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Abstract

The Eastern Cape Planning Commission identifies human development as the central concern that the Provincial Development Plan should be premised on (Eastern Cape Planning Commission, 2012). This article proposes to critically examine the emerging (albeit implicit) philosophical foundation for sustainable human development, which we read as a combination of consciousness, capability, and rational organisation, and discusses these three interrelating aspects against selected stakeholders of sustainable human development: the State, civic society and the university. We determine that a re-imagination of the Eastern Cape Province would require serious consideration for the reshaping of the State, a rethinking of the roles and relationships with, and between, civic society, and a review of the third mission of the university.
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Introduction

South Africa has a vision 2030; a vision that its National Planning Commission determines as one that seeks to improve the wellbeing of its people; a vision that aspires to Create a caring South African society...[where] the nation’s energies are focused both on attacking poverty and on expanding a robust, entrepreneurial and innovative economy...communities will need the resources and capabilities to become their own engines of development (National Planning Commission, 2011:4).

Now, the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa requires a long-term vision, a vision to 2030 that would overcome what the Eastern Cape Planning Commission (ECPC) refers to as the central challenge for the province: the alienation of the human condition (http://www.ecpc.co.za/working-groups.php). Thus, the ECPC has ‘identified human development as the central problem the new long-term vision of the province must seek to address’ (Eastern Cape Planning Commission, 2012:4), and argues that this calls for a re-imagination of the Eastern Cape Province.

If the ideal of human development is about expanding people’s choices (Thakrar, 2013), then the history of human civilisation, particularly in Africa, which has been fraught with subjugation and servitude, suggests that expanding people’s choices can also be read as the freedom to choose.

The Hegelian derived consciousness of freedom, that is, for individuals to govern themselves according to their own conscience, within a world (with all its social and political institutions) that is rationally organised, provides one scaffold from which human development can be framed. If the objective world were not rationally organised then individuals acting in accordance with their own conscience would conflict with its laws and morality. Thus, if it is the bringing together of the individual conscience (and capability) within a rationally organised world that human development can be achieved, then the obvious question would be, what is meant by a rational (social or political) organisation today? And in the context of South Africa and in the Eastern Cape in particular, what is the contemporary consciousness and capability across the civic and civil realm?

Building on the discussion document (UNDP, 1990:iii) on human development developed for the ECPC, which argued that strategies for human development (and economic development) should not exclude environmental concerns, in this article, we further examine the notion of human development, and propose a critical philosophical
foundation of consciousness, capability and rational organisation, upon which the identified stakeholders involved in human development, that is, the State, civic society and the university, are considered. We begin, however, with a discussion on human development generally and the human development index more specifically.

[Sustainable] Human Development
Whereas the 1950s onwards saw African nations that were under the rule of European colonisers gain their independence, countries like Namibia and South Africa that were subjected to rule of apartheid had to wait until the 1990s for all its people to achieve equal rights and freedoms, as the citation below demonstrates.

We are living in stirring times. An irresistible wave of human freedom is sweeping across many lands... In the midst of these events we are rediscovering the essential truth that people must be at the centre of all development (Sen, 1999).

Indeed, post-colonial Africa, within the context of modernisation, saw the rise of a political and social ideology of human development, with its liberal characteristics of human rights and market economy, and an oppositional view of remaining undeveloped and/or uncivilised. And yet, post-colonial development in Africa brought forth contestations around what is meant by [human] development (Peet and Hartwick, 2009:4), as Peet and Hardwick surmise, ‘developmentalism is a battleground where contention rages among bureaucratic economists, Marxist revolutionaries, environmental activities, feminist critics, postmodern sceptics and radical democrats’ (Sen, 1999:285).

It is Amartya Sen’s Development as Freedom that focuses the notion of freedom as both the primary end and principle means of human development. He frames development as the abolishment of ‘unfreedoms’, and central to this is the capability approach, as the main concern of human development is, ‘our capability to lead the kinds of lives we have reason to value’ (UNDP, 1990:10). Opponents of Sen argue that his treatise promotes individualism, microeconomics and localism, and fatally ignores macroeconomics, the breakdown of community (and therefore collective capability), global capitalism, and historical legacies of unequal entitlement (O’Hearn, 2009:151-161).

And so whilst the discourse and praxis of human development is certainly not new, indeed the recurring theme of human development can be attributed to philosophers and economists throughout the ages, it is the influence of Sen that resonates in
contemporary thinking of human development, as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) definition of human development demonstrates:

Human development is a process of enlarging people’s choices. The most critical ones are to lead a long and healthy life, to be educated and to enjoy a decent standard of living. Additional choices include political freedom, guaranteed human rights and self respect...Human development has two sides: the formation of human capabilities such as improved health, knowledge and skills – and the use people make of their acquired capabilities – for leisure, productive purposes or being active in cultural, social and political affairs. If the scales of human development do not finely balance the two sides, considerable human frustration may result (Cruz, 2007:97-154).

The human development approach considers human beings as both the means and ends of development. Central to the notion of human development is the concept of capabilities; capabilities, in terms of what people can do, as well as, capabilities that are formed, acquired, and applied to the pursuit of a meaningful life.

What is not clearly articulated by proponents of the capability approach is the concept of consciousness, as human development is subject to humanistic traits, such as imagination, judgement and will, in terms of social and political action (Barnett, 2000). Thus, efforts by the individual, the community, the State, the university, and the conditions of society can both expand or constrain capabilities and consciousness, such that those individuals and communities with poor capabilities or lack of consciousness are less able to chart their own course.

Whilst mindful of Barnett’s (Sullivan, 2006) portrayal of the 21st Century as the ‘age of supercomplexity’ (which requires us to make sense of our world, of ourselves, and of our relationships to the world, and to each other, and the environment), Sullivan (Clark, 2012:2) argues for a shift from ‘human as centre’ to ‘the earth and all species’ as centre to the development process; the emerging ecological age he suggests, requires us to bring into closer dialogue ecology and economics, physics and politics, biology and business, philosophy and communication, etc.

Is the ECPC notion of human development too narrow, particularly in light of the growing global concerns around energy, climate, amongst others? Should the ECPC rather expand the notion to encompass sustainable human development? Particularly in light of the opening speech for the Fifth Ministerial Forum on Development, where, Helen Clark, Administrator of UNDP, stated that, ‘we are now challenged to incorporate
environmental sustainability in the [Human Development] Index, appreciating the relationship between human development and the ecosystem in which it occurs’ (Neumayer, 2012: 561–579).

Neumayer (Neumayer, 2012) suggests that a frank and open discussion of the links, complementarities, and conflicts, will go some way towards addressing the criticism of vagueness laid against the concept of sustainable human development, as well as, intra-generational and inter-generational equity issues that will emanate as a result, ‘some are worried that, for example, increased spending on reducing gas emissions will take financial resources away from assisting the poor of today’ (Sen, 2000:18).

**Human Development Index**

In 1990, the UNDP launched its first human development report (HDR), having established a human development accounting process premised on a pluralist notion of progress to the scheme of development evaluation, as Sen points out, ‘human lives are battered and diminished in all kinds of ways’ (UNDP, 2003), and as the report stipulates:

This Report is about people - and about how development enlarges their choices. It is about more than GNP growth, more than income and wealth and more than producing commodities and accumulating capital. A person's access to income may be one of the choices, but it is not the sum total of human endeavour...Human freedom is vital for human development (UNDP, 2003:ix).

The 1990 UNDP HDR focused on three facets of human life – longevity, knowledge and decent living standards – as the foundation for measuring human development. However, a key proponent of Sen’s argument has been that analysis of human development cannot (and should not) lead to a, ‘misguided search for some one measure of success and failure, some single clue to all other disparate concerns’ (Sen, 2000:22), and yet the UNDP did just that in its overall and composite human development index, which it derived from averaging the values of life expectancy, adult literacy and the purchasing power to satisfy basic needs.

In 2003, the UNDP published its South Africa HDR, subtitled ‘Unlocking People’s Creativity’ (UNDP, 2003). This country-specific report focused on five challenges: poverty, and extreme income and wealth inequalities; the provision and access to quality basic
services; the promotion of environmental sustainability; a sustained reduction in the
unemployment rate; and the attainment of sustainable high growth rates. Interestingly
then, the South Africa HDR did contain the component of environmental sustainability.
The report surmises that in 1994, the South African transformation focus was that of
people-driven process, yet in 2003 the human development outcomes remain, “uneven
Africa shifted from 0.73 in 1990, to 0.67 (ECSECC, 2012) in 2003 – what does this mean
exactly? As Sen points out, ‘the real merit of the human development approach lies in
the plural attention it brings to bear on developmental evaluation, not in the aggregate
measures it presents as an aid to digestion of diverse statistics’ (Sen, 2000:22). The 246-
page SA HDR is sadly delineated to a composite index and there is a danger that this
overall measure serves to detract from the, ‘interconnectedness of the factors that affect
the human condition’, such as poverty, healthcare, education, social infrastructure, access
to assets (such as land) and services etc (National Planning Commission, 2011:27).

The South Africa HDR acknowledged that the five challenges addressed as part of the
human development analysis, as stated above, are interrelated and cut across the
sectoral responsibilities of government departments; the recommendations from the
report were better coordination among government departments and active participation
of civil society. How does the state realise such a recommendation?

The frustration with this report is that it does not express capability, of say the State
[or consciousness and rational organisation], in relation to sustainable human
development, in other words and by of example, the recommendations do not provide
enough detail from which the State could rethink its role, organisational structure or
priorities. In reference to the Hegelian notion of a rational organisation, what kind of
State, and its capabilities (and consciousness), realise sustainable human development?
This in turn begs the question: what kind of State is the Eastern Cape Government?

Finally, critical to developing a discussion on sustainable human development is how
sustainable human development is defined in the Eastern Cape context, and what
significant quantitative and qualitative factors are identified (and measured) as part of its
accountability process (Gorobets, 2011:751-779).
After the first democratic elections in South Africa in 1994, the new South African government embarked on large-scale political and socio-economic reforms, to redress the legacy of apartheid, which was a South African economy dominated by the white minority, and the majority black population deprived of basic political and economic freedoms (Rodrick 2006).

My Government’s commitment to create a people-centred society of liberty binds us to the pursuit of the goals of freedom from want, freedom from hunger, freedom from deprivation, freedom from ignorance, freedom from suppression and freedom from fear. These freedoms are fundamental to the guarantee of human dignity. They will therefore constitute part of the centrepiece of what this Government will seek to achieve, the focal point on which our attention will be continuously focused (Mandela, 1994).

The post-1994 reforms were driven by the macro-economic policy known as the Reconstruction and Development Programme (RDP), symbolised by its ideology of ‘growth through redistribution’, followed in 1996 by the more conservative Growth, Employment and Redistribution (GEAR) plan that focused on stringent monetary and fiscal targets; based on post-Fordist lines GEAR was a shift to ‘redistribution through growth’ (Fataar 2003:31-39).

In mid-2005 the national ruling party, the African National Congress (ANC), in its National General Council, committed itself to building a developmental State in an attempt to restructure the economy; the notion of a developmental State had subsequently remained a consistent theme in ANC policy discourse, as President Jacob Zuma in his 2009 State of the Nation Address (SONA) asserts, ‘working with people and supported by our public servants we will build a developmental state, improve public services and strengthen democratic institutions’ (Zuma, 2009). By his 2012 State of the Nation Address (SONA), President Jacob Zuma declares South Africa ‘a developmental state located in the centre of a mixed economy’ (Zuma, 2012). Interestingly, the 2013 SONA made no explicit reference to a developmental State.

Whilst a developmental State seeks to balance economic growth and social development, utilising State resources and State influences to abolish what Sen refers to as ‘unfreedoms’ (Sen, 1999), a developmental State is one that not only embodies the principles of electoral democracy, but also ensures citizens’ participation in the development and governance processes, and as Edigheji points out, ‘this will entail
possessing a developmentalist ideology’ (Edigheji 2010:4). Does the consciousness of the Eastern Cape State lean towards developmentalist ideology?

In addition, the notion of a developmental State, with its interventionist approach to facilitate economic growth, places the market and a top-down perspective on the role of the State at its core, is somewhat replaced in the National Development Plan, which introduces the notion of a capable State, which suggests a move away from a singular emphasis on the market towards an agenda that places importance on the value of people (and thus sustainable human development) alongside capable institutions that are responsive to their context; a correlation to Sen’s theory of development. Whilst the government may argue that a capable State and a developmental State are one and the same, the origin and exercise of power may not be as equal across both notions. For example, if the developmental State is one that is actively involved in guiding economic development, access to critical resources, such as land, places a level of power with the State in terms of decision making, whereas a capable state draws on inclusivity and responsiveness, which in turn imply transparency and accountability.

Furthermore, scholarly reflection on the notion of a developmental State has, on the whole, focused on economic growth measures to the neglect of social policy and human capability, and perhaps that is reflected in how the developmental State agenda has been realised, particularly in the Eastern Cape. For instance, whilst macroeconomic stability has largely been achieved, with South Africa turning itself into one of the emerging markets, that is, the more mainstream economy has become increasingly integrated into global markets, open to international trade and capital inflows, finance continues to direct and condition the economy (Fine, 2011), unemployment is one of the highest in the world and remains heavily concentrated among the young, unskilled and the black population, and inequalities in income and wealth distribution continue to rise (Eastern Cape Socio-Economic Consultative Council 2012).

Ngamlana argues for a capable developmental State:

A capable developmental state in my view requires as its bedrock active citizens and a common purpose. It requires active engagements by the people with the process of government in all its forms, beginning with the very local (Ngamlana, 2013).
What kind of State is the Eastern Cape Provincial Government? To investigate this further it is important to reflect on the history of the Eastern Cape Province.

The Eastern Cape Province was demarcated in 1994, as a separate part of the former, much larger, Cape Province. The eastern half contained two former Bantustans, the Transkei and Ciskei, while the western half fell within former white South Africa, the former Cape Provincial Administration areas. Picard (2005) argues that during the accession to power, the ANC [and its Reconstruction and Development Programme] had no detailed plans for public service transformation, rather political expediency gave way to effective rationalisation, and policy emphasis was on racial transition as opposed to organisational reform, such that by 1998, there were about 138,000 public servants in the province and by 2004 this number had only reduced to 125,068.

The province inherited poor administration capacities that were inherent in the homelands. The concept of separate development had seen different systems of administration that ran parallel (the homelands are known to have relied on patrimonial bureaucracy) until the democratic elections of 1994 which enforced integration (Ngoma, 2007). Yet, as the Provincial Government Growth and Development Plan 2004 – 2014 points out:

> Provincial Government has been unable to function as a single entity, but rather has been operating as a coalition of many government departments and bureaucracies. Compartmentalised government rather than “joined-up” government – has been the reality for the first 10 years of democracy (Eastern Cape Provincial Government, 2004:305).

What is a rational organisation for the Eastern Cape State within the context of a developmental and/or capable state and sustainable human development? Critical to sustainable human development has been Sen’s idea of a pluralist conception as opposed to monoconcentration, as he iterates, ‘the human development approach assumed the leadership of a pluralist world of multiple concerns, and its intellectual departure has a coordinating function that is quite central to the entire enterprise’ Sen, 2000:22).

What implications does pluralism have on the rational organisation of the Eastern Cape State? Moreover, what of the Eastern Cape State’s capabilities? Fine (Fine, 2011:16) suggests, ‘more coordination, skills and capacity are required if South Africa is to
become a developmental state’, whilst Yang (Yang, 2010) argues that the main focus in improving sustainable human development should be policies directed at strengthening State capacity, and promoting State effectiveness. Yet, the Eastern Cape State continues to experience high levels of staff turnover, particularly within the senior management ranks and this has significant impact on the State’s social, economic and fiscal directions (Eastern Cape Provincial Administration, 2006), and whilst Chang (2010) reflects on how ‘to do’ a developmental state in terms of the political, human resource and organisational requirements; he concludes the Eastern Cape State has failed to stretch the capabilities of its civil service.

The ECPC seeks to re-imagine the Eastern Cape Province. The process of re-imagination needs to take into account the prevailing consciousness, capability and rational organisation of the State, against a backdrop of public sector reform post-1994, particularly as its conceptualisation, design and implementation, ‘assumed capacity and resources where they did not exist but more important it assumed that the nature of the bureaucracies that existed were highly matured to absorb and act on the speed of the transformation required’ (Ngoma, 2007:217).

The Civic Society of the Eastern Cape

Critical to sustainable human development, and a developmental/capable State, is the role of civic society both in terms of public participation and community engagement. Public participation is based on the premise that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision making process, as Edigheji points out:

A democratic developmental state is one that not only embodies the principles of electoral democracy, but also ensures citizens’ participation in the development and governance processes. Thus...it is pertinent to bring citizenship back into politics (Edigheji, 2010:5).

Naude (2001:1) asserts that the colonial-cum-apartheid regimes sought to advance the agenda of racial segregation and exclusion; a history that is reflected by the reality of the majority prohibited from participation. Yet, Westaway concludes that in its formation, the Eastern Cape State did not attack segregationism but rather assimilated it, as he argues, ‘this year [1994] did not signal a moment of discontinuity, it did not mark the end of one era and the beginning of another...For former Bantustan residents, 1994
meant that they were no longer regarded as ‘extra-domestic aliens’...but they have not yet attained citizenship’ (Naude 2001:1).

Nyalunga (2006:15-20) argues that public participation will not happen by itself, it needs people who have a passionate conviction and commitment, yet the Eastern Cape Non-Governmental Organisation Coalition illustrates a present-day opposite:

The pre-1994 period is often regarded as having been a robust era for civic society in South Africa...During this period society had a definitive direction and purpose...Post-apartheid era CSOs [Civic society Organisations] are still in existence but have somehow withered (Eastern Cape NGO Coalition, 2012).

The questions thus arise:

- Why was civic society in South Africa, prior to 1994, so robust?
- Was it because the ‘definitive direction and purpose’ gave us something in common?
- Did that commonness make us a community?
- Are we suggesting then that post-1994 we no longer have a definitive direction and purpose? Put differently, do we no longer have anything in common?
- What is the prevailing consciousness of the Eastern Cape civic society with regards to citizenship and the common?
- How does this affect and effect sustainable human development?

However we define community, whether we consider it from a sociological perspective or from an individual perspective, what is central to both is the sense of who is included and who is excluded from membership. As Secomb argues:

*It is not disagreement, resistance, and agitation that destroy community. It is rather the repression or suppression of difference and disagreement in the name of unity and consensus, which destroys the engagement and interrelation of community* (Secomb, 2000).

This then raises the question of whether the method of public participation in the Eastern Cape Province, whether it is within a community or between the community and the State fosters difference? Secondly, what is a rational organisation for civic society, such that it ensures public participation?

Public participation should be seen as an on-going process rather than an event, which suggests then rich relationships say between the State and civic society...
organisations, community representatives etc; innovative methods of participation; capabilities for facilitating participation (particularly by the State); and the avoidance of politicization of the participation space (Nyalunga, 2006:15-20). Yet, one of the key mechanisms of public participation across South Africa is the Integrated Development Planning (IDP) process, a process that should bring together the State and civic society of a particular geographical area, to develop a coherent plan that seeks to improve the quality of life for all the people living in that area.

The following example of one District Municipalities IDP process demonstrates not only an event-driven public participation method, but also perhaps an assumptive and paternalistic philosophy of ‘I am the expert; I know best’ - the 2010/2011 Amathole District Municipality had an IDP steering committee comprising entirely of civil servants, and an IDP Representative Forum comprising of councillors, civil servants, NGOs and business, which as a body, was given 1 day in the 7 month IDP development process to identify development priorities. IDP road shows, which were public hearings that anyone could attend, took place at the end of the IDP process (IDP, 2011/2012), in other words, citizens were participating after the fact (Thakrar, 2012).

Recognising the vitality of public participation, in 2008 the Public Services Commission (PSC) conducted a study on the assessment of public participation practices across the civil service. Its findings included that public participation is not institutionalised, and where it does occur, it is implemented in a haphazard manner. The following key challenges were raised by departments in the application of their different public participation practices (Public Services Commission, 2008): budgetary constraints; lack of feedback-report on issues raised by citizens; inadequate human resources; poor institutional arrangements such as weak ward committees and local government; poor planning; translation of documents into different languages; and political dynamics where political parties always fight for influence. And yet, the PSC 2008 study demonstrates a unidirectional praxis of public determination, as there was no public participation in the research itself.

Community engagement is a process of inclusive participation with a self-identified community and is often made operational in the form of partnerships, collaborations and coalitions that serve as catalysts for change, as Thompson and Kinne argue, change ‘... is more likely to be successful and permanent when the people it affects are involved in initiating and promoting it’ (Thompson & Kinne, 1990).
Rousseau determines that, ‘as soon as public business ceases to be the citizens’ principal business, and they prefer to serve with their purse rather than with their person, the state is already close to ruin’ (GGLN, 2011:87). On 7th February 2013, civic society in Nkonkobe launched Sakhubuntu, a forum for dialogue and public participation; a key speaker from the Eastern Cape Department of Social Development used the platform to put forward the lack of State funds, and went on to provide a checklist of instructions regarding formal registration, as only then would organisational legitimacy be achieved and a relationship with the State formed. So in this case, the purse was empty and whilst there in person, the State representative had little to offer outside bureaucratic requirements. So neither purse nor person facilitated any form of community engagement.

Instead of a politics of power and interest, central to community engagement is a deliberative democracy, based on reciprocity and trust, where members address their community problems and by reasoning together, determine how best to solve them. As Ncinane, a member of the Cata community in the Eastern Cape illustrates, ‘One of the key factors for success was to ensure that ownership lies with the community. It is important that projects are based on the assets of the community, instead of simply copying what is done elsewhere’ (Kienast, 2010:4).

What is capability, consciousness and rational organisation of the State with regards to public participation and community engagement? Similarly, what is the capability, consciousness and rational organisation of civic society to participate/engage with the State, or other public entities, such as the university?

Tiwari and Ibrahim (2012:69-85) argue the relevance of agency for sustainable human development, and the importance of identifying and facilitating complementarities between the instrumental capabilities of key stakeholders, whilst Kienast identifies that the existing poor public participation and community engagement offers an opportunity for a shift from State-centric nature of development towards genuine forms of co-production, that is, a shift away from the narrow and technocratic approach to [sustainable human] development towards one that is community-directed and driven.

Finally, for the ECPC, public participation and community engagement is a double-edged sword. On the one side, public participation and community engagement is vital if the provincial development plan is to represent a re-imagination of the province and harness the assets of its people; on the other side increasing public participation and
community engagement needs to be contained within the provincial development plan itself, reflecting on the consciousness, capability and rational organisation of both the State and civic society.

**The Eastern Cape University**

Over and above the mission of human development traditionally ascribed to universities, that of producing graduates, there is a growing international discourse of the expanded mission (or third mission) of universities, that of university-community engagement to achieve social and economic transformation (Watson, Hollister, Stroud and Babcock, 2011), as Goddard argues.

Universities in the round have potentially a pivotal role to play in the social and economic development of their regions. They are a critical ‘asset’ of the region; even more so in less favoured regions where the private sector may be weak or relatively small, with low levels of research and development activity (Goddard, 2011:viii).

Whilst the South African university has this mission contained in legislation (DoE, 1999), there is little or no discussion across higher education as to who or what the community is that the university engages with? Furthermore, the Eastern Cape University is a ‘western’ institution (Wernick, 2006:557-579), established along the traditional lines of the modern European university, with its disciplines, academic programmes, faculties and departments. So whilst on the one hand it could be said that the very aspects of human development discussed above reside in the university, on the other hand, critics of the university argue that the ‘ivory tower’ prevails, in that the university is distant/isolated from its communities. Furthermore, when the university does engage, its approach to outsiders is unidirectional and paternalistic and thus debilitates true engagement (Keet, 2010), and as it is organised along mono-centric lines (discipline-specific faculties and departments), it is incapable of pluralist strategies.

In that sense then, it could be argued that the university is not rational; it does not have its own consciousness in terms of its organisational structure or its mandate and is incapable to either recognise this for itself or to change (Barnett, 2011). In fact, whilst the university has changed very little, society has become more complex. Does the university reflect the State in that regard? (PDoE, 2011/2012). An added complication is, of course, the historical legacies of the Eastern Cape University. The impact of apartheid, through its Extension of University Education Act in 1959, sought to dedicate specific universities
to white students. Thus, universities that were established in the early part of the 20th century were subsequently affected and consequently transformed and fragmented by the successive apartheid governments, such that by 1985, a total of 19 universities (out of a total of 29) had been established exclusively for white people, a minority racial group (Bunting, 2006). As a result, higher education in the Eastern Cape became synonymous with inclusion versus exclusion along racial lines, State disinvestment of some universities and investment in others and the post-apartheid anxieties to overcome these legacies being more than the auditable racial composition of its student and staff body today.

Nevertheless, a number of issues regarding university-community engagement need to be raised here; the first is that the legislated mandate of community engagement is an unfunded one. So, the Eastern Cape University, like its global counterpart, is rewarded and recognised by its rate of throughput of students and publication output, and thus these missions dominate over university-community engagement. Secondly, whilst there is a growing discourse in terms of the praxis and institutionalisation of university-community engagement across higher education South Africa, there is little or no discourse around what or who the community is, and what is meant by engagement. Thirdly, and like the State, is the assumption that the Eastern Cape university is capable of community engagement a correct one? Finally, is community engagement in the Eastern Cape University more of an individual endeavour as opposed to a systemic and strategic reality? (Council on Higher Education, 2010).

**Conclusion**

This article begins by advocating that the ECPC should rather consider the notion of sustainable human development as the central problem the development plan of the Eastern Cape province should seek to address, particularly since economic development and human development are increasingly constrained by environmental concerns; a system in stress. For example, as part of the State’s small town regeneration project, the action plan for the town of Alice determines that in relation to social and economic development, agriculture is a key focus sector. Yet, the diagnostic of Alice determines that the degradation of the natural systems within the town is clearly evident, with overgrazing having a direct impact on the water systems, both from a water and food security perspective (Aspire, 2010).
In reference to the State, what consciousness prevails across the civil service? Is it as Manuel suggests, ‘If we, in public service, cannot see the simple causal links between skills, education, good health, employment, prosperity and increased trust and stability, then we don’t belong in the public service’ (Manuel, 2013). Does this level of critical thinking occupy the consciousness of the State officials? Furthermore, the pluralist notion of such multiple concerns should effect and affect the rational organisation of the State, both in terms of structure and spatial presence. Finally, capability, whilst central to the sustainable human development approach, has to ensure the risks and challenges of omission and power are mitigated. The overarching capacity of the State in the Eastern Cape Province to implement a provincial development plan in a manner that may require shifts in consciousness, a re-imagination of its rational organisation and determinations of relevant capabilities, should be considered alongside the development of the plan itself.

In reference to the Eastern Cape civic society, first and foremost, the prevailing consciousness, and the Freirean concept of conscientization as a means to critically develop the individual and society needs to be critically reflected upon. Public participation and community engagement systems in the Eastern Cape need to be re-considered (and undoubtedly re-imagined) if cooperation and collaboration between and across civic society is to be realised. Whilst there is a concerted effort to bring the State closer to the private sector, there has to be an equalising effort with the non-governmental (and non-private) sector. How the state interacts with social movements, community-based organisations and structures, non-governmental organisations, traditional leadership, the university, alongside its own embedded system of local councillors demonstrates already the complexity of who or what is (or represents) the Eastern Cape community.

From a civic societal perspective the success of the provincial development plan will lie in not only what is produced, how it is shared, acted upon, implemented, monitored and evaluated but also the very process of its development in terms of whom is involved and how. As Manuel concludes, ‘this is not the time to play ideological games. We have to find ideas that work; not ideas that sound right’ (Manuel, 2013). Who is involved (and how) in the development of the provincial development plan should not be overlooked; the Eastern Cape Provincial Development Plan represents the long-term, and this requires the civic and civil (and political) society to think and behave likewise.
From a university perspective, a review of the third mission of community engagement, as both a self-reflection along the lines of institutional consciousness, capability and rational organisation, and at a national policy level, is imperative if there is to be equivalence of stature and reward of this mission alongside the traditional teaching and learning, and research.

Does a re-imagining of the Eastern Cape Province extend to reorganising and reengineering the rational organisation of the State or the university? Does it extend to a critical rethinking of individual and institutional consciousness? Finally, does it extend to a frank and honest discussion of capability?
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