see her; they set up an appointment for a different time; and Mashudo left.

Pleased that we understood why he sat where he did, we nevertheless wondered if there might be more to Mashudo's and our discomfort. We discussed the incident with one of our African colleagues. What we were told is that in traditional Tshivenda society, Mashudo would probably have sat on the ground, at an even lower level than us. In this office he was stranded between two different sets of socio-spatial norms with the only possible option leaving him marginal to both.

But the story gets more complicated. For Mashudo, it was also extremely disrespectful to disturb his 'elders'. We were told that had we been in his village, we would probably have been having our discussion outside. He would have sat on the ground far enough away not to hear us or disturb us, but not so far that we would not have been able to see him. When we were ready, the onus would have been on us to invite him to speak to us. The moment we stopped our conversation, we positioned him as someone who had interrupted us. Even had we known all of this, in the confined space of a small office it

---

1 This is a pseudonym.
would have been difficult to maintain privacy and to accommodate his cultural practices.

In rural Venda, Mashudo would have attended inadequately resourced schools and been taught by teachers poorly trained in apartheid colleges of education. It is important to remember that how we inhabit space is embodied and often unconscious but not necessarily deterministic. Despite the socio-historical and educational odds being against him, Mashudo did well enough in school to enter higher education. However, the incident we described illustrates that moving into a new space can produce a profound sense of dislocation.

In this paper we argue that how space is constructed, by whom, for whom, for what purpose, and according to whose normative expectations, is therefore an important social issue with particular relevance for both education and transformation. Foucault argues that space, time and social relations are inter-related. Analysis should not separate them as they need to be understood in relation to one another. In thinking about issues of transformation in education, we show how the inclusion of a spatial analysis in relation to time, social practices and social relations has explanatory power.

This chapter on spatiality relies on a Foucauldian analysis of exterior and interior spaces, the purpose and function of these spaces as well as the distribution of people and objects in these spaces. This history of these spaces and their current effects are also considered. It is organized around four moves. The first is a spatial reading of key aspects of the Wits School of Education (WSoE) Campus. The second analyses the ways in which a second year group of Foundation Phase B.Ed students in 2015 inhabited this space. The third examines how Wits students involved in the #FeesMustFall movement in 2015 harnessed space as a tool in their protests. The final move considers the challenges of transforming educational spaces.
A spatial reading of the Wits School of Education Campus

Spatial designs matter because they constitute the people who inhabit them (Foucault, 1994; Lefebvre, 1991; Massey 2005). For teacher education we have to think of the role buildings play in producing particular kinds of educational subjects - both students and teachers. The architecture at WSoE reflects a particular view of both society and education. Its buildings valorize institutional authoritarianism with monolithic, heavy, grey, concrete columns and bare empty spaces designed for surveillance.

Foucault (1977) argues that schools serve the same social functions as prisons and mental institutions to define, classify, control and regulate people. Figure 2 shows two interiors. One is the interior of the building in which we work, and the other is the interior of a British prison. At a glance, you may not be able to tell which is which. Foucault (1977) would not be surprised.

Figure 2.1 Our building or a prison?
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Figure 2.2 Our building or a prison?

![Figure 2.2](image2.png)

The similarity in design is neither co-incidental nor immaterial. Both buildings are designed for surveillance with walkways that look down on the empty space below².

²When Wits University merged with the Johannesburg College of Education it inherited its apartheid designed buildings. Thus far in one of the buildings the empty space has been turned into a purposeful computer laboratory known as the Glass Lab.
This space, because it is large, bare and exposed to the external gaze, becomes a space of transit rather than a space to congregate. In both institutions this is a space for ephemeral connections; for fleeting contact of people moving with purpose to somewhere else. It is an unproductive space.

This empty space is surrounded on all levels by cells (Foucault, 1977) designed for containment that is physical and mental. The difference is that in prisons such containment is involuntary.

**Figure 3 Tutorial rooms in the building where we work, WSoE.**

The images in Figure 3 are of the tutorial rooms on the South side of our building taken first thing in the morning before classes. Where we were unable to enter the room we photographed the exterior. The exterior images clearly show how locked security gates restrict access to many of the rooms.

What the images of interiors show is that the default arrangement of furniture in these spaces is that of a traditional teacher-fronted classroom: the students’ desks are arranged in rows facing authority. While some staff take the trouble to move the furniture every time they teach, the position of blackboards and screens, class size and the practice of furnishing rooms so as to provide an individual table for each student, together with the time it takes, do not make this easy. However, there has been no discussion in the school about changing either the furniture or the historical classroom layout that has become the norm. The ability to move away from the teacher-fronted teaching is further compromised by the placement of the fixed furniture such as blackboards, screens and new technologies. In recent alterations no thought was given
to the best placement for screens and boards, which were placed in the default position at one end of very long rooms. Had they been placed in the middle of the room, more students could have been closer to the centre of the action. Naturalised norms are unthinkingly perpetuated. Ironically the people who have control over the spatial arrangement of moveable furniture in the classrooms are the cleaners, who are least qualified to make pedagogical decisions. No doubt it would be possible for the school to negotiate something different in order to have a variety of spatial arrangements of the furniture in different rooms to accommodate different teaching styles.

Where the tutorial rooms have moveable furniture that allow for other possibilities, lecture theatres remain in fixed ranked rows complete with dais. The most powerful example in our school of seats positioned to face a dais and a screen is the staffroom (see Figure 4). Overall the furniture in this space mitigates against interaction which is further exacerbated by extremely poor acoustics. This space has an upstairs balcony, which with with its own entrance is well positioned to surveil the proceedings below.

**Figure 4 Education staffroom**

How bodies are organised as rank and file to face a seat of power, occurs in other institutional spaces: buildings designed for worship, conferences, venues, sweat shops. The place of power is symbolised by the dais, the altar and the supervisor's desk, which also enable surveillance. The point to be made about the endless repetition of this spatial norm is that it becomes taken for granted and invisible - naturalised (Barthes, 1973). Naturalisation constructs our sense of what is normal and in the process constitutes meaning through form. It is important therefore to understand what form does, and what ideologies inform it. It is important to understand that space and spatial forms are not neutral because

> power produces, it produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. The individual and the knowledge that may be gained of him belong to this production' (Foucault 1977: 194).
The placement of objects in space affects the ways in which educational rituals of truth, such as lectures, powerpoint presentations, tests and examinations, are enacted. In these rituals students seated in rows are constructed as individuals who are there to receive the truth in silence unless they are invited to speak. That each student sits at his or her own table suggests that individualism is privileged and that collaboration and cooperation are not foregrounded in the acquisition of knowledge. At worst this produces docility, at best passivity.

There is an orderliness to lines and rows that speaks of discipline, regulation, and obedience to which students are expected to conform. Foucault's (1977) descriptions of the ever-increasing need to maximize the use of time means that bodies have to be managed. Productivity on a factory floor requires docile and useful bodies and education provides the training ground. However, democracy and new forms of labour require an agentic workforce capable of creativity and imagination. This is particularly important if we hope to transform teachers so that they are able to educate their students to be autonomous subjects for a democratic society. The way space, macro and micro, is arranged needs to be considered in relation to transformation because of the ways in which spaces produce embodied subjectivities. Our analysis points to the importance of reconceptualising spatial arrangements in Higher Education Institutions as part of the process of transformation.

All of Foucault’s (1977) techniques of power - distribution, surveillance, exclusion classification, totalisation, individualisation, regulation and normalisation - can be read as operating in the forms given to spaces by our institutional architecture and interior design. They operate in concert to produce and maintain power. The tutorial rooms epitomise the art of distribution, which divides, arranges and ranks bodies in space. We see distribution, individualisation and regulation working together to produce future teachers. The design of the buildings also distributes people in space: staff have access to different spaces from post graduate students who often have access to better seminar rooms than undergraduate students.

Surveillance works side by side with distribution to support the working of hierarchical power relations. The walkways as shown in Figure 2.2, enable both the ability to watch and the threat of being watched for people walking through the empty space below. The tutorial rooms, with the lecturer placed at the front of the room, next to the blackboard, the screen, the desk and the technology, standing above the level of the seated students, also produces this spatial hierarchy of power on a micro level. Surveillance is not only about being watched it is about avoiding the gaze. The design of the buildings is such that academic staff can avoid the gaze because their offices are in separate recessed corridors. These corridors are secured by locked, glass doors, and iron gates; they include the staff toilets. Students cannot access these corridors, unless the academics open the gates. The space is thus designed to mark staff as more powerful – with access to their own enclosed spaces that are specifically designed to minimize disturbances (Foucault 1977). In these spaces, many staff tend to arrange their furniture as in Figure 1, positioning themselves behind their desks in the zone of power.

---

3The original design distributed men's and women's toilets differently across these corridors suggesting that hierarchies of gender were also in operation. Staff toilets are separated from students' toilets and until recently there were no wheel-chair friendly or gender neutral toilets.
Staff offices are spread across the campus and office corridors are situated at the edges of the buildings. The principle of partitioning is part of the art of distribution (Foucault, 1977). It operates where space is allocated to individuals on the basis of classification. Within these corridors, a hierarchy of power and authority is created by the size and placement of the offices, with the larger professorial offices situated furthest from the entrance. Inaccessibility and size differentiate staff according to institutional rank and authority. Across corridors, individuals and groups are separated from one another according to their fields of specialisation. This reinforces the process of individualization that specifies individuals based on their teaching: the Maths and Science academics are in the first building, the curriculum staff are on the second floor of the middle building, the arts and technology people are not in the main buildings. The allocation of space reinforces the power and prestige of some disciplines over others. For example, until 2014, staff teaching African languages were situated in offices that were much smaller and dingier than others in their disciplinary field. Now these offices are used for part-time contract staff – another form of classification that separates the temporary from the permanent, the part-time from the full-time. Separate office silos limit the possibilities for chance meetings and an ongoing exchange of ideas across the school. As a result, the parking lot, the open space behind the chairs in the staff room (with the urn and water cooler), staff pigeonholes and the printing room become spaces where one encounters colleagues one does not normally see.

Exclusion is a technique that focuses on the boundaries and zones that define limits and signify difference (Foucault, 1977). While staff have space allocated to them and are distributed within buildings, students are not. There are no spaces designed for students to be inside the buildings when they are not in class. Students have not appropriated the concourse spaces in the building because they are wide, cold, drafty, echoing and empty. The floors above, with their walkways of surveillance, diminish people in the concourse and reduce them to insignificance. Figure 5 shows how small we are in this space, despite the use of a low angle shot, which usually makes human subjects appear powerful.

Figure 5 Diminished human subjects

In the thoroughfare that connects the three main buildings in the WSoE, some benches and tables have been placed on the sides, and students often sit there to work. Large windows make the space bright and there is Wi-Fi access. But students do not
stay for long periods of time; the furniture is limited and uncomfortable and there is
not enough space to congregate. People who bump into friends or colleagues in this
space have to stand to talk.

This thoroughfare connects the three main buildings and it is designed to take one
from one building to another as well as to the staff room, the mailboxes, the library
and the administration building. Like the empty open spaces in the three main
buildings, it is a space of transit. These transitional spaces push students out of the
buildings. They sit in the gardens, congregate inside and outside the canteen, and
engage with one another at the bus stop. Or they leave campus. With staff and
students pushed to the margins, the buildings assume a grandeur of their own. Cold,
bare and inhospitable they become a concrete manifestation of power and authority.

The architecture works to regulate movement through space and reinforces a range of
normalizing practices. Here practices of individualization normalise

- students as individual learners,
- assessment and ranking students of students based on their individual work
  (students' individual marks are published on noticeboards across the campus),
- learning as an individual and non-participatory experience, evidenced by the
  layout of tutorial rooms
- academics as individual scholars who teach alone, publish their own research,
  and are rated and ranked accordingly. They have their own offices with their
  names and titles on the doors.

What constitutes productive and unproductive space is also normalised. Tutorial and
lecture rooms, offices, and even the staffroom are constructed as productive places of
work. Marginal spaces are then de facto non-productive, non-work spaces - places of
socialisation and recreation. The expectation is that student subjects should be
engaged in work, in the library, in tutorial rooms. The result of this, as Foucault
(1977:200) puts it, is that 'visibility is a trap'. Students who are in open or recreational
spaces and not moving with purpose are clearly not engaged productively. Thus the
student body is expected to conform to a particular individualized work ethic.
Conformity becomes totalising.

In addition, the WSoE campus is removed geographically from other campuses that
have more student friendly spaces. At the time of writing the campus had no spaces
specifically designed for out-of-class collaborative work. There are no designated
spaces for undergraduate students to talk about their work or to do joint projects
outside of class and, as the classrooms have become more high tech, students have
been denied access to them, except under supervision. Students are positioned as
untrustworthy with regard to these new resources. Where they do have access to
technology in the computer labs, there is a high level of control and camera
surveillance.

Many of the new developments on the Education Campus are for the Faculty of
Health Sciences, which has its own campus across the road east of WSoE. According
to students many of the facilities are better than those of the education campus. The
School of Public Health, with related lecture theatres, was recently built on the east
side of the Education Campus and the Nelson Mandela Children’s hospital on a
sizeable chunk of the north-east corner. Encroachment is squeezing Education from both sides.

Lived Spaces: how students inhabit the education campus

Data was collected from second year B.Ed Foundation Phase students in 2015. Sixty-two students of the B. Ed Foundation Phase class of a hundred and ten students consented to take part in the research. Of the sixty two students: 3 are coloured, 13 are Indian, 22 are white and 24 are black. We are aware of the challenges of working with race as a fixed and essentialized category, and acknowledge that there are some students who may not identify with these markers. While this is not a fully representative sample of students in the WSoE, interesting patterns emerge from the data.

These students completed a questionnaire that asked them to list the places where they ‘hang out’ between lectures and at lunch times, who they meet, and what they do there. They were asked to identify places where other students congregate; what their favourite and least favourite place on campus are, and what space/s on the campus they would change if they could.

Data was first coded by organizing students into their self-identified friendship circles. The data was then coded according to the spaces where students said they spent their free time. The spatial data was mapped onto the friendship circle data to establish the favourite spaces of the different friendship circles. Favourite spaces were collated and then read across friendship circles. Ideas for transforming space were coded separately.

We recognize that the patterns that emerge in a survey are not as nuanced as findings from more in-depth forms of qualitative research. Even so, it is clear that the majority of students socialize within their second year group, within their phase specialization (Foundation Phase) and with members of their own racial groups. In this sample, the majority of black (23%), white (30%) and Indian students (18%) socialise almost exclusively within their race groups. There was a smaller category of students who socialise in multiracial groups (11%) and a final category of students who had no identifiable friendship circles and who identified themselves as loners/being alone (18%). There are only two examples of students who socialise both within and across racial groups. This cohort of students is very aware of the patterns of racial segregation on the campus, both in and out of class, and have discussed this at length with Kerryn.

Black students belonged to seven friendship circles, with one circle straddling two other friendship circles. The friendship circles were small with between three and five students being identified. But, the students who live in the residences and who tend to have a larger number of friends in other years and phases. They return to the dining halls for lunch. The majority of the black students said they spend their time in the computer labs where they work or watch movies or music videos or search the web. Since the students are not only working in the labs, it is likely that they are using resources that they may not have access to at home, or within the residences. Students also spend time at the cafeteria eating, laughing and ‘chilling’. Some use their free
time to check on their NSFAS applications. Interestingly many students talk about spending their time on ‘Main Campus’ in Braamfontein and the Health Sciences Campus across the road.

White students belonged to four friendship circles with a smaller friendship circle also straddling two circles. These friendship circles are bigger than the Black students’ friendship circles and all the students are second year Foundation Phase students. White students appear to spend their time outside classrooms waiting for lectures to begin, or in the cafeteria. Several students said they spend their time in their cars. One group mentioned spending time off campus at restaurants like Mike’s Kitchen, Nando’s or the nearby Woolworths, which has a cafe. This group is quite insular and closed.

There are five friendship circles to which the Indian students belong. The average number of students in the friendship circles was seven. Three friendship circles spend most of their time on the lawn between our building and the building adjacent to it. Two friendship circles spend their free time outside the cafeteria, and one on the lawn opposite the bus stop.

Students in multiracial friendship circles, comprised five circles. They located themselves on the lawns, on the staircase between two buildings, outside the cafeteria, and in the sun between buildings.

Eleven students (two Indian, one coloured and eight black) did not identify themselves as having a specific friendship circle. They all reported spending time alone in the computer labs, in the library, or on other campuses. Some of them reported this as a choice (‘Anyone whom I speak to, does not really matter’ LA6; ‘Anyone I meet before or after class. There is no specific person that I always go with’ LA7.) Others feel isolated. This comes across in their comments:

I go to the cafeteria to get lunch or I eat in my car. (LA5)
I’m always alone around campus. (LA2)
I am usually alone. (LA8)

It is a concern that by the middle of their second year, these students are not yet socially integrated.

All of the groups, including the ‘loner group’, spend a lot of time outside the main buildings. Overwhelmingly the students refer to how cold the buildings are inside, variously describing them as ‘cold’, ‘dark’, ‘depressing’, and as ‘a concrete castle’. Many students mention finding ‘sunspots’ across the campus to keep warm. The architecture pushes students out of the space and, at times, right off the campus.

Students also commented on not feeling welcome in the spaces. The state of lecture and classroom venues, described as ‘old’ and ‘dusty’, and the lack of plug points needed for working on computers and tablets are specific complaints. The state of the toilets is also viewed negatively across the entire cohort. They see them as ‘dirty’, ‘scary’, ‘blocked’, and as having a ‘strange design’, with some students commenting that they walk across the road to use the toilets on the Health Sciences Campus.
Across all groups, there is agreement that WSoE spaces need to be improved to create a ‘warm, colourful teaching environment’ that is ‘inviting. They want ‘places to sit’ and ‘spaces to interact’ - ‘chill spots’. All groups report spending time in the library but want ‘collaborative spaces’ to work there.

While at first glance the data indicates that students regularly spend their free time in the same spaces, these are liminal spaces. Within these spaces different groups of students have colonized particular areas and play out old apartheid practices of racial segregation. Foucault argues that architecture produces positive effects if the ‘liberating intentions of the architect coincides with the real practice of people in their exercise of freedom’ (1994:355). That our campus does not make students feel welcome, that the groups students congregate in are not fluid, and that many students feel isolated, constitutes a worrying set of social relations that have far reaching effects.

**How students use the affordances of space in the #FeesMustFall protests**

Clearly the spatial organization of the Wits education campus only partly explains the sense of alienation evident in the #FeesMustFall protests. The continuation of social relations produced by apartheid together with the colonial history of universities work together with the geographies of apartheid to produce the students’ demand for the transformation of Higher Education.

#FeesMustFall started at Wits University in response to the announcement that there would be a 10% rise in student fees for 2015. In addition, the hashtag was chosen to echo the #RhodesMustFall protests which used the removal of the statue of Cecil John Rhodes as a symbolic act to initiate the process of decolonizing the University of Cape Town together with the practices that continue to colonize African minds (Ngugi 1986). From the start both of these struggles were linked to the University workers’ demands for fair pay and to be directly employed by the University rather than outsourced, with benefits equivalent to that of other staff. These strategic alliances created a national student movement strong enough to force change and put the ongoing structural effects of apartheid on the national agenda. South Africa’s history of the power of students’ resistance contributed to the creation of the conditions of possibility for student action, worker action, and government and institutional responses

Wits University is made up of a number of fenced campuses each with a limited number of controlled access points introduced to make the campuses more ‘secure’. The securitization of campuses prevents outsiders from entering in order to protect the university population and property inside. On the first day of the protest the student protesters targeted these points of access on the Braamfontein campuses. They blocked these access points with their bodies – lying, sitting or standing so that motor vehicles could not pass (Figure 6). They prevented insiders, the university population,
from entering, symbolically linking financial access to the University with physical access to its campuses. They also prevented staff and students from leaving the campuses, fencing them in. By allowing people to use only the pedestrian gates, more privileged staff and students with private transport were forced to experience what a large number of students do every day: walk, catch public transport, rely on other people to help to get them home.

Figure 6 A student blocking one of the entrances to Wits

This action also brought public attention to the student protests. Despite fences, Universities are connected to the world outside. These actions gridlocked Braamfontein and the northern suburbs. People sat in traffic for hours. While this was probably not a conscious goal of the student leaders, what it does speak to are the very real connections between the city and the university, between people moving in, through and around the university, and the political, social and economic consequences of disruption.

Students were also strategic about the buildings they targeted. Senior managers and administrators work in Senate House in Braamfontein. It is where the offices of fees, admissions, financial aid, and international student offices are located along with disciplinary hearings and Senate and Council meetings. By commandeering the Senate House concourse, students were speaking ‘space’ to power. This is where they staged their mass sit-ins, where they held the Vice-Chancellor and other senior managers ‘hostage’, requiring them to sit on the floor for hours with the students (Figure 7). In renaming the building Solomon Mahlangu House, the students capitalized on the name of a great education struggle hero, an ANC cadre who was deployed to help with the student protests in 1977. He was wrongfully arrested and tried for treason and terrorism.
Students showed an understanding of the political use of space when they resisted Council’s intention to report the outcome of negotiations on the outside steps of Central Block, instead of the concourse inside Senate House as previously arranged. Student leaders told us that if they stayed outside, the police would be able to disperse them. This would have resulted in power shifting back to the University. By forcing their way back into Senate House, students used space and their distribution in space to maintain the advantage they had gained.

Students also used time to their advantage. By staging their protests in the last weeks of the term, during the run up to final end of year examinations, they put the whole of the 2015 academic year at risk. Academic staff, university management and many students, particularly final year students, were anxious to complete the year. This created additional pressure on those negotiating with the protesters, giving the students a strategic advantage. To demonstrate a commitment to their own studies, sit-ins doubled as study sessions in the evenings. Sympathetic staff and students provided these students with support. Like the seemingly incongruous remark written in a pink heart on the side of the poster in Figure 8, 'Witsies for life', this was not an anti-education or anti-university protest.

Figure 8 Witsies for life
Many students are proud to be at Wits and want an education. What they do not want is financial exclusion or the occlusion of the identities they bring with them to the institution.

**A failed attempt to transform space**

While it is hard and expensive to transform brick and mortar, we need to think about what we do with space. While we may 'know why [we] do what we do' (for example, lecture theatres that seat 500 students are one way to respond to the massification of education and high student teacher ratios), have we thought carefully enough about 'what what we do does'? (Foucault, in Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982:182).

Responsible for the new interior design of a postgraduate room, Hilary purchased furniture that was semiotically far removed from the wooden tables and chairs, so reminiscent of a school, that fill most of the teaching spaces on the education campus. She chose red upholstery for the chairs, white tables, white, grey and red paint for the walls, a grey carpet and grey pinning boards. The room looks smart and fit for adults. Most important of all, however, is that the furniture is easy to move. The tables have wheels that lock and the chairs are light and stackable. The room has two screens, one blackboard, one smart board, and one white board which are positioned on different walls for maximally flexible use of space. A large amount of pinning board is available for students' to pin up their individual or collaborative work for all to see and discuss. The room can easily be transformed into a space for drama, a gallery walk, group work or arranged with different areas for different activities. Figure 9 shows how we set the room up for a teachers' workshop on a weekend.

**Figure 9 Teachers workshop space**
We waited to see what would happen when our colleagues used it for teaching the following week. By Wednesday it had been changed back to a teacher-fronted configuration.

The students were more successful in their efforts to effect transformation. The name of Senate House has been officially changed to Solomon Mahlangu House and Central Block is now the Robert Sobukwe Building. The government has acceded to their demands for free higher education based on an income threshold and the University is exploring ways of decolonizing the institution. None of these gains address the question of space per se and it remains to be seen in what ways social relations at Wits are re-constituted after #FeesMustFall.

**Conclusion**

Space is not neutral. It produces us as embodied subjects and it shapes our sense of self. It affects who can speak and who can be heard. It enlarges some and diminishes others. It includes and it excludes. It marks who and what is at the center or the periphery. It affects the routes we take and the people we encounter. It is familiar to some, a space of belonging; and unfamiliar to others, a space of alienation. It is imposing or intimate. It invites us in or pushes us out. It is can be colder inside than outside. It echoes or it resonates. It is light or dark, soft or hard. We need to understand what space does in order to transform it - to make the University a welcoming place.

In this chapter we have discussed some of the historical dimensions of spatial relations and some of the historical formations that shaped the students and staff who inhabit the spaces of higher education and how this affects their experience of these spaces as places of belonging or alienation across time. We have shown how architecture produces material forms that endure, imbued with the ideologies of the past that are carried forward into the present and on into the future. Finally we talked about how the historical and spatial dimensions of students’ power and resistance constructed the conditions of possibility for both their actions and the responses of both the University and government.
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