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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the extent to which the postapartheid democratic space in South Africa has allowed for the emergence of new identities for Afrikaans women - beyond the normative Afrikaner nationalist volksmoeder [mother of the nation] ideal. The study interrogates Afrikaner subjectivities through the interpretive lens of ordentlikheid – an ethnicised respectability – at the intersections of gender, sexuality, class and race. Framed by the theoretical perspectives of Laclau and Mouffe, Foucault, and Butler, the study employs discourse analysis across three phases: Firstly, an analysis of Sarie women's magazine, as an instrument of a culturally-sanctioned, normative discourse; secondly, an analysis of texts generated in focus group interviews with subjects who self-identify as women, white, heterosexual, middle-class and Afrikaans-speaking; and thirdly, an analysis of texts from individual in-depth interviews. The interviews and focus groups were conducted with participants from Johannesburg and Cape Town to allow for the emergence of possible regional differences. The study finds that 'the Afrikaner' has not been rendered invalid as an identity, rather, it has become open to different interpretations that draw on both democratic discourses and on apartheid notions of race, gender, sexuality and class. The research further reveals how different discourses compete for the same subject position, which can result in a subject shifting between contradictory identificatory stances. Democratic discourses of feminism, equality and justice are used to reject 'the Afrikaner' identity as too closely associated with apartheid iniquities. Democratic conceptions are mobilised to re-imagine 'the Afrikaner' and remember the volksmoeder as 'strong woman', in order to arrive at feminist notions of female autonomy, while problematising heteronormativity and bourgeois whiteness. In contrast, subjects identify with 'the Afrikaner' to deny the effects of racism and sexism and to resist democratic ideas. Discourses persist that reproduce normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid through femininity as silence, self-sacrifice, servility, sexual accessibility and reproducing whiteness. This femininity is invested in the restoration of Afrikaner hegemonic masculinity. Neoliberalism and postfeminism renew normative volksmoeder elements, while global-local spatial strategies allow subjects to withdraw into hegemonic whiteness or marked white enclaves. The result is that Afrikaans women's postapartheid identities derive from many volksmoeders, rather than simply one.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and problem identification

After almost 350 years of Dutch, British and Boer colonialism and Afrikaner nationalist apartheid rule, the opening of the first democratic parliament of South Africa on 24 May 1994 featured an invitation – or, using the Althusserian (2008) term, an interpellation or hailing of subjects – which could be read as particularly compelling to South Africans who identify as ‘Afrikaner women’. African National Congress leader Nelson Mandela, in his inaugural State of the Nation address as new South African president, quoted Afrikaans poet Ingrid Jonker (1933-1965). She had written a poem, titled 'The child who was shot dead by soldiers at Nyanga' (1963), about black resistance and humanity in the face of tightening apartheid state repression. Jonker was the daughter of a National Party senator who chaired the committee in charge of apartheid censorship. There was an attempted excision of the poem before its publication in her Rook en Oker [Smoke and Ochre] collection of poems (1963) and she suffered public humiliation at the hands of her father.

Jonker was writing against apartheid at the time when Mandela was incarcerated for his activities in opposition to the regime of which her father was a part. The poem (Jonker, 2007:85) reads as follows:

The child is not dead
the child raises his fists against his mother
who screams Africa screams the smell
of freedom and heather
in the locations of the heart under siege

The child raises his fists against his father
in the march of the generations
who scream Africa scream the smell
of justice and blood
in the streets of his armed pride

The child is not dead
neither at Langa nor at Nyanga
not at Orlando nor at Sharpeville
nor at the police station in Philippi
where he lies with a bullet in his head

The child is the shadow of the soldiers
on guard with guns saracens and batons
the child is present at all meetings and legislations
the child peeps through the windows of houses and into the hearts of mothers
this child who just wanted to play in the sun at Nyanga is everywhere
the child who became a man treks through all of Africa
the child who became a giant travels through the whole world

Without a pass

It was a moment rich with meaning: a leader celebrated as the father of the freshly minted New South Africa speaking in an institution that embodied the fledgling democracy, welcoming an Afrikaner woman as belonging to the imagined nation after she had been expelled from the fold of the whites-only volk for recognising its black other. Mandela’s hailing was one of the many invocations of the democratic potentialities for subject positions located at the intersections of femininity, whiteness, heterosexuality and middleclassness. Mandela remembered Jonker on behalf of all in the country and poignantly proffered her ‘glorious vision’ of identitary openings to subjects: ‘she instructs that our endeavours must be about the liberation of the woman, the emancipation of the man and the liberty of the child. [She] was both a poet and a South African. She was both an Afrikaner and an African. She was both an artist and a human being. In the midst of despair, she celebrated hope. Confronted by death, she asserted the beauty of life’ (www.presidency.gov.za).

This is the focus of this study: To what extent has Mandela’s offer of identification been taken up? Have Jonker’s contemporary counterparts – at least in terms of the structural classifications of gender, sexuality, class and race (Smith, 1998) – stepped into the subject positions that democratic discourses prepare for them? Jonker has subsequently been awarded the democratic state’s Order of Ikhamanga in Silver (2004) for ‘her excellent contribution to literature
and a commitment to the struggle for human rights and democracy in South Africa’. Several commemorative films and plays have since been made. Are her present-day structural counterparts as readily absorbed in and absorbing of postapartheid discourses of democracy and human rights?

These questions are pertinent due to the end of official apartheid, precipitated by a weakening in hegemonic articulations (Laclau, 1990:28; Norval, 1996), or what Gramsci called an ‘organic crisis’ caused by ‘a dramatic collapse in popular identifications with institutionalised subject positions and political imaginaries’ (Smith, 1998:164). South Africa is not only in the throes of attempting to reimage a politics which does not marginalise and oppress but has also been reincorporated into the global economy (Habib and Bentley, 2008). The transition from apartheid coincided with seismic global shifts as communism came to an end, sparking neoliberal triumphalism (Fukuyama, 1992). South Africans not only have to contend with making sense within a radically dislocated postapartheid field but with renewed exposure to a ‘global postmodern’ characterised by massive upheavals in identifications (Hall, 1997a, 1997b). The global proliferation of identities has been reflected locally.

It is common cause that the postapartheid social field is in identity flux (Zegeye 2001; Wasserman and Jacobs 2003; Distiller and Steyn 2004; Chipkin 2007; Carton, Laband and Sithole, 2008; Hadland, Louw, Sesanti and Wasserman, 2008). The transition from apartheid to democracy has had differential effects on women (Samuelson, 2007; West, 2009; du Toit, 2009; Gunkel, 2011) and men (Shefer, Ratele, Strebel, Shabalala and Buikema 2007) and has troubled whiteness (Steyn, 2001, 2003; Ballard, 2004; Salusbury and Foster, 2004), masculinity (Morrell, 2001) and heterosexuality (van Zyl, 2005; Judge, Manion and de Waal, 2008; Steyn and van Zyl, 2009).

Specifically, the disarticulation of Afrikaner nationalism as discourse has catapulted ‘the Afrikaner’ identity into states of confusion and defence (Vestergaard, 2001; Verwey and Quayle, 2010; Steyn 2003, 2004), because ‘Afrikaners cannot escape the fact that the system was put in place in their name’ (Steyn, 2003:222, emphasis in original). The ‘Afrikaner’ identity has historically been forged in reaction to white Afrikaans-speakers’ in-between status of being marked as ‘not quite white’ (Roediger, 2002:336; see also Appendix C) in
relation to hegemonic whiteness, as represented by British colonialists and later white English-speaking South Africans (WESSAs) (Steyn, 2003). In the first half of the 20th century it was regarded as in perpetual danger of deteriorating to ‘the station and class’ of ‘the coloured’ (du Toit, 2003:172; Erasmus, 2001: 17-18; Adhikari, 2005: 11,14,15), especially during the ‘poor white’ scare of the 1930s when impoverished Afrikaans whites in the cities were positioned in a way akin to the US phenomenon of ‘white trash’, a liminal and ‘dangerous threshold state’ (Wray, 2006:2). The identity’s implication in apartheid, instrumental in the political, economic and social ascendancy of Afrikaners, has re-stigmatised it as morally suspect, a process which started in the 1960s, as indicated by intensifying political contestation in Afrikaner ranks (van der Westhuizen, 2007); intra-Afrikanerdom reflection on the effects of apartheid on black people, exemplified by the success of books such as Elsa Joubert’s *Die swerfjare van Poppie Nongena* [The long journey of Poppie Nongena]; and writings on ‘the Afrikaner identity crisis’ (e.g. de Klerk, 1984).

1.2 The object of this study

The official inauguration of the ‘New South Africa’ in 1994 heralded the end of the country’s reputation as international exemplar of a particularly intransigent colonial whiteness named apartheid and elaborated throughout the social realm. The Afrikaner nationalists that had come to power in 1948 devised and instituted hierarchical racial and ethnic divisions with borrowed features from British colonial indirect rule (Mamdani, 1996) but which sutured a specific and wholly new imaginary as symbolic horizon (Norval, 1996).

The interpretation of Afrikaner nationalism by the Gesuiwerde Nasionale Party [Purified National Party] (GNP) was the strand that wrested power from the United Party and its ‘South Africanism’, which had emphasised reconciliation between the two English- and Afrikaans-speaking ‘white races’ on the basis of racial segregationism. Norval’s apposite *Deconstructing Apartheid Discourse* (1996) finds that the GNP discourse not merely advanced racial exclusivity but also a version of whiteness that differentiated internally on the grounds of race (p.43). Immigration, for example, was only open to appropriate white elements. In the highly contested identity field of the 1930s and 1940s (Brink, 1990;
Hyslop, 1995; Dubow and Jeeves, 2005), the GNP increasingly distinguished ways of being ‘properly Afrikaans’” (Norval, 1996:44). It manufactured the volkseie (literally the volk or nation’s ‘own’): particularist demands creating political frontiers that were inscribed both racially and ethnically, and which became generalised (p.9). Norval criticises Marxist revisionism’s class reductionism and emphasises race and ethnicity instead. Yet she also points out that apartheid (and segregation) discourse ‘structured all social relations […] delimiting the sphere of the thinkable, setting the boundaries within which all social practices had to take place’ (p.27). Moreover, Norval notes, apartheid was effected not only through exclusion but through inclusion: these were simultaneous operations.

As Norval suggests, apartheid manufactured multiple others, both internal to the volkseie and external. However, within the predominant theoretical debates in South African scholarship the emphasis has been on either race or class. What has happened to apartheid’s other others after 1994? This study seeks to bring in its gendered internal other – the feminine – at its interfaces with race, sexuality and class, and investigate how the dislocation of the apartheid imaginary has (re)configured subject positions caught in these categories’ generative reciprocities.

The subjects under investigation are individuals who self-identify as Afrikaans-speaking, white, heterosexual, middleclass and women. The study’s delimitation means black women, lesbian women or working-class women, or men, have not been included, firstly because it would have made the scope too wide. Further, the rationale for the object of study is the following: a primary consideration is turning the dissection knife on those less analysed social markers which are the centres of power, in this case being heterosexuality, whiteness and middle-classness. It is only over the past two decades that researchers have turned their attention to understanding categories of normativity which hold hegemonic power to construct the social in their image. This study endeavours to contribute to these efforts, with a view to the deconstruction of these normative modalities. Simultaneously, including femininity as one of the objects of this study, constructed as it is as other in relation to hegemonic masculinity, introduces a counteracting dynamic that
allows for an unpacking of the co-constructions, reinforcements and detractive influences that social markers exert in relation to each other. Adding femininity allows investigation of a subject position advantaged by Afrikaner nationalism but simultaneously radically undermined due to gendered othering. Applying the project of decentring hegemonic identities to South Africa is all the more valid in the case of the confluence of whiteness, middleclassness, Afrikaansness and heterosexuality, as these categories were mobilised as ‘the Afrikaner’ by Afrikaner nationalism and managed to capture state power in the 1948 election. This assemblage of markers was turned into nodal hooks for an imaginary that exerted hegemony over all identities for a half-century – a hegemony which was only dislocated with democratisation. Part of the motivation for the investigation and deconstruction of this identity is that, as a group, it continues to command considerable material assets and economic power. Postapartheid studies have also found various strategies aimed at rehabilitating Afrikaner identity, of which the majority involve revamping oppressive power relations of yesteryear (Steyn, 2004). While the study provides insights into the process of postapartheid subjectivation, which can be drawn upon, analyses to understand the specificities of other, albeit co-constructed, identities warrant separate studies.

The concept of intersectionality, grown from feminist theory, proves particularly useful when investigating the mutually productive relationalities between categories (Crenshaw, 1995; Collins, 2000; McCall, 2005). This study approaches ‘Afrikaner’ identity as a subaltern whiteness (Steyn 2003) pursuing a masculinist and bourgeois agenda (Brink, 1990; Hyslop, 1995; Vincent, 1999; du Pisani, 2001; du Toit, 2003). Being mindful that race should not be conflated with ethnicity, despite their overlaps (Norval, 1996; Roediger, 2002; Cornell and Hartmann, 2007), the intersectional nexus at which the identity is (re)crafted is captured in this study with the term ordentlikheid, which refers to an ethnicised respectability. Ordentlikheid is both normative and analytical. The term acts normatively as productive dynamo set on recruiting subjects for a political project of white, bourgeois, heteromasculinist power, historically bolstered by Afrikaner nationalism. This study applies the term analytically as nodal category to dissect the social practices at identitary intersections which produce subject positions in a postapartheid context where Afrikaner nationalism is in disarray.
The thesis shows processes of subjectivation in postapartheid South Africa which would be generally applicable to identities at different intersections to the ones studied in this thesis. However, for this cohort of women, the disciplinary nexus of intersecting categories is captured by the concept of ordentlikheid. Further research could be conducted to investigate whether ethnicised respectabilities are formative of identities at different juncture of social markers.

Ample historiographical examinations exist of the volksmoeder [mother of the nation] discourse in the cauldron of Afrikaner nationalist challenges before 1948 (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989; Brink, 1990, 2008; Kruger, 1991; Vincent, 1999, 2000; Bradford, 2000; du Toit, 2003; Swart, 2007; Viljoen, 2008; du Plessis, 2010). The study traces the dislodgement of the volksmoeder as nodal point suturing Afrikaner nationalism. It investigates the volksmoeder's articulation with ordentlikheid and the postapartheid (dis)continuities in these two categories' purchase on subject positions.

Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, Butler's theory of performativity and Foucault's theory of subjection are used to explore pursuits of, or resistances to, openings provided by discourses of democracy. Questions that this study seeks to answer are: What are the contours of the particularist identity of ordentlikheid, or white Afrikaans-speaking middleclass subjectivities, specifically at intersections with femininity? What are the elements articulated to re-suture ordentlikheid amid interpellations by democratic discourses? Does ordentlikheid allow for openings that could make the subject positions under review susceptible to the project of radical democracy? Is there an othering of apartheid identities, particularly the volksmoeder?

1.3 Outline

A phased research scheme is followed, commencing with a discourse analysis of Sarie women’s magazine, the second largest women's magazine and most popular Afrikaans-language women’s magazine in South Africa, owned by former Afrikaner nationalist volksbeweging [people’s movement] media company Nasionale Pers. Focus group interviews with 25 respondents in
Johannesburg and Cape Town were held, followed by in-depth interviews with six respondents selected from the focus groups.

This chapter introduces the study, its background and objectives. The next chapter delineates its social constructionist theoretical positioning and a review of the developments in literature regarding the relevant concepts in the study, in particular ordentlikheid and its constitutive elements of whiteness, middleclassness and heterofemininity, with attention to the volksmoeder as dislocated nodal point. Chapter 3 sets out the methodology, as contained in Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory, Foucault’s directives for discourse analysis, and Butler’s analysis of performativity. It also reflects on the limitations of the study and the steps taken to satisfy qualitative research criteria. Chapter 4 presents a discourse analysis of a culturally sanctioned discourse compiling the elements of ordentlikheid, as found in Sarie magazine. Twelve editions from the year 2009, its 60th anniversary year, are examined. Chapters 5 and 6 contain the discourse analysis of the data of the focus groups and in-depth individual interviews. Chapter 5 starts with a section framing the two chapters. The chapters encompass a two-part deconstruction of ordentlikheid as ‘an order within’ and ‘an order without’, to analyse the apartheid order of exclusion and inclusion, and its internal decisions demarcating the possible. The framing section also introduces another level of analysis which is applied throughout Chapters 5 and 6. This is:

(1) the delineation of discourses seeking to rehabilitate a normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid – termed ‘Regrouper’ discourses, drawing partly on Hall’s (1997a) notion of a return to localised ethnicities; and

(2) the discernment of dissident or resistant discourses – termed ‘Ekthical’ discourses, drawing on Foucault’s cultivation of an ethical self – which disarticulate volksmoeder elements and may re-articulate the elements of ordentlikheid for democratic purposes.

Chapter 6 is the conclusion, which will outline further linkages and discontinuities between Sarie’s sanctioned discourse and the discourses produced by and which produce subjects to set out some of the terms of the de-re-articulation of volksmoeder ordentlikheid in its reciprocal engagements with democratic discourses.
1.4 A note on terminology

In this study, postapartheid is not hyphenated to emphasise that, while democratic discourses may be operational in the field, no radical division can be made between apartheid and what follows – it is a ‘specific system of signs’ (Mbembe, 1992:3).

South Africa’s colonial and apartheid history has left a minefield of racial terms, further complexified by postapartheid revisions. The term ‘black’ is here used to refer to apartheid’s racialised others, i.e. the categories of Indian, coloured and black. ‘Brown’ is a translation of the Afrikaans ‘bruin’, which is a postapartheid term for people who used to be classified as coloured. This chapter introduces the study, while the next provides the theoretical framing.
CHAPTER 2
THEORETICAL AND LITERARY POSITIONING

The transition from apartheid to democracy un-stitched the Afrikaner nationalist family's hierarchical unity, making subjects previously lodged at subject positions as 'Afrikaner women' available for identitary reconfigurations. This chapter outlines the theoretical framing for the analysis of these reconfigurations.

Identities have proliferated in what has been variously called the postmodern, postsocialist, postcolonial age – also in South Africa, as apartheid's divisions are rearranged, overturned or reupholstered. The study approaches the 'post' in post-apartheid circumspectly to avoid 'easy triumphalism': as has been cautioned with postmodernism and postcolonialism the study is alert to the 'problematics of temporal sequence and transcendence [...] continuity and rupture' in relation to its second term, apartheid (Quayson, 2005:89). The end of official apartheid does not signal the end of the effects of the apartheid discourse:

Postapartheid ‘signifies a mode of being which goes beyond, yet remembers, the logic of apartheid. This beyond cannot be a pure beyond. Apartheid cannot simply be left behind.’ (Norval, 2003:265)

Elaborating this point, Mbembe's (1992) insight on the postcolony is used here to understand postapartheid as 'a given historical trajectory – that of societies recently emerging from the experience of colonisation', or apartheid; it is a 'specific system of signs' and 'distinctive ways in which identities are multiplied, transformed and put into circulation' (p.3).

The rupture into postapartheid happened in a global context in which the projection of a national cultural identity as standing for a national formation has been disrupted (Hall, 1997a:22). As the centre weakens, so the differences pull away (p.37) and counter-discourses arise to stem these flows. Of particular interest to this study is that nationalism as a 'subset of identifications' relating to other identities also within the nation remains an underexplored area (Peterson, 2000:55). Among these identities, women, the object of this study, are rendered invisible through the 'fantasmatic gender hierarchy of the nation' (Eisenstein,
2000:35) under sway of the *volksmoeder* [mother of the nation]. Intersectionality can be usefully applied to address these relationalities (Peterson, 2000:55), as outlined in this chapter.

The rest of the chapter commences with an ontological placing of the subject, given that processes of subjectivation form the centre of this study. It then situates the study within feminisms and the analytical turn to intersectionality to capture identitary complexities and fill in the epistemological absences, before homing in on South African theories and the four categories under review. It concludes with an explication of the theoretical lens of *ordentlikheid*, an ethnicised respectability.

### 2.1 The subject of a complex world

In late modernity, the centrality of structure as object of enquiry in human and social sciences has become increasingly problematised and replaced with an emphasis on the question of identity, a concept that travels across disciplinary boundaries (Barrett, 1992; Rattansi and Westwood, 1994; du Gay, Evans and Redman, 2005; Bhavnani, 2001). In various forms of sociological analysis, class as a ‘master identity’ for the negotiation of all other social identities has been challenged by new struggles, including feminisms and black, ecological, lesbian and gay movements (du Gay, Evans and Redman 2005; Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Laclau, 1990; Hall, Held and McLennan, 1992; Winant, 1994; Hall, 1997b; Skeggs, 2008a). The hold of the other ‘great collective social identities’ of nation, race and gender has slipped, their impression of homogeneity faltering (Hall, 1997b:44-5) as ‘new subjects, new genders, new ethnicities, new regions, new communities, hitherto excluded from the major forms of cultural representation [...] through struggle [...] speak for themselves for the very first time’ (Hall, 1997a: 34). The turn to identity has coincided with a linguistic turn and a cultural turn in multidisciplinary flows of new knowledges, encompassing feminist, cultural and gay and lesbian studies, alongside poststructuralism, Marxism, philosophy and psychoanalysis (Rattansi, 1994: 27; Quayson, 2005; Spivak, 2006; Bhavnani, 2001).

The rise of what is loosely described as poststructuralist or postmodernist theories has wide-ranging influence. These theories have in common a
problematisation of the Enlightenment project and modernism and capitalism. The latter is understood as not only a mode of production but ‘a logic of rationalisation’ addressing itself to all social and cultural forms of life while dissolving traditions (White, 1992:3). Poststructuralism rejects theories grounded in metaphysical origins, which retrospectively assign epistemological power to the past in teleological accounts of history and ‘progress,’ and elevate the rational through a ‘disembodied objectivity’ with essentialist and universalist pretensions (Macey, 2001:309; Barrett, 1990:201-4; Cranny-Francis, Waring, Stavropoulos and Kirkby, 2003:70; Steyn, 2001:xxvii). Marxism, while opposing capitalist modernism, is criticised as committing similar errors with its ontologically central, seamlessly unitary and uniform working class destined to reconstitute the social through ‘Revolution’ (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985:2; White 1992) but being unable to account for the multiplication of antagonisms due to its economic reductionism (Joseph, 1998; Hall, 1997b).

A related development is postcolonial theory which points out that modernism’s unquestioned ‘grand narratives’ aimed at justifying scientific-technological and political projects (White, 1992:5) include colonialism and imperialism, with associated exclusions, expropriations, displacements and genocides, extending to the symbolic and the cultural (Rattansi, 1994). It deconstructs the ‘singularity’ of ‘the West’ and its pretensions at universality (White, 1992).

The rise of poststructuralism has led to a ‘war of words’ with those who maintain support for a realist ontology based on the Enlightenment thesis of the social, purporting that social objects and relations exist objectively and independently from the mental (Norris, 2005:2,14). These objects and relations form the basis for the abstract expression of such entities through scientific theories which are regarded as ‘true’ representations of reality (Archer, Sharp, Stone and Woodiwiss, 1998:15; Callinicos, 2006:158-9; Gunnarsson, 2011). Certain realist thinkers -- such as Habermas of the Frankfurt School, who postulated a theory of an ‘ideal speech situation’ in pursuit of democracy -- took on board poststructuralist criticisms but remained committed to the possibility of ‘truth’ and ‘progress’ and other Enlightenment values in science, ethics,

The ‘culture wars’ challenged some of the assumptions of postmodern feminism. Critical realists have insisted on the ‘realness’ of ‘women’ and the epistemological value of the category as abstraction (Gunnarsson, 2011); that ‘the politics of representing the Other’ required a materialist basis (McLaughlin, 1999:327); or that the ‘cultural politics of difference’ be reconciled with a ‘social politics of equality’ to redress the political displacement of redistribution by recognition (Fraser, 1995:69). Queer theorist Judith Butler (1997b:36), in a debate with Marxist Nancy Fraser (1995; 1997), problematised Fraser’s separation of materiality from culture and reduction of the new social movements as ‘merely cultural’. Socially and sexually conservative Marxists seek to relegate the cultural (race, sexuality) to secondary political status which could be an attempt to jettison sexuality from the political, and constrict homosexuality to ‘the cultural’ (Butler, 1997b:42,44). Mouffe (2009: 48-9) warns that realist theory serves to naturalise and reify what are in fact contingent power relations of inclusion-exclusion that should remain contestable.

These theories involve comprehensive critiques of the Cartesian or Enlightenment subject with its unchanging ‘centre’ (Hall, 1993; Barrett, 1992; Cranny-Francis et al., 2003), consciously ‘surveying, subduing and negotiating his way through a world of objects, other subjects and his own body’ (Enlightenment subjects were male) (White, 1992:6, emphasis in original). There is interdisciplinary agreement among those who have undergone the discursive turn about the fictional status of the claim that individuals can ontologically be ‘free agents’. But divergence exists over how identity should therefore be conceptualised (du Gay et al., 2005). Of interest to this study is the ‘subject-of-language’ approach which conceptualises identity as continuously under construction, ‘never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions’ (Hall, 1996:16-17). Individuals’ ‘political reference points are now criss-crossed with a variety of conflicting points of identification [including] [e]thnic, gender, local, party, family, consumer-produced, media-inspired, self-contrived passions and
aspirations blend[ing] and clash[ing] in [the] unstable amalgam of the self’ (Hall et al., 1992:8-9). In this approach, identities are analysed as constructed in particular historical and institutional sites, produced through discursive formations and practices by ‘specific enunciative strategies’ and within ‘the play of specific modalities of power’ (Hall, 1996:17). Poststructuralism attributes to language the power of making rather than just conveying meaning (Barrett, 1990; Foucault, 1998).

From the viewpoint of Cultural Studies, a theoretical trajectory can be mapped which includes Althusserian Marxism, Lacanian psychoanalysis and Foucauldian-inspired discourse theory. Attempts have been made to think through Lacanian psychoanalysis together with Foucauldian analyses of ‘subjectification’ (even given Foucault’s (1998) own misgivings about psychoanalysis), particularly in the post-Marxist work of Laclau and Mouffe and the ‘corporeal’ feminist work of Butler (du Gay et al., 2005; Butler, Laclau and Žižek, 2000; Joseph, 1998). Rattansi (1994:24) draws these strands together in what he calls ‘the postmodern frame’ to interpret the power of the discursive and of culture in encoding, composing and ordering modernity. This study positions itself within this frame.

2.2 Feminisms

This section explores theoretical contestations which have dislodged feminism from a universalist, modernist stance to a decentred proliferation of feminisms, with particular attention to the postmodern turn and the concept of intersectionality relevant to this study. In the 1980s, second-wave feminism came under sustained criticism from black and Third World feminists for privileging the viewpoint of white, Western, middle class, heterosexual feminists and generalising this position as encompassing that of all women, regardless of race, class, sexuality and geography (Bhavnani, 2001: 1-33; Jackson, 1998:21; Amos and Parmar, 2001; Ang, 2001). White feminist ‘herstory’ suffered ‘the same form of amnesia of white male historians by ignoring the fundamental ways in which white women have benefited from the oppression of Black people’ (Amos and Parmar, 2001:18-9). hooks (2001) challenged the founding text of second-wave U.S. feminism, Friedan’s *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), as representing the
experience of college-educated, white, middle- and upper class ‘bored housewives’ as representative of all U.S. women. While the problems of leisure-class white housewives were real issues, hooks conceded, these were not the most pressing issues for women struggling economically while staving off racism.

Such questions activated a paradigm shift away from equality, with its emphasis on equal opportunities, to thinking through the implications of difference for feminist work and heeding the histories of colonisation and arguments on post-coloniality and present-day imperialism (Bowden and Mummery, 2009; Barrett and Phillips, 1992; Bhavnani, 2001). The concept of difference, which became the hallmark of third wave feminism, assists in grappling with the interconnections between diversities, for example, how race affects women’s subordination (Maynard, 2001:125).

Feminists, poststructuralists and antiracist theorists converged to explode exclusions integral to the Cartesian hierarchised, dichotomous division of society (McCall, 2005:1776; Flax, 1997). Women ‘as historical beings, subjects of “real relations”’ (De Lauretis, 1987:10), are obscured by an imagined monolithic ‘womanhood’, ‘woman’ manufactured as ‘other’ (Cixous, 1995).

The ‘equality vs. difference’ debate set up a false distinction: that ‘women can either have equality at the expense of the values and practices of conventional femininity, or they can affirm their difference at the expense of challenging subordination and marginalisation’ (Bowden and Mummery, 2009:23). Postmodern feminism unhinges the underlying binary opposition by stressing the mutual inclusivity and political interdependence of the terms (Barrett and Phillips, 1992).

Nevertheless, ‘postfeminism’ has opportunistically stepped into the political breach created by the ‘equality-difference’ standoff. Utilising key tenets of third wave feminism – choice, empowerment (Tasker and Negra, 2007:5), postfeminism conflates choice, consumption and feminism with the message that women could reach feminist goals through their choice of consumer goods (Lazar, 2011:44). Feminism is commodified to reinvent ‘woman’ as ‘empowered consumer’ (Tasker and Negra, 2007:2). Disconnected from a political project, women are subject to an individualism of compulsory choice with its equivalence
of anything from a pair of shoes, to voting in an election (Beail and Goren, 2010:8). The postfeminist surge reminds one of de Lauretis's (1987:3) warning that ‘the construction of gender is also effected by its deconstruction’. Deconstructions of the subject can ‘recontain’ women in femininity, closing ‘the door in the face of an emergent social subject [...] constituted across a multiplicity of differences in discursive and material heterogeneity’ (p.24). Butler (1990:126-7) similarly cautions that the

female body that is freed from the shackles of the paternal law may well prove to be another incarnation of that law, posing as subversive but operating in the service of that law’s self-amplification and proliferation. In order to avoid the emancipation of the oppressor in the name of the oppressed, it is necessary to take into account the full complexity and subtlety of the law and to cure ourselves of the illusion of a true body beyond the law.

This study pays heed to these warnings in its exploration of the (re)constitution of subjects by competing global and local discourses.

2.2.1 Intersectionality

The concept of intersectionality, coined by Crenshaw in 1989, is applied to emphasise the need to account for ‘the multiple grounds of identity when considering how the world is constructed’ (Crenshaw, 1995:358). Audre Lorde in *Sister Outsider* (1984) was one of the first feminists to point out ‘the continuous negotiation and renegotiation of subjectivity between plural and intersecting social forces mak[ing] any attempt to set down the essence of womanhood or gender an impossible task’ (Bowden and Mummery, 2009:106). Crenshaw’s phrase captures critical race theory and black feminists’ anti-essentialist critique of the undifferentiated category of ‘woman’ in mainstream feminism and its erasure of the particularist and differential effects of racism and sexism on black women.

Intersectionality confirms that subject positions are never insulated or singular and always contingent on context (Styhre and Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2008:577). Subject positions can be complicated by conflicting statuses that are corporeally inscribed. Bodies marked as ‘different’ for their sex, sexuality or
colour are expelled and then repelled to produce culturally hegemonic identities, such as whiteness, masculinity, middeclassness, heterosexuality and able-bodiedness (Butler, 1990:182). These arrangements therefore regulate the subject but also serve as refuges, or sites of questioning or acceptance in subjects’ ‘struggles over meaning and access to resources’ (Styhre and Eriksson-Zetterquíst, 2008:577). The (dis)similarities in the processes of the construction of sexuality, gender, class and race assist in comprehending how these systems of oppression interconnect and it allows an elucidation of how we could experience both privilege and oppression (Ore, 2000:15-6).

Verifications of the effects of multiple categorisations signal a rupture with the erstwhile social sciences practice of dismissing them as an obstacle to universalist ambitions, or invisibilising their differential effects (Styhre and Eriksson-Zetterquíst, 2008). Intersectionality also assists in surfacing silencing of the other, even in transformative discourses such as feminism and antiracism (Crenshaw, 1995:361).

In South Africa the race-class debate, as discussed in the next section, had dominated thinking in the social sciences for most of a century, only being subjected to feminist critique from the 1990s onwards (Walker, 1990; Manicom, 1992). The simplistic, add-on construction of the ‘triple oppression’ faced by black, poor women has since given way to problematisations of western feminism and complexified understandings of gender’s collusion with other categories in the South African postcolonial context (Shefer, 2010:383). Thinking South Africa only in terms of racial capitalism misses its immersion in patriarchy and particularly white male privilege (Shefer, 2010).

2.3 South Africa: Race-class and its others

Early approaches in the social sciences to explaining ‘South Africa’ were white-centric modernist narratives lauding colonial expansion in teleological and Social Darwinist terms as a European civilising mission and God’s plan (Worden, 1994; Alexander, 2002). The technological and scientific superiority of the Europeans over the Africans […] was so great that it was taken as not only a gift from God but as bestowing on Europeans the moral right to rule over all other peoples…’ (Alexander, 2002:10). This intellectual legacy continued among
Afrikaner nationalist academics (cf. Krüger, 1977), while liberal-pluralist scholars designated apartheid an irrational, primordially Afrikaner aberration due to the ‘frontier tradition’ which would eventually be corrected by the ‘colour-blind’ market to follow the ‘normal’ pattern to a liberal and later welfare state (Maré, 2003; Posel, 2002). From the 1970s onwards, the revisionist or neo-Marxist position (R. Davies, D. O’Meara, M. Legassick) replaced the liberal-pluralist interpretations of race domination with class domination. While both strands made important contributions (Worden, 1994; Alexander, 2002; O’Meara, 1983), both collapsed into reductionism (Worden, 1994:3; Norval, 1996; Dubow, 1992:209; Posel, 2002:78; Ally, 2005). The discord over whether race or class should enjoy precedence in analysis continues in postapartheid South Africa (Alexander, 2002:26; Seekings and Nattrass, 2005; Erasmus, 2005:11-4; Seekings, 2008), as it determines the course of policy and activism (Maré, 2003:33).

Postmodern discourse analysis charts a way out of ‘oversimplified and deterministic analytical frameworks’ to study ideology, politics and culture on their own terms (Chipkin, 2007:18) and to deepen democracy as ‘an academic-cum-political task’ Alexander, 2002:27). Similarly, Norval (1996:27,139) proposes analysing the discursive construction of identities, which exposes the relationship between apartheid and capitalism to be contingent rather than necessary while showing how apartheid shaped all social relations.

This would carve a way to studying the still (relative to race and class) under-examined gender relations that underpinned apartheid and continues to shape postapartheid identities, not to speak of interconnected and mostly unexamined sexuality (Shefer, 2010). Manicom’s (1992:441-3) comment that ‘the invisibility or “otherness” of women and non-whites […] embedded in the very epistemological assumptions and analytic strategies’ exposes why gender does not feature in the class-race debate – ‘despite very fundamental categories of state and politics - like citizen, worker, the modern state itself - [being] shot through with gender; they were in fact historically constructed and reproduced as masculine categories, predicated on the subordination of women’ (p.444). The ‘sexual apartheid’ of conceptually separating women and family ‘from the “important” domains of men’ misrepresented colonialism, for example, by
dismissing families as ‘mere’ feminine spheres when they were core sites of class construction (Bradford, 1996:352, 357). This ‘conceptual denial’ of women mirrored women’s status in South African social and cultural structures (Bradford, 1996:354-7; Penzhorn, 2005). While gender only became ‘a more respectable concept in southern African studies’ in the early 1990s, its position within social analysis had still not been resolved (Walker, 1990:3; Bradford, 1996:351-2). Subsequent scholarship has started to fill the lacuna (e.g. in historiography, see Hyslop, 1995; McKenzie, 1996; Lester, 1998; Dagut, 2000; Keegan, 2001; Worden, 2012).

Walker (1990) raised the temporally and spatially contingent meanings of ‘woman’ in relation to ‘other significant markers of social power’ (p.26). Manicom’s (1992) addition is particularly relevant for this study:

There is no pre-given, historically ‘true’ ‘woman’ or ‘women’ that can be ferreted out from beneath [...] racial and class versions of womanhood [...] To assume a fixed opposition between men and women suppresses the diversity within each of those binary categories, invariably allowing normative or essentialist gender definitions to infuse our understandings. It removes from investigation that which has to be explained, namely, the meanings of those gender categories relative to their histories, relative to other social constructions (p.454).

Therefore, it would not suffice to tack on ‘patriarchy’ to break through the ‘sterility of the race-class debate’ (p.463). Rather, Manicom proposed a theoretical shift to a poststructuralist focus -- from ‘who rules and why’ to questioning modes of political subjection: how state and non-state sites manufacture ‘women’ as objects for rule in a mobilisation of normative ‘gender meanings [...] as metaphors of governance and of domination and subordination in relation to specific historic regimes...’ (pp.456, 458, 463). Others authors have proposed intersectional analyses to explore new questions and research areas as opened by postmodern and postcolonial modes (Posel, 2002:81; Distiller and Steyn, 2004).

The next section briefly examines the four categories of significance to this study, approached in their intersectional entanglements.
2.3.1 Heterofemininity

Early feminist theorists distinguished between sex as biological difference and gender as culturally constructed to emphasise the fabricated dimension of the latter (Jackson, 1999:123-4). By the end of the 1980s some theorists were cautioning that ‘women’ and ‘men’ were not biological givens but social groups distinguished by hierarchy and exploitation, as Jackson (1999:131) put it.

The shift to a postmodern emphasis on discursivity saw gender defined as ‘nothing but the variable configuration of sexual-discursive positionalities’ (De Lauretis, 1987:7). With the feminist turn to corporeality, a diverse array of feminists, including Butler and Irigaray (1993), work to dislocate the essentialising of sex which places the body as ‘pure’ biology outside of culture (Grosz, 1994:17-8).

Since Adrienne Rich’s (1980) exposé of compulsory heterosexuality as rendering lesbian existence deviant or repulsive or simply erasing it, sexuality has increasingly been legitimised as a feminist field of study and political action (Rubin, 1998). Foucault’s (1998) theory of sexuality influenced feminist thinking (Butler, 1990, 1993; McLaren, 2002; Bartky, 1990). The elaboration of power/knowledge, ‘the sphere of political technology’ linked through discourse, hinges on disciplinary techniques and regulatory methods that have not so much effected a prohibition as a proliferation of sexualities (Foucault, 1998:146), including a ‘reverse’ or counter-discourse of homosexuality (p.101). Butler (1990), drawing on Foucault, finds that sex artificially unifies unrelated sexual functions and postures in discourse as causal interior essence which produces pleasures and desires as sex-specific (p.128). Despite Rich’s 1980 essay, conceptual frameworks until the 1990s mostly assumed (hetero)sexuality, unquestioned except when dealing with the ‘sexual other’ (Richardson, 1998). Queer theory signalled a decisive disruption of the sociological habit of examining homosexuality as non-normative -- ‘the outside’ -- ignorant of it already being ‘inside’ (Namaste, 1994). Butler (1990) conceives (hetero)sex-gender power as follows: ‘The univocity of sex, the internal coherence of gender and the binary framework for both sex and gender are [...] regulatory fictions that consolidate and naturalise the convergent power regimes of masculine and heterosexist oppression’ (p.46).
While homosexuality and heterosexuality are both regulatory inventions dating from the 19th century (Faderman, 2001), heterosexuality is presented as universal and essential (Katz, 2000:137). Heterosexuality infuses the social realm to the extent of representing ‘the idea of normal behaviour which is central to the concept of the social and the process of socialisation into the social realm’ (Richardson, 1998:13). It is produced as a negative or exclusionary code, a sanction and a law of discourse in which the speakable is distinguished from the unspeakable, the legitimate from the illegitimate, the desired from the undesirable (Butler, 1990:89; Steyn and van Zyl, 2009:3). This sexual hierarchisation marks those that pursue marginal sexualities as sick, sinful or criminal; they pay the price while heterosexual, reproductive marriage, occupying the centre, ‘confers the prize’ (Steyn and van Zyl, 2009:5).

South African feminism, involved in the forging of democracy in the early 1990s, shifted to a politics of difference to problematise white, western, heterofemininity (Meintjes, 1993:39; Steyn, 1998). However, sexuality as wrought by apartheid still remains unexamined, especially relative to race and class (Shefer, 2010). Steyn and van Zyl (2009) point to South African sexualities’ immersion in westcentric versions of sex and sexuality due to whiteness and postcoloniality. Apartheid inaugurated ‘racist sexualisation’ which continues to produce and regulate racialised bodies (Ratele, 2009:295, 301, 302-3). Lesbian sexualities have claimed intelligibility in democratic South Africa through human rights activism and knowledge production (Morgan and Wieringa 2005; Judge, Manion and de Waal, 2008; Nkabinde, 2008).

Still, feminist engagement with sex in South Africa has been suffused with reproduction or violence, with concomitant silences about sexual pleasures, reinforcing heteronormativity (van Zyl, 2005:24). Walker (1995:424) cautions that motherhood continues to carry a ‘normative authority’ in postapartheid South Africa. Despite motherhood’s vaunted universalism that commonsense understandings so readily embrace, it is dependent on historical formations of families and production. In the mid-1990s, the normative ‘Good Mother’ still moulded subjectivities. Child-care was still the hallmark of how ‘the Good Mother’ interpellates white middle class women – ironically, given the ‘delegation’ of child-care to ‘a domestic worker or a nanny’ (p.425). Samuelson
(2007) posits that postapartheid ‘re-membering’ of the nation ‘dismembers’
women’s bodies as ‘women are shaped into the ideal forms that reflect the
desired national body – usually that of Mother...’ (p.2).

For Afrikaans-speaking heterosexual white women, the objects of this
study, persistent construction of woman-as-carer infuses these subjects, who
construe their sexual desires as in service of ‘the man': sex is ‘given passively to
care for their husbands’ (Spies, 2012:26, own translation). Matrimony translates
into automatic masculine access to female bodies, as refusal is tantamount to
‘contempt'; sex ‘is something that others do to them and define for them’ (Spies,
2012:38; own translation). However, the normalisation of intra-household
(sexual) violence against Afrikaner women during apartheid has been challenged
by autobiographical or fictional narratives (Lötter, 2004; de Villiers, 2004;
Russell, 1997). Nevertheless, the terms of postapartheid nation-building, still
based on westcentric constructions of ‘woman’, foreclose feminine subjectivity
by reproducing a meaning of rape that continues to be defined by the patriarchal
symbolic order (du Toit, 2009). Postfeminist sexualisation has emerged in
Afrikaans discourses, as exemplified by popular culture book Lang Bene en
Lipstiek. Gebruik jou seksualiteit en behaal sukses [Long legs and lipstick. Use your
sexuality and attain success] (Rust, 2012).

2.3.2 Whiteness and its particularisms

Critical whiteness studies arises from critical race theory (CRT),
originating in legal studies in the US. Questions intensified across disciplines
about the continued salience of race and ethnicity in the late 20th century
(Goldberg and Solomos, 2002). This study is situated in the social constructionist
branch of CRT, rather than the realist/economic determinist, as the former
emphasises the productive character of discourse as undivided from material
effects (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001).

Both race and ethnicity are not ‘natural categories’ but discursively
generated within social struggles, providing language for naming and explaining
differences (Goldberg and Solomos, 2002:3). Race is fabricated to accord
otherness on the basis of contingent bodily attributes, assigning belonging and
exclusion, privileges and (dis)enfranchisements (p.3). Racialised norms prop up
the illusion of ‘race’ as a stable, objective category (Maynard, 2001:122; Distiller and Steyn, 2004:4-5; Murji and Solomos, 2005). Of relevance to this study, ‘[r]acist culture has been one of the central ways in which modern social subjects make sense of and express themselves about the world they inhabit; it has been key in their responding to the world they conjointly make’ (Goldberg, 1993:9).

Gilroy (2007), Balibar (1991), Rattansi and Westwood (1994) and Essed (2002) discern a shift from biological to cultural justifications for racism. In response to antiracist mobilisation, new right discourses conjure ‘primordial notions of ethnic exclusivity’ (Goldberg and Solomos, 2002:8). The goal of racial supremacy based on social hierarchy has been replaced with cultural homogeneity, elaborated through tradition, while structural inequalities are covered with racist denials (Goldberg and Solomos, 2002). However, Stoler (2002:381) warns against finding novelties that may set up obfuscating distinctions, pointing out that what has been posited as new racism’s centring of the family in a primary generative role (Gilroy, 2007) has been a feature of colonial racisms.

These uses reveal that ethnicity and race operate according to similar logics but they are impossible to containerise due to the ways in which they overlap (Rattansi, 1994:53). Ethnicity was invented in the early 1900s (Hattam, 2001) at the time of the nascent stirrings of ‘the Afrikaner’ (Bradford, 2000; du Toit, 2003; Vincent, 1999, 2000). It compares to other categories in being without an essence or original features but fabricating itself as a ‘natural community’ in the past or future, with boundaries continuously being (re)drawn (A.D. Smith, 1998:204; Hall, 2001; Rattansi, 1994:53). It is produced through the competing and complementary routes of race and language which, articulated together, invoke the nation (volk) as a self-determined unit (Balibar, 1991:96; Hofmeyr, 1987). Ethnicity is ‘cultural socialisation’ (Goldberg, 2002:247); operationalised as a cultural marker (Rattansi, 1994:53).

Hall (1997a) detected ‘a return to the local’ in the emergence of new ethnicities in the wake of globalising forces and the dislocation of the equivalence between national cultural identities and nation-states. Of relevance to this study is how responses to the decline of the nation-state are both global and local. It is a ‘dangerous moment’ as embattlement gives rise to narrow and
defensive exclusivist national identities (p.25). The shift is away from singular entities of power to decentralised social and economic organisation. What Hall calls the ‘global postmodern’ encapsulates both the overconcentrated capitalist economic power which paradoxically homogenises and lives through cultural particularism and pleasure as consumption and the enclosed, defensive national cultural identity nostalgic about nationalism (p.32-3).

In contrast, ‘a return to the local’ is a finding of languages about the past and hidden histories, local roots that are knowable against the standardising of the global postmodern and its ‘flux of diversity’ (p.35). This reaching for grounding is a rediscovery of ethnicity. Similar to the global postmodern, it is a contradictory terrain, and it can adopt an outward or inward-moving posture. It can usher in a withdrawal into self-protective, exclusivist enclaves, resisting modernity in a turn towards fundamentalism. Outward postures remember the positioning of the particular within a discourse to avoid mistaking itself for a universal identity; and to think ethnicity as a continuous process, filled with contradictions. In relation to the new globals and new locals, Hall (1997b) asks: ‘what are the new subjects of this politics of position? [...] Can identity be re-thought and re-lived, in and through difference?’ (p.40)

Whiteness, as ‘structural and experiential position’ within ‘race’ (Distiller and Steyn, 2004:5) is best understood as ‘an ideologically supported and reproduced social positioning, which has psychological, performative, cultural, economic, rhetorical, institutional, political, and other, dimensions’ (Steyn, 2003:111). It is a ‘proposition imposed through subordination’ (Harris, 1995:281). In analysing whiteness as property, Harris adds: as an identity it is not ‘inherently unifying’ but constituted through exclusion of those deemed ‘not white’, also from privileges; the exclusivity of whiteness enhances its value, elevating difference to white supremacy and relegating black others to racial subjugation; and white supremacy is reproduced though social interactions with black others degraded as socially inferior (p.283). Exclusivity is closely policed as whiteness hinges on ‘the existence of the symbolic Other’, which fabricates reified white unity (p.290). The unmarked status of whiteness renders it invisible, ‘the view from nowhere’ (Cranny-Francis et al, 2003:70) from whence the ‘other’ is manufactured or analysed. Chambers (1997:189) provides a
valuable exposition on the functioning of marked/unmarked, relative categories borrowed from linguistics but applied as follows: power mediates social difference, according unmarkedness the privileges of normalcy and unexaminedness. Markedness, in contrast, receives equivalences with 'derivedness, deviation, secondariness, and examinability, which function as indices of disempowerment’ (p.189).

Whiteness in South Africa came under increased scrutiny in the 2000s (Steyn, 2001, 2003, 2004; Ballard, 2004; Salusbury and Foster, 2004). Its permutations differ from the North American version delineated in CRT, as it is aware of itself and its privilege was normalised, rather than purposively concealed. Steyn (2003, 2004) finds that even ‘hybridising’ postapartheid South African whiteness, including Afrikaans whiteness, devises rehabilitative strategies to reinforce its grip on ethnic entitlements. One such strategy is ‘inward migration’, or withdrawal from shared national spaces, which fits the defensive mode of Hall’s ‘return to the local’, while another is immersion in the hegemonic whiteness that neoliberal governance enables (Blaser and van der Westhuizen 2012:386). Explorations of white femininity discover an identity in crisis (Horrell, 2004; West, 2009). Horrell finds ‘a homology of guilt and subterfuge, desire and fear’ (Horrell, 2004:766). White Afrikaans author and poet Antjie Krog's (1999) writing owns up to connivance with white male perpetrators of apartheid crimes in texts filled with guilt, shame and ‘desire for an impossible reparation’ (p.774). She simultaneously acknowledges and is repulsed by her Afrikaner heritage. White women writers are in the throes of a ‘radical redefinition’ characterised by self-effacement (p.776).

2.3.3 Middleclassness and white heterofemininity

Skeggs, in foregrounding class in her examinations of its entanglements with gender-race (1997, 2004, 2005, 2008a, 2008b), points to the inadequacy of understandings of class in approaching current class struggle. With the displacement of the Marxist unit of analysis and vector of history in social sciences, class may be acknowledged in the construction of self (e.g. Callero, 2003) but is infrequently examined. Hobsbawm (2003:290), studying the European bourgeois in the 19th century, found middle class meant being superior
and moral. But, as the ‘ancient virtues’ of abstention and effort could not be used to describe many of the wealthy by the 1870s, biological class superiority was clapsed as reason for the dominance of the bourgeois. Social Darwinism was applied to class as it was with race. This confirms Butler’s assertion that analytically distinguishing between race and class only serves to remind that ‘analysis of the one cannot proceed without analysis of the other’ (Butler, 1997: 38). A biological class superiority was posited. Due to natural selection: ‘the bourgeois was, if not a different species, then at least the member of a superior race, a higher stage in human evolution, distinct from the lower orders who remained in the historical or cultural equivalent of childhood... From master to master-race was thus only a short step.’ (p.290). Here is the intersection with gender: The ‘worker’ was portrayed in the image of ‘woman’, says Hobsbawm: ‘[t]he right to dominate, the unquestioned superiority of the bourgeois as a species, implied not only inferiority but ideally an accepted, willing inferiority, as in the relation between man and woman (which once again symbolises much about the bourgeois world view’) (p.290). The ‘working class’ as a category was conceptualised to secure middle class identity and power by separating the middle classes from ‘definable “others”’ (Skeggs, 1997). As such, class is ‘a discursive, historically specific construction, a product of middle class political consolidation, which includes elements of fantasy and projection’ (Skeggs, 1997:5). The subjects in Skeggs’s (1997:115) study aspire towards ‘respectability’ which they regard and which has historically been regarded as the hallmark of middleclassness. The recent social invisibility of class ‘suggests that these differences are now institutionalised, legitimated and well established’ (Skeggs, 1997:5, 7). Through globalising capitalism, the middle class is recreating the world in its image but has become elevated above scrutiny—as opposed to the working class and ‘the poor’ which are constantly being dissected.

In later work, Skeggs (2004; 2005; 2008a; 2008b) investigates the uses of class in the verification of some subjectivities rather than others. She argues that as neoliberalism expands as an ordering rationality, an unequal distribution of access to technologies of self translates into a privileging of some ‘to both know and produce themselves’ (Skeggs, 2008a:13). The ‘knowing self’ is the bourgeois self. Unintelligibility is imposed on working class women, Skeggs (2004)
cautions in an alert comparable to that of Butler (1990) regarding lesbian women. Simultaneously the bourgeois position is appropriating previously abject dispositions of working class sexuality, as part of the commodification of class, to open new markets (2008b:45). The postfeminist swell, in tandem with neoliberalism (Gill and Scharff, 2011), is arguably a part of this. In Europe, postfeminism is distinctly white and middle class, defined by its exclusions on the basis of race, class and other differences. Middle-class white women can achieve ‘empowerment’ in formulaic female sexualities through enthusiastic performance of ‘patriarchal stereotypes of sexual servility’ (Tasker and Negra, 2007:3). Empowerment is predicated on self-confidence and sexual attractiveness which can be attained through the services of ‘the fashion-beauty complex’ (Roberts, 2007:229; Thornham, 2000:168). Thus, in mass media messaging ‘women are much less likely to be shown as passive sexual objects than as empowered, heterosexually desiring sexual subjects, operating playfully in a sexual marketplace that is presented as egalitarian or actually favourable to women’ (Gill, 2009:99). Postfeminism is associated with a move from the judging male gaze to a self-policing narcissistic gaze (Gill, 2009).

2.4 Afrikaner nationalism and its objects

Anderson’s evocative concept of nations as ‘imagined communities’ (1991) of which in the mind of each member ‘lives the image of their communion’ (p.5) put paid to the idea that nations are ‘organic, natural givens, flowering spontaneously into history as the teleological unfolding of a national spirit’ (McClintock, 1990:199). It is worth stressing that Anderson inflects his concept differently to Gellner’s (1964) influential assertion that nationalism is an invention of nations. Instead of nationalism as masquerade, which suggests that ‘true’ communities could exist, Anderson’s relevant contribution here is: ‘Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined.’ McClintock elaborates: ‘[N]ations are [not] allegorical phantasmagoria of the mind, but […] intricate social fabrications invented through daily contest -- in newspapers, schools, churches, presses and popular culture’ (1990:199). Norval’s (1990:140) definition of ideology captures the redundancy of Marxist notions of true and false: ideology (such as Afrikaner
nationalism) is a ‘will to totality’ rather than a false consciousness or a belief system of a specific class. It denotes ‘a discourse which attempts to constitute the social as closed, to construct meanings and to mute the effects of the infinite play of differences’.

It was also understood by the 1990s that Afrikaner nationalism could no longer, as both liberal-pluralist and Afrikaner nationalist scholarship had done before, be ascribed to the pursuit of a ‘primordial ethnic agenda’ or ‘an unchanging, timeless tradition’ (Dubow, 1992:209). Neither was there an ‘organic “Afrikaner identity” rumbling through South African history and mysteriously uniting all Afrikaners into a monolithic volk’ (Hofmeyr, 1987:95).

Rather, modernity involves a ‘narrative of the nation’ which conceals disparities such as gender, class and race and ‘stitches up’ such ‘deep internal divisions and differences’ (Hall, 1992:297-9; 1996) into a family of the nation (McClintock, 1993:64). This narrative, through prescribed continuity and a performative strategy, iteratively seek to domesticate the disruptive potentials of the cultures of the everyday into a ‘community’, argues Rattansi (1994:41, emphasis in original). The family resemblance between nations, ethnicities and other collective identities is a shared ‘cultural politics of representation’ (p. 74).

Hall’s ‘stitching up’ resonates with Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985:127-144) concept of ‘chains of equivalence’ in which different identities or particularities are strung together to construct a hegemonic formation, such as the nation (Chipkin, 2007:195-6) or, in this study, the volk. Nationality subsumes or expels differences to present itself as uniform (Hall, 1997a:22). It furnishes the subject with an identity, as it produces a self exclusive of other identities (Eisenstein 2000:37) through ‘frequently violent and always gendered social contests’ (McClintock, 1993:61). This is done through the ‘invention and performance’ of social difference within the ‘national family of man’ (p.64). The family legitimises social hierarchy – woman to man, child to adult – ‘within a putative organic unity of interests’ and therefore sanctions exclusions and hierarchies in the nation (p.61,64).

Eisenstein (2000:42), criticising Anderson (1991) for not gendering or racialising his ‘imagined community’, finds the nation a fraternity for which women, silenced, furnish the borders. The Afrikaner nationalist volk as fraternity, led by the Broederbond (League of Brothers, a secret society of
Afrikaner nationalist men), invested heavily in not only racial but gender difference (McClintock, 1993:71). Central to weaving the differences out of sight and into the family of the Afrikaner nation is the paradoxical trope of the volksmoeder.

2.5 Volksmoeder: What is a national family without a mother?

Anthias and Yuval-Davis (1989:7-10) discerned the following primary modes of women’s engagement in ethnic and national processes: biological reproduction; symbolic figuration of differences and boundaries; reproduction of the national culture; participation as supporters and nurturers of men. Afrikaner nationalism mostly articulated motherhood with its circumscribed bourgeois prescription of passivity and domesticity, figured in the volksmoeder (Walker, 1995:422). This study approaches the volksmoeder as the historical signifier in which the convergence of class, race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality served as a basis for social hierarchy, regulation and exclusion among white Afrikaans-speakers. From its deployment in the South African War, the volksmoeder discursively morphed from kragdadigheid [forcefulness] and veglustigheid [combativeness]; to actively recruiting subjects for Afrikaner nationalism in the ‘feminine’ spheres of whites-only welfare and in politics; to self-sacrifice and domestic cloistering for God, volk and family during Afrikaner nationalist dominance. See Appendix A (a short history of the volksmoeder) for a brief history of the banishment of Afrikaans-speaking white women to the home in the 1930s, from which they only emerged to re-enter the public domain in significant numbers during the transition to democracy in the 1990s.

The literal domestication of these subjects through their relegation to the ‘private’ sphere of the household and their concomitant invisibilisation, from particularly the 1930s onwards, does not divest the identity of political content (Kruger, 1990). Indeed, it paradoxically demonstrates the feminist notion of the private being political. The public/private division serves to obfuscate the identity construction and related group production that happens in the ‘private sphere’ (Peterson, 2000:58). Studying European woman, Moon (1999) describes the home as a space of enculturation reproducing discourses about gender, race, sexuality and class into which women (and men) are inducted. Butler (1997a:44)
shows how the production of gender is indistinguishable from the production of human beings, how gendering hinges on the social regulation of the family as site for the reproduction of heterosexual persons ‘fit for entry into the family as social form’ (p.40). The heterosexual family manufactures ‘naturalised sexes [...] to secure the heterosexual dyad as the holy structure of sexuality, they continue to underwrite kinship, legal and economic entitlement, and those practices that delimit what will be a socially recognisable person’ (p.44).

In Afrikaner nationalism, ‘women’s work’ was politicised in the home as space for the induction of children into Afrikaner nationalist culture and apartheid race relations with domestic workers (du Plessis, 2010:163-7, 188, own translation). The apartheid Afrikaner family was the site of production of racialised, classed and sexualised femininities and masculinities in service of the volk. Afrikaner women ‘were complicit in deploying the power of motherhood in the exercise and legitimation of white domination’ as engaged but marginalised producers of Afrikaner identity (McClintock, 1993:72). This troubles attempted insulation of the feminine domestic from the masculine political domain and Afrikaner women’s denial of political culpability.

Increased materialism among Afrikaners leads Gaitskell and Unterhalter (1989) to see a displacement of the home as Afrikaner nationalist base from the 1960s. Cloete (1992) contends that material advance had rendered the volksmoeder ‘inappropriate’ and ‘redundant’. Replacing white Afrikaans-speaking women’s ‘first confinement’ as volksmoeders (p.48), their second ‘confinement faces [...] especially first-world women [...] The visual images in the mass media of beautiful women and how to become more beautiful, and therefore more acceptable (to men) place women under even greater patriarchal control than in the past’ (p.54). R. van der Merwe (2011) also concludes that the volksmoeder is superfluous, interpreting its sexualisation from the 1970s as an indication of ‘the Afrikaner woman’ being ‘downgraded’ from ‘active’ fundraiser and organiser in NP election victories to ‘pin-up girls’. An NP electioneering advertisement in a student newspaper of 2 October 1970 showed a blond[e], buxom girl in a mini-dress [...] beckoning a male student [...] to come and vote. At the bottom of the cartoon [was] the
Instead, Afrikaans poet and writer Antjie Krog (Brink, 1988 quoted in Cloete, 1992) reads the coincidence of woman, home, western femininity and consumerism as rendering woman a reflector of Afrikaner masculine glory:

The Afrikaner woman, in my view, is a privileged species, unique on Earth. We enjoy the limitless freedom [of] time granted us by cheap, intelligent, black domestic help. So we can select the titbits and specialise in entertaining, or designing clothes, or studying, or gardening, becoming a connoisseur in silver, and making our own pots or poetry for Christmas [...] I blame the men for it. They like it that way. The more idle their wives, the more successful they obviously must be. Most have remained totally unliberated, living the way their ancestors did -- complaining about the government, hunting up north, or telling racist jokes in clouds of braaivleis [barbecue] smoke (p.53).

The next section proposes a prism to study these class-race-gender-sexuality intersections.

2.6 Ordentlikheid, an ethnicised respectability (re)animating volksmoeders

Hattam (2001:66) cautions against whiteness research losing sight of ethnicity, as happens among US scholars in the field. By ‘simply collapsing ethnicity into whiteness’, some questions remain unanswered, such as what the cultural and political significance of ethnicity is, or why a separate language of ethnicity was required if racial assimilation was the prime objective. Norval (1996) insists that ethnicity and race cannot be reduced to one another when studying apartheid. Projects of hegemony within and between ethnic collectivities can be analysed, also to reveal redistribution conflicts (Rattansi, 1994:58). Differentiating between whiteness and ethnicity allows discernment of their ‘interactive effects’ (Hattam, 2001:68). Of particular interest to this study is ethnicity as situational, a ‘plastic and malleable social construction, deriving its meaning from those who invoke it and the relations of power between individuals and groups [...] [and] from its articulation with other kinds of identity, notably class and gender’ (A.D. Smith 1998:204). Ethnicisation happens
as social formations are nationalised; indeed Balibar (1991:96) argues that the fiction of ethnicity is crucial for nationalism, which wields it as a double inscription of belonging: ‘what it is that makes one belong to oneself and [...] to other fellow human beings’. It provides the ‘nation’ – or volk in this case – with a ‘pre-existing’ unity and allows interpellation in ‘the name of the collectivity whose name one bears’ (p.96).

In critiquing South African historiography, Scully (1995:341) pointed out that historians had not sufficiently analysed the multilayered colonial and metropolitan histories in which sexuality, gender, class and race functioned as co-constitutive positionalities. This included being ‘referents to each other’, for example that racial classification was conjured from ‘a complex identification of class, sexual and racial markers’ (Scully, 1995:341). This study approaches such identitary processes through the lens of ordentlikheid, an ethnicised respectability, positing it as a mode for manufacturing, organising and regulating co-constitutive relations of gender, sexuality, class and race among Afrikaans-speaking whites. In particular, this study examines ordentlikheid as an intersectional nexus of disciplinary regimes – an intersectional dynamo (re)animating normative volksmoeder white, middle class heterofemininity. The discourse of ordentlikheid activates a double movement: it derives from and elaborates on white English-speaking respectability.

2.6.1 Respectability: A short history

Whiteness studies as focus allows for the tracking of the whitening of ‘Afrikaners’, as it historicises race and its adaptations over time (Hattam, 2002:63). Respectability is a 19th century bourgeois European invention exhibiting longevity partly due to its absorption by nationalism – later also by 20th century South African nationalisms, in reaction to British imperialism as nationalism writ large (Mosse, 1982; Hyslop, 1995; Lester, 1998; Thomas, 2006). Respectability’s usual articulation is as a ‘sexual ideology’ (Hull, 1982:265) with an emphasis on sexual control, restraint and prohibition. However, Foucault (1998:10-49) points out the limitations of the ‘repressive hypothesis’, as sexuality as a technology of power has not stymied, but multiplied, sexual heterogeneities. Given respectability’s historical invocation to demarcate the
bourgeoisie as dominant class (Hull, 1982: 248-9), the study applies respectability intersectionally, with sexuality in co-constitutive operations with other normative categories. Mosse (1982) describes the elements of respectability as dichotomisations such as normalcy/abnormalcy, man/woman, masculinity/femininity, heterosexual/homosexual, white/black, in which the second, lesser term degrades ‘the nation’ (pp.226, 228). This was the stuff that made the ‘absolutely hierarchised world defined by polarities’ that British imperialism generalised and which privileged adult over child, masculine over feminine, modern over primitive, normal over abnormal (Nandy, 1983:x). Englishness held sway as ‘a strongly centred, highly exclusive and exclusivist form of cultural identity’ which claimed for itself the right to ‘command [...] the discourses of almost everyone else [...] the colonised other was positioned in its marginality, devised in relation to the metropolitan centre. The British empire worked to employ differences across its localities to contribute to one system’ (Hall 1997a:20, 37). The Cape colony as of one these localities similarly saw the imposition of British ideas of respectability, particularly in relation to gender regulation (Ross, 2009). See Appendix B for a South African history of respectability.

2.6.2 Subaltern Afrikaner whiteness

Race and ethnicity function as political resources for both dominant and subordinate groups to advance their identities and related claims, which means race and ethnicity are not only forced but can also be devised as resistance (Goldberg and Solomos, 2002:4) This is exemplified by the conjuring of ‘the Afrikaner’ (Hofmeyr 1987; McClintock, 1993; Bradford, 2000). For Gaitskell and Unterhalter (1989:62) the volksmoeder is an active component of an Afrikaner nationalism which was out ‘to rebuild [Afrikaans white] distinctiveness for parity with or even domination of the English’. It is the assertion of a particularism against a hegemonic whiteness; an assertion against ‘the ethnicity which places all other ethnicities’ (Hall, 1997a).

Afrikaner identity works as a subaltern whiteness at a mutually productive interface with the normative whiteness of white English-speaking South African (WESSA) identity (Steyn, 2003; Steyn, 2004). Examining
‘Afrikaner’ identity through the lens of ordentlikheid surfaces this key co-generative relationality. Subalternity is a Gramscian concept associated with postcolonial studiesiv but used here defined as a non-dominant, marked, particularist or racialised identity ‘different from [any] of several competing identities’ (Howard, 2000:386). Gabriel (1998) distinguishes subaltern whiteness as one of several modes of whiteness which all share ‘a point of privilege, a position of power from where it has been possible to define, regulate, judge as well as accrue material and symbolic awards’ (p.184).

The conditions of subaltern whiteness arise from whiteness never being denied or conferred ‘once and for all’ and being characterised by changing boundaries of exclusions and inclusions along patterns of domination and subordination (p.185). These processes of racialisation are hidden and involve ‘the strategic use of one version of whiteness against another’ (p.185). Groups belonging to ‘minority whiteness’ have been both ‘the object of racism as well as colluding in it’ (p.5).

Subaltern whiteness shifts over time but remains ‘prey’ to normative whiteness, which builds whiteness into coded discourses of universalism in denial of its ethnic particularity (pp.184,185). Charton’s normative 1975 essay summarising the ‘empirical evidence’ of WESSA attitudes to ‘the Afrikaner’ list positive and negative clichés, such as simple, warm, uncultured, superstitious and lacking in efficiency. Pejorative terms for Afrikaners included: ‘Dutchman’, ‘hairyback’, ‘rock spider’, ‘mealie muncher’, ‘takhaar’, ‘bywoner’, ‘backvelder’ and ‘plank’. These ‘mocking’ terms show ‘the element of cultural and social superiority’ of WESSA identity (p.45-6). Charton adds: ‘Fifty years ago rural stereotypes were justified in the reality of the situation... [...] there was also some justification for socially superior attitudes on the part of the English’ as Afrikaners were lagging in education and business (p.46). Disparaging depictions about Afrikaner civil servants were ‘not misplaced’, given Afrikaners’ preponderance in the state bureaucracy (p.47). The racialisation of Afrikaner whiteness is confirmed with Charton’s note of the WESSA concern that Afrikaner nationalist ‘semi-barbarous political parvenus’ endangered white supremacy during apartheid (p.47). Such apprehensions echo racial anxieties in the 18th century over the lack of apparent European-style evolution among the Dutch
settlers, with European visitors questioning whether white expansion into Africa would indeed promote ‘civilisation’, or lead to white degeneration into barbarism (Fredrickson, 1981:36). This fear was also expressed about the British settlers (Lester, 1998:521), confirming contestation between whitenesses.

Reformist Afrikaner nationalist intellectual Willem de Klerk in 1984 identified the root of ‘negative Afrikaner nationalism’ as a collective ‘inferiority syndrome’ and ‘feelings of humiliation’ due to ‘the great offence of the English’ (p.21). The longevity of this productive ‘syndrome’ is apparent from the 1990 objection from Afrikaner nationalist newspaper *Beeld* (6 September) to the historically WESSA-owned *Financial Mail*’s refusal to use the official name Spoornet for the state-owned railways, because the word *spoor* (Afrikaans for rail) was not ‘good enough’ for them. Thus ‘the Afrikaner’ was constructed as an intermediate group mired between their aspirations to the power and affluence of the British/WESSAs, while threatened by competition from black people and population depletion through miscegenation (van der Westhuizen, 2007:60).

Afrikaner whiteness has historically ‘defied’ and ‘resisted’ WESSA hegemonisation (Steyn, 2003:218), deploying the counteracting discourse of Afrikaner nationalism which articulated ‘the Afrikaner’ with *volkstrots* (people’s pride), noble suffering and Calvinist decency (van der Westhuizen, 2007:59). These deployments have succeeded in installing a dominant trope in South African discourses, as illustrated by the following contemporary example emanating from South African president Jacob Zuma. It exhibits elements articulated to produce the trope of Afrikaner *ordentlikheid*, particularly its co-production with a hidden WESSA identity. Zuma expressed appreciation at ‘a meeting with representatives from Afrikaner groups’ for ‘the Afrikaner’s honesty’ and added:

> When the Afrikaner says, ‘you are my friend’ [or] ‘you are my enemy’, they mean it [...] Up to this day, they don't carry two passports, they carry one. They are here to stay. [...] Of all the white groups that are in South Africa, it is only the Afrikaners that are truly South Africans in the true sense of the word. [...] It is the only white tribe in a black continent or
outside of Europe which is truly African, the Afrikaner. (www.iol.co.za, 2 April 2009; Washington Post, 14 April 2009).

In this text, the ‘absent but present’ co-constitutive white counterpart to ‘the Afrikaner’ is the WESSA. WESSA identity by inference includes ‘carrying two passports’, which precludes ‘true’ belonging to South Africa and Africa as ‘two passports’ signify impermanence and foreignness. An equivalence is invoked between dual citizenship and dishonesty, or duplicity, the co-constitutive flipside being ‘the Afrikaner’s honesty’. Afrikaner nationalism historically wielded ‘belonging’ to claim entitlement to rule over South Africa. Zuma’s postapartheid intervention posits an inversion in which Afrikaners’ intermediate position is implicitly maintained but where ‘belonging’ renders them part of democratic South Africa.

2.6.3 Normative WESSA identity

While the ‘whiteness of the Afrikaner has been always already marked’ (Steyn, 2003:218), WESSA identity is exemplified by invisibilisation, its unexamined and normalised operation securing its ‘disproportionate influence’ in the South African symbolic order (Salusbury and Foster, 2004:108). WESSA identity claims normalcy by masquerading as ‘cultureless’ and lacking collective political aims, which it contrasts with other South African identities (Salusbury and Foster, 2004). WESSAs have historically been British identified and, post-1994, retain symbolic ascendancy from ‘a transnational culture of whiteness’ (Salusbury and Foster, 2004:108). See Appendix C for a historical tracking of the WESSA identity.

The gender, sexual, racial and class elements of a marked whiteness in relation to hegemonic whiteness are sutured into ordentlikheid, which captures the identitary complex under review in this study.

2.7 The end of ‘the Afrikaner’ and his volksmoeder?

The anti-apartheid Afrikaans newspaper, Vrye Weekblad [Free Weekly], announced in a headline on 24 August 1990 that ‘the Afrikaner volk does not exist’. The article’s author added: ‘the Afrikaners simply do not exist as a separate identifiable group any longer. There are, however, different groups or
fragments of Afrikaners, or Afrikaans-speaking whites. Some regard themselves as the Afrikaner volk, others simply as Boere [Boers], others as South Africans and others again as Afrikaans-speaking Africans' (Cloete, 1992:42-3). O’Meara (1997:7) agrees that:

[white Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa today do not define themselves in the same way as they did in the early 1950s [...] this shifting definition (or perhaps even abandonment) of Afrikaner identity is not explained by some collective coming to its senses [...] Rather, the conditions of existence which underpinned the framing of ‘Afrikaner’ identity in nationalist discourse have changed, as have the social position and roles of much of the white Afrikaans-speaking population. This latter point is crucial as it gives my answer to the question of exactly how such identities are constructed—i.e. through prolonged and contested processes of political struggle, not through mere discourse.

The conditions enabling the possibility of ‘the Afrikaner’ have indeed changed and can be analysed using ‘mere discourse’, as is done in this study. It approaches discourses sceptically, not expecting them to reveal their ideological disposition or ‘moral divisions’ readily, while questioning them on ‘their tactical productivity’ in effecting knowledge/power (Foucault 1998:102). Modern individual subjectivity is forged through knowledge/power relationships between institutions and individual bodies, which means that ‘the power to define is the power to create’ (Distiller and Steyn, 2004:1) – the very ‘prolonged and contested processes’ of which O’Meara speaks. As Foucault (1998) alerts us, we need to reorient ourselves to ‘a conception of power in which the privileging of sovereignty has been replaced by an analysis of a multiple and mobile field of force relations wherein far-reaching but never completely stable effects of domination are achieved’ (p.102). The terminal crisis in apartheid in the 1980s came about as a result of the ‘horror of indetermination’: ‘a situation in which the dominant discourse is unable to determine the lines of exclusion and inclusion according to which the identity of the social is constructed’ (Norval, 1996:133). Democratic discourses have been unleashed in the South African social order, which turn structural positions into sites of struggle by rendering
relations of subordination illegitimate (Chipkin, 2007:191). The purchase of the categories race, gender, class and sexuality has been disarticulated. Drawing on the theoretical framing in this chapter, and the methodology explained in the next chapter, this study analyses the variable compositions of these categories at the intersectional juncture of ordentlikheid. In probing the extent to which ‘the Afrikaner’ fraternity and its containerised volksmoeder femininity has been (dis)articulated, the study aims to show ‘how the various operators of power support one another, relate to one another, how they converge and reinforce one another in some cases, and negate and strive to annul one another in other cases’ (Foucault, 2003:45).

---

1 In the field of Cultural Studies, Stuart Hall (1996; 1997; 2002) in particular may be the closest to Laclau and Mouffe’s position (Critchley and Marchart, 2004: 10).

2 That said, the revisionist school’s analyses exposing the class formations underpinning Afrikaner nationalism (e.g. O’Meara’s [1983, 1996] investigations of volkskapitalisme) helped unpick liberal notions of monolithic Afrikanerdom.

3 Imported to South Africa amid intense contestations among Dutch and British settlers’ and metropolitan concepts with African and slave knowledges about race and sexuality, unleashed by the need to transform a slave society into one based on free wage labour after 1838 (Scully, 1995:338).

4 Subaltern studies developed in the 1980s out of a critical stance towards elitist historiography about colonial India by foregrounding subaltern groups as agents of history, particularly how in colonial India people resisted, e.g. a ‘politics of the people’ elite domination, as opposed to a politics of the elite (Chakrabarty, 2005:472). Later critiques about the absence of gender analysis and an unproblematised acceptance of subjectivity engendered feminist and postmodern adaptations, e.g. Spivak (1988).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter sets out the methodology utilised in this study, identifying key concepts, describing the research activities and reflecting on factors that may have enhanced or inhibited the process. It concurs with McCall’s (2005:1774) view of methodology: ‘a methodology is a coherent set of ideas about the philosophy, methods and data that underlie the research process and the production of knowledge’.

3.1 Research questions

As outlined in the previous chapter on theoretical positioning, subject formation in postmodernity is beholden to accelerated identitary ebbs and flows, globally, locally and in the interstices in-between. In the ‘new terrain into which history has thrown us’ we see ‘a multiplication of new (and not so new) identities in the collapse of the places from which universal subjects once spoke’ (Laclau, 1992:84). Space is expanded for political subjectivities that make decisions that dislocate social orders (Howarth, 2004:261). The white, masculine, bourgeois, heterosexual ‘view from nowhere’ is increasingly problematised while modernist projects such as the nation state and systems of inferiorisation such as apartheid are destabilised or dismantled. Investigating newly dislocated subject positions can be particularly productive to understand the subject as an effect of the dispersed operations of power.

This study is a qualitative, phased exploration of (dis)continuities in identifications in postapartheid South Africa. It specifically traces the (re)articulations of a previously hegemonic identity of Afrikaner femininity in a discursive field newly infused with signifiers that can now be regarded as floating signifiers -- democracy, woman, white. The primary questions concern the extent to which the expanded post-apartheid democratic space has allowed for the emergence of a new imaginary (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985; Smith, 1998) for the production of subjectivities beyond the normative Afrikaner nationalist volksmoeder [mother of the nation] ideal. The study captures (post)Afrikaner subjectivity through the interpretive lens of ordentlikheid, which demarcates a
space for this subaltern whiteness at the intersections of gender, sexuality, class and race. What are the contours of the particularist identity of ordentlikheid, or white Afrikaans-speaking middleclass subjectivities, specifically at intersections with femininity? How pliable is the conceptual confluence of ordentlikheid in reifying and dislocating volksmoeder figurations. What are the elements articulated to re-suture the identity of ordentlikheid amid interpellations by democratic discourses? To what extent have discourses of constitutionalism and human rights, through the (re)activation of signifiers such as gender equality and women’s empowerment, succeeded in interpellating subjects into troubling ordentlikheid and revising volksmoeder femininity? Is there an othering of apartheid identities, particularly the volksmoeder? Does ordentlikheid allow for openings that could make the subject positions under review susceptible to the project of radical democracy? Have subjectivities been disarticulated from the volksmoeder mooring by globalised discourses of white, western heterofemininity? If so, how?

3.2 Ontological positioning

In social constructionism, the focus of enquiry is on social practices because of a rejection of the notion of underlying structures that would reveal the ‘truth’ (Burr, 2003:9). While human beings experience the world as pre-given and fixed, they create and sustain social phenomena through social practices (Burr, 2003:13). The broad church of social constructionism is united by the following assertions (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002; de Fina, Schiffrin and Bamberg, 2007): discourses are social practices with constitutive effects; the social and the subject within it are historically and culturally specific, non-essentialist and contingent; and socially produced knowledge renders actions do-able and thinkable, or not.

problematise much of the objectivist understanding of social relations in the sociological tradition as having been reduced to the ‘metaphysics of presence’ (Laclau, 1990:180), i.e. ‘the assumption that society may be understood as an objective and coherent ensemble from foundations or laws of movement that are conceptually graspable’ (Wicke, 1994:22). Laclau (1990:182-3) argues that, rather than objectivity in which being is whole and fully constituted, human beings experience ‘society’ as a collection of conflicting forces that do not obey a unifying logic. Metaphysical thought, of which sociological thought is an extension, declares this failure of objectivity to be a problem of knowledge: there is a being of objects and their social and historical relations that is waiting to be discovered as a deeper rationality lies behind society’s apparent irrationality. But moving to deeper strata of knowledge only reveals more radical contingency, which means the being of objects is radically historical and objectivity is a social construction.

Social constructionism approaches identities as processes taking place in specific and concrete social occasions of negotiation and entextualisation that produce identitary constellations rather than individual monolithic constructs; and involve discursive work (De Fina, et al 2006:2). Identities are not simply represented through discourse but are rather performed and embodied (Butler, 1990, 1993). Thus changes in the definition of identities in time and space and the establishment of membership in new boundaries and social locations can be investigated.

Emphasis has shifted from pre-existing categorisations to the ‘locally occasioned, fluid and ever-changing nature of identity claims’ (De Fina et al., 2006:3). Social constructionism is broadly compatible with the postmodern framework, which foregrounds the multiplicity of subject positions which constitute ‘the individual’ in the social, thus positing difference as centrepiece of postmodernity (Maynard, 2001:127-8).

Difference as analytical tool allows a researcher to not only question dualities such as black vs. white or male vs. female but to problematise the unity of ‘race’, ‘blackness’ and ‘woman’ to point to these categories’ internal differentiations (Maynard, 2001:127). A multiplication of identitary possibilities can open ways to constructing emancipatory selves (Maynard, 2001:128). In this
study, ‘woman’, ‘white’, ‘middleclass’ and ‘heterosexual’ are not understood as given, immutable or unitary categories but as social constructions wielding differences with material effects, and are investigated as such, including their democratic potentialities.

3.3 Discourse analytical framework

Discourse analysis is a concept with divergent meanings across disciplines (Potter, 2008; van Dijk, 1993). A broad description of discourse analysis, deriving from discursive psychology, captures this study's utilisation of the method: as ‘the categories in language don’t reflect the world but constitute it’ (Weatherall, 2002:80), this study's aim is not simply about understanding language but 'to make a contribution to our understanding of issues of identity [...] and constructions of the self, other and the world...' (Potter and Wetherell, 2001:81).

Discourse analysis is entwined with theory to the extent that it can only be applied on the basis of specific ontological and epistemological premises. Within social constructionism, the following theoretical approaches can be identified: discursive psychology (Potter and Wetherell, 1987,2001; Weatherall, 2002; Potter, 2008); critical discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 1995,1999) and Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) discourse theory. The work of genealogist Foucault has held particular sway among social constructionist approaches such as critical discourse analysis and discourse theory. For Foucault (2006:53-4), discourse is not ‘a mere intersection between words and things'; rather, it is a group of rules that defines the ordering of objects.

Discourse analysis is particularly fruitful when investigating the operations of power (de Fina et al., 2007; van den Berg, Wetherell and Houtkoop-Steenstra, 2003). Indeed, in the case of poststructuralist discourse analysts Laclau and Mouffe and their supporters, accusations of failure to engage with important political questions and lack of distinction between political ideals or normative criteria of better or worse (White, 1992:16-18) are inaccurate (e.g. Laclau, 1990, 1992, 2004; Mouffe, 1992, 2009; Norval, 1990, 1996, 2003; Smith, 1998; Torfing, 1999; Van linthout, 2008). A similar argument can be made for the work of Foucault and Butler, given their and their supporters’ engagement with

The Foucauldian notion of discourses as knowledge/power regimes suggests that ‘truth’ is no more than an effect of power, while power is an effect of discourse (Weatherall, 2002:79-80). Thus ‘the common sense view of the world prevailing in a culture at any one time is intimately bound up with power. Any version of an event brings with it the potential for [...] marginalising alternative ways of acting [...] Therefore the power to act [...] depends on the knowledges currently prevailing in a society’ (Burr, 2003:68).

Foucault (1998:102) alerts us that sovereign power has been replaced by ‘a multiple and mobile field of force relations wherein far-reaching but never completely stable effects of domination are achieved’. Thus,

we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that come into play in various strategies. It is this distribution that we must reconstruct with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations required and those forbidden, that it comprises; with the variant and different effects – according to who is speaking, his [sic] position of power, the institutional context in which he happens to be situated – that it implies; and with the shifts and reutilisations of identical formulations for contrary objectives that it also includes (Foucault, 1998:101).

Foucault’s theoretical ‘toolbox’, as second resource for this study, does not provide a single method of analysis but rather helps with the framing, the kinds of questions asked and how the data can be thought through in discourse analysis (Cheek, 2008). Foucault’s (2003) ‘methodological precautions’ are relevant to this study:

- Rather than asking ourselves what the sovereign ‘looks like from on high’, we should by trying to discover how multiple bodies, forces, energies, matters, desires and thoughts are gradually and materially constituted as subjects or as the subject (p.28).
- We should not analyse power at its point of decision or intention but rather at its object, target or filed of application.
• Power is not ‘mass and homogenous domination’, ‘not divided between those who have it and those who don’t’, but circulates through networks. Subjects do not merely circulate along with power; rather, ‘power passes through them. It is not applied to them’ (p.29).

• An ‘ascending analysis of power’ should start with its microscopic mechanisms (‘technologies of power’), each with their own history and trajectory, which is colonised, inflected and transformed. The task is to show how these procedures are annexed by global phenomena (p.30).

Burr (2003:21-22) broadly categorises the predominant discourse analytical approaches as micro and macro social constructionism. In micro social constructionism, the emphasis is on discourse between people in interaction; in macro social constructionism the emphasis is on power relations and how discourses limit and produce subjects. This study utilises Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory as a macro social constructionist theory to expose the constitutive operations of power through discourses, particularly through subjectivation.

Discourse theory represents the first comprehensive application of poststructuralist thought as ‘tool’ in political analysis, combining deconstruction as the exposure of the ultimate undecidability of any social structure with an exposition of hegemony as the theory of the decision taken upon the undecidable terrain (Critchley and Marchart, 2004:5). Discourse is ‘a differential ensemble of signifying sequences in which meaning is constantly renegotiated’ (Torfing, 1999:85). Part of discourse theory’s innovation is its historicisation through an emphasis on contingency (Laclau, 1990; Norval, 1996). Discourse theory is ‘explicitly multidisciplinary’ and, while adapting concepts across disciplines, also encourages flexibility in the application of its theoretical concepts to promote novel outcomes (Van linthout, 2008:339).

Discourse theorists concur with Foucault that discourses are ‘systems of meaningful practices that form the identities of subjects and objects’ of which they speak (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000:3-4). They approach language use as a social phenomenon in which structures of meaning are fixed and challenged
through conventions, negotiations and conflicts (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002:25). In this vein, this study's aim is not to unearth the 'truth behind' discourses but rather to work with what has been said or written, 'exploring patterns in and across the statements and identifying the social consequences of different discursive representations of reality' (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002:21). As Hall (1997b:44) points out: the innovation of Saussurean linguistics, which influenced Laclau and Mouffe, is '[y]ou can only say something by positioning yourself in the discourse. The tale tells the teller, the myth tells the mythmaker, etc. The enunciation is always from some subject who is positioned in and by discourse.' The struggles to fix meaning is the entry point for discourse analysis, which has the aim of mapping out the processes in which signs are fixed, and 'the processes by which some fixations of meaning become so conventionalised that we think of them as natural' (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002:24-26).

The third theoretical resource of this study is Butler (1990, 1993, 1997), whose thinking bridges differences between Foucault and Lacan’s theories, and connects with Laclau and Mouffe by way of Foucauldian, Lacanian and Derridean thought (Laclau, 1997; Butler, Laclau and Žižek, 2000). Rethinking the Austinian speech act theory of performativity (Weatherall, 2002), Butler posits a gendered body that is performative: it has no ontological status apart from acts that compose its reality. Butler (1993:2) redefines performativity as 'that reiterative power of discourse to produce the phenomena that it regulates and constrains'. Performativity is not a performance of already existing meanings. Instead, acts, gestures and desire produce the effect of an internal core or substance, but produce this on the surface of the body, through the play of signifying absences that suggest but never reveal the organising principle of identity as a cause. Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally construed, are performative in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are fabrications manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means (Butler, 1990:185).
3.4 Key analytical concepts

Laclau and Mouffe (1990:107,108,115) assert that while a world exists external to thought, every object is constituted as an object of discourse and its material properties are discursive. The focus is on texts as materialisations of meaning, rather than on language per se, as is the case with micro-constructionist approaches (Carpentier and Spinoy, 2008:5; Phillips and Jørgensen, 2002:24).

The following section examines key analytical concepts in discourse theory, bringing in relevant analytical concepts from related theories.

3.4.1 Sedimentation of social practices hides political origins

For Laclau (1994:3-4), society presents itself as ‘a sedimented ensemble of social practices’ that are accepted as such and of which the founding acts of their institution are not questioned, concealing their political character. But the social always overflows the institutionalised frameworks of society, with social antagonisms revealing the contingency of those frameworks. The more the foundation of the social is challenged, the less sedimented social practices can ensure social reproduction and the more new acts of political intervention and identification are required. Democracy has a revelatory function as it shows us that behind the sedimented forms of social organisation lies the political moment of its originating institutions (Laclau, 1990:173). In this study, the method involves scouring discourses for reactivated meanings of volksmoeder and ordentlikheid obscured due to sedimentation.

3.4.2 Political projects seek to hegemonise the social

According to Smith (1994:36-7), a project that has achieved hegemony maps out rules of coherence, tables of authorised subject positions and sets of legitimate demands, and only recognises as coherent, authorised and legitimate that discourse which obeys its logic. It conceals its own partiality, historicity and contingency and normalises itself as the only possible way of thinking about politics [...] [and] experience by ruthlessly eliminating alternative interpretations, but it conceals this violent ground in that it pretends to perform merely the
a-political and innocent recognition of “facts”. It claims that there is nothing beyond the boundaries of the hegemonic project except total political chaos. [...] A hegemonic project [...] does not reduce political subjects to pure obedience [or] unequivocal support [...]. It pursues [...] the naturalisation of its specific vision of the social order as the social order itself” (Smith, 1994:36-7).

As part of the method of this study, hegemonic projects and performatives will be identified and particular attention will be paid in the analysis of discourses to normalisations, claims of ‘facts’, the elimination of alternatives and concealment of political grounds. Discourses will be deconstructed to see how hegemonic projects, akin to performatives, orchestrate the ways in which the subject positions under review in this study ‘consent and reproduce those tacit and covert relations of power’ (Butler, 2000:14).

Hegemony is produced through articulation, another key concept in discourse theory. Articulation refers to practices which create a new relation out of a dispersion of elements, resulting in the modification of their identities (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985:105). Articulatory practices structure elements into a discursive totality (pp.105,111; Critchley and Marchart, 2004:10). This study examines the (dis)articulation of elements, dissimilar and the same, or in overdetermined formations – i.e. articulations of contradictions, or elements irreducible to each other (Hall, 2002:45). Hegemony is achieved when articulation temporarily succeeds in the contingent linking together of different identities into a common formation, or new political bloc (Smith, 1994:6). Suturing a field hinges on ‘the extent to which the new articulations borrow from and rework various traditional frameworks so that they already appear somewhat familiar’ (p.6). This study will search for such ‘loans’.

3.4.3 Hegemony’s nodal points, empty signifiers and floating signifiers

‘Nodal points’ is the Lacanian concept that Laclau and Mouffe used to describe the hegemonic fixing of discourse (Critchley and Marchart, 2004:5). Power is constructed through processes of centring at nodal points, articulated in an attempt to render certain historical conditions ‘intelligible’ as per the interpretation of a certain political project (Smith, 1994: 8). The rearticulation or
re-coding of signifiers at multiple sites of conflict reveals their status as nodal points (pp.9-10). Political projects are engaged in a ‘trench war’ to fix the meaning of a greater number of social signifiers to a nodal point (Laclau, 1990:28). Nodal points are only partially fixed because of the ‘openness of the social’; the infinitude of the field of discursivity constantly overflows discourses (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985:113), which only succeed in partially delimiting the ‘surplus of meaning’ (Butler, 1990:166).

During apartheid, the volksmoeder indicated the success of the discourse of Afrikaner nationalism: it was fixed as a nodal point, or privileged signifier, partially suturing the meaning of a chain of signifiers (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985:112). Ordentlikheid is the other key nodal category in this study, articulating volksmoeder femininity with a not-quite-white identity’s aspirations to parity with hegemonic whiteness while retaining its ethnic particularity.

This study’s analysis includes investigating whether volksmoeder and ordentlikheid have been rendered floating signifiers, i.e. signifiers overflowed, or overdetermined, with plural meanings (Torfing, 1999:301; Howarth, 2004:261), or empty signifiers, i.e. signifiers so ambiguous, due to an organic crisis (such as the end of official apartheid), that there is no agreement on their interpretation (Norval, 1996:135). The distinction between a nodal point and an empty signifier is that, while they have the same referent (Laclau, 2004:322), nodal points relate to the articulating function in that they ‘join together and structure’. In contrast, a signifier’s emptiness points to its universal signification (Valenzuela, 2008:162; Laclau, 2004:322), which enables the system to represent itself because it negates the logic of differences, thereby forming the possibility (and impossibility) of any signifying chain (Howarth, 2004:261) to project its set of particularities as universal.

3.4.4 The (im)possibility of hegemony: Constitutive outside

Identity only ever makes itself out of what everybody else is not: it is ‘a structured representation which only achieves its positive though the eye of the negative’ (Hall, 1997a:21). Smith (1994:32-3) directs researchers in discourse analysis to search for these constitutive outsides:
We should look for the outsider figures against which these spaces were defined, for it is only against outsider figures that the boundaries of a social space are constructed. We should also look for the historical specificity of the relationship between the outsider figure and the social space. The outsider figure has to appear to personify some of the greatest threats to the social order. The social space has to appear to be deeply threatened by the outsider and yet, thanks to its apparent trans-historical permanence, ultimately recoverable.

This 'recoverability' is due to the attempts to make the decisions of a system of social organisation's original institution as coherent as possible – what Laclau (1990:80) calls 'reducing the margin of undecidability' to hide the formation's historicity. But the obfuscation cannot be complete as an ultimate suturing or closure is impossible. Therefore social coherence can only be achieved at the cost of repressing that which negates it (Laclau, 1990:180). But the exclusions always return to haunt claims of identity, constructed as it is from refusals, repudiations, repressions, abjections and so forth (Butler, 1993:21).

A related analytical concept is dislocation, a permanent phenomenon in that something always resists the discursive structure, revealing its limits and its contingency (Howarth, 2004:261). This lack of fullness creates crises that hamper the determining capacity of the symbolic order, introducing temporality, possibility and freedom (Laclau, 1990:39; Torfing, 1999:149) and opening spaces for subjects to identify with novel discourses (Howarth, 2004:261).

The method includes searching for dislocation and strategies of obfuscation and repression, given that identity's constitution is predicated on its very outside.

3.4.5 Subjectivation and the volksmoeder nodal point

The discernment of processes of subjectivation is the focus of this study. Subjectivity is an overdetermined construction because of the complex variety of identities and subject positions inherent to it, of which the combinations produce agency (Martínez, 2008:106). See Appendix D for a discussion of this study's orientation in terms of subjection and agency.
Smith (1998), following discourse theory, distinguishes between structural positions and subject positions. Individuals are ‘thrown’ into sexualising, racialising, gendering, classing structures; subject positions are formed by the intervention of discourse fabricating ‘a shared interpretation of a common structural position’ (p.73). In strongly nationalist social formations with ‘stabilised structural hierarchies and a relatively closed set of normalized interpretive frameworks’, ‘a singular and rigidly defined set of subject positions will operate as the only coherent interpretive frameworks through which structural positions are lived’ (p.59).

Within the Afrikaner national discourse, the volksmoeder served as nodal point constructing the subject position of ‘the Afrikaner woman’ for occupation by subjects identifying as ‘white’, Afrikaans-speaking women. A subject position can be likened to an ‘identity’ and is defined as ‘the ensemble of beliefs through which an individual interprets and responds to her structural positions within a social formation. In this sense, an individual only becomes a social agent insofar as she lives her structural positions through an ensemble of subject positions that makes sense to at least one other person in one other time and place’ (Smith, 1998:58-9). The subject is driven to occupy subject positions because it ‘seek[s] recognition of its own existence in categories, terms and names that are not of its own making, the subject seeks the sign of its own existence outside itself, in a discourse that is at once dominant and indifferent’ (Butler, 1997:20).

In Afrikaner nationalist discourse, ‘Afrikaner woman’ as subject position was forged to interpellate individuals structurally positioned as ‘white’ and ‘Afrikaans-speaking’ and ‘women’. Althusser’s (2008) term ‘interpellation’ is similar to the Freudian term ‘identification’, referring to attempts at filling the originary and insurmountable lack that exists at the root of any identity (Laclau, 1994:3). Butler (1993) usefully analyses interpellation as a call, or reprimand, which is ‘formative, if not performative, precisely because it initiates the individual into the subjected status of the subject’ (p.121, emphasis in original). Interpellation is the operation of power that categorises the individual, marks him [sic.] by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him that he
must recognise and others have to recognise in him. It is a form of power that makes individuals subjects’ (Foucault, 2000:331).

Constructed at the structural intersections of femininity, middleclassness, heterosexuality and whiteness, the subject position of ‘Afrikaner womanhood’ is (re)produced through repetitive articulations with the volksmoeder nodal point. With the subject a site of power, power is re-articulated ‘in the sense of already done’ and ‘in the sense of done over, done again, done anew’ (Butler, 1997:18) – the ‘I’ is configured through acts that are recurring, stylised and citational (Butler, 1993). ‘[S]lippage between discursive command and its appropriated effect’ is a ‘constitutive failure’ which may lead to insubordination in the form of refusals, ruptures and rearticulations (p.122). ‘You call me this, but what I am eludes the semantic reach of any linguistic effort to capture me’ (Butler, 2000:13). No articulation can fully describe what it represents; all identity is inconclusive. This analysis explains the shifts in elements articulated with the volksmoeder. This study will seek such refusals and rearticulations in the discourses analysed.

Other approaches to unhinging subjectivity-as-unchanging (e.g. in notions of ‘human nature’) are de-centring and de-essentialisation, drawing on Foucault and Derrida (Rattansi, 1994:29). The analysis will expose the multiple discursive sites splintering the subject and preventing a non-contradictory identity. It also involves surfacing the dispersed sources of power and myriad practices of regulation that institute the social (pp.29-30).

In modernity’s ‘violent hierarchy’ (white/black; man/woman) (Laclau, 1990:32), ‘man’ is equated with ‘human being’, as is ‘white’. What is peculiar to ‘woman’ and ‘black’ becomes ‘reduced to the function of accident, as opposed to the essentiality’ of ‘man’ and ‘white’; the main meaning is provided by the first term in the equation while the second term becomes a ‘mark’ (p.33). Hegemonic whiteness poses as indivisible singular touchstone, as opposed to the plural multiplicity of its others; paradoxically, it also homogenises the other through stereotyping while atomising whiteness, as others are reduced to their group ‘belongingness’ while whites are firstly individual subjects -- a manoeuvre key to invisibility and hegemony (Chambers, 1997:189-194). Derridean deconstruction takes apart these hierarchical dualisms of western thinking and shows how their
'claimed foundational character' collapses when thought through (White, 1992:15). Deconstruction explodes oppositions with the following moves: foregrounding alterity by bringing in marginal cases that are undecidable in terms of the proposed binary; exposing the difficulties in constituting the first term without aspects of the second; and not reversing the binary but problematising its very grounds (Rattansi, 1994:30).

3.4.6 Intersectionality

A key concept in this study is intersectionality, developed as an analytical category. As transdisciplinary term, it allows the researcher to draw on various theoretical paradigms (Styhre and Eriksson-Zetterquist, 2008:571). A useable definition is intersectionality as ‘the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations’ (McCall 2005:1771). With hooks’s (2001) criticism of Friedan (see Chapter 2) in mind, this study uses intersectionality to untangle ‘the way in which power has clustered around certain categories and is exercised against others’, subordinating some while privileging others (Crenshaw, 1995:375). It aims to deconstruct the ‘matrix of domination’ in which socially constructed differences of sexuality, gender, class and race function as devices to manufacture intertwined systems of inequality, always present even when not noticeable (Collins, 1991; 2000:559-560). Thus new formations can be examined in their ‘overlapping, mutually determining and convergent fields of politicisation’ (Butler, 1997:37).

Collins (2000:559-560) warned against collapsing into additive analyses in which conceptualisation re-entrenches underlying dichotomies and ranks them, e.g. man/woman; black/white; and against assuming interlocking oppression when faced with seemingly multiple oppressions (e.g. black, poor women), as all categories may not be equally salient. In this study the concept ordentlikheid is used in what McCall (2005) calls the anticategorical analytical approach to intersectionality. This approach deconstructs the normative assumptions of the master categories of inequality – e.g. race, gender -- to liberate individuals and groups from the ‘normative fix of a hegemonic order and to enable a politics that is at once more complex and inclusive’ (p.1777).
3.4.7 Everyday construction

This study analyses the discursive construction of post-apartheid Afrikaner femininities as presented openly in ‘ordinary, everyday language’ and ‘commonsense’ ideas. The everyday as arena of study is rich because it is being ‘increasingly disciplined, commodified and rationalised’ in modernity but is also a site ‘capable of radical transformation’ (During, 2006:21). Studying the everyday as terrain for multiple identity formulations assist in complexifying understanding of African postcolonies (Puttergill and Leildé, 2006:13-14). Steyn in her 2003 study of South African whiteness, following Laclau and Mouffe, argued that the task of the researcher is to uncover current social arrangements that may seem ‘natural’; and ‘common sense’ understandings that may seem ‘true’ to get to how groups are formed and how power is gained through discourse (p.54-5). Similarly, Norval (1996:2) argued in her deconstruction of apartheid discourse ‘that the view of the world constructed and disseminated by apartheid ideologues is already present and open to view in its ordinary, everyday language and material practices’.

Goldberg (2002) traces the ‘routinization of race’ in racial states as suffusing the everyday and invisibilising race. A racial state’s involvement in subject formulation is commensurate with its permeation of everyday life and routinised repetition of social practices that ‘collapse[s] ... the social imperative into the natural’ and ‘irreversible’ (p.245). Drawing on Posel’s (2001) notion of the apartheid state’s reliance on ‘common sense' understandings of race to deploy apartheid in everyday situations, Nuttall (2004:735) challenges social theorists to research microscopically ‘how people actually thought about themselves and, and the interstitial manoeuvres they were able to make with this “common sense” bureaucracy of race’ to describe the intimacies of race and class.

Essed (1991, 2002) points out that as antiracist resistance and human rights discourses have borne fruit, denial of race and the discrediting of discontent over racism have become imbricated in commonsense discourses. This necessitates the uncovering of ‘everyday racism’, which she defines as ‘not about extreme incidents [...] it concerns mundane practices’, ‘normalised micro-
injustices’ blended into familiar practices (Essed, 2002:207-8). This study will seek to detect such micro-level everyday-constructions.

3.5 Research design

A research design is derived from knowledge claims (Creswell, 2003), which refer in this study to the constructivist paradigm (Mertens, 2010), as per the ontological framing at the start of this chapter. The research, employing qualitative methods, is divided into three phases. Discourse analysis was conducted of texts generated from mainstream popular media, focus group interviews and individual in-depth interviews.

The first phase comprised analysis of messages conveying ‘preferred meanings’, i.e. messages imprinted with taken-for-granted ‘everyday knowledge of social structures, of “how things work for all practical purposes in this culture”, the rank order of power and interest and the structure of legitimations, limits and sanctions’ (Hall, 2006:513). The text of ‘everyday’, culturally sanctioned knowledge’ selected was Sarie, an Afrikaans women’s magazine.

The second and third phases aimed at eliciting discourses in iterative in situ performances by subjects. Subjects are not approached as ‘simple repositories from whom information can be extracted’; rather, subjects are seen as drawing on repertoires of familiar narratives that may vary according to situation, also because of changes in which stories are deemed acceptable (Puttergill and Leildé, 2006:15). Research interviews are situated productions of knowledge shaped by the interaction between researchers and respondents as active participants (p.15).

The second phase consisted of focus group interviews. Focus groups are optimal for gathering multiple and contending views in an interactive context (Litosseliti, 2007), particularly apt for this study with its focus on tracing not only identifications but also disidentifications with normative prescriptions (Butler, 1993). The focus group format also allows flexibility in the scope of topics covered; solicits ‘shared understandings’ in everyday language; and reveals mutual influence among respondents (Litosseliti, 2007:18-9), which is of value given the study’s attention to the constitutive outside. Focus groups interviews allow ‘insight into the world of the participant in the participant’s
own words’ (p.19), particularly of discourses more likely to surface in social gatherings (Gibbs 1997). These interviews work well as supplementary source (Litosseliti, 2007) generating discourses by subjects which may converge or contradict the normative discourses represented in Sarie, and for questions for the third phase of the research.

Individual interviews as third phase facilitated a more thorough and focussed exploration of discourses and subject positions generated in the focus group interviews. The interviews were approached as scenes of ‘collaborative meaning-making’ with forging of identities through stories (Doucet and Mauthner, 2008:335) A questioning schedule was developed with semi-structured, open-ended research questions, to allow flexibility in responding to answers while aiding the conversational flow of the interview (Knox and Burkard, 2009).

Discourse analysts are interested in the ‘analysis of knowledge formations’ (Talja, n.d.). In analysing the discourses surfaced in these three phases, the researcher probed for patterns of meaning-making and how these relate to broader discursive operations of normalisations and refusals. The analysis applied the key analytical terms of discourse theory in discerning

- elements articulated to form discourses;
- (re)articulations with the nodal points volksmoeder and ordentlikheid;
- discourses and whether they are hegemonic;
- operations of discourses in constituting subjectivities;
- compositions of subject positions in relation to constitutive outsides.

The researcher looked for interpellation by hegemonic discourses and how discourses compete for the same subject position, ensnaring subjects.

The phased research design facilitated a deepening perspective on the purchase of discourses within the analysis, as the research moved from phase to phase. Sarie presented normative, culturally sanctioned discourses as dispatched through an instrument of normalisation, the women’s magazine. The focus group interviews allowed the researcher to get closer to normative discourses of volksmoeder ordentlikheid, also as surfaced in the Sarie analysis, and the resistant
discourses that flowed between subjects. The researcher could also access how subjects (re)positioned themselves in relation to the discourses when speaking in the presence of other subjects. The focus group interactions, self-checking and shifts represented normalisations and resistances in action. The individual interviews allowed the researcher to focus in on how discourses operate and vie for hegemony within a particular subjectivity, and the entanglement of subjects in overdetermined discursive spaces.

3.6 Data collection
3.6.1 First phase: Sarie women's magazine

The first phase, a discourse analysis of popular women's magazine Sarie, had as objective the surfacing of the discursive strictures deployed in service of hegemonic volksmoeder femininity in culturally sanctioned texts. Sarie was selected as it is aimed at individuals who occupy the subject position under review in this study.

Sarie first appeared on 6 July 1949, a year after the National Party came to power. It is the second largest women's magazine in South Africa, at a circulation of 132,646 and total readership of 904,000 (April 2011 figures). This longevity in commercial success has persisted after the end of formal apartheid, even though the magazine is aimed at a comparatively small section of the population, i.e. Afrikaans-speaking middleclass women, and despite its origins as part of the formerly Afrikaner nationalist media company Nasionale Pers.

Sarie has typical mainstream western women's magazine features (McCracken, 1993), such as each edition starting with several double-page advertisements for hair products, perfume, cosmetics and other consumer items. The magazine has substantial volume at between 178-210 pages per edition and features full-page advertisements on every second page.

The twelve editions of Sarie for the year 2009 were selected for analysis because 2009 was the magazine's 60th anniversary, occasioning commemorative content on its Afrikaner nationalist history, which was of specific interest to the study. The data generated for discourse analysis was gleaned from four categories of text: the front cover; the lead article; the editor's letter; and readers' letters. The choice of the front cover was based on its status as
'interpretive frame’ of what is to follow (McCracken, 1993:32). The front cover also displays the normative ‘role model’ femininity in an embodiment of Sarie discourses, which is featured in the lead article. The editor’s letter was selected as primary site for the ‘official’ version of Sarie discourses. Editors of women’s magazines function as ‘high priestesses to the cult of femininity’, gatekeepers of the feminine agenda (Ferguson 1983:188). The readers’ letters were selected as messages mediated and standardised to fix Sarie discourses, illustrating Hall’s (2006) finding of the mass media communication process as ‘complex structure of dominance’ (p.508) in which power relations at the point of production approximate power relations at the point of consumption. Where relevant to the analysis, other articles were included, specifically on the constitutive outside (male homosexuality).

3.6.2 Second phase: Focus group interviews

Two focus groups each were conducted in Cape Town and Johannesburg, respectively, for comparative purposes. The research decision to host the focus groups in these two cities was based on debates in the public realm during the 2000s positing that Cape Town whiteness was more embedded and intractable than elsewhere in South Africa (see for example Institute for Justice and Reconciliation, 2012) while, in contrast, Johannesburg was described as an ‘Afropolis’, the ‘premier metropolis in Africa in terms of technology, wealth and racial complexity’ (Mbembe and Nuttall, 2008:25). Comparative research also found emphasis on ‘shared lifestyles’ in Johannesburg, in contrast to cultural and class compartmentalisation in Cape Town, where demands for cultural homogeneity at neighbourhood level extended to the level of the city and the country (Bekker and Leildé, 2006:155-8).

Purposive sampling (Babbie, Mouton, Voster and Prozesky, 2001) was done to select subjects who would fit the focus of the enquiry. Respondents were included who self-identified as women, white, heterosexual, middleclass and Afrikaans-speaking. The selected respondents therefore embodied intersectionalities combining both marked (femininity) and unmarked (heterosexuality, whiteness, middleclassness) positionalities in dynamic, co-constructive tension, which would generate rich, textured data. For comparative
purposes, and to trace (dis)continuities from apartheid to postapartheid, the study sought adult respondents across all age groups. A range of ages between 30 and 65 was achieved, as can be seen in Table 1 in Appendix E.

Respondents were selected by means of the snowballing technique, which is apt for qualitative studies using research interviews (Atkinson and Flint 2001). Snowballing has been found useful in accessing hard-to-reach populations, including among elites (Atkinson and Flint, 2001). The subject positions examined in this study could be regarded as ‘hidden’, given their emergence from Afrikaner nationalist domestication only as late as 1994; the dearth of research enquiries into these femininities; and studies showing its whiteness in defensive and withdrawal modes (Steyn, 2003; Ballard, 2004). The snowballing technique’s advantage of enabling the researcher to draw on reputable insiders facilitated participation.

In all, twenty-five respondents participated in four focus groups held in October and November 2011 in Cape Town and Johannesburg. Respondents formed a relatively homogenous group regarding marital status and maternity, with the majority of respondents currently or previously married (eighteen) and mothers (nineteen), as seen in Table 2 in Appendix E. This selection was particularly appropriate given the study’s aim of examining the vrou en moeder (woman/wife and mother) femininity of the volksmoeder. Of married respondents, only two kept their own surnames while one had a double-barrel combination of her husband’s and own surname. Respondents (six) who were unmarried and without children were included to create the possibility of counter-discourses.

Another notable feature is the preponderance of respondents with links to the education system, as seen in Table 3 in Appendix E. Particularly, three of the seven respondents over the age of 55 were teachers, while a third of the respondents’ mothers were teachers, as opposed to only eight percent of their fathers. This reflects both the utilisation of the state education sector in Afrikaner nationalist patronage during apartheid to improve the economic status of Afrikaners, and the positioning of education as ‘womanly vocation’ (see respondents’ reports in Appendix E). It is also of significance that two respondents (one of whom was forced by her parents to study teaching) were
engaged in work which would be positioned as ‘masculine’ in the patriarchal division of labour, i.e. welder of metal security gates and ‘handyman’. Other professions and company positions are contained in Table 4 in Appendix E.

Detracting from the efficacy of the snowballing technique is that one respondent was familiar with the researcher, as the researcher is known as a journalist. Also, six of the 25 respondents worked in the media, while another three of the respondents had previously worked in the media. This outcome is attributed to a drawback of the snowballing technique, as many of the researcher’s snowballing contacts worked in the media. However, it also enhanced the study as these subjects are the institutional producers of normative discourses akin to Sarie discourses.

To facilitate ease of interaction and comfort in the research space, the focus group discussions were conducted at middleclass suburban homes and in respondents’ first language Afrikaans.

3.6.3 Third phase: Individual in-depth interviews

The next phase of the study was to conduct semi-structured, individual, in-depth interviews in Johannesburg (25 and 28 May 2012) and Cape Town (31 August and 3 September 2012). After analysis of the discourses elicited in the focus group interviews, six respondents were selected from among the focus group interviewees. The decision to select respondents from the same cohort of participants aimed at deepening the analysis, as these respondents would be familiar with the research problem and the researcher, which would enable a more intensive probing.

The six respondents were selected according to the following criteria:

- reproduction or disruption of volksmoeder discourse in the focus group phase;
- inter- and intragenerational variety;
- spread of geographies.

With reference to the first criterion, all six respondents had been subjected to Afrikaner nationalist discourses through their primary institutional modes of distribution: apart from the family, through elite Afrikaner nationalist schools and universities (three respondents) and churches (four); volksbeweging
In fulfilment of the second criterion, respondents were selected according to a spread of ages (62, 57, 55, 42, 35 and 32 years old).

In meeting the third criterion, respondents were selected from two cities, Johannesburg and Cape Town, with the aim of discerning possible location-based differences. Nevertheless, a high level of mobility among respondents hindered a strict division between Cape Town and Johannesburg respondents (see Table 5 in Appendix E). As adults, however, three had mostly lived in Cape Town and surrounds and three mostly in Johannesburg and surrounds.

3.7 Research integrity
3.7.1 Trustworthiness

Researchers such as Lincoln and Guba (1985) have criticised the usefulness of the positivist categories of validity and reliability. Qualitative methodologies are concerned with deepening the analysis (Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2004) of how participants make sense of the world within multiple contexts (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Qualitative researchers are more focussed on the ‘evolving relationship’ with the data; they appreciate that results may differ according to researcher and method and they question goals such as replication as potentially obscuring existing diversity (Neuman, 2006:170-1).

Within qualitative research, poststructuralist researchers investigate the productive interfaces between knowledge/power and identity with cognisance of the localness of knowledge, which limits validity (Hughes, 2001). Alasuutari (1995) distinguishes between ‘factist’ and ‘specimen’ qualitative interviews. Lack of bias and accuracy is important in the former; in the latter less so, as especially in discourse theoretical analysis, the aim is to surface the discourses ‘that pass through subjects’ and have power effects, including the composition of subjectivity. Criticism that discourse analysis is not rigorous enough because its reading may not convince as the only possible reading, has been rebutted as follows: discourse analytic approaches do not seek to be the final word on a research question, as such an aim would contradict its basic principles (Cheek, 2008). As qualitative, and particularly discourse analytical research, does not
produce ‘hard data’, generalisability as research and ethical aim recedes (Creswell, 2003; Ulin, Robinson and Tolley, 2004) while reliability and validity become more important, albeit applied differently to how quantitative researchers understand these principles (Neuman, 2006). Validity is understood to be about authenticity, i.e. that the research is providing an equitable account of social life (Neuman, 2006:171).

Lincoln and Guba (1985) critiqued the usefulness of the positivist categories validity and reliability and instead suggested trustworthiness: for research to be credible and authentic, its methodology and analysis should be underpinned by a sound rationale. Therefore it is imperative to maximise the provision of evidence and transparency to allow readers to judge the research for themselves. It also involves ensuring that the analysis is open to readers by taking them along the evidence trail step by step.

De Wet and Erasmus (2005), in tracing the debate on trustworthiness, pointed out that trustworthiness does not differ substantially from validity and that rigour during research has not been ensured.

Validity and reliability is enhanced by self-reflexivity and triangulation which contextualise the researcher’s analysis (Potter and Wetherell, 1987). Creswell (2003) concurred with a number of overlapping strategies to ensure validity, which is qualified as whether ‘the findings are accurate from the standpoint of a participant, the researcher or the readers of an account’ (p.196) – i.e., believable (p.199). These strategies include:

- triangulation, or multiplying data sources, as in this study which includes three sources;
- ‘rich, thick description’ to present the evidence;
- clarification of the researcher’s bias (p.196), as below in the section on self-reflectivity.

Analytical findings should be anchored in the data. Reliability is advanced with the recording of the interviews. In this study, the focus group and individual interviews were recorded with the prior permission of the participants and thereafter transcribed.

The researcher produced transcripts of the focus group and individual interviews as transcripts ‘bring immediacy and transparency to the phenomena
under study, and the audience is given almost equal access to inspect the data on which the analysis is based, alongside with the researcher’ (Nikander, 2008:423). Given discourse analysis’ incorporation of the reader's judgment as criterion (Nikander, 2008), transcripts are particularly useful. The evidence presented here includes supplying the original verbatim quotations (in translation) from respondents as much as space allows. The researcher, whose mother tongue is Afrikaans, undertook the translations into English. While there is inevitably a degree of loss of meaning in the process of translation, I speak both languages with equal facility. I drew on my knowledge of the Afrikaans culture to translate in a way that provides the cultural cues.

3.8 Ethics

In accordance with the University of Cape Town Code of Research involving Human Subjects, and similar codes such as the Human Sciences Research Council Code of Research Ethics, the research was guided by an ethical approach based on integrity, quality, honesty and transparency, conducted with scholarly integrity and social sensitivity and responsibility.

To ensure the ethics and protect the integrity of the research, the following steps were taken: Respondents were provided with the aims of the research upon approach. After agreement to participate, respondents were furnished with a consent form detailing their right to anonymity and right to withdraw from the research at any given moment, which they were requested to sign (Appendix F and G). The principle of anonymity has been adhered to, not only by changing names but also any other details that may expose the identity of a respondent.

This study is mindful of the criticism that sociological research on race has frequently privileged dominant group perspectives (Andersen, 1993:39). The race of respondents in this research is not happenstance, and the study avoids a routinised approach to the race of the respondents and the researcher as mere ‘technical difficulties’ to be noted, as has been the case with research in the field of psychology (Morawski, 1997). The selection of white people as object of study is theoretically underpinned by critical whiteness studies’ aim of turning the dissection knife away from the margins and back to the centre of power in
the pursuit of its dismemberment. ‘The point of seeing the racing of whites is to dislodge them/us from the position of power, with all the inequities, oppressions, privileges and sufferings in its train...’ (Dyer, 2005:10). It is argued that the same applies to heterosexuality and middleclassness as hegemonic positionalities. The researcher situates this work within the feminist and social justice realm (Mertens, 2010).

3.8.1 Self-reflexivity

Criticism against discourse analysis poses that the method is hampered by bias, in that discourse analysts’ views are implicated in the source of analysis and the object of enquiry (Sarangi and Callin, 2003). While the problem of bias applies equally to qualitative and quantitative research, constructivist researchers more readily admit to being ‘co-constructors’ of research meaning (Morrow, 2005:254).

Laclau and Mouffe emphasise that the discourse analyst is always situated within a particular context ‘with no neutral Archimedean point from which to describe, argue and evaluate’ (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000:7). Self-reflexivity is imperative to ensure self-awareness that the researcher is intricately part of the social context -- which is already interpreted by the research participant, voiding claims of objectivity (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2007), and that ‘research is a product of the values of researchers’ (Mertens, 2010:16).

Regarding the research situation, the researcher’s own subject position seemed on the face of it to coincide with those of the respondents. The researcher as Afrikaans-speaking, white and middleclass woman has an intimate familiarity with the subject position under scrutiny but as lesbian has had an arms-length relationship with it. The researcher’s ethnic insider status contributed to access to respondents and the ease of interaction in the interviews, noticeable in especially the focus groups.

Cognisant of ethical complexities, I wish to note that I did not declare my lesbianism to respondents. Neither did I declare my own problematisation of whiteness and middleclassness in published analyses. However, these analyses are generally available. My own intersectionality and how I have positioned myself in terms of hegemonic discourses make me simultaneously an insider and
an outsider. These divergences from the subject positions under review benefited the analysis, as it enabled me as researcher to discern discourses of heteronormativity and bourgeois whiteness. Research participants were free to assume that I may not be heterosexual, racist or capitalist. Their possible assumption of my sexual and other statuses demonstrate how identitary closures happen.

This chapter outlined the methodology pursued in this study; the next chapter is an application of discourse analysis on Sarie women’s magazine as technology dispensing normative discourses.

---

1 Laclau prefers ‘identification’ as concept as it suggests the ambiguity of the process and the limits of objectivity (Laclau, 1990:186; Zerilli, 1998).
2 Johannesburg, founded in 1886, forms the pivot of the South African economy, while Cape Town as coastal city had its genesis as a Dutch colonial trading post, nationally rated among South African metropolitan centres as second in terms of economic affluence. In Cape Town the dominant language is Afrikaans (60%) but most of its speakers are not ‘white’, being racialised under apartheid as ‘coloured’. Johannesburg is South Africa’s most prominent spatial expression of identitary diversity, attracting people from across the country and continent, of different ‘races’, speaking different languages, some of whom introduce the rural into the urban. The lingua franca is English, while Zulu, Sotho, Tswana, and Afrikaans are the other predominantly spoken languages.
3 In the literature review for this study only a few examples could be found (e.g. Brink, 2008; S. van der Merwe, 2011 and R. van der Merwe, 2011, exempting writing on celebrated author Antjie Krog (West, 2009) and none utilising a poststructuralist frame.
4 Cape Town focus groups held in Bellville (29 October 2011) and Melkbosstrand (5 November 2011); Johannesburg focus groups held in Craighall Park and Emmarentia (both on 12 November 2011). As suggested for optimal engagement in focus groups (Litosseliti, 2007), all focus groups had six participants, except Focus Group Four with seven (Emmarentia).
CHAPTER 4

BE GOOD TO YOURSELF TO BE GOOD TO (WHITE) OTHERS: TECHNOLOGIES OF FEMININITY AND THE AFRIKAANS NEOLIBERAL SUBJECT

This chapter analyses Sarie women’s magazine as a textual tapestry weaving discourses to refix meaning for a dislocated white femininity. Sarie is a technology of normativity, dispensing culturally sanctioned discourses. It serves as purveyor of a changing ensemble of elements assigning intelligibility within the order of ordentlikheid. Ordentlikheid is conceptualised in this study as articulation of a particularist complex of subaltern whiteness, middleclassness and heterofemininity.

In the wake of the postapartheid dislocation of the social, or crisis in the space of representation (Laclau, 2004:319), wrought by democratisation, Sarie discourses, immersed in sedimented residues of historical antecedents, incorporate re-articulations of discursive elements to:

• renovate the volksmoeder nodal point through suture with domesticated, previously abjected outsiders; and a revamped father-husband masculinity.
• re-secure through erasure-denialism and nostalgia-re-inscription a beleaguered Afrikaner whiteness.

Women’s magazines tell women ‘what to buy’: It is a form of popular culture dependant on women still mostly being assigned the task of reproduction (McCracken, 1993:2-5). Consumerism has become a technique through which Sarie subjects continuously aspire to accomplishing white heterofemininity. Neoliberalism now serves as surface for the inscription of revamped white Afrikaans femininity. Consumption assists the reinstatement of volksmoeder ordentlikheid through the commodification of culture and demarcating masculinity to keep this femininity white and in check.

4.1. Sarie’s subject

Sarie deploys narratives of ‘celebrity lives’ as achievements of the ideal. The lead articles on ‘celebrities’ represent them as idealised subject positions:
they are platforms for performatives, for dispensing normative directives. Celebrity texts display the subject’s pursuit of the promise of cancelling the shortfall between itself and the normative ideal. The subject is invested in achieving completion. However, since incompleteness is constitutive (Laclau, 1996:79), fulfilment is a ‘phantasmatic promise’ (Butler, 1993:220). Nevertheless, the subject remains in a repetitive quest for wholeness – Lacan’s *jouissance* (Smith, 1998:81) – pursued through identification with hegemonic projects but repeatedly subverted by meaning overflowing the social. The overflowing of plural meanings, or overdetermination, prevents the subject from finding closure through suture with a signifier that is its own. In this case, the floating signifier overdetermined with meanings is femininity. *Sarie* seeks to stay the flow of meaning; it serves as technology dispensing discourses for the interpellation of subjects.

*Sarie’s* tales of ‘celebrity lives’ pursue a narrative pattern of individualism, a feminine version of the ‘hero’s journey’¹: trials and tribulations, followed by individualised ponderings on how to surmount obstacles, culminating in the inevitable confirmation that she will forge ahead. The trials are about ‘doing woman’: losing weight; finding a man (whether the celebrity wants to or not, *Sarie* wants her to); staying pretty; fighting old age and fat; or a combination of these (e.g. January 2009 edition). Articles are sojourns into a variety of disasters that heterofemininity has to ward off to achieve beauty and resultant verification from the masculine. *Sarie* discourses, called ‘*Sarielese*’ in this study, foreground aspects that fit *Sarie’s* hegemonic femininity; they de-emphasise outliers that do not fit *Sarie’s* cookie-cutter mode of femininity.

### 4.2. Women’s magazines, individualism and consumerism

Individualism has been a staple, albeit variable, discourse of western women’s magazines. Ferguson in her content analysis (1983) of British women’s magazines finds a switch between the themes ‘getting and keeping your man’ and ‘self-help’ (‘free choice’; ‘perfect self-presentation’) (p.52). From the 1940s to the 1980s, the former drops in prevalence from 59 to 12 percent while the latter grows from 13 to 47 percent (pp.50-3; 96-100). McCracken (1993) in her critical textual analysis of women’s magazines in the US in the 1980s finds a
‘commodity base’ as ‘essential characteristic of feminine desire’, alongside ‘consumerist competitiveness and reified individualism’ (p.299). These studies describe the formation of a postfeminist and neoliberal discourse. Neoliberalism is here understood as per Brown (2005) and Rose (1989) and postfeminism as per Gill and Scharff (2011), Budgeon (2011) and Tasker and Negra (2007). Both concepts will be further explicated in this chapter.

Fuehrer Taylor (2010), analysing women’s magazines in the US in the 1990s and 2000s, argues that instead of second wave feminism’s rejection of popular culture as reproducing gender inequalities, third wave feminism posits that women access feminist principles through popular culture rather than through political activism (p.218-222). Women’s magazines ‘inspire women to forge their own unique selves’ (p.230) and ‘create the lives they want’, even if it means embracing idealisations of marriage, motherhood and beauty that contradict feminism. Still, Fuehrer Taylor finds that women’s magazines advance third wave feminism’s concern with independence and equality and create a sense of a common political position as women but without prescribing how women should act (pp.226, 230). Such incongruities are exposed as untenable in Budgeon’s (2010) critical analysis of third wave feminism.

In South Africa during the 1970s, former Sarie assistant editor Alba Bouwer (1975:14-5,17 in Maritz 2012, own translation) remarked that ‘judging by our newspapers and magazines’, ‘little women’ (vroutjies) were concerned with their appearance, both body and home. Prosperity had led to an ‘ominous, self-indulgent love of comfort’: ‘[E]xcessive emphasis on external appearance – “the well-groomed image and the right outfit”, as the women’s pages often describe it – with a girl in the end seeing herself as a delicate twining plant that has to find her support wall at all cost and does not have to concern herself with the country’s affairs because that is after all a man’s world’.11 Maritz (2012) finds in her analysis of a Sarie article (May 1992) on the Conference for a Democratic South Africa (Codesa) negotiations in the early 1990s an iteration of a femininity that was ignorant, disinterested and playful about politics. Maritz (2012) concludes that Sarie’s construction resonated with the politically disconnected Afrikaner femininity generated during the period of Afrikaner nationalist state control; and with apathy and confusion due to a loss of identity of Afrikaner
women after the collapse of state power. The 1992 article is here read as interpellating subjects with an incantation of a femininity hegemonic during at least the 1970s-1980s. Maritz finds another three *Sarie* articles in 1992-1996 tracking the institutionalisation of women’s human rights and the creation of a special current affairs section. This political engagement suggests *Sarie’s* incorporation by the discourse of constitutionalism during the 1990s. *Sarie’s* ‘feminist phase’ was a brief hiatus before it followed western women’s magazines’ descent into postfeminism.

South African cultural studies has followed western scholars’ rethinking of consumption, which has seen the questioning of the privileging of (male) production (posited as ‘real’) in relation to (female) consumption (posited as ‘impulsive and trivial’) and arguing that consumption and commodities can offer liberating meanings (Nava, 1999:51). Joseph (1998:27) suggests understanding consumption as constitutive of subjectivity. Nuttall (2006:272) proposes that ‘the market’ has become a ‘vector’ for generating postapartheid identity, particularly remaking race. Consumption enables culturally encoded identity productions forged by ‘actively negotiated consent’ (Narunsky-Laden, 2008:129). The media manufacture, verify and refuse identities (Hadland, Louw, Sesanti and Wasserman, 2008); consumer magazines can serve as ‘cultural tools’ making available identitary repertoires of norms through goods and lifestyles, also in terms of group solidarity (Narunsky-Laden, 2008:131). Posel (2010:164) shows how consumption as producing selfhood was linked during apartheid to the ‘acquisition of symbolically loaded goods’ as a sign of respectability and how ‘workings of race became inseparable from the symbolic logics of material acquisition and deprivation [and] social advancement’. While she writes with particular reference to black people, it is posited here that similar interpellations were directed at Afrikaners as ‘marked whites’.

Hall (1997b) reminds us to explore how capitalism drives westcentric global mass culture to ‘invade’ and ‘weave’ particularist forms into its expansion (p.29). *Nasionale Pers* [National Press], the owner of *Sarie*, segments its target market in accordance with apartheid boundaries (du Plessis, 2012, own translation). Thus, Blaser and van der Westhuizen (2012) ask: ‘could we speak of an ethnicised group of individual consumer-citizens, constructed through the twin operations
of defensive ethnicity and neo-liberalism with their shared utility of facilitating retreat from public spaces?’ (p.387).
The next sections distinguish the different discursive strategies deployed by *Sarie*.

4.3. Discursive strategy I: Consuming self – the compulsory choice of heterofeminine embodiment

‘Myself’ in *Sarie*’s framework of ‘inspiration’ (‘My Style, My Inspiration, My Life, Myself’) is an Anglicisation.iii Appropriating an English concept to articulate ‘self’ in the signifying chains of *Sarielese* works in two mutually entangled ways: it confirms *ordentlikheid* as drawing from Afrikaans feminine identity’s aspiration to achieve hegemonic (white, Anglo/western, hetero-) femininity and it absorbs the discourses of postfeminism and neoliberal subjecthood.

‘*Sarie’s* editorial strategy’ crystallises the four elements of ‘inspiration’, stated by the editor as follows

- ‘We are an intimate part [...] and a true extension of her lifestyle and life philosophy. [...] [W]e tell typical South African stories that keep her feeling good about herself and her world. This is who she turns to for [...] life’s key solutions [...] [and] her special inspiration [...]’
- **My Style**: Glamorous content that inspires. Local and relevant global trends.
- **My Life**: [...] Fashion for a personal style. Beauty to look and be your best.
- **My Inspiration**: Good food and wine [...] Décor and DIY [...] Travel ideas and destinations.
- **Myself**: Reflective and motivational content that focuses on self-realisation and self-awareness...’ (*Sarie 2011 [Advertising] Rate Card*)

These four elements suture *Sarie*’s (re)interpretation of Anglo-American women’s magazines' stock-in-trade of:

- commodified desire and consumerism;
- technologies of femininity such as beauty, fashion and domesticity;
- fostering intimacy with readers;
• self-help (Ferguson, 1983; Bartky, 1990; McCracken, 1993; Fuehrer Taylor, 2009).

These elements are mutually articulated with neoliberal individualism as nodal point, and yoked with postfeminist elements and what Rose (1990) calls a 'therapeutic culture of the self'. Activated here is the neoliberal mode of governmentality which ‘convenes a “free” subject who rationally deliberates alternative courses of action, makes choices and bears responsibility for the consequences of these choices’ (Brown, 2005:43). This subject is gendered, in that ‘freedom’ requires successful management of the body, particularly exercising the discipline of feminine beauty, with accoutrements.

Sarie’s ideal subject position is articulated with a psychological discourse on self-improvement and obligatory choice (Lazar, 2011; Rose, 1989):

We always have a choice. We can decide what to do with every circumstance and event…
We feel frequently we have no control […] That life throws us about mercilessly […] But human nature is full of vitality […] [there is] always hope [to discover] inner strength (Editor’s Letter, October 2009).

You have to change things within yourself, and suddenly you feel free. You always have to exercise choice in life. Michelle McLean article (November 2009).

In neoliberalism and postfeminism, elements sutured are ‘the obligation to shape a life through choices in a world of self-referenced objects and images’ from, among others, the mass media’s transmission of ‘lifestyle’ (Rose, 1989:257). ‘Lifestyle’ culture induces the individual to be ‘the kind of subject who can make the right choices’ (McRobbie, 2007:36). ‘Every aspect of life, like every commodity […] is a mark of our individuality, each is a message to ourselves and others as to the sort of person we are […] illuminating the self of he or she who consumes’ (Rose, 1989:227). This mode involves shifting from objectification (women reduced to objects, either as bodies or body parts [McCracken, 1993:122-5]) to subjectification (the ways power operate in the constitution of subjectivities [Gill, 2009:100-101]) through the consumption of a commodified femininity. At play in actualising the Sarie self are repetitive elaborations of induction and grooming into white heterofemininity through consumerism. Consumption renders white heterofemininity. The article on Michelle McLean
(November 2009) features a photo of McLean in a designer dress surrounded by mounds of shoes with the caption: ‘This Errol Arendz dress with its ethnic feel symbolises our love for Africa and the dozens of pairs of shoes reflect Michelle’s passionate personality.’ The Editor’s Letter (August 2009) declares that the perfume Chanel Nr 5 has a ‘strong hold on our emotions’; ‘[it] still holds the promise of glamour and freedom, as Mademoiselle Coco Chanel promised women from the beginning’.

Foucault’s conceptualisation of ‘docile bodies’ (1991:181-2) has been found useful by feminists to describe a ‘perpetual and exhaustive [...] regulation of the body’s size and contours, its appetite, posture, gestures and general comportment in space and the appearance of each of its visible parts’ (Bartky, 1990:80). Inscribing white, western hetero-femininity on the body requires abiding by prescriptions for hair distribution, body fat and accessories that affect bodily movement (Orbach, 2009; Moletsane, Mitchell and Smith, 2012). Women’s magazines not only commercialise the bodily marking of ‘woman’ as feminine other but serve as inculcators (Blackman, 2008:25-6) of technologies of femininity.

The Anneline Kriel article (February 2009) -- covering 11 pages and 5 decades in age -- produces a subject position articulating self-policing of feminine embodiment and technologies of femininity, overseen by white western heterofemininity and experts in the ‘science of femininity’, with injunctions of consumption as resolution. In confluences of advertisement and article – journalistic ethics overridden – life-size photos of beauty products are featured alongside detailed titles of each product, e.g. ‘green tea and cucumber in Dermalogica Soothing Protection Spray (R440) protects your skin against attacks from the environment’. A photo of Kriel barefoot at ‘barely 20’ ‘in London’ is accompanied by: ‘Early aging already starts in your young days – it is just not yet visible’, followed by a quotation from dermatologist Dr Suritha Kruger. ‘Skin care expert Stephanie Hugo from Johannesburg [says] before 25 you can get away with just an eye gel...’ Make-up artist Algria Ferreira-Watling ‘believes’ in ‘your 20s’ ‘you can be just who you want to be!’ Every front cover interview features a ‘celebrity’ produced by teams of technicians, whose names and duties are listed, as well as the products and prices.
These significations are reiterates readers’ letters, articulated with the masculine/feminine dualism:

*I miss Saturdays – my dad and brother at a rugby game, my mom and I on the bed. We feast on chocolate and [...] Sarie. When I was 11 years old I started to join conversations about beauty and recipes. I had a cut-out with beauty tips for every day [...] [B]athing oil and foam bath, [...] skin oil and body powder! In my teen years I started experimenting with Sarie’s beauty ideas – home-made facials and lemon juice for shiny hair. A cut-out from the 60s says [...] some girls are blessed with a beautiful skin and a pretty figure [but] [e]ven you with your freckled face, pug nose and chubby little body can be attractive if you are spanning clean from your shiny brushed hair to your toenails. My daughters also know that!’ Theresa Smith, Rondebosch (August 2009).

Focus on the body in texts such as *Sarie* has intensified with postfeminism’s insertion of ‘the body’ in the space that ‘the home’ occupied in the 1950s (Gill, 2009). The body is ‘a signifying practice within a cultural field of gender hierarchy and compulsory heterosexuality’, ‘an object of systems of social coercion, legal inscription, and sexual and economic exchange’ (Butler, 1990:189). Postfeminism figures femininity as a ‘bodily property’ (Gill and Scharff, 2011:4). ‘[A] sleek, controlled figure is essential for portraying success, and each part of the body must be suitably toned, conditioned, waxed, moisturised, scented and attired’ (Gill, 2009:99). What happens to postnationalist women’s bodies that used to fence the *volk*? In the article on Cindy Nell she looks ‘rested’, ‘perfectly made up’ behind her fashionable ‘large sunglasses’. She is dressed in a

tight turquoise top that compliments her brown skin, courtesy of her own tanning lotion, Caribbean Tan, that she developed. It’s the second best seller in the country (January 2009).

Bodily distinctions are classed as they produce bourgeois taste as normative and ‘as expressing the quality of superior distinctiveness’ (Blackman, 2008:62). Thus postnationalist female bodies continue to perform ordentlikheid, even in lieu of a *volk*. Neoliberal governmentality produces the middleclass white female body in opposition to the ‘working class body beyond governance’ (Skeggs, 2005:965, 968). Differentiation within whiteness determines access to choice. While ‘the middleclass has no choice but to choose’, others have a ‘lack of access to the techniques for perform[ing] the good self’ (p.974).
'I have the right knowledge now to keep my weight stable.' [Her decision to] chuck her 'overweight clothes' [...] is the psychological proof that she is on the right path to keep the weight devil bridled forever... [...] 'I want to be a healthy mother [to my daughter]' (Bertha le Roux lead article, April 2009)

'Of course I, typically woman, sometimes see someone who is fat [when she looks in the mirror]. But I also see a wiser woman who [...] wants to make the right decisions [...] (McLean lead article November 2009)

Thus responsibility is assumed for displaying the ‘correct’ body as sign of an ethical self. The postmodern turn has left the dichotomous feminine norm fat=bad/thin=good intact, changing ‘looking after oneself’ into ‘a moral value’ (Orbach, 2009:4,141-2). Photographs accompanying the McLean article show her as being the same body-size as her 10-year old son, photographed with her. This femininity’s class and race status is corporeally inscribed, in that ‘fat’ is equivalent to lack of responsibility and morality (Skeggs, 2005:966-8,974).

The reader is interpellated into a construction of ‘self-confidence’ predicated on a body ‘under control’. Sarie verifies the subjectivity. The heading and blurb with the le Roux article read: ‘Prettier, thinner Bertha. Look at me now!’; ‘She shines with self-confidence [...] and shows her body proudly in tight-fitting clothing.’ Sarie similarly authorises Suzette van der Merwe (September 2009): ‘She is still thin, spontaneous and well-groomed’. At times Sarie allows the ‘celebrity’ to talk back but only within the discipline of feminine body management: ‘I do not want to follow strict diets [...] I do not have to prove myself.’ (Nell article, January 2009).

A July 2009 reader’s letter confirms the subjection effects of ‘Sarie inspiration’, edited by the magazine to emphasise the self-choosing individual:

Sarie changed my life. Thanks for the article about Bertha le Roux, who’s lost so much weight. I immediately [...] started with the diet. [...] when I feel like the wrong kinds of food I also read the article over and over for inspiration [...] Michelle du Toit, Highveld.

Consumerism is articulated with the intergenerational transfer of disciplines of femininity, which includes curtailing the unruly excess of the female body (Grosz, 1994):
Sarie was there when my eldest daughter was baby. She made herself up from head to toes with Vaseline. She saw how pretty you are and just wanted to do it like you... Liz Botha, Georgia, USA (September 2009).

‘My one constant message to [her 7-year old daughter] is: Skye, you’ve got to be a lady.’ van der Merwe article (September 2009).

‘I don’t want Kiana to grow up with body issues that she learnt from me as mom.’ le Roux article (April 2009).

It contrasts with the intergenerational construction of masculinity in which the son can be represented as masculine verifier of his mother as feminine (McLean article, November 2009).

Foucault (1998:58-70) traces the genealogy of the reconstitution of Christian procedures of confession in the scientific terms of psychology to cast the sexual under a regulatory regime. Rose (1989:217, 245) argues that the operation of psychotherapeutics has been expanded beyond sexuality and pathology to manufacture an autonomous self for ‘the analyses of social ills and cures, as the object of expert knowledge’. Sarie interviews with ‘celebrities’ are cast in confessional mode, where litanies of emotions are dissected in a psychologised discourse and the failures and triumphs in the accomplishment of hegemonic feminine embodiment are minutely and reiteratively detailed. Foucault (1991:183) calls these painstaking techniques a ‘new microphysics’ of power; Rose (1989) regards them as a perpetual self-surveillance of the performance of self in its minutiae (p.239).

The fear that she will pick up weight again will always gnaw at Bertha. [...] ‘Anything can happen [...] When [...] I am frustrated, I want to eat. I don’t know where it comes from... I have to sort [it] out.’ le Roux article (April 2009)

‘[P]ants or a top focus your attention on your body and on that you are forever critical.’ She thought her legs were too thick even though people told her they were her best asset. (Her feet are also a source of embarrassment. She takes her Tods off and shows slender feet without nail polish, with a skew toe that bothers her. Anneline Kriel article (February 2009)
Sarie's prescriptions combine the acknowledgement of 'life's challenges' with resolution through technologies of femininity and consumerism. Sarie patriarch de Villiers' 'frequent plea' to the editor was to 'make pretty', because

'Women like pretty things. Life is challenging. Make Sarie the one thing that spoils her [the reader]. She deserves it'. (Editor's Letter, November 2009)

Both the hardship and its resolutions are tinged with racialisation because, while white Afrikaans middleclass women as a group are more affluent than ever, they are addressed as suffering from trials and tribulations. The resolutions for the challenges include accessing a sense of belonging through consumption of technologies of femininity, as presented in Sarie. Sarie projects itself as a refuge, an Afrikaans white space away. Through (its) consumption, the reader accesses femininity and community.

4.4. Discursive strategy II: Modernising volksmoeder ordentlikheid - whiteness incognito

The front cover of the first edition of Sarie (6 July 1949) depicted a woman in 1940s feminine fashions positioned next to a faint outline of the same woman in volksmoeder attire (a 19th century bonnet and long dress associated with 'Voortrekker women' [Brink, 2008:7]). (See p. 78.) The combination of the two images yokes Sarielese: while white western middleclass heterofemininity looms large in the accomplishment of Sarie's ideal womanhood, with women interpellated to embody Afrikaner nationalist modernisation through western cultural accoutrements, their ethnic identification remains equally as valid, with the combination serving as blueprint for this particularist femininity.

Sarie can be defined as a cog in the 'apparatus of domination' (Foucault 2004:45) during Afrikaner nationalist rule. Nasionale Pers was founded in 1916 as media arm of the Afrikaner nationalist volksbeweging [people's movement] (O'Meara, 1983; Beukes, 1992). The company benefited from state contracts, catapulting it to its current position as largest media company in Africa and second largest in the southern hemisphere. A company-sponsored hagiography (Oor Grense Heen [Across Borders]) (1992) admits that Nasionale Pers saw its role as purposively steering its Afrikaans consumers in accordance with National
Party (NP) policies. In Althusserian terms, therefore, it interpellated subjects on behalf of Afrikaner nationalism, a process facilitated by the company's dominance in the Afrikaans language media market, which developed into a monopoly in the 1990s. Sarie's advent in the crucial year after the NP's rise to power advanced Afrikaner nationalist hegemonisation through the suturing of subject positions for recruits to the category 'Afrikaner woman'. Sarie is read here as technology in the service of ordentlikheid, as an instrument disseminating the Afrikaner nationalist discourse of modernisation of a subaltern whiteness aspiring to equal status with the hegemonic and globalised Anglo (bourgeois, heteromasculine) whiteness of the more successful settler class in South Africa. Sarielese hitches signifiers of consumerism and individualism with, paradoxically, the 'Afrikaner' collective.

The Editor's Letters of July and August 2009 mark the 60th anniversary of Sarie with a parable positing a Chanel/Sarie equivalence. The equivalence between the Estee Lauder company and Sarie puts their starting dates

a year apart [1948 and 1949], indeed continents and an ocean apart but both with one goal: to make women feel good about themselves and their world in the language of their heart. Lauder's language was beauty; our language was Afrikaans' (Editor's Letter, July 2009, original emphasis).

With the articulation of Chanel, the editor deftly reinvents Sarie: from Afrikaner nationalist vector into a neutral contributor to the universal history of beauty. It voids not only Sarie but hegemonic volksmoeder femininity of its politics, while sustaining particularist elements necessary for the continued reproduction of consumers of the magazine. Its reification of an unchanged 'Afrikaner' femininity dehistoricises in the same breath as affirming that 'everything has a history' that possesses 'value and truth', the latter phrase borrowed from Estee Lauder executive Aerin Lauder from an interview with the Sarie editor-as-globetrotter 'in New York'.

Sarie serves as an ethnicised gateway/gatekeeper to western heterofemininity: The writer describes Sarie as created to 'unlock a whole new world to women in Afrikaans. A world of Audrey Blignaut and Alba Bouwer, Chanel and Dior'. This confluence of Afrikaner nationalist female role-models, writer-journalists Blignaut and Bouwer, with Dior and Chanel as symbols of western hetero-femininity signifies accomplishment of the normative ideal of
Consuming the *volkseie* [volk's own]: A page from the July 2009 anniversary edition of *Sarie* with the heading "Did you know?" informing readers about the heady mix of elements of *Sarielese* during apartheid: Afrikaner nationalism and capitalist consumerism
western white heterofemininity.

Sarie's story, as per the July 2009 Editor's Letter, contains two explosive dates: 1948 and June 1976. This is a parallel history which elides the political and therefore the political origins of its discourse. The trite as truth displaces the political. The editor cites June 1976, but not as the date burnt into history as the start of the black youth revolts that precipitated the conclusion of formal apartheid. In a manoeuvre of erasure and transplantation, the editor cites June 1976 as the publication of a departing editor’s inanity of finding it ‘a pleasure’ to work at Sarie. In a similar manoeuvre, the editor incorrectly ‘remembers’ 1948 as the start of Chanel (the correct date is 1946). Despite meticulous whitewashing, Sarie is haunted: even if attributed to the magnificent history of international beauty, 1948 inadvertently conjures the spectre of apartheid as the NP’s reign commenced in that year.

A neoliberal inflected trope of ‘from small-town girl to globetrotter’ is repeatedly administered as format for subject formation. Ordentlikheid is rearticulated with neoliberal discourse: the promise of self-actualisation is about achieving equivalence with normalised bourgeois heterofeminine whiteness, while retaining particularity but without accountability.

Co-constitutive relationalities are conjured between ‘our golden girl’ Anneline Kriel; the ‘forgotten’ Pearl Janssen, who was Miss Africa South of the same year; and South Africa’s first Miss World ‘Penny Coelen from Durban’. ‘Annie’ and ‘Pearl’ both aspire to achieve Anglo femininity as signified by WESSA Coelen but only ‘Annie’ becomes Miss World. Neoliberal rationality’s depoliticizing effects are wielded to erase the ‘wages of whiteness’ (Roediger, 1999). Racialised Janssen fails at normative femininity’.vi She disappears while ‘Annie’ has South Africa ‘burst[ing] out of its seams’. The ‘South Africa’ signified here corresponds with Blank Suid-Afrika (White South Africa) as represented in National Party discourse in the 1970s, in an equivalence with volk, as signified by ‘our girl’.

‘Annie’s’ accomplishment of normative white western femininity (‘the nearest we ever got to our own [British princess of Wales] Diana’) serves as signifier to fix Afrikaner whiteness as counterpart to normative WESSA
whiteness in the construction of White South Africa. The *volksmoeder* nodal point is therefore renewed with a chain of equivalence yoking together the signifier ‘Annie’, ‘Diana’ as pinnacle of white western (British) heterofemininity and the neoliberal imaginary. *Ordentlikheid* as mode for modernisation is reasserted. Annie is also articulated with the *volksmoeder* nodal point, as *Sarie* disciplinary work renders her multiple marriages unacceptable. Kriel’s motherhood and current marital monogamy enable her rehabilitation.

The article headings effect the universalisation of rearticulated *volksmoeder* femininity, in contrast with the marked marginalisation of black femininity (‘Always Annie’, ‘who lives in the sky’, as opposed to ‘Pearl of the Flats’). ‘Annie’ as embedded, past convention is ‘invested with the political power to signify the future’ (Butler, 1993:80). In an articulation with neoliberalism, the Editor’s Letter explains the privileged signifier ‘Annie’ as: ‘all of us, Afrikaans, English, rich, poor, from places big and important to small and far-flung, have an equal chance in the big world out there’. A particularism is projected onto the global.

4.5. Discursive strategy III: The *Sarie* family

McCracken (1993:299) observes that women’s magazines ‘assimilate an idealised individual consciousness to a similarly idealised group consciousness as one of their primary narrative strategies’. Women’s magazines’ discourses of subjectification as normative femininity, consumerism and individualism are reproduced through a sense of community – interpelling readers ‘as if we were all girlfriends’ (Fuehrer Taylor, 2009:226). Women’s magazines therefore serve as an interface between group and individual as part of its interpellation of subjects. Third wave feminism in the west claims that a shift has occurred away from ‘others’ to the ‘self’ for women and they can participate in a ‘culture of the self that endorses self-invention, autonomy and personal responsibility’ (Budgeon, 2010:284). The proviso is that women have to proclaim that gender equality has been attained, thereby losing gender as conceptual tool even as gender difference is reified. The result is a tension between embracing individualised agency and performing femininity’s normalised subordination within gender relationality (p.285). Conflict between relationality and
individualism is resolved in Sarie by converging the neoliberal dictum of self-responsibility with the volksmoeder dictum of assuming responsibility for others, while also being responsible for her own failings. This is firstly done with the articulation of ‘inspiration’ and ‘Sarie-as-family’, incessantly reiterated to promote the magazine in its own pages. Both notions advance the commercial interests of the magazine, as ‘Sarie-as-family’ builds brand loyalty and ‘inspiration’ is found in consumerism and materialism on which the magazine depends.

_Sarie–My Inspirasie_ [Sarie–My Inspiration], the branding motto of the magazine, was inaugurated in 2001 with the appointment of current editor Michélle van Breda. The contents page (_Sarie, _January-December 2009_) is divided in accordance with the theme and spells out its four categories that are also, unusually, reflected on the spine of the magazine: _My Styl, My Inspirasie, My Lewe, Myself_ [My Style, My Inspiration, My Life, Myself]. Thus the magazine seems purposively styled in correspondence with the neoliberal and postfeminist dictum of individualised self-investment (Brown, 2005; Gill, 2009; Gill and Scharff, 2011).

As shown, individualised ‘inspiration’ and collective ‘family’ stand in relational tension. _Sarie-as-family_ is encapsulated in the Editor’s Letter’s recurrent subtitle ‘We, You and I’. The use of ‘we’ to promote articles on the front cover contributes to the sense of a collective, which is strengthened by the conflation of readers with _Sarie_ and representing _Sarie_ as an anthropomorphistic ‘she’, as in ‘she is pretty’ or ‘Sarie stood by me’. According to the Editor’s Letter on the 60th commemoration, each time _Sarie_ tells an ‘endearing South African story’, ‘Sarie’s story’ and ‘readers’ stories’ ‘interweave’, creating an ‘emotional tie’. She adds: ‘about _Sarie_ one feels, as Alba Bouwer said years ago, like a family member or someone who lives close to you’. _Sarie_ in the postapartheid context of 2009 was therefore still invoking the imagined community of the _volk_ -- but reconjured within the _Sarie_ space. The contemporary resonance of this myth is confirmed with the inclusion of the following letter, which speaks of the continued embeddedness of _Sarie_ in an Afrikaner nationalist imaginary. The manufacturing of the ‘_Sarie_ family’ resonates with the nationalist conception of nation as family writ large (Anderson 1991; Hall 1992; McClintock 1993). _Sarie’s_
60th anniversary occasioned its reliving in nostalgia for white days gone by. Displayed in a pink block on the Letters Page of the July 2009 edition, a letter starts:

*Still my inspiration* (original emphasis)

1949. 60 years ago. I am 14 years old and in high school. The Voortrekker monument is unveiled and two teachers grow their beards for the occasion. Both rust brown. And my grandma buys me my first Sarie Marais... Magda Frick, Gordons Bay.

This is the family that demarcates the extent to which individualised ‘inspiration’ may be acted upon. This ‘I’ is accessible through this ‘we’.

The purported ‘inspiration’ to embrace neoliberal and postfeminist self-actualisation results in a subject position demarcated for ‘Afrikaans-speaking woman’, re-sutured with key *volksmoeder* elements instilling an ethnic twist: the ideal self can be accomplished through consumption to enable care of others. In an Editor’s Letter (December 2012) that reduces agency to ‘keeping on dreaming’ and ‘waiting for surprises’, the editor writes: ‘Reach for the stars’ is ‘a kind of confirmation’ that ‘we can’: ‘...a little voice says: I am more. To be *more* and to offer more is how we have been put together’. This is also the quotation that is pulled and highlighted separately underneath the photo. Similarly, the editor’s motto is ‘*Give of yourself*’ (original emphasis), inserted in two columns during the course of 2009. ‘Giving of yourself’ is hitched with *Sarie*’s branding motto ‘inspiration’. Again, another version is: ‘You can never ever let yourself feel better if you don’t let someone else feel better’ (May 2009). These are read as ‘productive reiterations’ functioning as discursive performatives which produce what they name and therefore have subjectivating effects (Butler, 1993:106-7). *Sarie* discourses recalibrate the rhetoric of neoliberal individualism and rational choice to realign this femininity to one that constantly derives its sustenance from other people. The trope of selfless service is the primary sedimented trace of the iterated *volksmoeder* precedent. Rearticulated with the neoliberal notion of self-improving consumer-citizen it now says: ‘make yourself as best as you can to serve others’.

A heading to a reader’s letter (March 2009) iterates ‘Give of yourself’. Another is headlined: ‘To think of others’. Repetitive attempts at identitary
closures on the basis of the phantasmatic self-for-others woman-as-wife/mother framework circulate in Sarielese:

Lord… [d]espite my own admonitions […] I have again failed. I have collapsed into a routine of getting up, going on, planning weeks ahead… [D]id I build sand castles with my grandson […]? Did I really hear when my children told me something? I am guilty… Letter of the Month, Annien Teubes, Moorreesburg, January 2009.

I have my own business, a permanent post and do extra work… It is not enough. I realise I am emotionally absent for my husband and children because I focus on the wrong things. […] Let the thoughts go about losing our home… Letter of the Month, Alta van Spreeuwenberg, Pretoria, March 2009.

It is a renewal of self-sacrifice, a volksmoeder element articulated with postfeminist and neoliberal elements. ‘Give of yourself’ conjoined with ‘inspiration’ as central Sarie tropes have the subject in question consuming for others. The readers’ letters page exemplifies this. Entitled My Sê Tel [My Say Counts], Sarie suggests that the say of the reader/’ordinary woman’ ‘counts’. Instead, the letters page is overrun with promotions in a repetitive blurring of the ethical distinction between editorial content and advertising content (McCracken 1993; Baird, Loges and Rosenbaum 1999). Product placement is achieved on every page, in several editorial features -- with prices -- and even in a lead article (February 2009). Letters are mediated to the extent that uniformity in tenor and style is achieved, placing a question mark over whether letters are indeed from different ‘readers’. All letters bar one in the period 2009 are uncritical of, or promote, the Sarie discourse. The one (faintly) critical letter still capitulates to Sarie’s conflation of consumerism and pleasure:

I like to read Sarie and see the prettiest shiny things, most beautiful people and places where I will never go. You know, I also desire these things… The bible says you may not desire… what now? […] It comes and lies here in my heart to be cherished… Thanks, Sarie, that I at least can see everything! Jennie Agenbach, Okahandja, August 2009.

A more apt description of ‘Your Say Counts’ would be ‘Say after Sarie’. Who gets to ‘say’ or, as Foucault (1998:11) puts it, ‘who does the speaking’ and what are the ‘positions and viewpoints from which they speak’? ‘My Say Counts’ is in dialogue with Laaste Sê [Last Say], a column written by former Sarie editor and
ex-preacher in the Afrikaner nationalist Nederduits-Gereformeerde Kerk [Dutch Reformed Church], Izak de Villiers. The ‘Sarie family’ has a pater familias: the father who literally gets the last word on the last page of the magazine. His is the constitutive masculine outside to Sarie. The editor attributes her idea of ‘giving of herself’ to her mentor de Villiers -- the paternal guidance of the Afrikaner masculine. Having a say that counts means submitting to consumerism and to delimitation by an ethnic family presided over by a patriarch.

4.6 Discursive strategy IV: Whitewashing the blackout

In Sarielese, black people only surface from a generalised elision if they fit meritocratic ideas that make them ‘deserving’ (see Editor’s Letters in June and Oct 2009). Black subjects are also authorised when they take responsibility for lost ‘opportunities’ due to apartheid oppression (which is erased in Sarielese). Brown (2005) notes that neoliberalism’s rational agent is fully accountable, whatever the structural constraints; failure to achieve prosperity is depoliticised as a ‘mismanaged life’ (pp.42-3). Postfeminism similarly demands denial of the ‘classed and raced constitution of the “successful” feminine subject’, in return for a coherent narrative of choice and autonomy (Budgeon, 2011:285). Whiteness bolstered with neoliberal and postfeminist erasures are at work in the treatment of Pearl Janssen, who received the ‘black’ beauty title of Miss Africa South in 1970. Next to a blurb for an article on former Miss World Anneline Kriel, who received the ‘white’ Miss South Africa title in 1974, the promotional line ‘our forgotten Miss SA’ on the February 2009 cover suggests the excavation of Janssen. It promises her reinstatement in the ‘history of beauty’, the overturning of forgetting in favour of remembering and the ‘coming to speech’ of ‘those reduced to silence’ (Eribon, 2004:9) – it promises the opposite of the expunging work of whiteness.

But Sarie excavates Janssen not to confront the oppressive practices of apartheid or to rectify elisions in historical accounts, but to recast her exclusion in the rhetoric of ‘the market’ in which subjects find or miss opportunities. Apartheid discrimination against the black feminine is reinvented as ‘...life not always being fair, and that we aren’t always granted equal chances and the acknowledgement that we deserve’ (Editor’s Letter, February 2009). This
strategy is bolstered with exoticisation of Janssen in articulations with ‘opulent’, ‘sensual’ and fertility. Chambers (1997:194) points out that exoticising effects a disconnection between subject and objects that facilitates forgetting and denial of historical contexts because the stories become identified with the other. In Sarielese, exoticisation is yoked with neoliberal elements. Janssen's is a case of 'playing the dice as it rolls for us' (Editor's Letter, February 2009) – a depoliticisation hinting at neoliberalism’s advancement of ‘casino capitalism’ (Strange, 1986). Janssen's ‘message of hope for us all’ (‘It's time to fly!’) earns Sarie's verification of her worthiness as subject. The editor thus erases Janssen's actual life conditions of poverty and racist discrimination and reinscribes them with individualising self-help clichés. These deployments allow this white femininity to suppress the constitutive marginality of the racialised feminine.

‘Pearl’ as ‘good black’ (see discussion below on the ‘good homosexual’) is allowed entry into Sarielese to shield whiteness from accountability for the privations that racism brings upon blacks:

- Sarie's version of 'Pearl' acquits whiteness by apportioning blame not to apartheid or racism but to the 'beauty industry': ‘I had nothing, I was so disillusioned and then I realised: the beauty industry destroyed my life’.
- ‘When I see a Miss SA nowadays, I am not sad or bitter […] it is not their fault that I was born at the wrong time’.
- ‘Now we should all just have hope and look ahead because it does not help to ruminate over the past.’

Notable is the elision of race and apartheid as productive of Pearl's subject position and its transposition with class, a signifier which lends itself to articulation with ‘the assumption that a person’s economic fortunes derive from qualities of the person’ (West and Fenstermaker, 1996:376). This is due to neoliberalism facilitating a shift from racist attribution of qualities on the ‘basis’ of skin colour. Elsewhere apartheid is recoded in the euphemist ‘years of difficulty’ (Editor's Letter May 2009).

A reader's letter titled ‘Like her own’ employs similar tactics to the Janssen article. A good black adheres to the revered sacrificial femininity of the volksmoeder while also serving as the workhorse standing in for the white
woman’s mothering. She risks her life by remaining loyal to whiteness and facing down the ‘bad black’:

'Why do you love this white child? What about apartheid?’ the robbers wanted to know. ‘Where was he during apartheid?’ defended she. ‘His mom knows nothing about apartheid’ (January 2009).

The ‘good black’ acquits not only the white child but even its white mother of culpability for apartheid. The letter elides the identity of both the ‘good black’ and the author, as she is merely identified as ‘Kian’s mom’. Therefore a double erasure is effected of both the white and the black woman as the white masculine is centered to which they both stand as constitutive outsides. This is an iteration of normative masculinity’s generative centrality, here advanced through the signifier motherhood, which the boy has double of: a white mom and a black mom.

In the March 2009 cover article active non-service relationship interaction between a white Afrikaans woman and a black woman was rendered unintelligible. Photos show white actress Amalia Uys in conversation with and hugging black actress Vuyelwa Booi. Their relationship is not reflected in the text; instead, despite a lack of photographic depictions, Sarielese renders Uys ‘star struck’ with white Afrikaans male actors on the set. The erasure is expanded with captions reinscribing photos with insertions of white figures not in the photos. ‘Vuyelwa’ as racialised other is allowed in the text only when Sarielese invokes her failure in achieving the criterion of speaking Afrikaans. The suppression of the significations in the visual images prevents any further problematisation of Sarielese’s version of race.

The erasure of race and normalisation of racial marginalisation coincide with the discursive implantation of the marked whiteness of Afrikanerhood at an invisibilised centre of normative whiteness in the Sarie symbolic field. These discursive manoeuvres legitimise white femininity’s hegemonic position vis-à-vis racialised femininity.
4.7 Discursive strategy V: (Sm)othering centre

The signifier ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ is articulated with the *volksmoeder* nodal point through the application of discursive strategies of erasure, stigmatisation and entertainment. In the rare case (Caster Semenya in the Editor’s Letter, October 2009) where female masculinity (Halberstam, 1998) features, it is not named as such and is incorporated into the normal. Lesbianism is shrouded in silence in the editorial categories under revision in this study. According to Foucault (1998) this silence, ‘the things one declines to say, or is forbidden to name’, ‘functions alongside the things said, with them and in relation to them’ as part of the strategies permeating discourses (p.27). *Sarie*’s silence about lesbianism could be read as a strategy of exclusion of ‘contestatory possibilities’ to implement the heterosexual norm and enable the assumption of (hetero)-sexed positions (Butler, 1993:109). Such a strategy conceals the extent to which its closed spaces are dependent on oppositions with outsider figures for their constitution (Smith, 1994:24). Abjection renders heterosexuality viable at the expense of homosexuality *not* through refusal but through identification with abject homosexuality, which must be concealed (Butler, 1993:112). This ‘identification with abject homosexuality’ refers to the constitutive split at the origin of each identity (Laclau and Zac, 1994), the productive exclusions at the root of every identity. Not confessing to the constitutive outside also facilitates the obfuscation of the coercion and political struggles producing the exclusions. By repressing the other, the malleability of social structures can be obscured and social coherence (normative heterofemininity) achieved, albeit temporarily (Laclau, 1990:173).

In comparison, while male homosexuality avoids blanket negation, effeminate masculinity is subjected to domestication in the *Sarie* discourse. Male homosexuality is signified a ‘problem’ to be ‘solved’, an emergency (see ‘Dilemma: My son is gay’, *Sarie*, October 2009). ‘Being gay’ is yoked with ‘never a “typical” son’; artiness; interior decorating; and a ‘molly-coddling’ mother; alongside repudiations of effeminacy. In accordance with the problem-solving logic, three opinions of ‘experts’ are featured. The psychotherapeutics repudiate homophobia or even ‘change’ but essentialise gayness. The reader is instructed to support husband and/or son to fulfil her maternal duties.
However, this leniency is rebutted in an article in the same edition (Sarie, October 2009, pp.56-61), a popular Afrikaans singer (Nicholis Louw) is interrogated about ‘gossip’ that he might be gay. The stigma of child sexual assault is attached to the identity, alongside non-conformist utterances. He stands accused of violating ‘the heterosexual presumption of the symbolic domain’ (Butler, 1993:110). Therefore, iterative defences of heteronormative compliance are invoked: the marriage imperative; the male sexual prerogative; the masculine pursuit of cars. These ‘productive reiterations’ have subjectivating effects -- in this case of ‘culturally viable sexual subjects’ (Butler, 1993:106-7). Louw confesses in life and death terms to the obliterating effects of homosexuality, without naming it as such, an example of ‘the imaginary misrecognition of “the ego” as it “recognises” itself in the ideological formations which constitute it’ (Althusser, 2008:171). This exemplifies how the Sarie discourse constitutes ‘sexed subjects along the heterosexual divide to the extent that the threat of punishment effectively instils fear, where the object of fear is figured by homosexualised abjection’ (Butler, 1993:110).

Sarie’s treatment of homosexuality resonates with Butler’s (1993:111) notion that the assertion of heterosexuality does not always require full renouncement of homosexuality: homosexuality can be ‘entertained’ but only insofar as it remains ‘entertainment’, either as a figure of incomplete sexual subjectivation or as powerless to rearticulate the law of heteronormativity. This ‘entertainment’ is confirmed in the instalment of the male feminine in the signifying chain of the Sarie discourse. Nataniël, one of Sarie’s four male columnists in 2009, is a popular, gay Afrikaans singer-comedian. He is male-bodied but features material accoutrements of normative femininity. In his irreverent column for Sarie, called Kaalkop (‘Bald Head’, an untranslatable word play on his hairless cranium and an Afrikaans expression for being forthright), Nataniël plays the role of jester, traditionally ‘a eunuch, or a “female male”, castrated and thus sexually neutered and safe’ – similar to lesbian columnist Marianne Thamm in Sarie’s English-language counterpart Fair Lady (West, 2009:108). The jester is simultaneously the ‘Wise Fool’ and an outsider, a favourite figure of Afrikaans cultural narratives employed to speak the ‘truth’ about the Afrikaans condition. Nataniël’s other, complementary subject position
within the *Sarie* discourse is the gay man as the best friend, confidant and trusted advisor of the straight woman, who knows not only about style but understands emotions and speaks the ‘truth’ about what it means to be a woman. The caveat for this instalment is the desexualisation of the male feminine, which Nataniël personifies with his child-like performance and submersion of his sexuality. Harnessing the male feminine links what is new in the contemporary moment (the greater social visibility of gay men) with consumerist agency and the myths of the *volksmoeder*. Apart from his column, *Sarie* front cover features on Nataniël reiterated *Sarie* subjectivity: diets, etiquette and Christmas ‘togetherness’. A *Sarie*-branded notebook included with the May 2009 edition contained a maxim ‘from Nataniël’: ‘You can never ever let yourself feel better if you don’t let someone else feel better.’ Thus the *Sarie* discourse ‘entertains’ male feminine difference to articulate *volksmoeder* elements. Despite the margin having been folded back on the centre (Williams 2005), no space is created in the sexual order for a counter-discourse and resubjectivation (Eribon, 2004:7, 145, 313). Nataniël is *Sarie’s* ‘good homosexual’, as per Smith’s (1994:242) formulation: ‘[C]ontemporary homophobia constructs the mythical figure of the “good homosexual” and promises to include her within the normal in return for her denunciation of her fellow queers’.

### 4.8 Discursive strategy VI: The compulsory heterosexuality of *Sarielese* - Try and try again

Being marked ‘woman’ is about utilising technologies of gender to materially imprint a certain standard of femininity upon the body, which await masculine verification in order to commence reproduction, which in turn affirms accomplishment of *volksmoeder* heterofemininity, projected as ‘wholeness’. This persistently iterated myth is yoked in *Sarielese* with the above-described recalibration of the neoliberal focus on the self. *Sarielese* aims to steer this particularist subject position towards a self that is intent on ‘heterosexual union’, including by employing performatives of everyday heteronormativity (‘through thick and thin’; ‘forever’). A woman not tied to a man is figured as ‘lacking’ in femininity and subjectivity, with hetero-union proffered as remedy:
'Businesswoman, TV presenter, motivational speaker – but now, for the first time, Cindy Nell feels like she does not have to prove herself anymore. And the crown on her happiness is her trouman [literally ‘marry-able man’]. (‘More than just a beauty queen’, Nell article, January 2009)

‘She knows the right man will come at the right time.’ (Elma Postma interview, June 2009)

‘We will rather stay in an unhappy relationship and convince ourselves it is not that bad. There are always hundreds of reasons to stay and so few to end it’. (Nell article, January 2009)

As Foucault (1998:102) reminds us, discourses deploy contradictions, which should not detract the researcher from examining its power effects and the power relations that require such deployment. Sarie rebuts everyday failures in the accomplishment of the heteronorm with a two-pronged strategy: (1.) articulating the collapse of the fantasy of heterosexual union as devastating to femininity and iteratively invoking such failures to highlight contrasting moments of ‘model’ womanhood; (2.) interpellating subjects with denials of the criterion of masculine verification, overturned by pacifying naturalisations of relationships-as-feminine-responsibility that hide its oppressive dimensions. The loss of hetero-union causes devastation as a pleading, immobile feminine is ‘left behind’ by an active masculine, as in this reader’s letter:

‘Please come back’
My life falls apart piece by piece. […] My unconditional love was not big and good enough for my husband. […] How do you break off a piece of heart…? We are, after all, one. I pray you realise we belong together […] I thank God for keeping me upright… ‘New Hope’, Pretoria North (April 2009)

Departure from the norm can only be tolerated in extreme circumstances and commands a lesson in femininity. Subjects reach for neoliberal psychotherapeutics in seeming denials of masculine verification:

Her divorce taught her […] you can’t just throw it away. You have to […] learn from it.

‘Everything is dark and black […] as a woman you tend to think that if you change, your relationship will be better. But […] if you try and be someone that you are not, it won’t fit.’
Anna-Mart van der Merwe article (August 2009)
Even a perfectly beautiful former Miss Universe sometimes doubts herself. There was a divorce that made her feel like a huge failure; after that a broken engagement. She started to wonder if she completely lacks the ability to make the right choices in love. [...] Michelle realises now that one can’t expect of someone else to complete you. You first have to be happy and love yourself. McLean article (November 2009).

Sarielese articulates feminine service with self-responsibility and self-actualisation, irrespective of gendered power relations:

‘Amor and Joost van der Westhuizen, perfect couple, fairytale life [...] the shock came like a punch to the stomach: Joost and a stripper in a sex video [...] Amor was making food when Joost told her [...] Questions milled in my head. Am I not good enough? What did I do wrong? [...] my aim in life is to serve in a way that makes me happy... I am his wife. I have his children. What kind of woman would I be if I did not stand by my husband? I promised to be there for him in good and bad times. Amor Vittone interview (December 2009)

The ‘give of yourself’ performative is here upholstered with postfeminism, which removes gender as conceptual lens. It revamps a discourse about women taking responsibility to be useful wives and mothers. It feminises failure of norms and the required self-correction.

Self-production as in service of others permits another Sarie divergence from postfeminism: the relative lack of sexualisation, which departs from its postion as a nodal point in postfeminist discourse (Attwood, 2009; Tasker and Negra, 2007). The most prevalent iteration featured on the front covers of Sarie during the period 2009 was heterosexual relationships with men (n=40), outnumbering maternal relationships with children (n=16), ‘body’ (n=26) and ‘home’ (n=3). Sarie lead articles highlighted heterosexual associations with the featured celebrity as the predominant theme in all 2009 editions except March. The front cover promotional ‘plugs’ for the articles yoke ‘relationships with men’ with ‘romance’. Yoking with ‘sex’ is notably infrequent (n=7). Indeed, sex is comparatively scarce in Sarielese despite a contemporary context of western women’s magazines suffused with postfeminist hyper-sexualisation (Attwood, 2009; Walter, 2011).

Maternity is built into feminine sexuality, which is subservient to keeping the family intact. The husband can be ejected from the family if caught out with infidelity, but his straining at the harness of monogamous marriage is
naturalised as ‘manly’. This femininity struggles to pin its relational masculinity down amid the prevailing dichotomies masculine/feminine-active/passive-public/domestic. ‘Woman’ still seeks the reason for his infidelity in herself as she assumes (maternal) responsibility for his sexuality.

It is a sexuality that depends on masculine activation and therefore professes lack of knowledge. The April 2009 lead article cites boundless masculine sexuality, in contrast with a femininity anxious for the ‘perfect wedding night’. Sexual ignorance/innocence is feminine and sexual appetite/knowledge is masculine, with marriage as complementary completion. A distinctly child-like disposition is inscribed on the surface of feminine sexuality through repetitions of ‘fairytale wedding/life’; ‘princess’; ‘knight on a white horse’. These idealisations hide the political implications of heterosexual identifications.

This includes effecting an infantilised femininity. The cover text of November 2009 reads: ‘Michelle McLean and her Nr. 1’, with ‘Nr. 1’ referring to her son. A ‘pull’ quotation in the interview reads:

> When I am with [son] Luke, I learn a lot about myself. He has to know that I [...] support him [...] I would lose my temper [...] and [...] say ‘mom is a brat’. McLean interview, (November 2009).

> [The children] ask: ‘Mommy, why is your little heart sore?’ [...] I also tell them: ‘Dada made Mommy’s little heart sore.’ Vittone interview (December 2009).

Repetitions in identifications are never identical and contain violations of the rules of discourses (Smith, 1998:79). Momentary potential for self-creation occurs in the different decisions taken in the constituting of subjectivity (Laclau, 1990:44, 173). When such occasional resistances spill over into Sarielese, Sarie takes disciplinary action:

> ‘He did not take no for an answer when he phoned me [for a date].’ [...] Before the wedding she already experienced Bowen as jealous and controlling and she realised it would not get better. But she became pregnant on the honeymoon... Because she did not work, she was dependent on Bowen for everything. ‘I gave up my power as woman [...] I did not believe I was good enough. The marriage was emotionally destructive [...] But [...] marriage is forever, through thick and thin [...] I decided that I had made my choices and that I should [...] try my best to be a good wife and mom.’ van der Merwe interview (September 2009)
Sarielese inserts as heading ‘I have never been in love’ to contradict van der Merwe’s notion that the sacrifice of her independence was the sacrifice of her ‘power as a woman’. The heading invokes the myth of legitimisation by the masculine other as still out of reach. The word ‘already’ in the introduction alerts the reader to a problematic non-normative element: ‘Suzette van der Merwe has already been married twice but she has never really loved [...] Going forward she wants to trust her heart, rather than her head’. The words ‘Suzette’ and ‘heart’ are accentuated with large pink font. Thus van der Merwe’s unhappy marriages signify failure to achieve feminine completion due to her subscription to a masculine attribute, rationality. Lack of independence and masculine coercion, as hinted at, are both normalised.

Other closure-failures similarly invoke accusations of un-femininity: an unstable home life made businesswoman and former beauty queen Nell ‘hard as a rock’ (January 2009). A Sarie editorial interjection approvingly states: ‘Then it is good to hear you are pretty and nice’. Nell remains incomplete despite career success and own wealth. A ‘marry-able man’, identified merely as a businessman and property owner, is needed to complete her, a wholeness clinched when ‘the sun catches her engagement ring’. To be ‘more than a beauty queen’ cannot be accomplished in ‘hard’ things like business but by becoming ‘soft’ in union with the masculine. That this is in fact an ‘imperfect repetition’ (Smith 1998:79) is confirmed by her previous marriage.

Disciplinary action is also undertaken to articulate ‘independent woman’ with failure. Actress Elma Postma (June 2009) travelled 65,000 km for an Afrikaans pay-TV programme. Despite the programme’s title Boer soek ’n vrou (‘Farmer/Afrikaner seeks wife’), Postma as presenter finds ‘wives for men’. An Afrikaans woman crisscrossing the country articulates elements such as public sphere, career, mobility and detachment from masculine overseer. While the programme is heteronormative, Postma represents a subject position too unfettered, risking multiplied possibilities for Afrikaans femininities. Sarie intervenes to domesticate the freewheeling woman. Postma’s independence is yoked with the threat of becoming unfeminine. In Sarie’s manufacturings, the stigma of ‘the woman on the shelf’ is conjured up for 30-year-old Postma:
‘She wonders sometimes if she is not too independent for a relationship. “I take big decisions about finances and property on my own. [...] I do not have to ask anybody’s permission [...] But I want to be soft again and I want to hand over [...] It would be nice if [a man] could look after me a bit”.

‘Life is not about money and what you achieve. It is about love [...] about relationships. If you are 80 and you are lucky enough to have a man in your life, it is wonderful. Without that you are a has-been actress with a few photos against the wall.’

Femininity is normalised as handing over power.

4.9 Discursive strategy VII: Sarie’s panoptical masculine surveying the limits of ordentlikheid


However, Sarielese does not hide the operations of its masculinity but rather parades a hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity iteratively delimiting femininity. This masculinity double-marks the Sarie subject position: as feminine, and as Afrikaans. It acts as a normalised and constant standard legitimating the Sarie version of Afrikaner femininity and inscribing and policing its limits and thus the borders of ordentlikheid. Examining these positionalities in relational form reveals a femininity yoked into a chain of meanings with dependence, weakness, suffering, emotionality, infantilisation, self-sacrifice and selflessness. Its co-construction is a masculinity hooked into a signifying chain with father, protector, God, adviser, leader and knower.

The regulatory prevalence of this masculinity was epitomised by the patriarchal succession of male-only editors at Sarie between 1949 and 1994, of which de Villiers was the last. It is dispersed throughout the magazine. Men write four of the six monthly columns. When ‘Last Say’ columnist de Villiers passed away in 2009, tributes (December 2009) positioned him as grand patriarch to
the ‘Sarie family’ of readers and staff. Jointly with Andre le Roux, another columnist self-positioned as ‘brother’ (Letter, November 2009) to de Villiers’s *pater familias*, he counteracts the ‘self-empowerment’ that the neoliberal discourse may effect by setting the limits of the ‘inspiration’ that may be garnered from the magazine’s pages. This regulatory operation is in the service of a masculinism drawing on Afrikaner nationalism. De Villiers is ‘saluted’ as a ‘blueblood Afrikaner’; a former male editor invokes Afrikaner nationalist icons and poetry which erase women:

> About him I can repeat the words of the poet Jan F.E. Cilliers about General Christiaan de Wet: ‘Be still, brothers, a man passes’. Fritz Joubert (November 2009).

While the brother editor laments the passing of a man, a former female editor is rendered child: the only other female editor in the magazine’s history apart from van Breda, Professor of Journalism Lizette Rabe quotes de Villiers approvingly as authorising her accession as editor: ‘remember, my child... when I wanted you to succeed me [...]? Yes, Reverend Izak. But, Reverend Izak, […]. No, my child, no[...]. Now Reverend Izak is also not there anymore...’ Thus slippage occurs in Sarielese between man and father, also exemplified in the following letters:

> In difficult times you carry me […] you hold me tightly and sometimes I even see the pride in your eyes. ‘Unfinished diamond’, Centurion (June 2009)

> I miss our days of cherishing and protection, when I would be cradled in your arms, safe...’

> ‘Wife of a stranger’, Klerksdorp. (February 2009)

The distinctions between ‘man as husband’, ‘man as father’ and ‘God the Father’ blur as signifiers attached to these categories coincide. Sarielese invokes Christian nationalist notions of the patriarch as the family's interlocutor with ‘our heavenly father’. The interchangeability of terrestrial and heavenly masculinities resonates with Landman’s findings in *The Piety of Afrikaans women* (1994), constructions which have shown longevity into post-apartheid South Africa\(^i\) (Landman, 2005):

- A reader declares to her husband: ‘You who see angel wings in the clouds, you are the one with the biggest wings.’ Letter of the Month, Marguerite Dippenaar, Norwood (February 2009).
Letters about de Villiers hint at the divine: ‘Good old spirit’ and ‘Bread and sardines’ (insinuation of Jesus Christ) (November and December 2009)

The approachable patriarch (‘like a dad’) is a knower of women ‘because he had so much respect for them’ (Editor’s Letter, November 2009). It is a masculinity which determines the terms of speaking: while an anecdote relays de Villiers’ mother’s defence of his right to speak, he inspires a reader to put ‘a guard in front of my mouth’ (Crizelle Dempers, Bothasig, December 2009). This masculinity may or may not explain itself, in contrast to a confessional femininity:

'It is part of being a woman to want to know [...] A man’s attitude is: this is what happened, let’s move on.' (Vittone interview)

Communication problems easily slip into a marriage, so I wrote to him: [...] ‘Thanks that you sometimes say nothing when words can be redundant’. ‘Unfinished diamond’, Centurion (June 2009).

Sarielese also domesticates ‘husband/father gone wrong’. Sarie’s editorial decision to elevate the sentence ‘Sometimes you are familiar’ as heading for the following letter contradicts the despair and the suggestion of violence by emphasising the potential for continued ‘normalcy’:

In your place is a man that hurts me, scares me, a man that revolts me... Sometimes you are familiar. Wife of a stranger, Klerksdorp (February 2009)

The threat of violence constitutive of this masculinity is thus normalised, also in the following letter by a reader whose friend, ‘the life of the party’, has confessed to ‘the secret’ of being a child victim of intra-familial sexual assault and who has since been wearing a ‘mask’:

Dad’s Princess
Thank you to my dad because he treated me like a little girl when I was one. When he came into my room it was to rub cream into my legs suffering from growing pains [...] how lucky I am not to have my childhood murdered like the Annas. To all the dads that protect and love their children – you made us princesses. Princess from Murrayfield, Pretoria (January 2009)
Bestselling Afrikaans boek ‘Dis ek, Anna’ (Lötter, 2004), translated into English (‘It’s Me, Anna’, 2005), is an autobiographical tale about child sexual assault within an Afrikaans family. In the letter’s text those damaged by a coded violence are othered as ‘masked’ ‘Annas’, a part of them ‘murdered’ due to their ‘secret’. The masculine that ‘murdered’ is elided from the text; rather, the reader thanks an idealised masculinity for not assaulting her. The threat of masculine sexual violence is always already present (Peterson, 2000), therefore she is grateful for the exemption, even when he had the opportunity when entering her room and touching her. The power granted the masculine either violates you or makes you a princess.

Masculinity as surveillance of ordentlikheid is normalised as an ‘everyday panopticism’ (Foucault, 1991a:212) in Sarie texts:

*I gather my courage and ask how he found me in the packed café. He says: “Easy, he said you’d wear red and smell of roses.” [...] The description could have been so different. [He] could have said I am round-ish with brown hair, or that my front teeth are skew...’* Veralda Schmidt, Kyalami (January 2009).

*I page through my wife’s Sarie and enjoy the beautiful photos of the women. There are few things as pretty as a woman. I believe it is God’s “cherry” on His creation...* Lukie Carelsen, Waterkloof Ridge (September 2009).

In the Editor’s Letter of April 2009, small-town hair salons are depicted as ‘places to gather, to socialise and to be made pretty’. The editor surmises this idea also accorded with ‘Uncle Jan’, who delivered ‘his wife’ for a haircut at a salon in a small town where the editor was also present. Hence, he ‘checked out every woman’ before ‘thank[ing] the hairdressers for helping keep SA’s women so pretty’ (emphasis in original). The editor concludes: ‘I told you hair is important. More than that, it is a case of national interest!’ The column recasts a sexist incident in which masculinity appropriates a women-only space. The editor ‘playfully’ interprets the objectification and policing of women as an acknowledgement of woman’s role as ‘national symbol’. The playfulness falls short of subversion because it does not problematise panoptical masculinity. It contains woman in the patriarchal order of signification as body, object, spectacle and symbol (de Lauretis, 1987:20). Moreover, in a small rural town a
salon with Sarie's white, upper-middleclass editor as client would exclude many if not most of the local women on the basis of class and race, including racial coding of hairxii. The column's unstated norm is of an invisibilised whiteness reminiscent of the National Party's 'White South Africa' (van der Westhuizen, 2007:128). It suggests a production of white spaces which are then claimed under the misnomer 'South African' spaces. Exclusionary practices are again based on un/marking the body, in this case white masculinity's stamp of approval unmarks white femininity and renders it standard, alongside invisibilised middleclassness. In this mini-microcosm of apartheid reproduction, the heteronormative gender hierarchy is firmly in place. 'Uncle Jan' could only proclaim his appropriation of the space if it were a white, feminine, Afrikaans 'we' that gather, socialise and get pretty there. Feminine self-investment is rendered in service of the volk, which has been privatised for reproduction in white Afrikaans spaces, sanctioned by and reproduced in Sarie.

4.10 Discursive strategy VIII: Sarie as white space

The dislocation of this whiteness also stems from South Africa's decentring as 'home' (Steyn, 2003). As Johanna van der Walt of Centurion ('Letter of the Month', July 2009) puts it: she needs a 'GPS for the heart' to 'give me just a little indication of what direction I should go in to arrive home'. The May and June Editor's Letters on the 2009 national elections ruminate on the 'times when only your country is good enough' but promote a belonging to a South Africanness produced through the ethnicised whiteness of Afrikaners.

This whiteness co-produces Africa as 'unknowably other' (Chambers, 1997:189-194). In the January 2009 Editor's Letter, Africa is filled with its over-used, colonial meaning of 'dark continent'. The Editor's Letter articulates terms such as 'midnight', unfamiliar, strange and darkness repetitively from the viewpoint of a distant 'I'. The city Dakar is pictured by the 'I' of the column as 'lively' and 'colourful', i.e. the exoticism of the 'other'. The dis-ease of the 'I' is reaffirmed: the rising of the sun can be 'reassuring' 'in the unknown'. The conclusion is a call to stay close to the familiar; and to find inspiration in new things, which resonates with neoliberal self-crafting. Thus, two strategies are
proposed: disappearance into the global postmodern and a return to the local (Hall, 1997a, 1997b).

Sarie is positioned as a stand-in for a lost white, Afrikaans world that offers a brief respite from the world ‘out there’ for Afrikaans whites scattered across the globe. Readers’ letters reveal how nostalgia is articulated with remnants of the apartheid discourse in repeated attempts to anchor this dislocated whiteness. Sarie’s 60th commemoration created discursive opportunities for white nostalgia by stealth. Using readers’ letters, Afrikaner nationalist signifiers such as ‘founder’ of South Africa, Jan van Riebeek, the Voortrekker Monument and the apartheid anthem are reinvoked in Sarielese.

When Sarie is delivered my heart beats [...] pure Afrikaans [...] We remember the home-things. Marlein Fanoy, Stanford (Britain), April 2009.

Only a few things can dull [the feeling of] missing home. The magazine did it for me. Marelize Wessels, Dubai, July 2009.

The biggest problem in Bahrain is that you unlearn your language [...] Fortunately we can buy [Sarie] [...] We women [...] are hungry for news about our people, soaps and recipes... in Afrikaans. Dawne Odendaal, Bahrain, May 2009.

Sarie, [...] you shared my sadness when we had to come [to] the strangeness, away from everything and everybody that’s precious to me. [...] We chat and gossip about [...] SA and you keep me abreast of issues. Liz Botha, Georgia, USA, September 2009.

...I am [...] reading Sarie that my mom-in-law posted all the way from Graaff-Reinet. [...] With every word I read I miss home and I think of the words ‘We for you, South Africa’. I sing it softly while an excitement bubbles in me about the articles that follow. Thanks, Sarie, that you could let me feel so close to home in a foreign country. Jana Larson, Lourdes, August 2009.

In conclusion, this chapter finds Sarie to be an instrument in the modernisation of a subaltern whiteness aspiring to equal status with the hegemonic and globalised Anglo (bourgeois, heteromasculine) whiteness of the more successful settler class, ‘the English’. Afrikaner whiteness’ ambition of equality with hegemonic whiteness is figured in Sarie’s normative heterofemininity. Sarielese consists of performatives for a mode of ‘doing woman’ at a sexuality-race-class-
gender juncture that melds the particularist and the hegemonic. In a reverse manoeuvre, Afrikaner nationalism’s volk as a particularist family constellation writ large before and during apartheid is flipped around and projected into privatised white spaces. Class-based consumerist choice is the tool of demarcation of these spaces. Sarie serves as one such (virtual) white space away from democratic troubling, a stand-in for a lost Afrikaner nation-state. Black others that escape blackout in Sarielese are domesticated to exonerate Sarie subjects from apartheid culpability and to assume responsibility for apartheid privations. In return for absolution, the resuscitated volk in miniature holds sway in these spaces, setting the terms for the allowable heterofemininity. Subjects access both community and femininity through the consumption of Sarie. Sarie resolves the prevalent tension in western women’s magazines between submission to oppressive gender relations and assertion of agency by articulating two complementary injunctions: the neoliberal call to self-responsibility and self-improvement and the volksmoeder dictum of selfless assumption of responsibility for others, while also assuming sole culpability for any failure in the accomplishment of heteronormative prescriptions. This is a sexuality that remains child-like until activated by masculine verification, after which it also turns maternal to assume responsibility when male sexuality steps outside of conjugal monogamy when compelled by an ingrained ‘manliness’. The threat of male sexual assault is always already present. This self-for-others woman-as-wife/mother is the ‘I’ accessed through the ‘we’. As with black others, Sarielese annexes potential for resubjectivating counter-discourses through a lockdown on lesbian others, while gay male others are permitted in the capacity of male feminine vassals channelling the prescripts of volksmoeder ordentlikheid. These machinations are overseen by a hegemonic masculinity (a conflation of god-father-husband-man) that is not implicit, internalised or invisible, as in western women’s magazines, but foregrounded and actively delimiting the Sarie subject position, double-marking it as feminine and Afrikaans. It counteracts whatever feminist effects the neoliberal espousal of self-actualisation might have, creating what can be read as Sarie’s version of postfeminism. These are the contours of what can be called normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid, as elaborated by Sarie.
The next two chapters investigate the discursive ordering of *ordentlikheid*, inside and outside, to (re)capture subjects dislodged from the subject position of ‘Afrikaner woman’ in the democratic un-stitching of the Afrikaner nationalist *volk*’s hierarchical unity.

---

1 The ‘hero’s journey’ is a popular narrative of self-construction described by Joseph Campbell in *The hero with a thousand faces* (1949).

2 *Die Vrou* [Woman] (van der Merwe and Albertyn, 1972), an Afrikaner nationalist text generated during that period, dispenses a normative Afrikaner nationalist gender discourse in contradiction to Bouwer’s problematisation, which suggests discursive competition at the time.

3 The correct grammatical form in Afrikaans would be ‘ek’ (I). Afrikaans grammar rules forbid the use of ‘=self’ in certain instances while prescribing it as ‘unnecessary’ in others. The use of ‘=self’ is only necessary to avoid confusion (Müller, 2003: 189).

4 A September 2009 reader’s letter (Elsabe Olivier, Brooklyn) describes relief in the consumption of *Sarie* after radiation and a hysterectomy.

5 All excerpts from *Sarie* are own translations from the original Afrikaans.

6 ‘I looked up to Penny Coelen (Miss SA and Miss World in 1958). I wanted to be like her’; ‘Pearl’ s long, black hair was ‘smooth’ and worn in a ‘Farah Fawcett-style’ (reference to a white U.S. film actress).

7 Only four Readers’ Letters in the period 2009 refer directly to black people, of whom all are nameless and in relations of service to the letter writer, with the exception of one passing reference to Anglican Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu. Another four letters refer indirectly to black people, coded as rendering the country unsafe as criminals; incompetent black masculinity; a domestic servant; and the ‘younger generation’ with whom middle-aged Afrikaner men cannot ‘compete’.

8 Skeggs (2005: 975) uses authorisation to indicate a process of validation by ‘those [...] positioned to make judgments of other’s subjectivity’.

9 Mulvey’s influential article (1975) on visual pleasure in narrative cinema identifies ‘the image of woman as (passive) raw material for the (active) gaze of man’ as part of ‘the ideology of the patriarchal order’ (pp. 17-8).

10 Foucault’s (2002:58-9) panopticism, associated with the rise of bourgeois domination, organised around ‘what was normal or not’, requiring continuous surveillance. It is a micropower that classifies, hierarchises and invalidates (Foucault 1991a:212).

11 Also evident in writing by women of the Moreleeta Park Dutch Reformed Church, Pretoria:

‘My Bridegroom’
‘I hear Thou whisper, feel Thou breath against my cheek
[...] Thou take me in Thou arms... Our hearts beat as one and my being screams and shouts, JESUS, I LOVE THEE...
[...] Forever I want to be with Thee [...] Until the fairies and the dwarfs don’t play on the mushrooms anymore [...] Until the lion and the lamb lie with each other [...] That’s how long, my love, I will love Thee.’ (‘Rinie’, 2011, accessed at http://www.moreleta.org/)

12 In 2005 the SA Human Rights Commission’s chairperson won an Equality Court case against a hair salon after hairdressers refused to cut his ‘hair, because it is different to that of whites’ (www.iol.co.za, 30 March 2005). See also case involving hairdresser Tanya Louw (www.rapport.co.za, 29 April 2012).
CHAPTER 5
ORDENTLIKHEID: FRAMING THE ORDER WITHIN AND WITHOUT

The previous chapter analysed a culturally sanctioned discourse of normative or volksmoeder ordentlikheid deployed by the second largest South African women’s magazine, Sarie. This chapter, as part of the phased exploration of (dis)continuities in identifications in postapartheid South Africa, draws on a discourse analysis of texts generated in focus group research and individual in-depth interviews with subjects who self-identify as women, ‘white’, heterosexual, middle class, and Afrikaans-speaking.

Tracing the interpellation of subjects into revisions of volksmoeder ordentlikheid, this chapter and the next two (Chapters 6 and 7) analyse the construction and regulation of the others within and without ordentlikheid. This analytical arrangement was arrived at after analysis of the discourses under review showed disruptions in the Afrikaner identity’s suturing with volksmoeder ordentlikheid where respondents would reject or embrace the Afrikaner identity with the same aim of advancing democratic identitary openings, or with the aim of resisting such democratic potentialities (see below). To understand these strategies, two modes were identified and named as Regrouper and Ek-ethical, which are explained later in this chapter.

At issue, therefore, is the inclusion/exclusion dynamics of the identity. Hall (2001) reminds us that identity is stepping ‘into the place of the recognitions that others give us. Without the others there is no self, there is no self-recognition’ (p.286). To ‘be’, therefore, ‘marks a primary vulnerability to the Other’ (Butler, 1997:21). Apartheid was a closure against such vulnerability. Inclusion/exclusion modes, with the family as primary site, were strategies of colonial racisms retained in contemporary racism (Stoler, 2002), or what Gilroy (2007) regards as ‘new racism’. Norval (2003) argues that suturing a radical democratic imaginary in contemporary South Africa requires resisting the identitary logic of closure, taken to extremes with apartheid, which would be possible only if apartheid identities are constructed as other (p.265). Of use to this study is Stoler’s (2002) cautionary note about new racism’s wielding of
culture: the subjects of colonial racisms also had ‘racially cued comportments, moral sentiments and desires [...] [which] were invariably “about” bourgeois respectability and culture and less explicitly “about” race’ (p.381). These theoretical pointers suggest that an investigation of the manufacturing of ordentlikheid and its others – including the family as site for the regulation of ‘the others within’ – should be productive in tracing the possible expansion of a postapartheid radical democratic imaginary.

This and the next two chapters explore the interplay between subjects’ strategies in rehabilitating/subverting a subaltern whiteness in relation with globally unmarked whiteness, while simultaneously resisting/reinforcing a particularist production of a marked but nevertheless hegemonic bourgeois heterofemininity, which stands in a co-constructive relationship with hegemonic masculinity.

5.1 Subjection and agency

The focus groups and the interviews are read as in situ performances generating subjectivities through iterations. In the decentring commotion of clashing discourses, the contents of both racist and anti-racist identities may fluctuate and subjects may not be able to access these identities with ‘transparent self-knowledge’ (Rattansi, 1994:70). At the same time, subjects are seeking identities to still the flux in meanings in the field of discursivity. The era of the ‘global postmodern’ (Hall, 1997a), or Bauman’s ‘liquid modernity’ (2001:137),1 is a particularly tumultuous time, also for South Africa in its postcolonial condition. This was confirmed by respondents2 (see Appendix K with names and dates of focus groups and individual interviews):

Daleen (65): when was that earthquaking speech made by FW [de Klerk]? [...] the whole playing field changed. (FG1)3

Katrien (42): what was presented as morality as true and right were suddenly swept off the table.

Lindie (43): It made us very confused [...] there is also more of an openness and a religious collapse in the world because people rebel against everything, against rules and regulations... (FG1)
Antoinette (36): what happened after 1994 in South Africa but also in the rest of the world people’s moral values dove into the ground [...] we can’t distinguish anymore between what is really right or wrong… (FG1)

In such a context, identification becomes even more urgent as ‘still points in a turning world’ (Hall, 1997a:22). The subject is compelled to seek verification of self in normative categories not of its own making, over and over again (Butler, 1997). Reiteration is not mechanical as the subject runs the risk with each reinstatement of the norm of not doing it correctly – but this allows the possibility of ‘imagining the contingency of [social] organisation, and [to] performatively reconfigure the contours of the conditions of life…’ (p.29). The subject is the effect of a working of a power which ‘conceals its very working’ (Butler, 1997:16) but the dislocation of the apartheid imaginary reveals the contingency of all forms of identifications (Norval, 1996:13). While Rattansi is therefore correct that subjects do not possess ‘transparent self-knowledge’, the dislocation of ordentlikheid and the resultant rupture in its sedimented grounding contains the potential of democratic agency, allowing reflection on the inconsistencies of a shifting subject position, as Tani expresses:

Tani (32): We definitely live a double-life. We all live two or three lives. You live what you are with your gran. You live that which you are with colleagues. You are racist with the people who are racist when it suits you. But you are very progressive in a new context. We wear many hats. (FG4)

The following excerpt reveals the transformational potential of the decentring of apartheid identifications – and the attempt at re-suturing it: agency can be derived from discursive democratic openings, or denied, as the following interchange shows:

Katrien (42): It feels […] like brainwashing: I believe something because it is acceptable within my group. But if you really ask someone who they really are […] they don’t know their moral standards […] because it is what’s acceptable within that group…
Lindie: It is a normal natural thing there will always be people that brainwash and people who are brainwashed it is a group thing as a person we are made like that there are very few people that can survive on their own so the group thing will always be there some people just have a stronger sense of choice than others… (FG1)
Subjects' comprehension of their subjection was revealed in respondents' assessment of subjection as contingent on historical conditions, as per Marx's insight that humans make history under conditions not of their own choosing (Hall, 1997b:43):

Andriette (56): a theologian asked [dad] [...] three times if he was really free if he really can say what he wants [...] it made him think and realise he is actually trapped [and] is busy the whole time to act according to the structures of [apartheid] society... (FG4)

Katrien (42): You identify at a certain time with some people there was the struggle [...] but then [...] cultures borders shift but the whole time it is about where you go do you shift with the culture or by yourself I am Afrikaans but I can’t identify with [being] agitated to go along with the big group [...] thanks to my dad [...] I am lucky I could just as well have been in another home... (FG4)

Dislocation of 'the Afrikaner' occurred from the 1960s onwards, as in the following 'normativity-as-ruin' narrative in which volksmoeder ordentlikheid is deconstructed. The respondent attended an elite Afrikaner nationalist girls’ school in the Cape province in the late 1970s:

Leah (49): Stellenbosch is a very snobbish [...] if you stay in the residence you are doomed [...] it ruined me for the rest of my life [...] all my girl friends even though they had so many opportunities all married and had children [...] as young girl at school I did not get the opportunities or created them because of the pressure of society I was under the false impression that... you [finish school] then you study then you have to get engaged and then you have to marry [...] I was never accepted in my community. When everybody goes to Voortrekkers [Afrikaner nationalist youth organisation] I go to Girl Guides if they read Afrikaans I read [British writer] Enid Blyton I failed Afrikaans I was a terrible rebel against Afrikaans, against the whole conservative... the Christian I was terribly frustrated because I could not express myself [...] when I went overseas everything made sense [...] the world became open [it] was in '87 when it was very bad in South Africa [...] overseas gave me as woman strength 'you can do just what you want go for it' [...] I learnt my own identity [...] because the Leah before 1994 was definitely not the Leah after 1994. (FG3)

This contradictory narrative describes an alternation between resisting and acquiescing to subjection to volksmoeder ordentlikheid, abiding and refuting the prescriptions of Afrikaner femininity but feeling thwarted by her inability to 'express' herself. The resultant subjectivity is understood both as one of 'life-long ruin' and the accomplishment of identity. The respondent as child resisted
certain interpellations while simultaneously feeling beholden to a ‘false impression’ of femininity predicated on conjugality. Interpellation by a different conception of femininity outside the country allows her to discover ‘herself’. This exposes a lack of alternative discursive resources in apartheid South Africa even when Afrikaner nationalist hegemonising of subject positions was weakening. For example, in the 1970s, Sarie discourses studiously avoided the feminist groundswell interpellating white, western, heterofeminine, middle class subjects, which the magazine otherwise proffered as aspirational femininities (Maritz, 2012).

The contradictions in this narrative can be explained as follows: the conditions of power are reiterated by subjects despite the resulting subordination to a normative femininity because of the foundational ambivalence of the subject, as ‘agency is implicated in subordination’ (Butler 1997:16-17). Leah could be read as the subject ‘deriving its agency from precisely the power it opposes’ (p.17). The lack of accomplishment of social terms resulted in what Butler (1997:18-19) phrases as ‘the peculiar turning of a subject against itself that takes place in acts of self-reproach, conscience and melancholia that work in tandem with processes of social regulation’. Normalisation occurs despite respondents’ expressed awareness of phases or steps of completion of a normative heterofemininity (as in Leah’s ‘study-marry-reproduce’ myths and Daleen’s ‘20-year cycles’ quoted above and later in this chapter). Butler (1997:18) describes the conditions of subjection as ‘[p]ainful, dynamic, and promising, this vacillation between the already-there and the yet-to-come is a crossroads that rejoins every step by which it is traversed, a reiterated ambivalence at the heart of agency’. Leah explicates the class-infused gendering effects of Afrikaner nationalist discourse, finding volksmoeder prescriptions intact in the reformist apartheid phase. She describes a destruction of self akin to a non-identity, hinting at the violence which wroughts such demolitions.

In the following excerpt, respondents reflect on emancipatory potentialities since the first democratic election South Africa in 1994, and the limits thereof. The excerpt reveals that democratic discourses have opened new potentialities for Afrikaans female subjectivities in the public realm.
Interpellation can be discerned by global discourses, particularly a neoliberal and postfeminist discourse on ‘choice’. Emancipations are experienced in terms of greater inclusion (locally, ‘acceptance’ of difference and globally, ‘acceptance by the world’). A private realm (‘family’ and ‘friends’) exists where constraints are reproduced that mobilise remnants of *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*, specifically elements that equate femininity with heteronormative reproduction and dependent on masculine verification.

*Pieta* (35): I think 1994 also forced people to accept other people

*Sandra* (43): the choices have enlarged. You can now go there or there or you are involved in this or that and you know it’s your choice, nobody can take you out for it or judge or so

*Nerina* (32): Although, in your brother’s little [rural] town [...] everything is still very traditional.

*Pieta*: ... they still have the Bible

*Nita* (62): But they know [that] it is more open

*Willemien* (33): [in] 1994 there were social and political movements and events in our own country but in the rest of the world there were also the same kinds of things [...] [From] the early 1990s to 2000 with the millennium there were enormous changes in media and technology [...] there were global movements in terms of access to information and access to how other people do things and it all plays a role in the options and possibilities in your own world [...] after 1994 the world accepted us and it was easier for us to have access to [...] currents outside South Africa.

[...] *Nita* (62): with the whole human rights bill, the constitution and everything [...] we can all sit here and know what we want, not so? one can feel ‘this is how I want to be’ without the broader society crucifying your for it… your family could perhaps [still] discipline you, or your circle of friends...

*Leah* (49): much [has] changed but [...] certain things in life are still… not

*Nita*: But you can choose.

*Leah*: Yes, I have a freedom… I feel sorry for those people who refuse to accept that you’re okay not having a child… in my mom’s generation it was different… still, today despite all the uh modern times and openness there are still certain aspects that are non-negotiable...

*Nita*: 1994 gave in a way to each of us around this table that ‘I can stand on my own feet and I can choose’. Even if someone still moans [...] you will always get people who moan about things you do.

[...] *Nerina*: And if you don’t get a man at university then you are lost (FG3)

Notably, respondents who were able to critically analyse knowledge/power regimes, politicise identities and reflect on their subject position as historically
dependent exhibited greater availability for interpellation by democratic discourses. Conversely, respondents who reported 'not thinking' about their subject formations were prey to the naturalisation of Afrikaner nationalist discourses, including articulation with the volksmoeder nodal point. Disparities were however found, depending on the particular organising category dominant in an interpellation, for example whiteness may be destabilised but heterofemininity remaining firmly affixed.

5.2 Subjectivity in relation to the volksmoeder and 'the Afrikaner'

5.2.1. The volksmoeder as floating signifier activating democracy or domesticity

The volksmoeder signifier served as a nodal point for the production of an 'Afrikaner femininity' from the rise of successive waves of Afrikaner nationalisms after the South African War and throughout apartheid rule (1948-1994), reinforced by idealised constructions of middle class respectability and 'racial purity' (Brink, 1990; Hyslop, 1995; Keegan, 2011). The decentring of the apartheid imaginary and resultant dislocation of the 'Afrikaner' identity has rendered the volksmoeder a floating signifier in the postapartheid field, as it is flexible (Swart, 2007) and is filled with divergent and contradictory contents.

5.2.1 (a) The volksmoeder as sign of oppression/liberation

Focus group respondents were asked the following question: 'What does the ‘volksmoeder’ mean to you?' The question met with responses indicating a lack of direct identitary associations and elicited ridiculing of the term. The exceptions amounted to only four out of 25 respondents. Three of these four were between 59-65 years old.

Nina (65) traced the volksmoeder back to a girls-only, 'formerly' Afrikaner nationalist elite school that she had attended. She described how she 'resented' the display of a 1907 sculpture by Anton van Wouw, called Noitjie van die onderveld, Transvaal, Rustenburg sijn distrikt (Young woman from Transvaal, Rustenburg district) at the school with the words 'I see her win because her name is Vrou [Woman/Wife] and Mother'. These words are the motto of the school, derived from a regularly cited poem by Afrikaner nationalist poet Jan F.E.
Nina’s recitation of the motto was met with exclamations of disbelief by the 30, 32 and 46-year old respondents in the group.

The lack of recognition of the volksmoeder by subjects exposes the erasure of political origins of an identity. In a reworking of these elements which depart from the other narratives, a 32-year old respondent found her ‘feminist roots’ at the same school described by Nina:

Nerina (32): X was a very very traditional [school]... but if found my feminist roots there [of] women that move away from boys we rebel you’re a woman, you do your own thing you don’t wait for men to encourage you [...] I was there between 1993 and 1998 so it was exactly in the [democratic] transition period If I weren’t in X I would perhaps not have my strong feminist... to stand up as a woman... I read [...] that from the 1900s to 1914 the Afrikaner woman was actually very strong with the [1915] march they did then the National Party came and put the Afrikaner woman back in the kitchen they were still these strong women but you were told ‘no you just have to raise children there’s not really a big role for you’. Only after 1994 did it come out that you as a woman can fully have a career... only in the 1980s did you thaw and get away [...] look at the history of the National Party there were only women ministers in the 1980s [...] X [school] drilled it into us ... the women who walked to the Union Buildings [in 1915] and there was a [Cilliers] poem (FG3)

Thus, the exact poem and depiction that Nina (65) and other respondents found oppressive, due to its equation of womanhood with motherhood, Nerina (32) recovers with her rearticulation of the volksmoeder with the democratic discourse, particularly women’s empowerment. It echoes the socialist Garment Workers’ Union’s re-threading of Afrikaner nationalist tropes about 19th century resistance to British imperialism to bolster their working class agenda, as in the words of garment worker Anna Jacobs: 'We, workers of our state and for all the women in our country, shall take the lead and climb the Drakensberg again.’ (Brink, 1990:288; Walker, 1995:433). They sent their own Kappiekommando [Bonnet Commando] to the centenary celebrations of the Great Trek in 1938 'as radically different interpretation of the event to the meaning being given to it by its Broederbond [League of Brothers] organisers' (O’Meara, 1997:5).

Nerina goes further in yoking feminism with ordentlikheid to produce an incongruous ‘lady’ rebutting hegemonic masculinity:
Nerina (32): ...My feminist side was strongly activated... I met the bullies from the [twin male school X High] they were chauvinist and they looked down on the women and in counter-reaction my friends and I felt we are strong women and we will resist them [...] the [female] teachers encouraged us to be strong women to study... a lady always has respect you stand up when someone enters a class... those refined things... people respect you because you have good manners and you can express yourself... it was never in my frame that I need a man to make me a successful woman one day... everything for myself, my dreams I just have to work hard study hard... a strong Calvinist work ethic a lot of pressure on us to excel there were may opportunities at school... there were no boys men to intimidate you (FG3)

In contrast to these creative re-imaginings, stands respondent Pieta’s invocation and re-articulation of the Garment Workers’ Union as a space for heterofeminine domesticity, emptying it of its militant and political content (individual interviews). Other respondents normalised a stark distinction between masculine/feminine, even as they rejected the *volksmoeder* as myth.

5.2.1. (b) The *volksmoeder* as signalling the other

Explorative discussions with respondents who made no association with the term allowed, paradoxically, for the emergence of associations of the *volksmoeder* with the black feminine, one of the few explicit references to black women in the focus groups. In a typical symbolic conflation of black women’s bodies with fertility, evoked by the reproductive dimension of the *volksmoeder*, respondents referred to ‘Zuma’, a wife of South African president Jacob Zuma, and to ANC leader Winnie Madikizela-Mandela as *volksmoeders*.

What is notable about this racialising association is again the obscuring of the political origins of the term, in that individuals such as the very respondents of this study were the targets of the *volksmoeder* discourse. While some respondents detect the similarity in function by their location of the term within the currently dominant African nationalism, the lack of recognition of its Afrikaner nationalist location eases the normalisation of the foundational *volksmoeder* element of reproduction, as currently formative of their own (white) subjectivities.

A respondent (Anke, 46) who served in uMkhonto weSizwe, the ANC’s armed wing, challenged other respondents’ equation of the *volksmoeder* with black women, and redirected the discourse back at ‘white’ Afrikaans women:
Lida (42): Winnie Mandela. There are volksmoeders in all cultures

Corlia (59): Volksmoeders today are the woman in the township [South African term for predominantly black urban areas dating from apartheid] today raising her kids on her own... and working at 10 homes

Anke: that is fundamentally where I depart... why does a volksmoeder have to be the mama in the township? She's a volksmoeder [pointing at respondent Elsebeth]

Corlia: So we are all still volksmoeders.

Elsebeth (48): I perhaps teach my children different things... my mom never took me and my brown friend who I didn't have to drop her at her home so that my children can see there are children staying in [informal housing]... my children are exposed to such things and we can't pull up our noses because we live in a luxury house look at that child's heart that's what is important

This excerpt reveals a rearticulation of the volksmoeder with democratic cross-racial, cross-class identifications, due to the intervention of a different discourse which rejects the equation of the black feminine with reproduction.

5.3 Claiming/Shedding ‘the Afrikaner’: Strategies for (re)constructing ordentlikheid

Similar to the volksmoeder, ‘the Afrikaner’ has been dislodged and rendered a floating signifier, as emerged in its divergent contents, as per the following discourses. Race is foregrounded as analytical factor in this section but, as this analysis is intersectional, it should be kept in mind that the decentring of ‘the Afrikaner’ in relation to these subject positions occurs across nodal points. This study shows the unstitching of constitutive gender, sexual and class elements along with race that had sutured volksmoeder ordentlikheid. The resurfacing of political origins provokes a reciprocal unhinging of these constituent aspects.

A turf battle is waged between those shedding and those claiming Afrikanerhood. More than half of respondents rejected ‘the Afrikaner’ identity, with 12 identifying as such. Identifications exhibited a spatial dimension, as most of those claiming Afrikanerhood were based in Cape Town. Cape Town focus groups interactions included disciplinary actions against the two respondents (one in each focus group) who disidentified with Afrikanerdom. These actions
aimed at renouncing their opponents’ stances as much as saving face. The discursive strategies are outlined below.

5.3.1. ‘I'm not a racist but...’ volksmoeder ordentlikheid

5.3.1. (a) Shedding Afrikanerhood to merge with hegemonic whiteness.

This shedding is to cleanse the self from the stigma of racism, notably through repetitive disavowal of the ‘far-rightwing’ identity. This was specific to subject positions troubled by whiteness insofar as the particularist identity of ‘the Afrikaner’ has become spoilt. These subjects aspire to disappearing into unmarked, globalised western whiteness, or into the ‘liberal’ whiteness of ‘colour-blindness’, i.e. hiding the political sources of white privilege. Denial is a primary tactic, not only of racism but also apartheid sexism and classism, the effects of apartheid discriminations and exclusions on black people’s lives, and it also denies other oppressions and exclusions, even when asked to reflect on themselves as women.

5.3.1. (b) Renovating Afrikanerhood to peel away the stigma of apartheid

This renovation is done from a positionality paradoxically interspersed with shame and white supremacism, while disavowing ‘the far-right’ and claiming ‘liberalism’, in opposition to an essentialised blackness for which the only hope lies in whitening. This discourse invisibilises white privilege; denies apartheid intra-white sexism and classism, while re-asserting heterosexist exclusions, even if chafing at the harness of heteronormativity. It invokes nostalgia for apartheid South Africa as a place of discipline, moral values and justice. It contains elements of victimhood and anger at postapartheid redress.

Alternatively, in a continuity of imposed apartheid ethnicisation (Zegeye, 2001), subjects positions utilising this strategy construct South Africa as an ‘ethnic patchwork’. Race is replaced with ‘cultures’ and/or ‘tribes’, which are misrecognised as intrinsic, immovable, primordial. Race, ‘culture’ and ‘tribe’ are essentialised. This includes a respondent who served as MK soldier and is now recovering her ‘roots’ derived from an ethnic essentialism in her interpretation of African nationalism. ‘The Afrikaner’ is therefore rehabilitated drawing on other nations (e.g. Swiss, German); equality is claimed with ‘the other ethnicities’
of apartheid categorisations and other ethnicised groupings such as Jews and Muslims. It can serve as a manoeuvre to refute redress, as ‘we are all equal’ and Afrikanerhood should be treated equally with other ethnicities. It suggests interpellation by global discourses in reassertion of local identities, and is paradoxical in its democratic openings alongside re-articulation of the paternalistic racism of apartheid Afrikaners.

5.3.2. ‘Recognising the other’ - Dissident ordentlikheid

5.3.2. (a) Withdrawing from Afrikanerhood to embrace expansive inclusivity

It starts from the premise that ‘Afrikaner identity is per definition racist’. They admit apartheid racism and white privilege, acknowledge complicity and debunk myths of racial inferiority as ‘explanation’ for black poverty, poor black schooling etc. They historicise and ground their understanding in actual events. Interpellated by democratic discourse, they articulate difference not with expulsion but with acknowledgment and even embrace. These subjectivities display a self-reflective and transparent sense of Afrikanerhood as production, in co-construction with a sense of self-creation, particularly of an ethical self. Some apply feminist analysis of apartheid gendering and all reject projections of Afrikaner men as ‘victims’ of postapartheid change. Dissident femininities pursue inclusive South Africanness and Africanness with a sense of the creative potential of the historical juncture. They crack open ordentlikheid by recognising and engaging the other in intimate spaces and breaking the taboo of reproducing ‘black’.

5.3.2. (b) Claiming ‘the Afrikaner’ to incorporate difference inside and outside:

This claiming is done by excavating and reincorporating its excluded others (including gay) as part of a re-imagined Afrikanerhood, and reclaim the differences in own ranks weeded out by Afrikaner nationalist othering and violence throughout the 20th century (e.g. Bram Fischer, Communist Party of South Africa leader and lawyer for ANC accused). Self-reflectively aware of the contingency of Afrikaner identity and recuperating and rearticulating positive myths, e.g. generous, hard-working, tough women. These positionalities battle against continued circumscription of racism and heteronormativity with active
subversion of racial, gender and sexual *volksmoeder* norms. They present coherent discourses of openness to diversity and increase options for varieties of being without judgment. Starting during apartheid, they have moved their bodies into spaces that violate apartheid racial divisions.

### 5.4 Eth(n)ic(al) strategies: ‘Regroupers’ and ‘Ek-thics’

Interviews in this study were crafted with open-ended questions about respondents’ own understandings of self and other during and after statutory apartheid and on historical differences by comparing women in their families across generations. From these answers emerge cogent and contradictory fragments of discursive interpretations, coming to light through subject positions, particularly in relation to identititary dislocations caused by democratic discourses, and/or interpellation by other discourses. The performatives of *ordentlikheid* produce shortfalls or failures in accomplishment of the norm, which in some instantiations evoked rebuttals at subject positions. What emerges are clashing discourses displaying contradictions within which even a single subjectivity can both resist and succumb to *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*.

Image management (Bell and Valentine, 1995) occurred. It is here read as the subject’s desire to project an image of self that resonates with what it deems to be the dominant discourse in a particular environment, in this case the research interview situation. Rattansi (1994:70-71), in cautioning against research that finds everyone both racist and antiracist, advises contextualisation to discern the investment that a subject may have in an identification. As this study is concerned with knowledge/power regimes as mobilised truth effects, face-saving techniques were read against (1) relations with others (black; masculine; lesbian) and (2) body/space shifts, i.e. where subjects put their bodies.

Two modes of identification are discerned which are *not* dependent on self-(dis)identification as an ‘Afrikaner’: (1) discourses of ‘ethnics’ and (2) discourses of ‘ethics’, therefore of either an ethic of ethnic regrouping or of an ethical ‘ek’, an ‘ek-thics’ in which ‘ek’ refers to the Afrikaans translation of the word ‘I’ to invoke the notion of a sense of self-creation.
Regarding (1), what are called The Regroupers in this study are subjectivities that employ various identitary strategies to either rehabilitate ‘the Afrikaner’ or refuse the identity and dissolve into hegemonic whiteness (whiteness incognito) by denying the stigma of racism and sexism and defying democratic discourses to re-recruit members to a reupholstered *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*. When opting for dissolution in hegemonic whiteness amid the dislocation of ‘the Afrikaner’, recourse is taken to other discursive resources formerly wielded to suture the identity to de-stress or discard Afrikanerhood as such while rearticulating its constitutive elements, such as the oppressive gender relationality or race-sexuality workings of *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*, to attain hierarchical ex-/inclusions.

As alternative strategy to dissolution into whiteness incognito, Regroupers pursue a white spatial ‘return to the local’ (Hall, 1997a; Hall, 1997b) through the privatisation of *ordentlikheid*, which is demarcated by bodies owned as white, female and Afrikaans women, presided over by a hegemonic white bourgeois heteromasculinity.

In both modes, whether retreating into whiteness incognito with recapitulated *volksmoeder ordentlikheid* in hand, or fabricating white retreats which recapitulate *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*, ‘culture’ is the wellspring for meaning-making. As Hall (2001:282) notes: ‘Histories come and go, peoples come and go, situations change, but somewhere down there is throbbing the culture to which we all belong. It provides a kind of ground for our identities, something to which we can return, something solid, something fixed, something stabilised, around which we can organise our identities and our sense of belongingness. And there is a sense that modern nations and peoples cannot survive for long and succeed without the capacity to touch ground, as it were, in the name of their cultural identities.’

The identitary strategies of The Regroupers are as follows:

- intersectional denial, ranging from denial of apartheid race iniquities to intra-Afrikaner oppression of women;
- primordialising difference, whether race or gender;
- reasserting gender/age hierarchies;
- deploying ignorance;
• intra-group distancing of own generation from other generations;
• re-inscribing race as ‘culture’, which is primordialised;
• re-installing masculinity as presiding identity;
• laagering, or a withdrawal to localised white spaces;
• and/or disappearing ‘Afrikaner’ into colourblind whiteness.

Regrouper identification is resistant to scrutiny, as in the following excerpt which features iterations of volksmoeder elements of the long-suffering but determined and tough survivor to resist attempts at problematising the identity. These normalisations are possible because of the obfuscation of the volksmoeder origins of subjects identifying as Afrikaans, white, heterosexual and feminine.

_Pieta: [Little contemporary research is done about Afrikaans women because] we are self-maintaining... we just go on doesn’t matter what the situation is there aren’t any problems to investigate_

_Nita: Pragmatic (FG3)_

The concept of ‘Ek-thics’ draws on Foucault’s thinking, also as interpreted by McLaren (2002). Whether complying with or resisting volksmoeder normativity, respondents are interpellated by what they refer to as ‘individualism’. A distinction should be made between neoliberal and postfeminist governmentality -- Sarie’s version of individualism – and the Foucauldian creation of an ethical self. Neoliberalism ‘figures individuals as rational, calculating creatures whose moral autonomy is calculated by their capacity for “self-care”—the ability to provide for their own needs and service their own ambitions’ (Brown, 2005:42-3) but with a depoliticisation, decontextualisation and de-socialisation of subjects to deny structural contingencies and maintain unequal power relations. The Foucauldian ethical self-creator deploys technologies of self which resist the normativity of the volksmoeder and embraces self-productivity. This, however, is not for the purposes of white ‘semigration’ or denial about whiteness or masculinity.

_Foucault (2002)_ explains the shift in his work as from investigating the processes of objectivisation that turn an individual into a subject, to ‘the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject’ (p.327). The following of his observations are relevant to this study: New struggles have erupted about gender, ageism, and the ‘government of individualisation’ emphasising the right
to difference and ‘what makes individuals truly individual’ while simultaneously challenging that which ‘breaks his [sic] link with others [...] forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way’ through, for example, abstractions that submits the subject to others (p.330-1). Foucault discerns alongside this struggle against the ‘submission of subjectivity’, or subjection, another two modes of struggle: against ethnic, social and religious domination and against exploitation that ‘separate individuals from what they produce’. These battles can overlap (p.331-2), as this study also shows. Similar to Laclau (1990), who emphasises that hegemony never means a totalisation of power but rather continuing turf wars, Foucault also emphasises that power can only be ‘exercised over free subjects’ and that freedom is a prerequisite of the exercise of power (p.342). Regarding the mode of subjection, Foucault (1992:27) elaborates on the formation of the self as an ‘ethical subject’ in relation to systems of prescription ‘explicitly or implicitly operative in [her] culture, and of which [she is] more or less aware’: ‘the way in which the individual establishes his relation to the rule and recognises himself as obliged to put it into practice’ (pp.26-7). The proviso for an action to qualify as ‘moral’, is that ‘it must not be reducible to an act or a series of acts conforming to a rule, a law, or a value’ (p.28), i.e., morality is not equal to normativity. Foucault further distinguishes between different systems that either require subjectivation to specific rules to avoid punishment, or that are based on ‘practices of the self’ (pp. 29-30), where adherence to rules may be as important as the relations with the self in endeavours to form the self as an ethical subject, the methods and practices for self-knowledge and transforming the self (p. 30). This is later refined as a ‘cultivation of the self’, in which the ethical subject is forged out of processes of self-examination – discovering ‘the truth concerning what one is, what one does and what one is capable of doing’ (Foucault 1990:68). In answering criticism that Foucault had merely shifted into individualism, McLaren (2002) points out that cultivation or ‘care of the self’ is positioned ‘as social practice, giving rise to relationships between individuals’ (Foucault, 1990:45). Therefore, drawing on Foucault’s formulations, the discourses of ‘Ek-thics’ pertain to critical engagements with the self and others, including non-conformism with hegemonic norms, in this case of volksmoeder ordentlikheid.
The identitary strategies of the Ek-thics in subverting dominant codes (Pile and Thrift, 1995) are:

- recognition of the black other and admission of racism;
- subversion of naturalisation of apartheid gender, sexual and race hierarchies;
- foregrounding of contingency through contextualisation and historicisation, e.g. of institutionalised apartheid Afrikaner masculine power and postapartheid Afrikaner masculine victimhood;
- and/or exposing gender iniquities during and after apartheid;
- seeking *différance*, as per Derrida’s formulation.

Katrien’s counter-talk designates Afrikaner patriarchal rule as morally suspect, creating a discursive chain hitching apartheid with immorality and Afrikaner nationalist institutional exclusion of women. Her quest for sense-making is bolstered with discourses of Ek-thical self-production, in the face of Regrouper rebuttals:

*Katrien (42):* I am much more expansive and larger than [Afrikaner identity] because I believe you figure out for yourself what you believe in, what your religion is, whatever your view is and the dilemma for me comes in the moment when you find those things within a group and you no longer think for yourself. That’s when a country can justify certain things [...] and that for me is scary because that is what happened with Hitler, that’s what happened with apartheid...

*Daleen (65):* But that doesn’t make those people less German, even though Hitler did disgraceful things.

*Katrien: But why does something like that happen? Because people find their identity within a group and they don’t think for themselves anymore.* (FG1)

Thus Ek-thics may even draw on elements of *ordentlikheid* re-articulated with democratic discursive aspects to pry openings for identifications. This explains why some subjectivities disarticulate whiteness but are tripped up by heteronormativity.

In conclusion, this chapter finds both ‘Afrikaner’ and ‘*volksmoeder*’ floating signifiers. The *volksmoeder*’s political underpinnings are obscured to the extent that respondents were unable to trace heteronormativity to the *volksmoeder*, while they identify the *volksmoeder*’s resonance in the ‘mother of the nation’ of the dominant nationalism of the moment, African nationalism.
Another finding is that, in an echo of the Garment Workers' Union's conception of a socialist *volksmoeder* in the 1920s-30s, the *volksmoeder* is de-re-articulated with democratic discourses to shed its oppressive race and gender meanings while retaining its significations of strength, independence and industriousness. These elements are yoked with reclaiming public life – this time round for feminist aims. However, this 21st century *volksmoeder* retains the middle-class aspiration of 'earning respect as a lady' – paradoxically, given its feminist claim. ‘Afrikaner’ is available to be filled with content seeking to recuperate dominant power formations of gender-sexuality-class-race, or to subvert these very formations. A turf war rages between normative and dissident *ordentlikheid*. Given that self-(dis)identification as an ‘Afrikaner’ has contradictory social aims, two modes of identification are discerned which are not dependent on ‘Afrikaner’ identification: ‘regrouper’ discourses of ‘ethnics’ and ‘ek-thical’ discourses of ‘ethics’. Regrouper modes of sense-making are: primordialisation, hierarchisation, normalisation and denialism. Ek-thical modes are: recognition, contextualisation, historicisation and subversion. Both groupings confirm Butler's (1997) notion that iteration of norms is not perfunctory. The contraction of the apartheid imaginary precipitated a relativisation, as subjects bereft of the phantasms conjured by apartheid norms are forced to self-consciously locate themselves within the flow of discourses. Divergent aims can be pursued at subjects positions but they remain beholden to the discursive resources that are available: Regrouper positionalities seek to re-cement shaken but still dominant modes of sense-making while those of Ek-thicals trouble the prevalent terms set for living. The next chapter applies these insights to analyse *ordentlikheid*'s 'order within'.
CHAPTER 6

ORDENTLIKHEID’S ORDER WITHIN: PRODUCING AND POLICING THE INTERNAL OTHER

This chapter investigates the production and policing of the internal differences of ordentlikheid. Volksmoeder ordentlikheid, as hegemonic version, manufactures and sustains internal gendered and external racial divisions complementarily. Regrouper discourse shows these matching identitary dynamics in its normalisation of such divisions as ‘coincidence’ and Social Darwinist ‘natural selection’, drawing on the apartheid dictum of birds-of-afeather-flock-together, while recentring masculinity and whiteness:

Ansie (57): maybe it is just natural selection... that you just talk about... if you as woman go and stand among the men and start talking about children your conversation won’t last long... just like this whole thing of apartheid... maybe one should just sometimes relax a bit because things have a natural flow... once we were invited by a little black guy... to his wedding... the normal talk was between people who knew each other and it was coincidentally the black people who knew each other... people spoke across [groups] but in the end you still grouped with the people for whom you had most to say who had the most subjects in common (II5)

This section traces apartheid continuities and discontinuities, re-erections and refusals as elaborated in discourses surfaced in the focus group interviews (FGs) and individual interviews (IIs) of this study.

In discussing ‘ethnosexual frontiers’ Nagel (2000:113) points out: ‘correct heterosexual masculine and feminine behaviour constitutes gender regimes that often lie at the core of ethnic cultures [...] because of the common importance of proper gender role and sexual behaviour to ethnic community honour and respectability’. Bell and Valentine (1995:146), writing about the sexed self, alert us about the positioning of self in generative relation to other, how the demarcation of self in relation to the other reveals the ‘rules of the game’, the delimitations of performativity as iteration of constitutive norms. The performatve options are ‘an embodiment of the regulatory regimes’ (p.145) circumscribing the secondary or lesser term in co-constitutive relation. Therefore, exposing this femininity’s co-constitutive other, in the form of a
particularist masculinity, uncovers the dialectical operationalisation of hegemonic volksmoeder femininity and counter-hegemonic femininities.

An Afrikaner nationalist tract from 1972 inadvertently acknowledges masculine/feminine co-composition and declares its terms: ‘...woman is unmissable for man’s self-confidence [...] When he loses confidence in himself, in his work or in the world, it is his wife’s admiration that keeps him going [...] Through the centuries woman has served as mirror to provide a man the enchanting image that he is twice his normal size. How on earth would poor man continue with making laws, writing books and casting the world’s biggest judgments if he could not at every meal see himself twice his normal format in the mirror that his wife holds up to him?vi (‘Dr Goedhart’, 1972:368, own translation).

This study concurs with du Toit (2003) and McClintock (1993:71) that Afrikaner nationalist women were active producers of Afrikaner nationalist discourse and not ‘hapless female victims’ (see also Appendix A). Du Toit (2003:155, 176) questions contradictions in some studies about the agency of Afrikaner nationalist women (e.g. Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989; Brink, 1990). Du Toit takes issue with Bradford’s (2000) description of the ’hegemonic gender identity of “the Afrikaner nationalist” [as] male’, arguing that dominance does not deny subjectivity. The question is not so much subjectivity denied as subjectivity circumscribed in a particularist mode. As du Toit (2003:166) puts it herself, Afrikaner nationalist ‘men were at pains to demarcate female territory...’ or, as Cloete (1992:49-50) asserts, to ‘herd’ women ‘into the new laager of nationalism’.

‘Woman’ in nationalism is usually understood as the carrier of nationalist values and the border of respectability (Hull, 1982; McClintock, 1993; Hyslop, 1995; Keegan, 2001). Masculinity is read here as the borderpolice to the feminine border of volksmoeder ordentlikheid but also as the embodiment of the volk as brotherhood (McClintock, 1993:68). In Afrikaner nationalist texts reproduced from the 1940s-1960s, the patriarch, exalted as the ‘ruler, priest, educator and manager of his family’, oversees the volksmoeder (Cronjévi, 1958:38). Moreover, instead of the volksmoeder, the patriarch ‘embodied the highest spiritual values of [...] morality, volk pride, racial consciousness, love of
freedom [...] and whatever else was beautiful and noble and good in the character of the Boer nation’ (Cronjé, 1945:325). Thus the patriarchal family was the bulwark against *volksvreemde* [alien to the volk] influences (p.325), rather than the *volksmoeder*. (See Appendix J for background on the patriarch as overseer of the *volksmoeder*.)

The following sections examine ‘Dr Goedhart’s mirror’ and its reflection to trace continuities and resistances. Afrikaner nationalist discourse availed only a highly constricted subject position to female-bodied individuals. The next section shows that this is also true for its tenacious remnants. The discourses manufacturing this intensified containment co-constitutively suture masculinity-as-regency-cum-despotism and femininity-as-servility-and-silence (and, intermittently, infantilisation). Protection of *volksmoeder* femininity as reproducer of the *volk* serves as ruse for the exercise of despotic Afrikaner masculine power. This masculinism displays continuities in reiteration across the apartheid-postapartheid periodisation and is therefore presented as such in the next section.

6.6.1 Compulsory heterosexuality, compulsory motherhood

Analysing how the sexual realm as a construction is used to create and maintain the social as oppressive to women, it is noted that the identities available to women are frequently defined in terms of location in heterosexual relations: wife, mother, daughter, girlfriend (Jackson, 1999:130). The resilience of gender hierarchies was exemplified even by respondents able to question *volksmoeder* normativity, as with respondent Andriette who would consistently reference people engaged in anti-apartheid activities as heterosexual couples and only provide the husband’s name and surname. ‘The wife’ would be identified as ‘X’s wife’, her identity folded into that of the husband (II1). The hierarchical binary masculine-feminine depends on the enactment of heterosexuality.

Reproduction is central to heterosexual femininity, with ‘the maternal body [being] an effect or consequence of a system of sexuality in which the female body is required to assume maternity as the essence of its self and the law of its desire’ (Butler, 1990:126). In this study it is read as the result of the
sedimentation of the political sources of ‘femininity-as-motherhood’. Bar three, respondents did not discern connections between their own presumptions of heterofemininity and an attendant naturalisation of ‘woman as nurturer/care-giver’ and the Afrikaner nationalist construction of volksmoeder ordentlikheid predating femininity on motherhood. This lack of discernment occurs despite intermittent refusals of the norm. The Ek-thical discourse allowed reflection on this phenomenon:

*Katrien (42): it is culturally acceptable the women frequently live through their children I worked at a school... their whole being depends on it (II6)*

Middleclass whiteness liberates certain female-bodied subjects from the otherwise compulsory feminine duties of reproduction. Such subjects can afford to reiterate the conflation of motherhood and womanhood as the full extent of reproduction is not demanded of them. Black women’s bodies serve as their reproductive stand-ins (Shefer, 2010).

With Afrikaner nationalism as a discourse in disarray, articulation of the nationalist imperative with heteronormativity and motherhood has waned, but woman-as-wife-as-mother remains:

*Katrien (42): I’m not married and I experience the pressure extremely strongly in [Cape Town’s northern suburbs]. Specifically because I work with children it is the parents’ first need to know you are married and have children...*

*Yvonne (47): and if you are married the day and you don’t have children that becomes an issue...*

*Katrien: that is the Afrikaans culture very typical if you don’t go that way there is something wrong with you I’m at that point where I say ‘if only I was married and divorced’ because it seems more acceptable [because] the next question is ‘were you married’ and if you say ‘no’ look then there is something seriously wrong*

*Researcher: Why is it so important?*

*Katrien: Is it not part of that culture of it is the place and position of a woman? (FG1)*

The Ek-thical positionality exposes the regulatory function of the heterofeminine motherhood discourse by positioning it as a prescription of ‘Afrikaans culture’ and exposing its stigmatising dynamic (‘There is something wrong with you’), as well as its disciplinary, incessantly repetitive interrogations to ‘place and position’ and thereby render subjects intelligible.
The next narrative is a Regrouping disciplinary action against the above interchange between Katrien and Yvonne – revealing the contours of the injunction:

Antoinette (36): ... [laughing] my dad... supported our children tremendously my dad said you choose what you want to do go with it [...] I grew up in a very [happy] house... my [cousins] not one of them is married and it buzzes in the family the mouths are going why have they not married? what is wrong? Did marriage put them off... it's just strange to people everybody has such high expectations of people that he should have a companion (FG1)

Regrouping legitimises compulsory heterosexuality by yoking it with 'choice' in a 'happy home'. The content of 'choice' emerges as: not accomplishing the injunction of matrimony leads to stigmatisation (questions about 'something being wrong with the individuals/their family/their parents’ marriage'; questions that 'something happened to them'); such lack is 'strange' because 'everybody sets high expectations’ that 'people' (its signification as the 'neutral' 'he' hints at the law of the father, also suggested by the opening reference to 'dad') should have 'companions'. These prescriptions also act as erasures due to their naturalising assumption of heterosexuality.

The Ek-thical positionality makes visible the ground of the discipline, what was called in FG4 the ‘social contract according to which they have the right to ask’ about the accomplishment of the heteronorm.

Butler (1993:107) cautions that resistance merely predicated on failure to accomplish identification is politically inadequate as it does not rework the injunction that produces the failure in the first place. This is exemplified by Yvonne in the following excerpt:

Yvonne (47): people always say to me 'but one has to have children’ my reaction is 'the only thing you have to do is to breathe otherwise you die' they will never ask why don't you have children many people just assume I don't have children... because I took this selfish decision because of my work it is absolutely not true... it is because we had problems and decided that’s it. (FG1)

Yvonne exonerates her failing of the norm of motherhood as not due to 'selfishness' but to biological reasons, thus normalising motherhood while
stigmatising conjugal childlessness in a manoeuvre which contradicts her own problematising of a prescription that equates reproduction with 'breathing'.

But failing heterofemininity-as-conjugal-maternity can fulfil the democratic requirement of disrupting iterative performatives with the aim of reworking the symbolic order, in this case read as **volksmoeder ordentlikheid**. Performatives can be dislocatory if lack of accomplishment foregrounds difference, which confuses the self/other relationality and which allows equivalences between ‘othering due to failure of the heteronorm’ and ‘othering due to race’. If one stitch of the **volksmoeder ordentlikheid** discourse comes undone, the whole pattern can start to fray. For the Ek-thical subject position it even allows the ultimate repudiation of the **volksmoeder** dictum – ‘I hate children’:

*Tani (32): The next question when you are married is... why don't you have children?... you've been married [many] years What is wrong with you? ... but one does not have the skills to deal with that because it is not taught at home... how do you handle people who aren't like you? How do you handle racist people? ... it is also one's right not to have children

*Emma: you have to be able to say, you know what, I hate children (FG4)*

### 6.6.2. Reinventing the revered masculinity of normative ordentlikheid

During apartheid, the patriarch determined the values of the family, as he did in the *volk* as family:

*Andriette (56): my dad said what happens and how it happens... I see with my children's generation it becomes easier mutually not to have those control issues even though it is still there but not in the patriarchal sense of the dad has to be respected the dad is the breadwinner the dad is the one determining the values... (II1)*

*Ansie (57): one is taught... to look up at your dad and that you have to respect older men... the principal... teachers... it is just a remnant of how we were taught to think about men specifically... specifically this cornerstone of our community could not have feet of clay it was always guys that you put on a little throne*

Presiding masculinity hitches gendered public/private hierarchisation at the **volksmoeder** nodal point in articulating normative **ordentlikheid** – normalising a network of masculine authorities linked through disciplinary technologies such as religion, education and medicine (Faubion, 2002). In contrast, the Ek-thical
subject ‘remembers’ ‘teacher, preacher, doctor and dentist that tell you this is the truth... apartheid was acceptable in their order’ (II6). The Regrouper rebuttal is to de-historicise and individualise this gender hierarchy as belonging only to the questioner’s generation (FG1).

Nita’s identity was antagonised by the unequal Afrikaner nationalist masculinity-femininity categorisation during apartheid, especially ‘when I had X and it is the third daughter and people said to me shame you have to try again’ (II2).

Postapartheid femininity retains reverence for ‘masculinity as regency’: Leah compares her rural-based mother-in-law’s welcoming of her son when he visits to Biblical ‘calves being slaughtered’ (FG3); Willemien’s Johannesburg-based mother-in-law could ‘carry’ her son ‘from the car’, which Willemien normalises as ‘that’s mothers... doesn’t matter which language they speak’ (FG4), obfuscating oppressive gender relations. In a major renovation, hegemonic masculinity is articulated with ‘Madiba’, a Regrouper insertion of Nelson Mandela as signifier. Mandela’s clan name Madiba, colloquially used and which references ‘father of the nation’, is articulated with masculinity-as-rationality to re-legitimise ‘man as head of the household’ in a heteronormative arrangement:

Pieta (35): He’s really amazing with [daughter] [...] he tells her ‘how pretty you look!’ then everything is right... he’s really the head of the household he dominates nobody he’s just this Madiba he’s an inspiration in how he handles people... how clearly he can think without getting emotional (FG3)

6.6.3 Feminine ordentlikheid as service

Central to the production of docile feminine bodies is what Jackson (1999:167) identifies as an ‘ethic of service to men’ which is intrinsic to practices of heterosexual femininity, in that women police themselves and are policed through disciplinary practices to fulfil the heterosexual imperative of attracting and pleasing a man, whether sexually or otherwise. These can range from the micro level (‘how they sit and avoid eye contact’; being ‘sexually attractive’), to uncritically supplying unpaid home-based labour, to withdrawing from public spaces (p. 130).

The Ek-thical rebuttal of criteria for a viable feminine body, to instead generate an ethical self, reveals the discipline and the resistant alternative:
Katrien (42): I was never terribly pretty I was that slightly chubby nerdish little girl but because I had personality the boys always wanted to talk to me... and I got a strange self-confidence... who you are and what you stand for carry more weight than... the role you have to play or how you have to look.

In Afrikaner nationalism the appropriation of women's bodies and labour (Jackson, 1999:130) was articulated with particularist elements. The relationship of the hegemonic femininity to the hegemonic masculinity was one of service: the father was as 'unapproachable' as the mother was 'an examplar of understanding love and subservience' (Cronjé, 1958:66). This division in affect is due to 'a different life attitude because man and woman are essentially different' (p.326). This 'iconography of domestic service' (McClintock, 1993:72) positions 'woman' as 'servant to the volk' (Cloete, 1992:51), remarkably still in iteration within postapartheid heterosexual ordentlikheid. This is the particularist performance produced by hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity. Volksmoeder ordentlikheid constructs the heterosexual union as a service relationship, with whiteness as (invisibilised) perk substantially alleviating white women's burden of reproductive labour through black female labour (FG4).

The Ek-thical discourse invokes the 'unfeminine' possibility of anger and 'hardness' in reaction to the reproductive service norm during apartheid, thus creating space for resistance of normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid's thwarting of subjectivity. This is a resistance against the invisibilisation of women's domestic work and against the normalisation of the masculine enclosure of the feminine as 'safety':

Emma: my mom's eyes became rock hard... and flat from frustration from sitting at home with three tiny children [...] it must be soul-destroyingly boring however much you love your child... my dad said all proud 'no wife of mine will work' of course I will work you can see you mom is not happy you mom wants you to do the same as her because to her it is a [Nina: confirmation] not just a confirmation but it is safe (FG4)

In a Regrouper retort to Ek-thical radical challenges, contradictory claims connect women’s liberation and the correct ‘phasing’ of the life of the ‘Afrikaner woman’. Daleen first claims freedom from a gendered labour division inside and
outside the apartheid household, a claim then contradicted by her quoting Afrikaner nationalist sociologist Dina Wessels’s (1972:383) prescription for ‘woman’: 20 years of ‘basic education’; 20 years when it is ‘in order’ for her to reproduce, legitimised as ‘the very important work of motherhood’; and then, at 40, to ‘go for it’\textsuperscript{viii}. But Lindie, a generation younger than Daleen, confirms that the lived reality remains feminine regimented hetero-duty, with the only respite allocated according to the gender division of labour, an adjustment to domesticate women’s shifting social position:

\textit{Lindie (43): My dad [...] brought [us] up to be subservient... you had no aspiration to be a director. You will be a secretary and then a mom and a housewife (FG1).}

Claiming an Ek-thical subject position on gender during apartheid demanded:

\textit{A lot of small wars before [husband and I] got where we are... it frequently came down to the care of the children... I said to him if we wanted women to do more then women would have had children on their own (Nita, II2)}

In (post)apartheid contexts, household labour remains not only outside the masculine purview of activities but respondents reported their mothers’ (60-75 years old) ‘service of doing everything’ including daily regiments of women rising before their husbands to have cooked ‘English breakfasts’ ready, which in one case is always served in bed. A persistent social gender division underpins the labour gender division. Ek-thic femininities’ resistance subverts dichotomies with its revelation of an active feminine fence with an inactive masculine sitter:

\textit{Nerina (32): I refuse to be that humble Afrikaner woman who is now suddenly helping in the kitchen and not sitting at the BBQ with the men I know my mother-in-law thinks I am this terrible rebellious Johannesburg woman (II3)}

A gendered division of labour inculcated during childhood is normalised and transferred intergenerationally, a finding in concurrence with research by S van der Merwe (2011):

\textit{Pieta (35), whose dad ‘never made food or washed dishes’: ...my sister’s children for example now have men’s jobs and women’s jobs. Her little boy told his sisters he doesn’t have to help with dishes because he helps with mowing the lawn (II4)}
A daughter is expected to act as substitute servant when the mother is not available. But these prescriptions are challenged, either through conscious pursuit of different gender relations or in challenging the parental status quo, even in households in the sway of volksmoeder ordentlikheid:

Pieta (35): I asked [my dad] if he knows how many sugars he takes because mom always puts his sugar in and she stirs it for him then he just laughs

The lived dependence of the fathers on the mothers made two respondents comment that they wished the father died before the mother as they were not willing to look after their fathers and their fathers would ‘end up a bum’ without the mothers (II3 & 4).

While service to the masculine is the mark of the feminine, leisure is the preserve of the masculine. Sometimes feminine service and masculine leisure combine through women’s labour:

Nerina (32): [my dad] phones my mom... you have to do this and that and my mom says yes... [like she is] his personal assistant... his hobby is cars but he doesn’t do anything my mom does it all... holidays they go where he wants to go he loves 4x4 driving then they go for a week to the Kalahari and my mom says never again a month later they’re going again... (II4)

It is a masculinity that sets the parameters of feminised service within the domestic domain, even determining the exact terms of food consumed:

Nerina (32): few vegetables a lot of red meat a lot of rice chicken maybe but never fish... not too spicy or too many herbs... my mom can make tasty food but he wants it bland (II4)

Ansie (57): my dad wasn't an adventurous eater Saturday evenings everything is BBQ’d... Sundays my mom had to cook... very specific things... no alternative vegetable dishes beans rice potatoes meat... chicken is not big... it is quite... rigid (II5)

6.6.4. A despotic masculinity that silences

Despotic masculinity invokes ‘respect’ as key performative of ordentlikheid that functions as a knowledge/power regime (man as knower) with the power effect of the male-bodied never being naysayed by a muted feminine:
Andriette (56): when I married into a... 1950s-type family where the man is the breadwinner... my mother-in-law was dependent her whole life she simply fell in with everything he said... that kind of position of power I hoped to overcome it in my own marriage... but at times my husband sees it as I don’t respect him if I differ from him... the man makes the decisions my father-in-law said ‘don’t worry Mommy’ and patted [mother-in-law] like this (III)

Geoffrey Cronjé’s ‘feared father’ is transferred intergenerationally and across genders: Pieta’s father, whose sugar in his coffee is always administered by his wife, ‘was more scared’ of his dad than ‘of the devil’. It accords with Cronjé’s (1958:42) normative ‘description’ that a son’s ‘deference for his father borders on fear’. But Pieta still regards her grandfather as ‘a formidable old man’, as per Cronjé’s prescription that the younger generations (of men) still be told the feared grandfather was a ‘remarkable man’ (p42). The feared father has a silent audience:

Leah (49): you are seen at a table and never heard we did not grow up where you speak at the table... quite strict... dad speaks.

Katrien (42): [brother (46)] is a typical Afrikaans man... when he speaks the woman stays quiet because he’s speaking

Underpinning silence is violence.

6.6.5. Hegemonic masculinity as limitless violence

Apartheid’s absolutisation of white power encompassing all spheres of sociality produced ‘limitless violence [...] against the perceived forces of debilitation’ (Goldberg, 2009:301,303). While Goldberg does not gender his analysis, the division of this violence is male enactor/female spectator:

Katrien (42): people who lived on our corner hurt two boys non-whites badly because they dared to buy bread at the shop... that you can decide on the basis of someone’s skin colour... it’s a sick form of power because of what the government had announced to claim the right and the authority to straighten other people out who were where they were not supposed to be (II6)

Andriette (56): in Stellenbosch a very white enclave... I was so angry and upset... school boys who threw a coloured man with acorns I experienced it as extremely humiliating who gives them the right [another time] when a coloured man climbed over the rope guys pulled
it and then he fell it was so humiliating in front of everyone my dad said hold yourself in because I wanted to reprimand them (II1)

Fanon (2001) found reciprocity between the public and private violence of white colonial masculinity (pp.215-6). Violence embedded male petty dictatorship inside the white apartheid home (Russell, 1997), continuing after apartheid:

\textit{Andriette (56): when her dad asked where’s my hat the whole household stood still and everybody searched... everybody knew now life is blue and everyone made themselves small and stayed in their track because they feared his angry moods and outbursts and things (II1)}

\textit{Nerina (32): if my mom does not execute my dad’s instructions precisely then he absolutely freaks out (II3)}

Despite the fear of ‘his things’, stigma attached to violence was demonstrated by respondents denying any intimate violence; only two out of 25 admitted knowing ‘friends’ who had been subjected to intra-family violence, of which one (child sexual assault) insisted it was ‘not serious’ while the other (domestic violence) ‘hit back’. Respondents used minimising euphemisms and declared their own bodies violation-free.

Corporal punishment was more readily admitted to. The ‘humiliated father’ is entitled to perform random violence. In Cronjé’s ‘familialism’ (1958) the patriarch only ever acts in the best interests of the family, which he ‘knows’ to the exclusion of other family members.

\textit{Pieta (35): I had a beating... my dad was so humiliated... it was one of those just grab and hit (II4)}

Masculine public violence disciplines feminine subjects with gender and racial performatives. The following excerpt details postapartheid gender relations at an Afrikaner nationalist elite school in the late 1990s. The racial marker ‘Putco’ refers to a bus company commonly transporting black people:

\textit{Nerina (32): [typical Afrikaner masculinity is] superior towards women if you aren’t a pretty little doll then you don’t really have a place... the boys erected a board with a hippopotamus saying ‘be careful’... they said we were fat their name for the girls were Putco buses... nobody was fat... it is an easy way for men to make girls feel insecure... there were a few... eating disorders... it was these chauvinist strong men ‘main men’... [telling]}
those typical toilet humour jokes about women my one friend because she challenged them they hit her with a [cricket] bat one guy was [temporarily] suspended (II3)

This excerpt reveals the interconnected racialisation, gendering and sexualisation of *volksmoeder ordentlikheid* as disciplinary scheme marking bodies.

Violence as method creates hierarchies of masculinities: it is an intergenerational corrector for an Afrikaner masculinity militarised by apartheid conscription (du Pisani, 2001):

*Pieta* (35): *my dad always said [military service is] the best thing for a young guy because they cut you down to size... if you're a little spitfire... they get you right quickly and you also learn how to iron and do all manner of things* (II4)

*Nerina* (32): *Dads who transmit [the culture of violence] to their sons [as in] 'I went through it so you have to go through it'* (II3)

6.6.6. Feminising non-conforming male-bodied others/masculinising non-conforming female-bodied others

Non-violent and non-Afrikaner men are feminised, including by being accused of being ‘gay’. The Ek-thical discourse allows Nerina to reject the ‘bad discipline’ of masculine ‘initiation’ in apartheid military service that continues at postapartheid schools and universities. Non-conformism has provoked disciplinary measures against her ‘pacifist’ husband and the punitive tagging of her four-year-old son as ‘gay’. A frontier effect is discerned in homosexuality as the border that cannot be breached.

*Nerina* (32): *[son’s cousin] for his fourth birthday got a .22 [rifle] the hunting culture is very close to the military [culture]... there is a world of difference between that little boy and my little son... the little bucks with the blood upset [son] so much... he’s a soft child but not gay it is more like a loving... that little [cousin]... has a knife... he doesn’t think twice about hitting someone to get his way...*

*R: so that side of the family thinks your son is gay?*

*Nerina*: *Yes.*

Nita, who self-identifies as ‘arch-feminist’, deployed Ek-thical discourse to refute *volksmoeder* gender dichotomisation in the apartheid context:
Nita (61): My girls... must just know the world is there for them they are not bound by anything because they are women... I always told them we are firstly people... boys don’t go into a little box but also not girls it is an equal story... those were bad times the first [apartheid] state of emergency [1985] (I12)

Nita’s self-construction in challenging gender is an elaboration of the theme of openness in her discourse; that difference does not equal ‘wrong’; and that subjects cannot be reduced to unchanging essences. Her subject position articulates second wave feminism, with its emphasis on gender equality, contextualised within apartheid. Nita inducted her daughters into resisting sexual disciplining:

I purposefully tried to help them deal with it and think of answers at their level to say to a teacher... one day [daughter] said... the [school] miss said ‘close your legs’ and she asked her ‘why?’... I helped her to answer [the teacher]... (I12)

Hegemonic femininity pushed back – the challenge provoked disqualification:

Nita (62): the children were not known as the most refined girls... in those years’ terms ‘tomboys’... they could climb trees ride bikes they could do what they wanted in terms of... gender (I12)

Nerina’s non-compliance with violent masculinity creates the potential for identitary openings amid regulatory pressures channeled through the family.

Nerina (32): [son] may dress like a fairy neither I or [husband] have a problem... we don’t have gender boundaries that we impose on him the other day they had to dress in fantasy dress [at the day school] he wanted to dress as a witch I know the other boys were wearing hunting and military [dress]... he also likes pirates... he’s mad about construction vehicles but these are his own interests and not what we impose of ‘this is how a little boy should be’ I want him to be a strong man who takes strong decision but not because he’s a man... as a strong person who has respect for women and does not carry the baggage of the apartheid years’ idea of a strong man (I13)

6.6.7. Volksmoeder ordentlikheid’s small femininity

The constitutive outside to despotic masculinity is a femininity that ‘tiptoes around his chair’ (FG1), which cannot be seen to be ‘confrontational’ (FG2). It is a self-deprecatory femininity forged from a trope with remarkable
longevity: historical antecedents include titles of two autobiographies. Lesbian Petronella van Heerden, the first Afrikaner woman to qualify as a medical doctor, whose title *Kerssnuitsels* (candle snuffings) (1962) suggests a disposition towards her life story as being as disposable as discarded candlewick (Viljoen, 2008:188). Heterosexual M.E. Rothmann, a popular Afrikaner nationalist press columnist, entitled her 1972 autobiography *My Beskeie Deel* (my humble contribution). Respondents repeatedly (dis)qualified their own endeavours, including contributions to this study, with the adjective 'small'. The self-diminution is infantilising:

Louise (43): *only after my dad’s death did [my mom] say she always felt like one of four children* (FG4)

Diminution inaugurates a hierarchy of uncle/little girl:

Andriette (56): *there’s probably a part of you that will always remain a child where you carry these fears and respects within yourself... the ooms [uncles]... my husband is also an oom but... I unconsciously fall back in this hole of “scuse me I’m the little girl’... of ‘listen to the uncle’ it is difficult for me to contradict them. I did not grow up like that where you just take them on and say ‘oh really?’* (FG4)

If she is ‘strong’, she has to minimise herself to ‘keep the crown on his head’ (II 6), even with ‘lesser’ masculinities, such as white non-Afrikaner men. This is what Deliovsky (2010) calls ‘derived power’.

Ek-thical defiances note the divergences in families between aunts who were ‘assertive opinions thoughts debates strong women’ – ‘I didn’t know women could or may sound like that’ – and ‘the conservative more “little doll” side of “you have to dress speak look a certain way”’ (Katrien, II6), which is servile and bows before a masculine line of authority. The ‘assertive feminine’ side provides the identitary opening: ‘as little girl I always thought... I want to be [like my strong aunts].’

‘Self-sacrifice’ emerged as another trope with postapartheid durability, elaborating on Afrikaner nationalist injunctions, e.g. by D.F. Malan in 1927 (van der Lingen, 1953:144). Discourses surfaced in the study (re)capitulated feminine forfeiting of self as ‘a woman thing’, plaited into signifying chains with ‘instinct’,
woman-as-caregiver and family ‘glue’, in compliance with Cronjé’s (1958:57) prescription of woman as cornerstone drawing the family together.

Andriette (56): it [/is] the woman who keeps the family together who makes the sacrifice who says for the sake of everybody... I will do myself a little short... so that everything doesn’t fall apart. (FG4)

Volksmoeder femininity manages the private spheres of affect and domesticity on behalf of a masculine centre and is recalibrated as powerful because she is ‘ruler of the domestic roost’ in discourses denying victimhood, submission and the retrenchment of rights. A discourse of psychotherapeutics is deployed for sense-making:

Elsebeth (48): My mom [was] definitely... not submissive but the peacemaker my dad was a difficult man I understand why he had issues... he was the youngest... never good enough for grandma when he arrived at home at 5pm the food had to be on the table he didn’t like chicken [or fish] so we never had [that]... my mom kept him happy because she didn’t want confrontation... but we were never brought up that girls are inferior (FG2).

Elsebeth’s claim of gender equality is belied by the fatality of volksmoeder ordentlikheid for her mother, with divorce ‘as a sin’ unthinkable ‘for that generation’:

Elsebeth (48): My mom couldn’t take it anymore she didn’t commit suicide she got cancer and died within three weeks and now she’s free from that... she didn’t have it in her to leave him... for better or for worse you stick with the guy you married (FG2)

Emma: ... my sister left her husband to my mom’s great shame because now two of her children are divorced she has thus failed as a woman... my aunt said ‘if I could leave your uncle Johan 40 years ago I would have’. I wonder how many of that generation of women [would’ve done so if they could]... (FG4)

What remains is what McClintock (1993) terms ‘small power’ after being ‘jealously and brutally denied any formal political power’ (p.72). As a former woman leader of the Cape NVP (National Women’s Party) put it in 1953: will National Party men allow ‘woman’ to help build a volk in ‘her own independent way’ or ‘will it forever be her role to be only a shadow’, banished to the household and behind-the-scenes party support (van der Lingen, 1953:147, own translation). ‘Woman-as-neck to man-as-head’ is the Regrouper normalisation of
hegemonic masculinity as despotism/hegemonic femininity as submission. Its operations are:

\begin{quote}
Pieta (35): My dad will definitely think he is is the head of the household but my mom makes him think so... he is the head and my mom is the neck, she turns him where she wants him (FG3).
\end{quote}

Volksmoeder femininity is a cumulative learning of keeping masculinity intact:

\begin{quote}
Pieta (35): subtly in her extremely feminine way she gets her way without damaging her husband... the longer you are married the more you understand how to go about achieving things... as though it is his plan (II4)
\end{quote}

This reworking of power can be understood as the subordinate reformulating its navigation of a field hegemonised by an(other), i.e. Afrikaner masculinity, to extend its agency. The Ek-thic subject position declines this formula, summoning the stereotype of ‘womanly wiles’ as mode for self-actualisation:

\begin{quote}
Emma (46): My gran told me that but no man is my head I am my own head women... who say you are the head have ways to manipulate and there is guilt... My mom does it like this [deep sigh] then my dad says 'jeez okay' (FG4)
\end{quote}

Notable is the longevity of this trope of man=head/woman=neck, as 46-year old Emma reports that her grandmother used it, and 35-year old Pieta is reproducing it seamlessly. Its sedimented political origins are the Afrikaner nationalist prescription of ‘the Boer woman’ as ‘accepting her husband’s supremacy over everything’ and ‘being second-in-command’ (Cronjé, 1958:67).

6.6.8. Volksmoeder sexuality, a masculine production

The lay of this fraught terrain is further sculpted by sexuality, a public, everyday process of power relations (Bell and Valentine, 1995:146). Foucault (1998:145-7) posited sex as juncture for the organisation of the management of life, a ‘micro-power’ that disciplines the body.

Afrikaner nationalist patriarchal ‘familialism’ was ‘an unceasing aspiration to create a family’ as a primary order of authority predicated on the ‘principle of reproduction’ (Cronjé, 1958:98,101). Masculine sexual prerogative with implicit violence was normalised: ‘Man cannot understand when woman
alleges that she is unconscious of encouraging him. He can also not understand why she looks over her shoulder when she runs away from him’ (‘Dr Goedhart’, 1972:369, own translation). ‘Familialism’ warranted no existence except as ‘family person’ under unassailable patriarchal control, installing the family as black box with white male sexuality running rampant (Cronjé 1958; Russell, 1997). Masculine access was bolstered by the dictates of womanhood as silent servitude and self-sacrifice (Cronjé, 1945:326; Vincent, 1999:68), rendering the sexuality of volksmoeder ordentlikheid a masculine production, in concurrence with Spies’s (2012) findings.

6.6.8. (a) Compulsory male sexual access: ‘If he wants to, you want to’

Andriette (56): the submission expected of women... sexual types of things... you had to kiss all the omies [uncles] and tolerate if they touched you what standing did you have if you said this omie [uncle] is touching me? Many women were too scared to say anything (I11)

Emma (46): [...] [mom of 70+ years old] says but if your husband has to have sex, my child, then you have to [oblige]. [Nina: uh-uh] I almost fell off my chair.


Emma: Oh [she] probably [thinks of] the Boere Vierkleur [Boer republic flag] or something [...] I almost had a fit. I said, no way...

The Ek-thical discourse problematises the equivalence ‘woman’s value=man’s happiness’, which hinges on sexual compliance, as advanced by women’s magazines.

6.6.8. (b) ‘Sweet and naughty, with pearls’

Respondents discerned paradoxical prescriptions for the feminine sexuality of ordentlikheid: men want ‘wholesome sweetness with a touch of naughtiness’: women who are ‘prudish in public but a whore in the bedroom’ (FG2). This is an adjustment of 19th century racialised prescriptions: as working class women and women of colour were denied respectability by virtue of their racial and class categorisation, white women in co-productive contrast had to be chaste to be respectable (Scully, 1995:345). Respondents suggested that the ‘more modern Sarie’ of today still produced a ‘circumscribed ordentlikheid’ (FG2):
Anke (46): that thing of ... I am going to put my pearls on [...] the reason why it works is because of perceptions that for example Sarie creates.

Liesl (64): we want you to also be good in bed. But you must also be ladies... there is this ordentlikheid that has to go together [with being a woman]. You can't go in walk in the street like a man.

Anke: With a cigarette in your hand

The English word 'lady' seems a residue from earlier fabrications of WESSA femininity and from Afrikaner nationalists’ early 20th century manoeuvres in whitening Afrikaner subaltern whiteness with respectability, similar to male African nationalists’ deployment of respectability in the disciplining of wayward women (Thomas, 2006:466; Hyslop, 1995:60). The research does not find constructions of black male sexual peril comparable to discourses during 1910s-1940s (Keegan, 2001; Hyslop, 1995). Therefore, forgetting the origins of the volksmoeder identity includes amnesia about its relation to sexualised black bodies.

6.6.8. (c) 'Testosterone as manipulation, womanly wiles as in-born'

Further to Foucault's (1998) discernment of a discourse of sexuality firmed up in the 19th century, Victorian conceptualisations in the 19th century Cape colony posited men's sexuality as derived from 'uncontrollable passions and enticement by women' (Scully, 1995:345). The 21st century version of these heteronormative performatives are:

Elsebeth (48): all women are born with skills all men are born with testosterone so they use it we use our feminine skills... if it is necessary to be a bit flirty he uses his testosterone to manipulate me it's fine, it's nature it happens with animals

Anke (46): but it's unconscious... almost automatic

Volksmoeder ordentlikheid's sexual dichotomy is normalised through the articulation of colonial remnants with postfeminism: the naturalness of the male sexual prerogative (Steyn and van Zyl, 2009; Herbert, 2002; Potts, 2002) and woman as wily manipulator of 'men's sexual weakness', reinterpreted as automatic skill (Kipnis, 2006; Attwood, 2009; Walter, 2011). An innovation is that both ascriptions are 'in-born', while the unstoppable male biological sexual
urge (‘testosterone’) is re-inscribed as ‘manipulation’, contradictions revealing contestation over the meaning of these floating signifiers.

6.6.8. (d) ‘Silent sex’

Performing Afrikaner subaltern whiteness’ aspiration to normative WESSA whiteness, respondents declared sexual similarity between Afrikaans and WESSA women but that dominant discourses such as Sarie denied that young women go out for one-night stands and therefore declined sexual agency to Afrikaans heterofemininity, including directives on experiencing pleasure and avoiding violence.

Liesl (64): Cosmo says ‘this is how you can give him the best blowjob or how he can give you the best orgasm’
Anke (46): this is how to pick him up and how to identify chancer who you don’t want to go [home] with.
Researcher: Why doesn’t Sarie address it?
Liesl: It is not ordentlik

Silences as those occurring in Sarie texts is read here not as repression but as regulation generating subjectivity (Foucault, 2004:29-30). Elements that receive Sarie’s sanction are feminine ‘sexual purity’ and lack of sexual agency, articulated with heterodomesticity, while lesbianism is abjected and postfeminist sexualisation avoided:

Nina (65): Cosmo says how you get a man in your bed and Sarie tells you how to keep him out of your bed.

A 32-year-old respondent reported silences, as circulated through the family. Silences are articulated with the sexual and the race and gender regulation of ordentlikheid.

Tani (32): [...] I still think it takes a lot of guts to divorce, especially in Afrikaans circles.
Elsabe: There is a stigma-ish...
Tani: there is always somebody who says: but why? Have you seen the reverend? [...] I think we are not prepared because we never talk about sex in the home and we never talk about relationships. Because the things happen behind doors, you don’t know what it is like to live with someone else. You are not at all prepared for what comes I married straight out of home. I always thought we were terribly verlig [enlightened], and you know, but my mom never spoke to me about sex... my husband and I are are struggling to have children and it
is very difficult because now [...] we have to talk about sex. Nobody ever spoke to us about sex and now the doctor is also talking to you about it. You want to die because you are not prepared for these conversations I think it is the same with divorce These are those uncomfortable things that you rather... that is why you won't tell people to stop being racist because it is so uncomfortable. You rather sit there and you... okay I try not to think about it and whatever and you try to get out of that moment but actually Afrikaans people never sit and talk about [...] real issues. It is always superficial, dirty jokes around the braai [BBQ]. [...] The things that are important just never get discussed.

Emma: Wow.

6.6.8. (e) ‘Amputated sexuality’

‘Unthinking’ intergenerational transfer was of sex as ‘something that you use to have children the day you married’: ‘if I think back, it was a scandal to enjoy sex’, says respondent Ansie. She draws a line back to Victorian times when ‘you were buttoned up to under your chin’:

_ansie (57): It comes from my gran and them my mom always told the day they arrive home pregnant they can take their stuff and go it was a terrible shame... my mom was a social worker so she worked with all these unmarried mothers so there was always a finger under my nose_

A discourse of psychotherapeutics precipitated a ‘mental shift’ for Ansie de-re-articulating volksmoeder ordentlikheid with the ‘60s sexual revolution’ and the pragmatics of the ‘normal need to have sexual intercourse with another person’, making her realise that she lived the sexual part of her life

_amputated because of this collective consciousness that it isn’t ordentlik it’s an Afrikaner thing other cultures are more open (I15)_

‘Amputated and unknowing sexuality’ for the feminine co-constructs masculine knowing and sexual licence. Ansie’s mom always told her:

_ansie (57): the day a man marries he doesn’t want someone... with experience he’s looking for a chaste ordentlike girl... I always believed my mom there were strict rules... the stereotype is men can be looser... they are more accommodated because a man’s needs are different they are more physically oriented (I15)_

In response, postfeminist sexualisation theorises a heterosexuality ‘attempting happiness’ and ‘self-discovery’ while ‘not necessarily married’ for Ansie, in
contrast to a (male) homosexuality only verified if ‘monogamously un-celibate’. The unequivocal colonial demand of marriage to secure white women’s respectability (Scully, 1995: 345) has been replaced with ambivalence. While respondents report that regulation of femininity is still focussed on marital status, they also reported their acceptance of daughters’ or their own engagement in unmarried sex and maternity without marriage. Respondents of 50+ years of age reported a shift regarding the unacceptability of pre-marital sex, unmarried maternity, adoption and divorce vis-à-vis their ‘mothers’ generation’ of 75 years old and older.

6.6.9. Inside out: The constitutive lesbian, hegemonic femininity’s last frontier

In an echo of nationalism and the volksmoeder’s bowdlerisation of ‘abnormal’ and ‘weak’ lesbianism (Viljoen 2008:193,200), focus group interviewees did not mention lesbianism, bar one. Questions during the individual interviews evoked face-saving declarations of friendships with lesbians. However, while ‘every girl has her gay’ (II4), lesbians remain ‘unknown’ (II6). Lesbianism was yoked with sexual threat; discomfort; choice; extreme; testing; not standard; strange; not normal; different. The entanglement of sex-gender-sexuality (Butler, 1990, 1993) was demonstrated in the disturbance of female-bodied individuals claiming masculine privileges:

Katrien (42): the stigma is huge because someone who looks like a woman can’t choose to be like that (II6)

Pieta (35): my mom thinks it’s very funny because when X and Y [lesbian couple] visit my aunt and then X lies on the couch and Y helps in the kitchen (II4)

The next sections examine strategies of reupholstery and dismantlement of Afrikaner masculinity. This study finds that the contestation that the Afrikaner masculine is subjected to does not only take place in the ‘public’ sphere through its displacement by the black masculine outside in state politics, but also inside the household.
6.6.10. Losing his grip

6.6.10. (a) The Afrikaner man crumbles, the Afrikaner crumbles

Postapartheid resistances have shifted the gender relations of volksmoeder ordentlikheid into turmoil:

*Emma (46):* The Afrikaans men I know have huge issues they were promised the world and whoops they didn't have it anymore… they don’t see their own privilege women are running out from underneath them they are a very uncertain group and politically bitter (FG4)

*Leah (49):* the woman has become so strong in the family she juggles a job and the kids... it's just go go go... she doesn't have time to also pamper the husband so he deteriorates systematically (FG3)

The entwinement of hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity, the state and Afrikanerhood is revealed, as is the investment of volksmoeder ordentlikheid in hegemonic masculinity’s resurrection. Questions in the interviews about the status of Afrikaner men led to talk equating Afrikaner masculinity with Afrikanerhood. Bereft of the institutional resources sponsored by the apartheid state for violent intra- and extra-masculinity hierarchisation, this loss has paradoxically been reinvented as resource for postapartheid Afrikaner victimhood.

Regrouper volksmoeder femininity acknowledges the psychological damage wrought by ‘Total Onslaught’ army conscription (II4). Paradoxically, nostalgia is mobilised over the loss of military service. It reveals the symbolic charge of masculinity for ordentlikheid, as ‘moral decay’ is attributed to ‘boys do not have that hardness in them anymore’; they are ‘directionless’; the 30-something generation of men, exempted from apartheid conscription, feel they ‘missed out’ (II3). Nevertheless, this discourse suggests the emergence of masculinities that do not conform to the prescription of the presiding patriarch who ‘knows’.

6.6.10. (b) The boys want all the toys, or nothing

Ek-thic deconstruction exposes the white work of postapartheid where, instead of ‘self-reflection’, Afrikaners adopted a ‘poor we’ position: ‘male patriarchal masochism’ means men are ‘moaning’ because it’s ‘power or nothing’, which
includes men murdering whole families because ‘he owns you and the children’ (II1). Ek-thical de-re-construction draws on democratic discursive resources to problematise the ‘all or nothing’ entitlement of this masculinity, intergenerationally transferred: Nita (62) told her husband

\[
\text{you have nothing to complain about we are still in the pound seats I won’t feel sorry for you it’s almost like a child who complains over the few toys that have been taken away instead of playing with what you’ve got (II2).}
\]

6.6.11. Keeping the crown on his head
6.6.11. (a) Reinventing apartheid, rearticulating ‘democracy’
The Ek-thical positioning exposes postapartheid identification’s drawing on apartheid constructions:

\[
\text{Katrien (42): people find their identity in a culture... in a relationship... it has to be done...}
\]

\[
\text{marry, have children... it goes back to apartheid when you found your identity within a...}
\]

\[
\text{norm and you can’t figure out for yourself if you are happy...}
\]

‘Mighty Men’ rallies have emerged to resurrect the Afrikaner ‘man’ as ‘king and priest’ of the household, a discourse that refreshes the constitutive elements of despotic masculinity (Nadar, 2009). The rallies articulate ‘man should stand strong from a Biblical point of view’ to address ‘social decay’ (pp.21-22), a rearticulation of Afrikaner masculinity through religious discourse. An Ek-thical position rebuts this reinstatement of despotic masculinity:

\[
\text{Sandra (43): the woman has to do this and that and the children must listen and everybody must shiver when daddy walks in the door and the children must be sorted and the coffee on the table (FG3)}
\]

In contrast, hegemonic volksmoeder femininity, as advanced by Regrouper discourses, deploys contradictory discourses to obscure masculine despotism and foreground ‘male disempowerment’, disavow feminism and patriarchy, posit women as ‘stronger’ (in an apology to men) and then question whether being stronger is in women’s favour, as the last say means assuming responsibility (invoking frivolous femininity, as celebrated by Sarie [Maritz 2012; van der Merwe, 2011]).

Eager for reinstalment as feminine crutch, Regroupers reiterate dualistic gender as mutual prop to prevent the collapse of an essentialised ‘man’ while
continuing woman-as-reproducer. As defensive *volksmoeder* femininity stakes its claim in the face of democratising discourses, it claims a ‘loosening’ of patriarchal relations, recalibrates gender as merely ‘mutual influence’ and reinvents ‘equality’ as ‘he has the final say’:

*Ansie* (57): among my friends everyone acts as equals except that the man necessarily takes the final decision and the responsibility

A democratic discourse is here used to recuperate *volksmoeder* prescriptions: Cronjé (1958:57) set out the heteronormative day-to-day operations of *ordentlikheid* as that ‘he [the man] needed her help and advice and although she regarded him with deference and respect, and he was the bearer of authority and took leadership upon himself, she was a comrade for him that had great influence on his actions’.

These manoeuvres include a reinvention of apartheid gender relations with rearticulations with neoliberal and postfeminist elements ‘opportunity’ and ‘choice’:

*Ansie* (57): [apartheid] was quite patriarchal... but if a woman wanted to make choices... to have a career [she could] although it didn’t happen a lot... (II5)

In contrast with the Regrouper retrospective and depoliticising application of ‘choice’, the Ek-thical discourse links the enforcement of normative codes during apartheid and blocked self-production:

*Katrien* (42): the gap between [apartheid and democracy] is bitterly wide just in terms of career choices... during apartheid... you didn’t build... your own identity as a person now women can do anything the sky is the limit (II6)

Even when a subject is able to identify the violations wrought by man/woman reification and masculine privilege, explicitly and implicitly, reiteration still occurs:

*Tani* (32): My friends [have] partnerships the man does as much as the woman... it’s healthier for a child to grow up in a home where equality is important because otherwise we won’t get equality in society right... but rather a strict dad than no dad if you don’t have any example of what a man does and what a woman does not in the traditional way just examples of how to deal with each other across the genders (FG4)
This narrative, riddled with contradictions, disrupts and then reinstates a gendered order in which the household is politicised as sphere for the production of the democratic value of equality, which is then contradicted by an invocation of ‘what a man must do and what a woman must do’.

6.6.11. (b) Man as natural hunter/protector

Biological determinism is invoked to position ‘man’ as ‘protector’ to compensate for his displacement as ‘provider’:

*Willemien (33):* If you take away traditional and you just look physiologically how... men and women work differently... I didn’t marry a terribly traditional man but he has a need to protect his home his wife... I am the main breadwinner... (FG3)

*Ansie (57):* it’s maybe genetic throughout all the centuries the man was the protector the hunter... that perception has probably stayed in our Afrikaner men’s heads European men get other exposure but our lot here at the southern tip of Africa and suddenly things changed drastically (II5)

6.6.11. (c) Woman’s choice to be natural nurturer

The neoliberal/postfeminist trope of ‘choice’ is wielded to naturalise femininity-as-nurturance and to essentialise gender difference while denying concomitant subjection effects:

*Tani (32):* it’s natural for women

*Elsabe (41):* as nurturers

*Tani:* if it makes me who I am... that I make food... then I have a problem I enjoy making food for my husband he doesn’t expect it... women and men are different after all

*Elsabe:* Ja, ja. And that’s quite nice

Articulations with ‘choice’ allows for Regrouping iterative normalisations of the woman-mother equivalence underpinning the gendered division of labour of woman-as-primary-caregiver. The Ek-thic return undermines the iteration with an insistence on men being co-responsible for reproduction:

*Andriette (56):* ... My mom was a doctor and later a psychiatrist... first thing in the mornings she... put her face on... she said... sorry sick people are more important than you... I chose to stay home I almost died of boredom but I didn’t want to do that to my children...

*Tani (32):* It’s the balance
Nina: It’s the balance yes

Emma: but this is where the man comes in because it is... ‘either my children or my work’... you have to be able to say ‘hallo there are two of us’ (FG4)

‘Choice’ is also explicitly welded with volksmoeder elements to ‘freely’ claim woman-as-natural-nurturer in a postfeminist juxtaposition with feminism’s ‘compulsory career woman’. Pieta places ‘women’s liberation’ interpelling Afrikaner women in the 1980s, rather than 1960s:

Pieta: wasn’t it expected in the 1980s... that a woman would work if ... you wanted respect? I am... probably the offspring of a volksmoeder because I am like my mom. I want to be at home with my children I chose my career so that I could do something at home when I have children... I love cooking... I am naturally a nurturer and free to do it no one looks down on me (II4)

However, the Ek-thical appropriation of ‘choice’ acknowlegdes the middleclass contingencies producing this femininity, with consumerism as its generative mode:

Elsebeth (48): [Sharing of household duties with husband] is my choice [...] everything is about choice. it is my choice not to work... I choose to be with my children... I live in an unnatural world in Durbanville it is not the normal South Africa... In Durbanville there are women who work because they enjoy it and then there are those ... who are not willing to say I hate it to be with my children... so she says I work to drive the new blablabla Mini and my husband drives the new blablabla car and we have DSTV and go overseas I drive a 15 year old car because it is my choice not to work. (FG2)

6.6.11. (d) Feminine silence as proviso for natural motherhood

The disciplinary effects of heteronormativity, as deployed by the currently defensive masculinity of ordentlikheid, wear down resistant subjectivities as femininity is rehitched to volksmoeder dependence, self-silencing, self-reduction and actualising through others. Gender essentialism is also revamped with neoliberal and postfeminist ‘choice’: choosing motherhood is ‘like choosing a car’. Sense-making of capitulations draws on postfeminist decontextualisation, which conceals political regulation. Naturalisation of motherhood sees this subject turned against her own non-heteronormative accomplishment, which is a handyperson business:
Katrien (42): the men are very insistent... that ultimately they make the decisions... they want prettier more supportive women... who won’t take them on on their opinion... he doesn’t want to arrive at home in the evening and... be questioned... my friends would meet a nice guy and realise they’re just to bright for him... but they compromise to reach their dream [of having children] don’t give their opinion... but it’s okay because they’ve chosen that someone looks after them... it’s like me wanting my own business [...] 

Researcher: Why don’t men devote their lives to children? 
Katrien: it’s about the sexes... some women want to nurture naturally... it’s like why do people want a certain car or overseas holiday? ... I’m not willing to... make such compromises so it’s probably a question of that not being my only dream (II6)

Katrien relays a discourse that combine paradoxical elements: verification by the masculine but also an advancement of a ‘self-made’ subjectification instead of normativity, i.e. the Foucauldian ethical self articulated with Rose’s (1989) hyper-self-critical, psychologised governmentality, interspersed with postfeminist elements. It is not a coincidence that it is in response to verification from the masculine, confirming Gill and Scharff’s (2011) notion of women as ultimate neoliberal subjects intent on embodied selfgoverning. Katrien’s conundrum shows the flaw in third wave feminism’s embrace of self-definition based on choice, as it obfuscates actual gendered, classed and raced contexts, causing women to individualise (i.e. decontextualise and depoliticise) their failure to achieve normative femininity (Budgeon, 2011:285-290).

These findings also confirm research showing whiteness as firstly a masculine identification, in that white women may only access the privileges of whiteness if they conform to the prescriptions of white heteronormativity (Deliovsky, 2010). The next section examines postapartheid manoeuvres of Afrikaner whitening.

6.6.12 Reproducing black: Fatally failing the volksmoeder 

Following on from the previous section, the prescription of white heteronormativity -- volksmoeder ordentlikheid -- is to spawn white. The 200 year history of whiteness is suffused with notions of racial ‘purity’, with white women’ bodies the border discursively (re)installed and policed to ensure the reproduction of racially ‘pure’ offspring (Painter, 2010; Haste, 2001; Keegan, 2001; du Toit, 1993; Brink, 1990). In particular, to be a ‘good girl’ in the
patriarchal bourgeois white context is being a ‘good white girl’ generating white offspring (Deliovsky, 2010). This dictum works in a double movement: it keeps ‘her’ in, and it keeps ‘them’ out. Subjects in this study remain in a pressure cooker of breeding white, a particularly stubborn remnant of the Afrikaner nationalist volk constellation. Put differently, the reproduction of the black other constituted a fatal failure of postapartheid volksmoeder ordentlikheid.

Subjects’ attempts to respond to the injunction of maternity as continuing citation of feminine accomplishment are still constrained by racial disciplining effected at the family interface, through spoken and unspoken prescriptions:

Leah (49): my husband’s mom told me you don’t bring a piccanin home non-negotiable [...] that was a selfish thing because I may want a child no matter what colour [...] it’s not going to work, not today not in 10 years’ time... except if the child is white... we won’t talk about in the family... for the sake of peace and harmony (FG3)

Subjects in the Johannesburg focus groups cited punitive ejections from families of those who deviated from white reproduction, even if only through adoption, which confirms postapartheid non-normative challenges to the regulation:

Nerina (32): my husband’s cousin adopted an AIDS orphan... and my family-in-law has cut them out totally... when they came to a reunion no one spoke to them (FG3)

The next excerpt exposes racialisation dynamics as played out in a Cape Town focus group interview. Durbanville-based Elsebeth’s decision to reproduce ‘black’ presents a radical defiance of volksmoeder interpellation, caused by and causing rearticulations of elements constituting her own subject position, which in turn challenged the subject positions of other respondents in the focus group, with some scrambling to re-suture possible fissures. Violating the bedrock of volksmoeder ordentlikheid allows the decentring of race, demonstrated both in Elsebeth’s life and, upon her revelation thereof, in the focus group.

Her decision to adopt a bruin (or ‘brown’, an Afrikaans phrase for the apartheid categorisation ‘coloured’) baby provoked ejection:

Elsebeth (48): The day I told my dad we’re adopting a little boy... he said ‘will it be a white child?’ and I said ‘99 point 9 percent no’ (FG2)

The focus group fell completely silent at this moment.

Elsebeth: He said he won’t be able to live with it
Other respondents audibly sounded their sympathy. During the rest of the discussion respondents displayed interest akin to being confronted with a fetish object, while seeking to restore the family fabric:

Elsebeth: My dad has no contact with me... it’s his choice
Corlia (59): Stoic Afrikaner
Elsebeth: Yes, because it will embarrass him. ‘It doesn’t fit in my little block’
Liesl (64): to be ashamed in public and also not-divorcing have to do with each other

Elsebeth makes meaning of her father’s response as both structural and psychological. To her, Afrikaners ‘are those Corne’ Mulderksr guys who won’t even be associated with black people. My dad is an Afrikaner’. Consequently, she disindentifies as ‘Afrikaner’ to identify as ‘a South African and an African’. Her use of the word ‘embarrass’ to explain her ejection, which another respondent equates to embarrassment about divorce, exposes the co-implication of sexual and racial regulation.

Anke (46): You may be a bit intolerant... I have sympathy... it’s like telling a Muslim he must suddenly change his ways.
Elsebeth (48): I understand why my dad does it... he was never good enough for gran... the eldest son was up there with [the biblical apostle] Peter... you do what you know. [...] he’s a terrible introvert... pushes people away from him... I’ve stopped putting energy into that empty hole... it’s bad for me.
Lida (42): But it’s ignorance and... fear
Elsebeth: It’s still a choice

Notably, other respondents, especially the former MK soldier, contest Elsebeth’s dislocatory narrative with exonerations of the father (equivalence with ‘other cultures’; ‘ignorance’). But Elsebeth’s Ek-thic disposition draws on discourses of democracy, ethical governmentality and psychoanalysis to rebut these interpellations and to disrupt the law of the father, literally. Elsebeth also exposes the performativity delimiting whiteness: ‘you do what you know’. Thus governmentality based on an ethics of self does not effect the decontextualisation and depoliticisation of neoliberal governmentality but the opposite.

Elsebeth’s decision has also dislocated her own whiteness, as she admits to her own racism in lapsing into racially marking the body of her new child. The
word ‘klong’ is both a derogatory term for a black man, akin to the English ‘boy’, and a term used in a non-discriminating mode in certain areas of the Western Cape to refer to a ‘coloured’ man or a white or ‘coloured’ boy. White Afrikaans-speaking parents may refer to their white son as ‘klong’ as a term of endearment. Elsebeth’s use of the term here is racially problematic, as she is white and her son is ‘brown’, suggesting a racial hierarchy imposed through the parent/child unequal division.

Elsebeth (48): Gramps is 80, gran is 79, they were... apprehensive about the brown klonkie we’re bringing into the family... his hair... let me tell you we all have racism in us. That first day when I held that brown klong I said to [husband]: ‘He smells different. Do you think it’s his skin?’ we realised because he’s so fat he had a little wet spot where they didn’t clean him properly
Researcher: in your head you first jumped to race as explanation
Elsebeth: Yes. And I have never seen myself as a racist, I have never blamed someone that parks badly because he’s black. He parks badly because he’s a bad driver.

Elsebeth speaks openly about the racialisation of her son by his context, an affluent still-white suburb in the Afrikaans-dominated northern parts of Cape Town: arriving at the school ‘the little mommies’ heads turned’. She deconstructs race by de-linking colour from hierarchy. However, the other respondents are unable to respond to the challenge she poses and instead opt for ‘colour-blindness’, or the normalisation of whiteness.

Elsebeth (48): Hy is a brown child with light people... he’s said to me ‘mommy will my hair get straight?’ And then I say ‘no little fellow it won’t your nose won’t change he’s got a pretty little flat nose... in winter I grow his hair and put nice stuff in it... he’s learnt about being different my girl [daughter] has also learnt about being different.
Teresa (37): In which school are they?
Elsebeth: X preparatory there are also brown kids, black kids
Teresa: So they are used...
Elsebeth: but [daughter]...
Teresa: doesn’t see it anymore
Elsebeth: no they see it but... they don’t have a negative connotation whereas we grew up with if you are dark... then you are less than me.

The excerpt above shows how Elsebeth’s step-by-step discursive work through whiteness disturbs Teresa in her ‘colour-blind’ (read: white) world. Teresa’s
response about the school including children from different races ('so they’re used to it') exposes the ‘colour-blind’ discourse’s investment in an apartheid template of ‘birds of a-feather flock together’, in opposition to Elsebeth’s exposure of racism as ‘the particular values attached to [race] and the way those values foster and create social hierarchies’ (Crenshaw, 1995: 375).

The interpellation wrought by Elsebeth’s subject position provokes active manoeuvres to reclaim Afrikanerhood as white:

*Teresa (37):* I want to be an Afrikaner… I want to be married with a white Afrikaans man not with a black man… I want white children

In conclusion, this chapter traces the ethnosexual delimitation of normative *ordentlikheid*: the rules of the game as exposed by the positioning of the feminine in relation to the masculine. Addressing criticism by du Toit (2003) of Bradford’s (2000) assertion that masculinity was the hegemonic gender identity of Afrikaner nationalism, the chapter finds that the *volksmoeder* has an overseer in the form of the patriarch, thereby concurring with Bradford’s observation. This finding does not, however, disable women’s subjectivity, as du Toit intimates, but does entail subjectivity that is circumscribed, a circumscription of which the terms are set by its co-constitutive masculinity. Women serve to embody nationalist ideals; in this case, women’s bodies are surfaces for a particularist masculinity’s inscription of the terms of normative *ordentlikheid*. Woman serves to reflect the respectable brotherhood of the *volk* back to itself. The primary rule of the game, during and after apartheid, is femininity-as-prop to masculinity-as-regency, a scaffolding now under democratic pressure. Gender relations in the family are a primary site of postapartheid contestation, involving race, as the *volk* is projected into privatised home spaces. In nostalgic reminiscence of apartheid-era entwinement of Afrikaner identity and Afrikaner masculinity, the particularist whiteness of normative *ordentlikheid* depends on the resurrection of the male king.

In postapartheid South Africa, with Afrikaner nationalism in disarray and the *volk* truncated to privatised white spaces, the normative *volksmoeder* model is resuscitated through its constitutive equation ‘*vrou en moeder*’, or ‘woman/wife and mother’. This norm is revealed when it is failed. Subjects are
only exempted on biological grounds. The Ek-thical position, drawing on its failure of the norm, exposes the otherwise hidden political grounds of ‘vrou en moeder’. While both Regroupers and Ek-thicals compulsively reiterate the rules, Ek-thicals’ moments of ‘not fitting’ allow a ‘stepping out’ from a discourse. Alienation from the dominant discourse due to lack of accomplishment destabilises the dominant self/other relationality, opening spaces for differences and also equivalences between differences, such as the black other and the failed feminine self. It avails the subject to interpellation by counter-discourses that could politicise subject positions. Drawing on feminist and anti-apartheid discourses, an active pursuit of openness ensues in which difference is reclaimed as ‘not wrong’ and essentialism is rejected.

Elements of newly legitimised democratic discourses are borrowed to recoup oppressive bits from splintered Afrikaner nationalism. Postfeminism does its depoliticising work at an otherwise Ek-thical subject position as ‘choice’ in consumption of commodities is equated with ‘choice’ to be subjugated to the heteronorm. It reveals compulsory motherhood to remain a prerequisite for feminine verification in the postapartheid context, normalised by the woman-mother equivalence and woman-as-natural-nurturer. A contradictory Regrouper formulation links ubiquitous neoliberal ‘choice’ with ‘happy home’, the rule of the father and heterosexuality as ‘natural expectation’. Similarly, Regrouper performatives claim ‘freedom’ from gender labour division while simultaneously, and paradoxically, naturalising woman as the household-bound reproducer of the family. Regrouper discourses also invoke democratic signifiers, such as ‘Madiba’, the colloquial name for Nelson Mandela, the post-1994 ‘father of the nation’ to re-legitimise Afrikaner masculinity. ‘Madiba’ is yoked with (masculine) rationality and action to reinstall the man as head of the household while objectifying femininity (‘so pretty’). Normative femininity remains equivalent to domestic service, with its whiteness a perk allowing the transferral of some of its unpaid labour to black women. Ek-thical resistances crack Regrouper naturalisation of the distribution of domestic labour in favour of male-bodied subjects, and of masculinity as signifying natural entitlement to leisure. Regrouper patriarchy is revealed as contingent upon compliant femininity-as-service. This compliance is underpinned by muting and
infantilising feminine subjectivity through the ever-present threat of automatic male violence and the male sexual prerogative. Postapartheid nostalgia about the militarised white masculinity of the 1960s-1980s provokes Ek-thical pushback to expose and challenge hegemonic masculinity's implicit right to violence and instead claim fluidity in 'doing man'. Despite counter-discourses conjuring gender variability, sexuality remains fraught as even Ek-thicals prevaricate in the face of accusations of homosexuality and reassert the heteronorm. Silences about sexual alternatives buffer hetero-prescriptions. The lesbian other remains a frontier too far to reach. Its co-production is an 'amputated sexuality' forged in silence and ignorance, being reinvented by postfeminist and normative heteromasculine interpellations to be a 'prude-in-public-and-whore-in-private' – a redrawing of the parameters of ordentlikheid for middleclass white femininity. Male homosexuality is equated with sexual licence even as non-conjugal serial sexual relations are claimed for a postfeminist heterofemininity. Male control over women’s bodies also includes invoking colonial hierarchies in which the non-compliant feminine is racialised and animalised – amid amnesia about white femininity's co-constitution with threatening black male sexuality. Still, a good white girl produces white offspring – a double movement that keeps 'her' in and 'them' out. Deviation remains a fatal failure of the femininity of normative ordentlikheid. Self-sacrifice endures in the postapartheid context, reupholstered with woman-as-natural-caregiver and instinctive family 'glue'. Domestic containment of female-bodied subjects is recalibrated as 'ruling the roost', an assertion of female power. In pursuit of verification, Regrouper subjects paradoxically claim power in subjugation through tropes such as man-as-head/woman-as-neck, which accords with the notion of power as not merely oppressive but also generative.

---

1 Bauman (2001:137) describes the concept as: ‘There is more change these days than ever before – but [...] change nowadays is as disorderly as the state of affairs which it is meant to replace and which prompted it in the first place. Things today are moving sideways, aslant or across, rather than forward, often backward, but as a rule the movers are unsure of their direction and the nature of successive steps is hotly contested.’

2 All interview excerpts are own translations from the original Afrikaans.
FG with a number indicates the relevant focus group from which the excerpt is taken.

IV T-shirts bearing Madikizela-Mandela’s image and the words ‘Mother of the Nation’ were for sale at the 1997 ANC Women’s League national conference in Mafikeng, confirming her standing in the African nationalist imaginary.

V Il with a number indicates the relevant individual interview from which the excerpt is taken.

VI ‘Dr Goedhart’ reclaims for Afrikaner patriarchy Virginia Woolf’s (2005 [1928]:35) statement that: “Women have served all these centuries as looking glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size.”

VII All Cronjé quotations are own translation.

VIII Wessels (1972:383, 397) however, invoked the ‘woman and mother’ conflation to stress that a woman’s ‘highest calling’ remains the reproduction of children within the home and only when she is ‘partially freed from her family duties’ may she enter the labour market, and then for part-time work.

IX Freedom Front Plus politician Corné Mulder is the son of Connie Mulder, a contender for the prime ministership of apartheid South Africa in the late 1970s who represented the verkrampte wing in the party at the time.
CHAPTER 7
ORDENTLIKHEID’S ORDER WITHOUT: PRODUCING AND POLICING THE EXTERNAL OTHER

The focus in this chapter is ordentlikheid’s order without – the co-production of the externalised other. It finds apartheid reverberations in the (de)construction of volksmoeder ordentlikheid in continuities in Regrouper discourses and resistances in Ek-thical discourses. Foucault (2002:329) alerts us to the productivity of investigations into resistances against power to reveal its strategies. Ek-thical oppositions are therefore also traced here to understand the power relations forging subject positions against or within the mould of volksmoeder ordentlikheid.

7.1 Discovering you are white

The following Ek-thical accounts show how ordentlikheid is demarcated in a confluence of hierarchical exclusions – age, class, race – as an ethnicised whiteness. This is done through the creation of frontier effects with blackness and poverty, articulating civilisation, while installing internal class divisions to produce the bourgeois self. This discourse’s formative impetus can be discerned: whitening through class and race barriers. Implicit in the discourse is the uncomfortable proximity between poor Afrikaners and black people, who are ‘naturally poor’. The discourse effects distance. Ordentlikheid is an aspirational identification. This critical recollection shows a subject’s path to questioning white superiority as starting out without a sense of superiority, then being interpellated to elements of ‘blackness’, then disarticulating these elements as inaccurately attributed (see Appendix K with names and dates of focus groups and individual interviews):

*n[erina] (32): We played... with the black children and I enjoyed it... my aunt said you’re becoming black and then I [called out] 'I don’t want to be be black'...
Researcher: What were you thinking?
Nerina: I felt superior... when my aunt pointed it out to me... it was probably in the back of my mind but it was the first time that I thought I feel superior towards the black child that I was playing with... I didn’t want to be the same skin colour... I was white and I believed it’s better than being black
Researcher: What is that ‘better’?
Nerina: It was more civilised probably because their houses were poorer and dirtier than ours
Researcher: I’m hearing a resonance with class
Nerina: Definitely for a large part of my life as child I looked down on poor Afrikaners to be honest I still don’t have the greatest respect for white poor Afrikaners (II3)

Nerina’s narrative does not turn her arrival as child in a context without understanding how race is created into mechanism of white denial but rather admits shame about her wrongful attribution of the elements that fix white privilege. Reflecting on the above narrative, she says:
Nerina: When I think back I feel very ashamed
Researcher: Why?
Nerina: Because in later years as a teenager I started to understand about the political situation that ... and some people did not get opportunities it is not that they are inferior it is just that... you got the right skin colour... that you are in a very privileged position
Researcher: Do you think it was that bad for black people under apartheid? That they actually had opportunities and their deprivation is being exaggerated?
Nerina: No I don’t think apartheid is exaggerated... they did not have opportunities it wasn’t genocide like the Germans and Hitler but apartheid was very bad it elevated a certain little group of people over others. (II3)

Similarly, in what can be termed ‘porousness interrupted’, intergenerational disciplining at the intersection of race and class is also revealed in Andriette’s childhood memories of separation from the black other:
Andriette: (56)...I could speak [a local vernacular Tshivenda]... when I was little and my gran was very opposed to it... [because it was a language of] black people and a class consciousness... of a baas-klas [master-servant] relationship whoever is black is subservient to you (II1)

An Ek-thical narrative cites the condition of being ‘born unknowingly into apartheid’ but the subject turns a critical eye on her young white self, discerning race-class entitlements and recalling the unsettling laugh of the black other:
Andriette: as child... I called [black] people by their names and it was found offensive... there was a discomfort... the realisation of adults laughing at you... and a consciousness you know there is something not right about this situation but as child you do not know exactly what (II1)
7.2 Natural apartheid

In the next excerpt, Regrouper discourse prevaricates between ‘commonsense’ racism (Posel, 2001a) and professed awareness. In contrast to the above-cited Ek-thical narratives, a manoeuvre to justify whiteness foregrounds emerging as a child in a context with a ‘natural division’ based on race – an explicit normalisation of apartheid transposing a ‘confidence in the authority of everyday experience as the site of racial judgment’ onto the macro context (Posel, 2001b:56). Obfuscation continues in ‘amnesia’ suggesting shame about the word ‘baas’ but the word ‘boy’ for an adult black man slips out. The discourse hooks onto the apartheid ‘presumption that whites were always privileged, always in charge – the baas [boss], always serviced, never the beneficiaries’, underpinned by ‘[b]lack people work[ing] for whites; the reverse legally prohibited’ (Goldberg, 2009:301). ‘White master/black servant’ apartheid divisions are hidden and naturalised as ‘basic little things’:

Ansie (57): One was always aware that there is hierarchy
Researcher: Based on what?
Ansie: Because of where they stayed… they were never our neighbours... geographically… there was already a natural division but as child I never thought about it like that [that we] paid them for a service… my dad had a black chauffeur… X was his car boy and ways of addressing… my mom was miesiesv I can’t remember how X addressed my dad… but there was that slightly superior we give the orders of what has to be done those basic little things

7.3 Whiteness as morality and order

Respectability is sutured with a white ‘morality’ to produce worthy subjects. ‘We know who we are and how much our culture and practices enable us to accrue’ through ‘representations of moral value’, ‘the mechanisms by which social positioning is known’ (Skeggs, 2008b:38, original emphasis). These representations serve as the demarcators of the nation, in deciding which bodies will be included and which excluded. In this context, they are the sedimented markers of the limits of the volk.

Respondents reported a contemporary sense of ‘lack of morals’ and ‘confusion’ between ‘right and wrong’, ‘disorder’ associated with the global postmodern. However, respondents ascribed their sense of dislocation to
‘collapsing morals’. To a specific question about what would constitute ‘good moral standards’, respondents positioned themselves as voices of authority and conjured racialised binaries of white/black, adult/child, right/wrong, order/disorder, advancement/degeneration and responsibility/irresponsibility. ‘Apartheid’ is explicitly mentioned only once in this discursive intervention, and ‘democracy’ never, with the temporal reference ‘after 1994’ serving as the Regrouper dividing line between moral/immoral. Postapartheid blackness was yoked with disorder and lack of morality to construct whiteness as ‘civilisation’

Ansie (57): It is about integrity... honesty... punctuality. You get up for an older person, you greet someone who enters your house I have friends who... teach their children it is no longer necessary to greet older people.

Yvonne (47): Those basic things that we learnt at home of you say 'please' [...] and 'thank you' and you call an older person oom [uncle] and tannie [aunt]. I come from a stalwart Afrikaans family... you greeted everybody with a kiss whether you knew the people or not.

Katrien (42): But is that about moral standards?

Yvonne: It's where your moral standards start. [...] Katrien: Don't you think moral standards are really very subjective to a particular culture and group?

In the excerpt above, Afrikaner age- and gender-based hierarchies and social norms are equated with morality, which is linked in a discursive chain with integrity, honesty and punctuality (‘respect for property, respect for time’). An Ek-thical intervention points out its particularity. In the continuation of the discussion below, morality and order become equivalent to whiteness, as blackness and ‘our coloureds’ mentality’ are explicitly equated with ‘African time’ and implicitly with lack of ‘respect for property’ and therefore with ‘dishonesty’. People that ‘start to move’ in corporate (white) spaces, i.e. black people, attain characteristics such as ‘guts’, ‘hard work’, ‘making something of their lives’ and ‘prosperity’. These versions of whiteness and blackness, and the speaking subject producing them, are legitimised by ascribing their source as a ‘close friend’ who is coloured. Whitening is revered to the extent that the speaker interchanges the us-them perspectives, intermittently positioning as ‘us’ the whitened black other. Divergent questioning by an Ek-thical subject (Katrien) is refused with normalisations (‘basic little things’; ‘universal’).
Yvonne (47): My black colleagues complain about their colleagues who aren’t punctual… They are there because they’ve had the motivation and the guts… I have a close girlfriend and she will say… you know, I can’t understand our coloureds’ mentality when it comes to their watches… we work for prosperity, we don’t work with African time.

Katrien (42): My question will always be: who determines moral standards?

Elsebeth (48): It has to do with struggle history, responsibility shifted from your personal responsibility [to] that you blame the… apartheid dispensation, for everything… even if you’re in an executive post, you’ve been caught for stealing, you’re corrupt…

Lindie (43): The people who were oppressed in that era, in their fight… they were indoctrinated to be lawless and to do many wrong things…

Daleen (65): In a structured society…

Lindie: maybe people are starting to realise […] the people will have to almost be re-indoctrinated… because… they… indoctrinate[d] the children… to be lawless and cause chaos… even the new government struggles… all these strikes and marches…

In the above excerpt, the assertion of whiteness as ‘basic little things that are important everywhere’ – but not the property of blackness – culminates in an outright reversal in which culpability is placed on black people who ‘blame apartheid for everything’. Resistance against apartheid oppression is rewritten as ‘unwillingness to take responsibility’ and linked with criminality in post-apartheid South Africa. This is juxtaposed with an ‘ethos’ which is not explained and needs no explanation as, in a signature white manoeuvre, it relies for its content on its co-constructive relationship with ‘irresponsible, corrupt, thieving’ blackness. These manoeuvres not only refute the basis of the anti-apartheid struggle as an opposition to injustice but also re-asserts a blackness that is unchangingly inferior and, because of its irresponsibility, ultimately immoral. These machinations effect a total erasure of white culpability, expanded upon with dismissals fixing anti-apartheid resistance as ‘indoctrination’. Lindie’s rhetoric fuses thin admissions of apartheid as oppression with National Party propaganda of ‘black instigators’. Paradoxically admitting that apartheid entailed oppression while constituting ‘law and order’ – constructed in the negative by anti-apartheid action’s equation with lawlessness and chaos – this discursive strand contains repetitive ‘they’s’. Oppression was exercised but by an absent agent. Black people are again essentialised as a homogeneous whole that ‘unlearnt’ values in ‘that era’, apartheid euphemised.Unnamed apartheid is
reinstated as moral order in contrast to democracy, made equivalent to chaos and lawlessness.\textsuperscript{vii}

7.3.1 Ek-thical countertalk: democracy as morality

Speaking against these discourses, another respondent (Katrien) drew on democratic discourses’ dislodgement of apartheid as ‘order’. Daleen’s attempt to recuperate the spoilt identity of ‘the Afrikaner’ is rebutted by Katrien’s iterations linking ‘something going wrong’ with ‘apartheid’, ‘Hitler’ and individuals submerging their individual responsibility in collective identities. Katrien’s counter-talk designated Afrikaner patriarchal rule as morally suspect, creating a discursive chain hitching apartheid with immorality and Afrikaner nationalist institutional exclusion of women.

7.4 Inside Out: Using whiteness to escape gender

Within Regrouper myth-making, the hierarchisations instituted within \textit{volksmoeder ordentlikheid} are also done without, with essentialism pivotal to both constructions. Ansie (57) acknowledges her gender prescription as ‘stereotyping’, which in her understanding is still legitimate; it acts as a synonym for ‘typical’ or ‘general’.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Ansie: [It’s] the stereotypical view of womanhood... [white and black women] are after all carers... it is a cultural thing... in every country it would be different but it [womanhood] is the softer side of humanity... [I would want] to have transparency to talk [to black women] about normal things as with girl friends... how are your children? you? your husband?}
\end{quote}

The topic of conversation between essentialised women, ‘black’ and ‘white’, resonates with the \textit{Sarie} instruction for femininity, in which ‘woman’ equals the \textit{vrou en moeder} [wife and mother] who exists for others. The longevity of \textit{vrou en moeder} iterations is notable: for example, at a 1946 inquiry into the legal rights of married women, the ACVV ‘was not so much concerned with the rights of a woman per se but rather with the interests of a woman as mother of a family’ (Cloete, 1992:52). The conversational items and their sequence (how are your children; you; your husband?) further constructs a femininity immersed in compulsory motherhood and heterosexuality. This is a continuation of a discourse captured in the mid-1980s when the National Party launched
programmes to interpellate black and white subjects with mutually compliant femininities, based on woman-as-mother (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989: 67).

Ek-thical accounts of the everyday power relations between black and white women overturn the obfuscations of motherhood myths to talk about race and class. Andriette (56) describes the apartheid intersectional race-gender-class hierarchy, exposing a femininity resisting gendering by deriving power from ‘natural’ white entitlement, with feminine ornamentation its paradoxical prize:

There is the privileging... white women also carry much guilt for apartheid we... were not the main beneficiaries but we were privileged... how many white women have this ‘someone has to make the beds and wash the dishes and I walk around with my long nails’? (III)

She reflects critically on white women’s collusion with white men ‘in a unity of conception about the world and how to organise it’ (Keegan, 2001:477). Her owning up to her shame at the eye of the other witnessing the decay of the white self is reminiscent of Nandy’s (1983) alert to the psychosocial corrosion of postcoloniality. It is the everyday cruelties, the ‘microinjustices of everyday racism’ (Essed, 2002:207-8), that cause the shame and guilt:

Andriette (56): my generation of people in their 40s 50s en 60s we lived symbiotically the women copied the men's talk... and did not maintain their opinions... oppressed but also sharing in privilege what they received from above they took out on those below them

Researcher: what do you mean?

Andriette: the way domestic workers were treated... you would think being a woman you’ll understand another woman’s position

Researcher: any examples?

Andriette: in shame I have to admit the woman who worked for me had a three-year-old child she couldn’t get enough money together to go home to see the child... she had to wait a year to see her three-year-old I said I didn’t have money but then I arrived at home with plants and I know she saw them in retrospect I feel terrible that I didn’t help her (III)

This narrative speaks to Nuttall (2004:735-6), discussing creolisation and the violence and cruelty of ‘processes of mixing’. She cites the intimacies across race and class, which would include a practical knowledge of the other, sometimes
happenstance; an intimacy ‘not necessarily happy’ but wrought from violation and tyranny (p.735).

Andriette’s post-apartheid subject position is conscious of its whiteness; constantly engaged in an iterative process of self-conscientising. She identifies this hierarchical division that othering puts in place as colonialism\textsuperscript{ix} and explicates it as integral to currently existing whiteness. This self-reflective realisation prompts her to continuously question her own enactment of whiteness:

\begin{quote}
Andriette (56): That is why I raise colonialism... I don't have another language to explain it... you have a superiority... I see it not only with Afrikaners but with white people and it sits inside me too... I also have to re-evaluate myself in terms of all my actions [ask myself] am I not now thinking that I'm better know better (II1)
\end{quote}

It is an organisation of domination and subjugation: the white woman is slotted into a hierarchy with benefits and abuses. Shefer (2010:388) finds white privilege ‘troubles’ gender hierarchies across race. It is posited here that white privilege granted and still grants white women temporary escape from gender confinement to embody power regardless or even in defiance of gender prescription:

\begin{quote}
Andriette: You do it without thinking... this [black] woman's son asked if he could paint... then [he did] something wrong I attacked him... he said to me you have humilatied me terribly and I realised I had to ask his forgiveness I was so angry I hadn't realised how much I was hurting him in front of other people (II1)
\end{quote}

She ascribes her reworking of her whiteness to the recognition of the other and being unable to cloak herself in ignorance about apartheid's operationalisation of whiteness:

\begin{quote}
Andriette: I can only take it back to my experience as a child to have lived among [black] people... eat pap [local porridge] together and BBQ grasshoppers... my dad told us what was happening in the townships so I always say I'm the only Afrikaner that benefited from apartheid who can't say I didn't know [what was going on] (II1)
\end{quote}

The following two sections trace the Ek-\-thical becoming of apartheid’s other and the Regrouper becoming of postapartheid’s other.
7.5 What was inside became outside I: Becoming apartheid’s other

7.5.1 Proliferation of discursive resources

Subject positions disarticulated from the volksmoeder nodal point were prone for (re)production by what is termed in this study Ek-thic, or discourses of ethical governmentality. The historical permutations of one subject position dislocated and radically de-re-articulated exemplified this decentring; at an Afrikaner nationalist and Calvinist university this subject was positioned in a cauldron of discursive contestations: Afrikaner nationalist reformist Willem de Klerk presented his analysis of verligte [enlightened] and verkrampte [reactionary] Afrikaner identities for the first time in 1966; and discourses took a ‘liberal’ turn. Future Conservative Party founder A.P. Treurnicht had started his questioning of the National Party’s deviation from Verwoerdian politics. A heightened contestation commenced. For Nita (62), these contestations about the terms of Afrikaner whiteness were overtaken by an increased awareness of the constitutive black outside. The disarticulation with apartheid whiteness in conjunction with seeing the other caused the recreation of Nita’s positionality into an antagonistic relationship with the Treurnicht discourse, confirming again the historical contingency and conditionality underpinning each identity. For a while Nita was attracted by the questioning of hegemonic position by Treurnicht and then it lost its traction; she is slightly embarrassed about the initial appeal but she was seeking/interpellated by a questioning of the hegemonic position. In this case, Treurnicht’s content did not articulate with the elements constitutive of her subject position, which had been articulated with ‘the humanity’ of the other in a system that renders the other ‘animal’.

*Nita (62): the shooting of the children like animals [during the 1976 uprisings] [my understanding] wasn’t very deep but the injustice I just remember those children running it was terrible (II2)*

Nita uses the word *kru* (crude) to describe apartheid, racism, sexism and homophobia. ‘Crude’ in the Collins Dictionary and Thesaurus is defined as ‘lacking taste, tact or refinement; vulgar’ or as ‘lacking care, knowledge or skill’. Synonyms are: ‘boorish, coarse, crass, dirty, gross, indecent, lewd, obscene […] uncouth, vulgar’ or ‘…primitive, rudimentary… undeveloped’. Therefore the use
of ‘crude’ makes class meaning out of racism, sexism and homophobia. The subject is creating herself in contradistinction as not ‘boorish, coarse’ and so forth. Within the construction of Afrikaner subject position as ordentlik, this is a subjectification that draws on the same discursive material (Afrikaner nationalist race discourse; Christian National race and gender discourse) but then comes to question these discourses, forging for itself ordentlikheid but a distinctly different ordentlikheid, based on democratic elements such as equality, shared humanity and a recognition of the self in the other, and vice versa. This sets Ek-thic apart from Regrouper ordentlikheid.

Nita’s politicisation of identification inaugurated a period of increased disarticulation from ‘Afrikanerhood’ and a seeking of other discursive resources. Such resources were moulded from available religious discourse, delinked from the apartheid knowledge/power regime and re-thought. Dubow (1992:218-9) comments that the neo-Calvinism of 19th century Dutch theologian Abraham Kuyper that underpinned Christian nationalism, as primarily developed at Potchefstroom University, was ‘contradictory and can be used to sustain opposing viewpoints [whether] authoritarian and libertarian, racist and anti-racist, elitist and democratic’ (p. 219), as it elevated God’s will above all but also held that church and state should be separated and that miscegenation could ‘strengthen’ human development (p.218). Nita de-articulated the anti-humanist, anti-liberal individualist elements to Kuyperian Christian nationalism to rearticulate ordentlikheid with democratic possibilities. These reworkings, experienced as organic, politicised the field and enabled as excavation of the sedimented social:

*Nita (62): there wasn’t a Damascus moment... the university had a way of teaching you... to look at... the origins of what you believe in or what someone says it brought you to answers and you had to make choices... it opened our eyes... and the biblical concept of justice do unto others what you want done unto you (II2)*

7.5.2 Overdetermination of Afrikaner nationalism confuses inside/outside

Her implication in resistant discourses led to the hegemonising discourse over-extending itself in an Afrikaner nationalist clampdown and revealing its political origins.
Its overdetermination of the discursive field confused the source of threat and the source of protection, in that the ‘ants’ felt threatened but not protected. This upheaval dislocated Nita’s subject position, as she felt antagonised by the identity that was representing her. It became unclear who was preying on who, who was a threat to whom—the rioters or the government? The disarticulation of Nita’s subject position re-instituted as antagonising outside the identity representing her. This rupture opened access to different discourses, which led to further openings to the black other and a radical unfixing of whiteness and, eventually, of volksmoeder ordentlikheid. Her questioning of essentialisms and power/knowledge regimes, which are resources for democratic politics (Nicholson and Seidman 1995), led her to disarticulate white superiority:

Nita: not so much white and black I just thought it’s injustice... where do you get the audacity to classify people white people could do as they like [domestic worker] also didn’t know about these things until they told her to go and live somewhere else [because she’s black]

7.5.3 How do we arrive at white?

Katrien (42) reports similar disarticulations with white superiority, also drawn from the politicisation of the contradictions in the ‘political theology of race’ (Goldberg 2009). As with Nita (62) and Andriette (56), she questioned othering with whiteness as organising principle, as determining standard, redrawing religious principles to arrive at equality and liberal principles of separation of church and state):

Katrien: the contradiction was... what the reverend says is right and they propagate love but... only for some people... how can you draw a line and say these people are not good to be allowed? who gives you the right? When church and state speak as one it gets dangerous how just is it to cut some people out of the society... why does one person want to make another bad or shift them out. is it power? What makes a lot of people run along with one idea? (II6)
7.5.4 Expulsion upon recognition

Andriette’s (56) subject position became troubled by her father’s disarticulation from Afrikaner identification. It started with his missionary work on the basis of ‘white civilisation’, which he undertook in the 1950s as a peer of Carel Boshoff from the post-apartheid Afrikaner ‘homeland’ Orania and the anti-apartheid Christian Institute’s Beyers Naude.

The Ek-thical discourse allows Andriette to interpret punishment by hegemonising Afrikaner nationalism, which had as foundational element the racist denial of humanity to the black other (Goldberg 2009), as aimed at her dad’s recognising of the black other. She reads transgression of apartheid norms as recognition of the other (Lloyd 2007:144; Butler 2004b); acknowledging the abject elicits expulsion from the imagined collective ‘we’ purporting to represent the ‘I’ -- the Afrikaner volk.

Andriette (56): it was that he didn’t see it as a missionary calling but that these are people and the state is committing injustice towards them... my dad saw their human dignity that was seen as wrong

The Afrikaner nationalist identity was exposed as strictly policing its borders.

Andriette (56): after my dad accepted the appointment in [a black township] and they moved there... it was as though a wall of steel or the Berlin Wall sprung up between them and their friends [church notables] didn’t want contact anymore (II1)

Andriette’s dad’s ‘value system’ influenced her husband. His association with the family led to his career at an Afrikaner nationalist company being halted. Expulsion leads to openings to the racialised other, as he embarked on a new career path in the early 1990s that brought him into close working relationships with black people. The sanctions for resisting this state-enforced identity meant state intrusion in the most intimate zones of the self, isolating subjects.

An expulsion-resistance dynamic is created as the hegemonising discourse's attempts at domestication antagonise subjects. Andriette (56) left the church in the 1980s, rejecting apartheid divisions and challenging the apartheid truth regime.

Nita (62) reports a similar avalanche of actions against breaching the borders of the hegemonic identification. Her husband was part of a group of
Christians who released a statement demanding the details of Black Consciousness leader Steve Biko’s murder and confronting the then police minister for saying his death ‘left him cold’. Things ‘became rough’ as their phones were tapped and her husband was threatened with dismissal:

*Nita (62): you got [anonymous] phone calls saying boys are dying on the border... church people phone you... politically everything turned for us you couldn’t feel at home anymore*

The antagonism did not produce re-absorption but further disarticulation – she could not feel at home anymore, did not belong anymore. The Afrikaner identity had been rendered the constitutive outside to these subject positions.

7.5.5 Undermining of white power opens identification

Nita (62) became politically active in establishing contact across apartheid barriers, engaging with black women and men, advocating political prisoners’ release, forging personal relationships and disarticulating apartheid legitimacy.

*Nita: one of those big clashes between my husband and I [was] that thing of [before you assist activists legally you must know] ‘what was he caught for?’... god those years you could have a skew toe and they would lock you up...after ’94... I found out X was PAC that’s why they [arrested] him (II2)*

She became involved with anti-apartheid activists in a township near a medium-sized city. When a close black collaborator was arrested by the security police, she ‘cried’ and then used NP parliamentarian contacts to have him released. Her drive to crack open the identity was the opposite of the apartheid order, as metaphorically captured in her description of the security police offices:

*You had to get permission [at the security police] for white and black to gather but as I walk through [the building] those doors slam behind you about three doors locked behind you... steel gates (II2)*

7.6 What was inside became outside II: Becoming postapartheid’s other

7.6.1 You were not supposed to question

Nita (62) and Andriette’s (56) constitutive outside is Regrouper Ansie (57), which represents normative *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*. Her positionality paradoxically exhibits potentialities for disarticulation, as in the following excerpt:
Ansie (57): if I think about these questions... I think it is actually terrible what we were living in... you just carried on... you weren't supposed to question anything... you take decisions with the light that you think there is your sounding boards say the same (II5)

She illustrated 'just going on unquestioningly' with a gripping metaphor that captured the sedimentation and normalisation of political origins:

Ansie (57): it makes me think... about the hat on the table... [somebody] said 'no no no you can’t put your hat on the table’ ‘why?’ I don’t know ask mom’ mom says ‘no I don’t know ask gran’ gran says ‘no it is from that time when your grandpa’s head was so full of lice that my gran said he can’t put his hat on the table but now everything is half fine’ (II5)

Questioned about whether resistant subjectivities personified by Communist Party leader and African National Congress lawyer Bram Fischer and anti-apartheid writer Breyten Breytenbach did not act as an alert to trouble the normalisation of apartheid, she responded:

Ansie (57): No because they were enemies of the state they could not defy the establishment it was just not part of the picture someone like [former Dutch Reformed Church clergyman turned anti-apartheid activist] Beyers Naude was volksvreemd [enemy to the volk]... you are actually a bit jealous to realise here and there someone realised what we are doing won’t work... (II5)

7.6.2 Irrelevance and shame

This discourse links with one that emerged in the focus groups reconjuring the NP justification of apartheid as ‘good intentions gone wrong’, which carries a sense of being caught out amid trying to get away with something. Ansie (57) reports feeling ‘half ashamed and half culpable for not really thinking much about things but that is how it was’. She was a member of Afrikaner nationalist women-only organisations such as Jong Dames Dinamiek [Young Ladies Dynamic] and Dames Aktueel [Ladies Contemporary] which did ‘wonderful projects’ but only for ‘Afrikaans-speaking children’. She looked differently at them and the – ‘in quotation marks’ -- ‘incredibly good organisation [Junior] Rapportryers’ (literally ‘dispatch-riders’, a men-only Afrikaner nationalist organisation) after 1994, as they had become ‘irrelevant and half ridiculous’.
Ansie: it’s hard to be dug up your roots are loose you don’t really have a new place to feel comfortable and live sensibly (II5)

Ansie’s subject position entails jealousy about not being alerted to her identification becoming ‘irrelevant’. The identity had become deligitimised and this subject position has lost its symbolic verification. She feels humiliation about her self-construction becoming ‘ridiculous’. Questioned about the reasons, she responded:

*Ansie: we discussed the threat on the border... and serious things but never really how to reach out to our anderskleurige [literally differently coloured] people... what Nelson Mandela started with the RDP [reconstruction and development programme] houses one night... we had a man talking to us about it I would have like more of that to have a transition where your organisation can keep your relevance and your credibility (II5)*

This narrative features shame and culpability for immersing herself in whiteness and not seeing the ‘anderskleurige’. This word is directly translatable as ‘other coloured’, which captures it as an identification of a deviation from the white standard, which is how Ansie still constructs black people. She is the unreflective subject that Katrien problematises; she now reports ‘paralysis’ and ‘uprootedness’, the phantasm of identitary fullness shattered.

**7.6.3 A dearth of discursive resources**

Despite her ‘Mandela moment’, Ansie (57) has not found any discursive resources (‘ideas’) to draw on to remake her subject position. Constitutionalism does not feature in this account of self. In contrast to the radical democratic imaginary, which would require apartheid identity formation to be iteratively othered, Ansie’s circumscribed terms limit the discursive resources she draws on. Without other discursive resources, subjects rely on Afrikaner nationalist essentialisms. Thus this subject remains beholden to the NP discourse: fearful due to ‘black peril’; ‘minorities’ and ‘our group as whites’ were not ‘taken along’ or furnished with meaning which would mobilise their investment.

*Ansie: one felt paralysed you’re treading water there’s not really a new direction that you can be sent in of where you’d want to plough your energies... there weren’t really new options*
Researcher: what about the man who came to speak about the RDP houses where you saw potential?

Ansie: it made you aware there are changes in the country... and that one does not understand and feel safe to be take along it's quite a gap... all the things Nelson Mandela tried to put in place to protect minorities... it wasn't finalised [or] inclusive enough (I15)

No trope compels Ansie (57) if it is not white-centred. White privilege, when called on, she denies by invoking the 'black middleclass':

Ansie (57): as whites you go on with your lives... all the talk of a rainbow nation or nation-building remains a vague concept in my head... who is our nation? how on an everyday level do we find each other... and talk... that we don't just threaten each other... you read statements in the newspapers that whites still have all the money and good life... you can't defend yourself it's ideas that people have about each other

Researcher: there is truth therein that white people are still privileged

Ansie: that is so but you definitely also hear there's quite a strong middle class black person who is doing well (I15)

The 'black peril' element, the antagonising outside, is intensified when white privilege is invoked by the other. Ansie (57) iteratively reproduces apartheid 'fears'– apartheid's constitutive, antagonising others included ‘the Black Peril’, ‘the Red Peril’ and ‘the Roman [Catholic] Peril’. She automatically conjures ‘fear’ when asked about her first realisation of race; reasons for emigration; and sex before marriage, which reveals the power and cross-category utility of the trope. Fear is conjured to regulate the body of the other, whether black or female.

7.7 Disappearing Afrikaner into whiteness incognito

7.7.1 You should know I’m not a racist

In Regrouper narrative Pieta (35) (I14) falls back on whiteness as centre and disciplining of black other in a strategy directed at regulating black bodies, unavoidable in the Johannesburg corporate space. She describes an Indian colleague complaining about not being greeted, to which she retorted ‘It is because you are Indian’, an ostensible reference to ‘lesbian friends' whose joke about mishaps is that ‘it is because you're bent’. When called to account, she deploys ordentlikheid by minimising her comment as ‘in bad taste’ and ‘tactless’,
and that she ‘meant nothing with it’. She writes an email to apologise as she has ‘a lot of respect’ for the colleague.

Image management about race is found in the narrative, filled with contradictions that reveal a subject position re-sutured by whiteness. Black is coded, e.g. ‘the majority’. Re-attributions are made, such as black people ‘carry the burden of the past’. Pieta’s instruction is that whites have stopped oppressing blacks, so blacks should be grateful and move on. Whites think everything is fine, just to be disappointed by blacks with their ‘burden’. Her discourse exemplifies invisibilised operation of a happy-go-lucky whiteness that wants to pronounce on the margins on its own terms and, when exposed, problematises the black other (chip on the shoulder; overreacting; too emotional). It starts by acknowledging itself and then deploys whiteness as strategy, also invoking other marginal identities to exonerate itself. While even Ansie’s discourse features shame, Pieta’s is a denial of apartheid’s effects: blacks should move on; she should know Pieta is not a racist. Therefore blackness is required to exonerate whiteness of its racism. This whiteness is indignant that it could be regarded as ‘spiteful’, as opposed to the ‘angry shame’ of blackness. Institutionalised whiteness supports Pieta as her employer decides that the colleague knew she overreacted, with white deciding for black.

Similar to Ansie (57), Pieta’s discourse reveals an eagerness to shake particularist whiteness and fade away into hegemonic whiteness. But her arsenal includes the latter’s colour-blindness to effect this trick, while studiously avoiding othering terms such as ‘them’. The discourse claims colour-blind interracial ‘mixing’ in contradictory combination with an essentialised racial ‘species’ sticking together. Racial division is ascribed to black people relegating themselves to ‘black spots’. When challenged, it changes tack to accuse blackness of entitlement (‘they feel that have not got all the opportunities’) as deflecting strategy, which is another strategy of unmarking itself. Anecdotes derived from the Afrikaans press are rolled out: a (black) MP put sandwiches at a meeting in her handbag and when questioned by a white journalist claimed ‘she deserved it’. A reminder about the apartheid legacy of black poverty sees another change of tack to ‘constructive engagement’ in a shift to ‘education’ to attribute poor results to black illiteracy. This is followed by a concession about ‘legacy’.
7.7.2 Pragmatic colour-blindness

Regrouper whiteness navigates the racial terrain of Johannesburg pragmatically, as in dissuading her racist father from using what she calls ‘strong language’ about black people in front of her children:

*Pieta (35): because they are growing up in a different world they will go to school with black children and they will have a black teacher (I14)*

Still, she insists that the children ‘won’t really experience colour’. As part of this project, Pieta seeks to extend the adult/child hierarchy of *volksmoeder ordentlikheid* to include black people by teaching her children to address black people as *tannie* and *oom* (familial terms ‘aunt’ and ‘uncle’ that Afrikaner children are historically forced to use when addressing all adults, whether related or not). This serves as an elaboration of the hierarchy constitutive of *ordentlikheid*.

*Ordentlikheid* fixes itself at unequal white/black dualism, which is naturalised as ‘DNA’. It still fixes Pieta’s subject position because despite her protestations, she colludes with intergenerational racial disciplining and the parent/child hierarchy; it enforces mono-racial sexual relations; it institutes a race-class hierarchy of acceptable blackness as well-educated and ‘speaking good English’. The word ‘respect’ indicates that hierarchies are intact. *Ordentlikheid*’s racism is ‘mere’ paternalism; *ordentlikheid* is also always already heterosexual. The excerpt below shows the preoccupation is with a projection of self as moral, a whiteness eager to distance itself from racism, also by denying its own complicity.

*Pieta (35): my mom and them grew up with that traditional view… that white people are half superior it is half part of their DNA… they don’t think about it… they are not malicious at all, though… my mom bought her house maid a little house… I realised you can’t teach old dogs new tricks… I’ve got a Zimbabwean [black] friend I told her I’d like to invite you t my wedding but my mom and them won’t survive it she laughed… she doesn’t know what her mom would do with a white girl [either]
*Researcher: How would your parents respond?
*Pieta: My mom will think I’m insensitive… they won’t disinherit me… but it will upset them
The next section explores *ordentlikheid* at its interface with hegemonic whiteness and particularly WESSA identity.

### 7.8 Re-whitening a spoilt *ordentlikheid*

#### 7.8.1 Racist baddies displaced, but still polite

Respondents report shame vis-à-vis hegemonic whiteness, as the universalising ambitions of their particularist identity of *ordentlikheid* failed to complete suture the discursive horizon. The international move against apartheid exposed this subaltern white identity as not living up to the norm of the then decolonising hegemonic whiteness – as again ‘not good enough’.

*Andriette (56):* especially after a year in Europe... it was terrible to be take on by school firend... and suddenly realising it is a very wrong system (II1)*

*Katrien (42):* sanctions were a huge factor that we couldn’t compete in sport... as if you start looking outside and realising... what we are doing is actually not right... internally you can justify it but externally... (II6)*

The conjecture that ‘racist excess’ is more typical of lesser whiteness, as opposed to civil and educated white men, is a fiction that Stoler (2002:377) criticises as recurrent in historiography, and serves to obscure racism in the rest of society. There certainly prevalent attribution of apartheid as an exclusively Afrikaner project, deflecting from WESSA culpability despite the majority of WESSA voters shifting to the NP by the 1960s (van der Westhuizen, 2007). This conflation may partly explain the push of the Regrouper identity to disappear into hegemonic whiteness, the privilege of the WESSA positionality, but it needs to rid itself of racism:

*Ansie (57):* these far-rightwing guys... I believe with my whole heart is someone feeling tremendously inferior within himself... no normal right-thinking person... acts like that you don’t grant someone else a place in the sun... it shocking that racism is still so deep in our community to all sides

Regrouper whiteness claims the right to apportion racism to ‘all sides’. Ansie’s recitation reveals the extent to which racism is read as the sign of the spoiling of the Afrikaner identity, hence the colloquial observation that ‘there are no
apartheid supporters left in South Africa’: racism has exposed the Afrikaner identity as abnormal and irrational.

Similarly, Regrouper strategies recurrently proclaim ‘liberalism’, as in the following narrative emphasising the mutuality of care and affection, but merely re-implicating itself with its othering discourse:

*Sandra* (43): *our generation who grew up in the apartheid era... were all raised by nannies... there was a very close relationship between you and your nanny... you didn't realise what was going on the pass books and those things... we grew up very liberal... this is a person in front of you... you couldn't say the k-word... you speak ordentlik to them... things happened in a certain way and that's how you had to do it but I think without know it we did rebel... to do things differently to our parents... black people that sort of grew up with us... know we are part of that era when things went a bit better we had respect I cried myself to death when one of them had to go away because you started to love them* (FG3)

This narrative notes apartheid once, as an ‘era’ and then elides it as ‘things happening in a certain way’. Complicity with apartheid is denied by claiming ignorance and displacing responsibility on the generation that preceded hers. She was born into a ‘way’ where ‘pass books and things’ ‘happen’ and that is ‘how you must do it’. The narrative of *verontskuldiging* culminates in a claim that her generation ‘unconsciously rebelled’, linked to black people that sort of grew up with us’ ‘knowing’ that her generation is part of the era when ‘things started going better’, and that her generation had ‘respect’ for ‘them’. The notion of black and white people growing up together reclaims an intimacy usually denied but also serves to minimise the actual discriminatory differentiation. Notably, the word ‘them’ is used throughout, as in the exclusionary, co-constitutive dichotomy ‘us/them’, even as she claims to have loved ‘them’. The attempted rehabilitation is undermined by the othering talk, including the reference to ‘one of them going away’, an objectification which evokes an image of faceless figures passing through. The ‘going away’ hooks to the pass books that she did not know about but is left unexplained and therefore its reality as an effect of racist apartheid policies is erased. It is rewritten as an opportunity for the respondent to present herself as victim, crying herself ‘to death’, rather than an acknowledgement of the pain and loss apartheid movement control caused to black people’s lives. This manoeuvre can be read as an implantation of the
postapartheid trope of white victimhood to displace actual pain and loss experienced by black people during apartheid. An alternative would be to read it through a Butlerian lense (Butler 1990, 1997), as an admission of the melancholia caused by the loss of the abjected other.

The next set of excerpts from a Johannesburg focus group surfaces a discourse in which Afrikaner-identity-under-duress is recalibrated to remove racism, ‘badness’ or guilt as sources and re-iterate the identity’s articulation with ordentlikheid:

Leah (49): Don’t you think that the Afrikaans people are under pressure after 1994 because... we are to blame for everything... the Afrikaner is the baddie in everything...
Pieta (35): People perceive us as racist
Leah: ...we [introduced] the tot systemxii, we are the baddies and nobody likes [us]
Sandra (43): I don’t agree with this
Leah: ...you get English people [who go] eeeuugh
Willemien (33): No, I don’t agree
Nita (62): One doesn’t agree with this
Leah: Don’t you think we are under pressure and that’s why we’re trying to be the best?
Nita: I wouldn’t say we’re under pressure but sometimes it seems like...
Willemien: Like guilt
Nita: ...that the Afrikaners, if we now talk about progressive and liberal, then we’re definitely not in the top ten... And I think there’s something jeez I think this ‘bare feet across the mountains’ is stuck half deep in us...

In this manoeuvre, respondents deflect questioning about Afrikaner identity in relation to apartheid (hidden as ‘everything’ and the present absence opposite to ‘after 1994’) and to English-speaking whiteness (representing a hegemonic whiteness in relation to Afrikaner subaltern whiteness). Admissions are made, and then subverted, of Afrikaner whiteness as ‘under pressure’ relative to black people (‘people perceive us as racist’) and to ‘English people’. The identity is articulated with racism, colonial and apartheid practices, guilt and attempted rehabilitation, an elaboration on the earlier acknowledgement in the same focus group that ‘Afrikaners’ were an object of ‘global rejection’ until the jettisoning of apartheid (Willemien (33): ‘...after 1994 the world accepted us’). Therefore, shame about apartheid contains traces of an earlier shame, the shame vis-à-vis occupying a lesser whiteness in relation to ‘the English’. A 62-year old
respondent who became actively involved in anti-apartheid activities in the 1970s-1990s refutes as ‘perception’ that Afrikaners cannot be counted as ‘progressive and liberal’. She reticently references an Afrikaner nationalist trope from the ‘Great Trek’, about traversing (the Drakensberg) mountains with bare feet, which serves as metaphor for Afrikaner survival in harsh conditions for the sake of ‘freedom’. This invocation relays Afrikaner nationalist identification as ‘stuck half deep’ – even for this particular subjectivity – and thus hindering interpellation by discourses of liberalism.

The next excerpt features Leah’s resumption of her interrogation of English-speaking whiteness, rather than her conjuring of racism and guilt in relation to black people. Her attempt runs up against another rehabilitative, this time paradoxical, move. Respondents report displacements of Afrikaner identity in the form of ceasing to speak Afrikaans with resonances of its sedimented ‘association of being the language of the underprivileged’ rather than ‘the key cultural expression of a great volk’ (Vincent, 1999:60). These displacements trigger resistances that simultaneously cede social space to the hegemonic WESSA identity and appropriate a WESSA element – respectability – as constitutive of Afrikaner identity.

*Leah (49):* when I look in Johannesburg where we live [an affluent, multiracial, centrally located suburb], 70% of the people speak Afrikaans but we all speak English…
*Sandra (43):* That makes me angry, yes
*Pieta (35):* Isn’t it just the lingua franca?
*Nerina (32):* If you go into a shop in Johannesburg you automatically speak English
*Willemien (33):* …it is… the effort we make with other people, not so?
*Nita (62):* The accommodation

*Willemien:* Yes, we are now going to speak English to you because you are English
*Pieta: Because it is polite [English] to do that
*Leah: The Calvinism shines through, it is the politeness [English]
*Willemien: You will get one English person and five Afrikaans people
*Nita: But […] it gives me a kind of ‘I can’ [feeling]. If you can’t, I can. […] I struggle with my English but I can

In the above text, white Afrikaans identity is confirmed as self-consciously relational with ‘English’, a remnant of Afrikaner nationalist discourses. It occupies a subalternt position in this relationality, with respondents reporting
routine relinquishing of social space for white English-speaking subjects, in attempted fulfilment of normative whiteness (’[I struggle with my English] but it gives me a kind of “I can” feeling’). This temporary abandonment of Afrikaans as linguistic identitary bedrock is covered over with an articulation of Afrikaans identity with ‘politeness’ and ‘accommodation’, associated with ‘manners’ as key element sutured with the nodal point ‘respectability’ in British nationalist discourses (Thomas, 2006:466-7). This appropriation extends to a conflation of the Afrikaner identitary trope of ‘Calvinism’ with ‘politeness’. This is noted across generations: respondents ranged between 33-62 years old.

7.8.2 Proud Afrikaans English-speakers

Some respondents resist concession of space, reporting ‘anger’, with the source of the resistance revealed not as a problematisation of WESSA identity per se but as a competitive relationship with WESSA identity as subjects question the displacement of Afrikaans by English identity. This conclusion is reinforced in the next excerpt where two respondents report their mothers adopting recalcitrant stances vis-à-vis the use of English in ways resonant of early Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation claiming social space for Afrikaans (Vincent, 1999:60) as political identity.

Pieta (35): [...] My mom writes Afrikaans books, so the language is very dear to her... when we go to a restaurant I will order in English and then she says ‘speak Afrikaans to the people’ when she phones [companies], she insists on speaking Afrikaans... it’s not that I am ashamed of Afrikaans... I can speak English those people can most likely not speak Afrikaans.

Nerina (32): I also speak just about only English also in my profession [...] for the sake of convenience... My mom [says] ‘Afrikaans is our language and... if somebody can’t help you, they should go and find someone that’s Afrikaans because we have a right to be here’ I [go] ‘whatever’ [English] The easiest language is the one in which you and another person can understand each other

Sandra (43): from my side it is just polite... Johannesburg is essentially an English settlement, poor whites, rich English in the 1920s I just get angry when people knowingly in a group [speak English when most are Afrikaans]...

Pieta: I will speak to someone on the telephone and they will start in English and at some stage I’ll hear the person is Afrikaans [...] and then I’d feel too bad switching to Afrikaans because I’m afraid they’ll think they speak bad English [...] 

Nerina: That happens to me on a daily basis
Thus, resistance to ‘English’ has intergenerational existential significance, the assertion that ‘we have a right to be here’, suggesting the persistent re-invocation of the South African War as an existential attack. Paradoxically, acquiescence of social space to ‘English’ aims at subjectivity without shame and ‘speaking English’ serves as rebuttal of inferiority, that is, as signifier of equality with English whiteness. In this particular excerpt, the denial of shame references not ‘Afrikaner’ shame about apartheid but the shame of the subaltern ‘Boer’ in relation to the ‘superior’ British/’English’, the sedimented remnants of sense-making about the South African War and anglicisation campaigns in the early decades of the 1900s. However, an intergenerational difference occurs as younger respondents (between 32-35 years old) stressed ‘convenience’ and ‘mutual understanding’ as reasons for linguistic fluidity. One respondent dismisses existential investment in Afrikaans as ‘whatever’, a contemporary colloquial English term popularly used to convey a ‘don’t care’ attitude. Thus younger respondents resisted such investment and displayed an adaptability to the linguistic and identificatory plurality that is Johannesburg. In contrast, an older respondent (48-years old) was ‘angry’ and without problematising the co-construction of the two whitenesses, traced their relationality back to a time of explicit political contestation, the 1920s, when Hertzogite Afrikaner nationalism first captured state power on the back of initiatives such as the Tweede Taalbeweging (Vincent, 1999), which culminated in Afrikaans being declared as official language alongside English in 1918.

7.9 Sharing the spoils of whiteness

In contrast to the obfuscations in the above-quoted excerpts, the historical underpinnings of the aspirational relationship of Afrikaner to WESSA identity were more self-reflectively uncovered in a Cape Town focus group, with the initial view through the prism of class:

Elsebeth (48): Durbanville is not the normal South Africa... we’re not average we are privileged we have good schools there’s little violence there’s not really criminal activity... it is an unnatural fairy world that we live in. I can’t express an opinion about other people in South Africa because I don’t know how they live. We are behind the boerewors curtain...
A follow-up question about consumerism elicits the following response:

Elsebeth (48): It’s about… grandpa and grandma always being desperately poor and grandpa always remembers how the English did them in, and the concentration camps… He says it in a joke but still. He bought policies at Sanlam\textsuperscript{iv} and so on and they have paid out so he’s a bit better off and his children could go and study and they got bursaries because they’re white… so they are leading even better lives and we now have to prove that we have arrived

Lida (42): But it’s basic human nature, not so?
Elsebeth (48): Yes it’s the same in the black market

Lida: That South African War… all those things […] all those apartheid laws, you know, were the Afrikaner trying to build himself up…

Anke (46): At the expense of others…

Lida: A beautiful ideal, unfortunately at the expense of a whole lot of other people in the country… In other words, what was done to the Afrikaner in the Second War of Liberation, he then went and did to other people.

Elsebeth (48) exposes ‘the English’ as constitutive outside to ‘the Afrikaner’. She historically situates this construction as commencing in the South African War, continuing through Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation and capture of state power and the attainment of white privilege. It persists in postapartheid materialism in, as class-based ‘Afrikaner’ reiteration of accomplishment \textit{qua} ‘Afrikaners’ of equivalence with hegemonic whiteness (‘the English’). This Ek-thical uncovering interpretation is resisted by a Regrouper narrative re-hooking elements that recentres ‘the English’ and foregrounds Afrikaner-as-victim. Disparate elements come together in one respondent’s narrative, drawn from democratic discourse (the inclusive term ‘South African War’ to stress the war’s effects on all South Africans) and Afrikaner nationalist \textit{verkrampte} discourse (‘Second War of Liberation’ stressing ‘Afrikaner’ resistance against the British). This disjuncture could be due to the intervention by another respondent that ‘the Afrikaner’ building ‘himself’ up was at the expense of others, disrupting the normalisation attempted with the phrase ‘basic human nature’. The Afrikaner nationalist notion of apartheid as an ethical ideal is presented alongside the implicit truism of victims as historical agents repeating the crimes committed against them. Neither the ‘original’ crimes, nor ‘the Afrikaner’\textquotesingle s crimes, are stated. The perpetrators of the original crimes during the ‘Second War of Liberation’ – the
‘English’ – remain unnamed, the normative white identity and constitute outside to ‘the Afrikaner’.

7.10 Black verifier of white goodness

In the next section ‘respect’, ‘warmth’ and ‘caring’ are singled out as the affective elements constituting Afrikaner ordentlikheid.

Sandra (43): \(\ldots\) you started to love them they did everything with you I see it in my household I have a Maria... we can't get by without Maria... the children love her... I told her you teach my children to speak Zulu because I want them to be part of the new cosmopolis... what is it? Cosmopolitan... there's a mutual respect between me and the petrol attendant that is my age because we grew up together and things ehm improved from that time... politically it didn't improve... that only came after 1994 but I think it's inherent in us in that growing up together... that things are perhaps a bit easier (FG3)

The text is replete with vaunted racial equality, confusing social proximity with political equality: ‘grew up together’; ‘did things together’. However, the centre remains white, of which blackness is the necessary co-constructive appendage. In this case, the co-construction is wielded for rehabilitative ends, to indicate the ‘non-racism’ of the ‘white’. Whiteness is prime mover to such an extent in this narrative that it mobilises blackness to exonerate itself. Contradictions in the text reveals its rehabilitative function: the family ‘loves’ the black domestic worker; the respondent reports instructing the worker to teach her children Zulu, but the family uses her ‘Christian’, rather than her vernacular name. The othering phrase ‘them’ is persistently utilised in denoting black people. The object status of ‘the black’ extends to the use of the indefinite article ‘a’, as in ‘a Maria’ and reinforces objectification and sense of white ownership. Throughout, the use of black women’s bodies as labour surrogates for white women is normalised. The beginning of the ‘improvement’ of black people’s lives is blurred in a manoeuvre that situates improvement (admitted as ‘not politically’) in the apartheid era. The unequal effects of apartheid are erased with the statement that ‘things are easier’. The rest of the group responded as follows:

Pieta (35): We are a warm culture
Willemien (33): We’ll make you cookies and put an extra little sauce on
Pieta (35): I see it with my mom... she has Le-na... my mom’s worried about Lena because she doesn’t have a paraffin stove and then they go and buy her a paraffin stove... I think we
are a warm culture and we... our moms are sentimental... perhaps it's how black people see us... what I have also surmised from black colleagues is that they appreciate that we are straightforward. what you see is what you get. It is not 'we make terrific little chats with you but behind your back we gossip about you'. If we don't like you... we will definitely show it. (FG3)

Sandra's intervention facilitates an outright recuperation of Afrikaner whiteness applying ordentlikheid. Apartheid paternalism is presented as ordentlikheid: ‘we are not racist, we look after our blacks’. The ‘salt of the earth’ colonial-era myth of ‘the Afrikaners’ as straight-forward, honest people is resurrected (see Chapter 2.) In this version the silence is about the co-constructive relation with hegemonic whiteness: ‘straightforward, good’ Afrikaners is constructed in elided opposition to ‘the English’ that cannot be trusted. The emphasis on ‘warmth’ and generosity towards others stands in contrast to individualism and is about communalism, which in this case is extended to the black other, not as racist paternalism but because of Afrikaner goodness. The reference to food makes it about the home, the hearth, where woman reproduces the ‘us’. Whiteness as prime mover again utilises blackness as verifier of white goodness.

7.11 Yielding to the dangerous black spectacle: jouissance, loss, gain

Whereas Pieta (35) strips ‘them’ down to flat, featureless outside to her magnanimous, honest ‘us’, Sandra engages ‘them’ as exotic other to her thoughtful, considerate, ordentlike ‘me’. In the next excerpt blackness is conjured as ‘terrible’ spectacle articulated with elements ‘ground’, ‘goats’, ‘big black pots’, ‘tiny room’, ‘slaughter’ and ‘cloth’ (instead of ‘clothes’); and as ‘culture’ and ‘tradition’ with opaque habits, opposed to a whiteness that is western (wearing ‘jeans’) and rational (‘understand’). She invokes favourite recitations of ‘black difference’ from apartheid ‘South Africa as ethnic patchwork’ discourses formerly used to justify Bantustan divisions. The narrative places her centrally: she distinguishes between different whitenesses, with specific reference to the focus group (‘at this table too’) as part of whites who ‘want to know’ the exotic black other, opposed to those who ‘don’t want to know’. Those ‘who want to know’ do so for divergent reasons, ranging from instrumentality (‘if you want to get somewhere with them’), to belonging (‘want to be part of’), to
acknowledgement (‘want respect from them’). Such seeking of knowledge of the other involves time and making available the body for labour and could be lethal (‘I almost died’) but means an induction into the difference of the black other (from the all-seeing white eye to ‘my eyes opened’), with a rewarding embrace (‘they just put a cloth around me’).

Sandra (43): And I think one should make the effort to understand their tradition if you at all want to get somewhere with them or or want to be part of or want respect from them. I for example went to a sangoma induction. It was terrible, I almost died because goats are slaughtered and everything

Researcher: Were you inducted?

Sandra (43): No… Old Liesbet… she who had worked for me already ten years… you know I arrived [wearing] jeans and they just put a cloth around me and I… love cultures terribly… many people don’t want to know [for example] ‘she does not look me in the eye’… they rather look down it is a form of respect we that look you in the eye that talk to you… ‘respect me, look me in the eye’… her sangoma induction for me… my eyes opened… the sangomas of course have to lie on the ground… you can’t be higher than your older sangomas… I was in this little room… I had to cut cabbage for at least an hour my arm was… almost exhausted. [Nita (62): Be glad it wasn’t onions.]… with the young women… cut the cabbage in big black pots… but that’s not actually what I wanted to say my whole point is is… be polite you can see it at this table too and it’s a big part of us Afrikanerdum there is a thing of ordentlikheid that was bred into us what she [Willemien] also said: you speak English because her husband is English… just take into consideration… especially our generation we can really make a difference if we know what we are busy with

Therefore, ordentlikheid is not only the performative with which to act middleclass femininity and whiteness but also paradoxically holds transformative potential in relation to both hegemonic whiteness (‘speak English out of politeness’) and the black other. Sandra’s narrative is replete with repetitive admissions of uncertainty, contradictions and confusions, further indicated by incomplete and incoherent sentences and self-professed distraction towards the end of the above excerpt. It could be read as image management pressures. Another reading is that it suggests ambivalence as factor alongside differentiation, inferiorisation and legitimisation in racialised discourses (Rattansi 1994:68). Ambivalence works to ‘interrupt the subordinating charge’ of racialised discourses (p.68). With Afrikaner whiteness dislocated, Afrikaans writer Antjie Krog suggests a complete metamorphosis: ‘of tongue, of voice, of
being, of identity’ (West 2009:71). Sandra’s account of herself hints at an undoing, a self-composition fraying and coming apart, which resonates with Butler’s (2004b:23) writing on the story of the ‘I’ stopping in the face of the other:

What grief displays is the thrall in which our relations with others hold us in ways we cannot always recount or explain, in ways that often interrupt the self-conscious account of ourselves we might try to provide, in ways that challenge the very notion of ourselves as autonomous and in control. I might try to tell a story here about what I am feeling, but it would have to be a story in which the very ‘I’ who seeks to tell the story is stopped in the midst of the telling; the very ‘I’ is called into question by its relation to the Other, a relation that does not precisely reduce me to speechlessness, but does nevertheless clutter my speech with signs of its undoing. I tell a story about the relations I choose, only to expose, somewhere along the way, the way I am gripped and undone by these very relations. My narrative falters, as it must. Let’s face it. We’re undone by each other.

The loss that precipitates this undoing by the other can be of a person or of a community or a place (Butler, 2004b:22). Respondents in both cities reported the loss of community and guilt over enjoyment of Afrikaner community:

**Ansie (57):** We Afrikaners are really under pressure postapartheid we were really the skunks for a long time I was with [Afrikaner nationalist organisations] Jong Dames Dinamiek [Young Ladies Dynamic] and Dames Aktueel [Ladies Current]… and how it really just fell apart… it was as if one… not shameful but that one was half under pressure because one could not live out the Afrikaans cultural values freely like it was done previously… It is still enjoyable to attend Afrikaans festivals and boerewors [boer sausage] rolls and koeksisters [pastries associated with Afrikaners] and those things that define us but I think there has also been a bit of alienation, one can’t deny it… many things changed in our country… family and friends have gone overseas and when you visit them… they can’t really hundred percent [identify] because they are different, they have lived in Scotland for 20 years and when you talk about Afrikaans things… they don’t really know about them. There are different angles in our culture nowadays (FG1)

**Andriette (56):** I am actually very guilty of certain things… like last night it was [an] Afrikaans [evening] at [X high school]… I felt so pleasurably at home because there were many Afrikaans people, we speak Afrikaans and many of them, because I know them, don’t fit in or slot in with the Afrikaans community anymore but it makes you comfortable to speak in your own language…
Nationalism’s identitary purchase rests on a phantasm of Lacanian *jouissance*, a promised fullness of enjoyment, of pleasure of being (Stavrakakis, 2010:13). Nationalist enjoyment occurs through official institutions and in everyday practices, including the culinary (p.13). Laclau (2004:326, emphasis in original) argues that ‘something belonging to the order of affect has a primary role in discursively constructing the social. Freud already knew it: the social link is a libidinal link. And affect [...] is not something added to signification, but something consubstantial with it’. This explains the force in certain identitary investments, in this case the *volk*. Racism is the disavowal of the way in which the Other ‘takes her jouissance’, i.e. in a way radically different to ‘ours’ (Miller 1994:79).

Undergoing loss, in this case of the phantasmatic fullness of the *volk*, reveals ‘something about who we are… delineates the ties we have to others […] that these ties constitute what we are, ties or bonds that compose us’ (Butler, 2004:22). Therefore Butler, with reference to gender and sexuality, proposes a re-think of relationality to reveal that which its usage partly hides: ‘as a mode of being dispossessed, a way of being for another or by virtue of another (Butler, 2004:24, her emphasis). Grief potentially allows for the apprehension that autonomy is qualified by sociality – fundamental to embodied life – a ‘mode of dispossession’ intrinsic to who we are (Butler, 2004:28). This potentiality has erupted in the wake of the dislocation of the apartheid imaginary. Elsewhere Butler (2005), writing against self-preservation as basis for an ethics of the self, states: ‘One seeks to preserve oneself against the injuriousness of the other, but if one was successful at walling oneself off from injury, one would become inhuman’ (p.103). She accordingly argues that becoming human is indeed persisting in vacillation between claiming a right against injury and resisting such a claim. The discursive undoing of identity in the excerpt above, from reiterative exacting othering to ‘wanting to be part of’ the other refutes apartheid’s walling off and grasps at the potential of ‘knowing the other’. As ‘different angles’ are introduced in Ansie’s *volk* and Afrikaans-speakers have to explore different commonalities for ‘slotting in’, the potential arises for the ‘I’ to gain the ‘you’ ‘through this disorientation and loss’ (Butler, 2004:49). Therefore,
could it be that *ordentlikheid* as a reupholstered subaltern version of respectability creates openings that allow dislocation of racial binaries?

Sandra’s narrative suggests that recognition of the other can happen through moving bodies into spaces of difference to self. The next section explores the opposite strategy: the withdrawal into white.

**7.12 White Afrikaans spaces: The innards of *ordentlikheid***

Identity is spatially organised (Hall, 1997b:43). Spatial organisation is infused with investment as ‘sites of fantasy, pleasure, ambivalence, anxiety and paranoia’ (Rattansi, 1994:32). Postmodern reconfigurations of time-space dislocate anchorages (Rattansi, 1994) and populations are more mobile – also in South Africa as the country is reinducted into global circuits and apartheid’s geographical divisions are slowly dismantled. Greater flows have been met with greater efforts at fixing; culturally homogenising globalisation has provoked culturally heterogenising localisms (Geschiere and Meyer, 1998). Global reconfigurations have rendered locality more uncertain, provoking ‘determined efforts towards boundary-making and closure, expressed in terms of belonging and exclusion’ – processes termed ‘autochthony’ (Geschiere and Nyamnjoh, 2000:425), with racialisation and masculinisation of territorial claims (Rattansi, 1994:33,65).

For ‘white ethnics’ (Roediger, 2002) in the US, being white still remains more important than ethnicity for these groups (Dyer, 2005:12). This study finds that keeping Afrikaners white remains prime to the Regrouper identification. Regrouper subject positions deploy two global-local strategies: dissolution into globalised whiteness incognito, which proclaims actualisation in ‘absence’ of an other (Dwyer and Jones, 2000:212); and wielding ethnicity (Afrikaansness) as space whitener in a ‘return to the local’ (Hall 1997a). Dissolution as strategy is discussed above (in the section ‘Disappearing Afrikaner into whiteness incognito’). This section explores postapartheid ‘inward migration’ (Blaser and van der Westhuizen, 2012:386) through ethnic manoeuvres to whiten locales.

A comparison between Cape Town and Johannesburg focus group texts reveals greater mobilisation of performatives of ‘irrevocable’ Afrikanerness in the Cape Town focus groups. The majority of Cape Town participants (ten out of
twelve) identified as ‘Afrikaners’ and devoted focus group time to re-recruit the two participants (one in each group) who rejected Afrikaner identity. In the Bellville focus group, various iterations were launched to submerge the Ek-thic position’s destabilising difference, confirming the Regrouper primary claim of ‘unacceptability of difference’:

Katrien (42): the little box [Afrikaner] is too small
Daleen (65): every culture [has] its things that they are very ashamed about... the Germans... but it is your culture
Katrien: the problem... is that Afrikaanse people don’t easily accept difference I don’t want to get my identity from a group... Afrikaner means buy-in in what the group believes its culture what it believed in the past I don’t buy into that
Daleen: But do you think one can choose?
Katrien: Yes (FG1)

‘Remembering’ and rejecting apartheid exclusions as constitutive of Afrikaner identity open identitary possibilities of ‘choosing’ against normativity. To debunk the Ek-thic discursive claim to self-production removed from volksmoeder ordentlikheid, the Regrouper positionality invokes ethnicity-as-a-given and Afrikanerness as autochthonic (‘of this soil’):

Daleen (65): nothing can take that identity from you it’s a given whether you like it or not
Katrien: I’m a South African but I’m not an Afrikaner I’m a... citizen of this country... what you are born with can’t... bind you to a context...
Daleen: But what is you identity?
Katrien: Why does my identity have to lie in a group?
Daleen: It’s you roots you were planted there you were born into it whether you want to be there or not
Katrien: I am much wider and bigger because I think one makes out for yourself what you believe in how you want to be your moral standard your belief and the dilemma comes in for me the minute when you find those things in a group and you don’t think for yourself anymore that’s when things go wrong that when a country can justify certain things... it is scary to me because that is what happened with Hitler... apartheid
Daleen: But... they are still Germans even if Hitler perpetrated all those disgraces (FG1)

Thus, Ek-thic subject positions among Cape Town northern suburbs respondents are created in explicit opposition to ‘the Afrikaner’ identity, in contrast to Johannesburg Ek-thic positions, which allow a few respondents to claim a
diversified Afrikanerhood. In the privatised white Afrikaans spaces of Cape Town northern suburbs respondents have to disidentify as Afrikaners as the identity is too narrowly circumscribed to allow flexibility in interpretations of ordentlikheid.

Regrouper particularist whiteness seeks a disappearing trick into hegemonic western whiteness, by removing its body altogether – emigrating -- from the South African space, due to its infection by its political project of apartheid.

Ansie (57): When a guy emigrates you want to get away from what apartheid stood for

Ansie (57), using the masculine ‘guy’ to denote ‘a person’, nods in the direction of democratic discourses but whiteness surfaces time and again to resuture, as in a contradictory narrative of ‘it’s good to have your comfort zone challenged, let’s emigrate’:

Ansie: It is sometimes not so easy because a guy wants to be rooted you want to sit in your comfort zone and not be challenged to think differently… but then a person stagnates... if I just think about the religious debates and stuff that you read in the paper... just because of this whole revolution that started in ‘94... you have been massively challenged to dig out the previous stuff that you believed in so deeply and to see what still works is it still relevant and what do I say to my children?

Researcher: What do you say to your children?

Ansie: We tell them to go and find their lives somewhere else in the world but they don’t want to… they are very happy here

If unable to dissolve in whiteness incognito, Regroupers revert to comfort zones: a newly privatised enclave whiteness that employs micro-apartheid (see also Appendix L). Performatives include constructing race through spaces: producing white spaces to perform white – to remain white. Regrouper whiteness, as a resuscitation of elements of Afrikaner nationalism, resonates with Hage’s (2000) conceptualisation of white nationalists imagining themselves masters of a territory in which ‘the other is constructed as object of exclusion’ (p.48). The production of white Afrikaans spaces elaborates the apartheid principles of volkseie (exclusive to the volk) and eie sake (own affairs) (Norval, 1996), a territory akin to Sarie’s white world (Chapter 3). ‘Natural’ apartheid divisions
are now, in lieu of state-enforced apartheid, privatised, also through new racist encoding that reupholster normative ordentlikheid:

Pieta (35): in Centurion [city near Johannesburg] everybody... is quite ordentlik... they will really never use a crude [racist] word nevermind a swear word... [but] they assume you are semi-racist... they say they aren't... [husband’s] brother is an engineer... he’ll say ‘we are doing a project again with the Groenewalds [common Afrikaans surname] so it is taking long
Researcher: Meaning?
Pieta: That is the black people green for Groenewald... in that sense I don’t want to be Afrikaans it’s half our traditional image... looking down on you know other people (II3)

Katrien identifies the privatisation of white spaces as fundamental to the regulation of black bodies within white spaces and the lack of contact between ‘black’ and ‘white’ bodies in Cape Town’s northern suburbs. The borders of whiteness have been enlarged to include previously unacceptable white bodies (e.g. tattooed bodies [Bell and Valentine, 1995]). Race and class override ethnicity in the privatised ‘warm’ space of ordentlikheid:

Katrien (42): In the Durbanville area [suburb in northern part of Cape Town] there is a certain... closedness our people our language our tradition our way of doing... in the restaurant [where she works] here are two or three English [speaking] waiters Afrikaans people’s first comment will be ‘but oh it’s an English waiter’ it takes them 20 minutes to get used to the English waiter... then they become spontaneous and warm [...] [to appoint a black person] everybody knows it won’t work in this specific area... We have a little Indian guy [as waiter] who sometimes wears a beanie... if he does one thing wrong it’s immediately ‘this guy doesn’t know what he’s doing... what’s that beanie on his head?... but there’s another [white] waiter with tattoos whose hair hangs in his eyes but there are never complaints about his appearance... [the beanie] is neat and clean you know

The ‘beanie’ disciplining can be understood using Hage’s (2000) theorisation that the other ‘exhibits too much will’ independent of the will of the white nationalist and thus threatens the dominance which the white nationalist requires to make the space ‘homely’ (p.70). Hage’s analysis applies to nations but is apposite to the localisation and privatisation of racism in South Africa. He emphasises that these constructions are ‘yearnings’ for self-constitution as ‘the all-powerful nationalist in the homely nation’, which is a fantasy space (p.70), an ‘autochthonic dream of the “pure” otherless universe’ (Yuval Davis, 2011 para 1).
Part of Regrouper disavowal of racism is to profess desire for mutual transparency with the black other:

Ansie (57): I really have a need to learn more about the heart beat of my black girl friends whom I don’t know yet… I really don’t know how to bridge [the divide] (II5)

But white spaces keep black out. Speaking Afrikaans does not qualify subjects for exemption, as confirmed by Katrien. When prompted about brown people who speak Afrikaans, Ansie claims ‘shock’ at a racist expulsion action undertaken in her white suburb:

Ansie: A very prominent brown family got a nasty letter... that they don’t belong here... the chairperson of the residents’ association... said... the person felt really very shocked and offended by the whole tenor of the letter... everybody is shocked and disappointed because they are really nice people and he holds a high position it is to the benefit of our community it was really bad for us because a guy doesn’t know where it is coming from [it is an anonymous letter] because then you could act accordingly... [you] feel disempowered [and] shocked to say there are people among you that hold these kinds of views (II5)

The subject repeatedly wields ‘shock’ that people exist ‘among us with such ideas’, which is contradicted by the ostensible ‘inability’ to take action, with the anonymity of the attack as excuse. There is no suggestion of lodging it with the law enforcement agencies despite South Africa’s 1996 Constitution and equality legislation providing a basis for action. In a positioning of the male as patriarch, she does, however, indicate that class may allow ‘him’ access to whiteness.

Regrouper discourse iteratively instals ignorance as white buffer (Sullivan and Tuana, 2007). It incorporates ‘shock’ at the existence of racists and bemoans its own unquestioning stance during apartheid (II6). But it persists with refraining from questioning white enclave living, just as apartheid remained unquestioned, with the white subject continuing to be manufactured by – and to manufacture – ignorance about racism’s conditions of construction.

Ansie (57): [My] family and friends in Johannesburg... at work level there is greater [racial] mixing but I’m not sure people necessarily socialise together afterwards
Researcher: Do you discuss why it is like that?
Ansie: No actually not we just go on with our lives... if anybody thought about it they would not have a problem in principle to have black friends... I wish I knew where the thing lies... it was a massively upsetting realisation that we don’t have black or brown people that we can invite over it is something that haunts me (II5)
However, this intention is belied as bodies are not put into spaces that could enable that contact, as opposed to Ek-thical subjects. This is reflected in Ansie’s engagement with the whites-only world of Sarie (Chapter 3) which she bemoans but persists in connecting with – despite it offering ‘really extremely few articles about black women’ by her own admission (II5). Cultural policing continuous through technologies such as Sarie, social media and the consumption of cultural goods that allow the production of privatised spaces:

*Katrien (42): we want our language... look how Afrikaans music is selling at the moment...*  
*Afrikaans movies I find it fascinating that Afrikaans [people] stand up so strongly for themselves... the loyalty the drive... but on the other hand there is still a kind of judgment because you don’t speak our language (II6)*

Heightened mobility and shifting interconnections between the local and the global (Rattansi and Westwood 1994) means that subjects can draw on global discourses. In this study subjects moving between countries ‘import’ new right discourses – which Hall (1997a:26) identifies as the ‘embattled defensiveness of a narrowly identified cultural identity’ – to reinforce white Afrikaans enclosure. Particularly volksmoeder gender relations are bolstered with rearticulations of new right heteronormative ‘family values’ (FG1). Similarly, volksmoeder ordentlikheid’s gender division of reproduction is exported:

*Ansie (57): I have so many girl friends whose children are in Australia and I see how they suffer... because there are grandchildren and then mom gets sick and gran would have like to have helped*  

Leaving or staying in South Africa is both reinterpreted as verification of masculinity, while staying enables ethnic enclosure:

*Ansie (57): we always say to leave the country is not for sissies and to stay is also the same... sometimes I think it’s better to stay because then you can at least speak in Afrikaans to each other about all these things (II6)*

By contrast, other whiteness strategies were deployed in Gauteng, the province where Johannesburg is situated, as geographical spaces could not be racially seceded to the extent possible in highly divided Cape Town. Gauteng’ metropolitan complex of Johannesburg-Midrand-Tshwane spatially does not
allow the frontier effects of white enclaves. Pieta (35) describes ‘cell groups’, gender segregated postapartheid fundamentalist church groups which function as spaces of privatised whiteness where neoliberal consumerism and heteronormativity bleed together into *ordentlikheid*. These discourses are normalised to the extent that they are presented as identity management by the respondent keen on performing ‘non-racism’ to distance herself from the spoilt identity of ‘the Afrikaner’:

*Pieta (35): It is a little... show-off things... people who are in cell groups they invite... the whole cell group with all their children... [to] children’s parties that are so lavish you can’t think that child is three years old... they cost four five thousand rand... [everybody let drop] the new Audi they bought... they’re sending the wife... to Paris for a little break and that is all they talk about... the one girl got engaged and she was wearing this little ring immediately when you see you think ‘oh they’re probably still making the ring’ [I congratulated her and her response was] immediately ‘listen this is not my ring’ but so nervous that you are now going to think this little golden ring is her ring (II4)*

In a normative article on Afrikaner identity, Gouws (1996:20-21) draws on neoliberal thinker Fukuyama (1995) to naturalise an ‘intricate link’ between ‘the desire for material possessions’ and Afrikaner ‘cultural identity’. Accordingly, accumulation restores the ‘voice, cultural space and respect’ of the masculine-identified (Afrikaner) subject.

**Johannesburg respondents noted that local ethnicised withdrawal obviated flexibility in ‘the Cape’, rural areas or ‘the enclave of Stellenbosch’ (university town in the Western Cape associated with Afrikaner privilege). Ethic resistances defy heteronormative regulation to allow rebuttal of the dictum of compulsory matrimony for women in Johannesburg because,**

*Andriette (56): [it] is a much more cosmopolitan community here there are greater freedoms for people to live more liberally and be less bound to a certain social group (II1)*

Another manoeuvre in the loosening of ‘Afrikaner’ identification and resisting or rejecting hegemonic Afrikaner femininity is withdrawal from spaces of interpellation. Churches were jettisoned as primary purveyors of volksmoeder discourse:
Applying time-space strategies (Bell and Valentine, 1995) to separate audiences and activity spheres, Katrien breaches the border of Cape Town's *boereworsgordyn* – a term referring to a ‘curtain’ of the sausage associated with Afrikaners, used by Capetonians to refer to the geographical language and racial divide in the city\(^{xvii}\). Katrien posited a ‘playing field’ for a resistant subject position disarticulating norms around gender, sexuality and race, allowing for a play of difference in the making of self. Politicisation of the apartheid knowledge/power regime mobilises elements for a project of an ethical self, fleshing out a discourse re-fixed at democratic nodal points. This allows for movement across spaces and audiences. Katrien is an outsider inside, an armslength participant perhaps akin to de Certeau’s (2006:127) observer from a distance – a postapartheid *flâneur* traversing the urban landscape, wandering through a repertoire of porous identifications in pursuit of radical democracy.

In conclusion, this chapter shows *ordentlikheid* to be a confluence of hierarchical exclusions marking out an ethnicised whiteness. This whiteness is predicated on middleclassness; its co-constitutive other joins blackness and poverty as synonymous. Racialisation is shown to be an intergenerational disciplinary regime into which subjects are induced. Ek-thical defiance of racialisation entails shifting the focus to the operations of whiteness, exposing racial superiority as an arbitrary allocation of resources based on the coincidence of phenotype. It further exposes racism as an imposition of social and economic inequality through designating certain people ‘inferior’ and ‘naturally’ subservient. It exposes a racism in which blackness always already denotes subservience, the second term in the *baas/klaas* [master/servant] relationship. Regrouper iteration of this apartheid conceptualisation of white/black relationality proclaims it to be a ‘natural division’ but postapartheid shame prevents the re-invoking of *baas*, feigning amnesia about the term despite its common use. Postapartheid formulations echo colonial dichotomies: white=adult=morality=order=right=responsibility=advancement/black=child=d
ecay=chaos=wrong=irresponsibility. A Regrouper innovation is to verify equations of blackness or colouredness with laziness, ‘African time’ and disrespect for property by ascribing them to a coloured ‘friend’ who is a colleague. Neoliberal tinges can be detected as corporate middleclassness is coded as both superior and white. These signs of ‘moral good’ cannot be grasped by blackness painted as corrupt and prone to lawlessness in postapartheid South Africa due to its mindless opposition to the order(liness) of apartheid. In the process, white culpability is obscured.

In the Regrouper imagination, womanhood is an essence shared across racial lines, during and after apartheid: its vrouw en moeder conflation has remarkable longevity, given its span across 20th century South Africa into contemporary times. However, Ek-thicals own up to the hidden privilege of white femininity: wielding whiteness, this femininity resists gendering such as the feminisation of domestic labour, which is shifted onto black women’s bodies. White women’s bodies are availed for ornamentation, as an object denoting white masculine status. The dynamics of the intra-white hierarchy man/woman – inferiorisation of the lesser term and its subjects, channelling of resources to subjects categorised as belonging to the superior term – are repeated further down a pyramid stacked in accordance with criss-crossing gender-sexuality-race-class statuses. Necessary domestic proximity between the white woman and black others occasions intimacies shot through with everyday cruelties. These microinjustices are a source of shame that politicises Ek-thical subjectivity: the practices are understood as products of a colonial mindset which requires continuous, self-reflective resistance. Recognition of the other troubles any attempted re-cloaking in white ignorance about the damage wrought by racism. As the apartheid imaginary came under increased pressure and discursive sources proliferated, as from the 1960s onwards, the lines between self and other blurred for Ek-thical subjectivity amid an overdetermined discursive field. In one example, dissident ordentlikheid is construed from a Christian nationalism that draws on contradictions in Kuyperian thought to foreground anti-racism and democracy. This is melded with the biblical injunction of ‘do unto others what you want done unto you’, precipitating openings to subversion of the hegemonic discourse. The identity
purporting to represent her is experienced as antagonising her. In these upheavals, the equivalences in the apartheid discourse are upended and its contradictions become stark: white supremacist justifications lose traction as the Ek-thical subject recognises the other in the self (‘humanity’) and the injustices become transparent. Attempted domestication of these subjects precipitates further disarticulation as the sense of belonging is lost. Expulsion follows, with Ek-thical subjectivity rendered other to apartheid. In contrast, Regrouper identities are predicated on ‘not questioning’ admonitions that foreclose certain subject positions as volksvreemd [alien to the volk]. A sense of uprootedness and even unintelligibility within the democratic symbolic order besets the Regrouper subjectivity. Black people are still positioned as anderskleuriges, literally ‘those coloured differently’ from the unnamed white standard. ‘Mandela’ is briefly entertained but then discarded as discursive alternative. Instead, Regroupers remain interpellated as members of an endangered ‘minority’, in an echo of National Party tropes. It deploys denial (of white privilege, of Afrikaner nationalist women’s oppression), the ‘black peril’, ‘black entitlement’ and decontextualised ‘low education level’ of black people. Black subjects are required to exonerate Regrouper subjects, also when they are engaged in explicit racism. In Johannesburg, a defence strategy is disappearance into whiteness incognito, or hegemonic whiteness, which involves pragmatic colour-blindness as tactic. Alternatively, as in Cape Town, Regroupers withdraw into privatised enclaves, otherless mini-universes where a narrow cultural identity imbued with heteronormative strictures and fenced by class is enacted. In defiance, the Ek-thical flâneur shifts across a playing field, traversing differences and dipping in and out of porous identifications for a project of self built on the possibility of radical democracy.

The next chapter provides the conclusion to this study.

---

1 Drawing on Derrida, Smith (1994:24) explains frontiers thus: ‘...the enclosure of a space within a set of frontiers only comes about when an opposition has been established between that space and some sort of outsider figure. It, in short, only against an outside that an inside is possible. In this sense, we could say that the inside space – such as the white nation in racist discourse – actually depends on its outsider figures – such as the black immigrant – for its constitution’. Frontiers are drawn and redrawn according to the limits experienced by antagonised identities and therefore constantly displaced (Wang, 2008:229).
for race. (southern suburbs, although with the increasingly multicultural nature of suburban Cape Town this is a generalisation.)

This discursive manoeuvre is done using other seemingly ‘neutral’ ‘issues’ such as education. A Regrouper deflected whiteness by focusing on ‘the black problem’ in a parable of ‘the education system’ to claim that the loss of white rule has been more detrimental to black people as apartheid delivered ‘excellent education for all children, white, brown, black, Indian’ (FG1). She declares her subject position as white and middle class only to declare it irrelevant and claim the universal white ‘view from nowhere’.

Apartheid spatial arrangements meant urban black workers’ families were frequently living in remote rural ‘homelands’.

Nandy (1983) writes about colonialism’s suppression of the other in the hierarchical dichotomisation of the western mode of rationality associated with the European Enlightenment.

Verlig and verkramp were coined by Afrikaner nationalist reformist Willem de Klerk in 1966 denoting liberals that throw all tradition overboard and reactionaries who are out of step with the times. He posited a ‘positive’ identity combining elements of both stances but the press reinterpreted it to denote two political camps (Norval, 1996:187).

While apartheid state encroachment on the churches had occurred substantively already by 1960 under Verwoerd, with the Cottesloe declaration, Katrien’s narrative reveals it remain contested, not static, with subjectivities rising that resist it.

A system on farms persisting since colonial times in which ‘coloured’ labourers are ‘paid’ in alcohol.

‘Curtain of Boer sausage’ referring to the ethnic and geographical divide between English and Afrikaans-speaking sections of Cape Town.

First Afrikaner nationalist insurance company used to build a capital base for Afrikaners (O’Meara 1983).

The three Afrikaner nationalist ‘sister churches’ lost credibility after withdrawing their warrantees that apartheid was Biblically justified (van der Westhuizen, 2007).

An Afrikaans word play on ‘green people’, i.e. people with ‘noticeable’ skin pigmentation.

The prevalence of the term is exemplified by a December 2012 commercial holiday supplement to the English language Cape Town newspapers featuring a page headlined ‘Beyond the Boerewors Curtain’, in which the divide is described as follows: ‘The northern suburbs are subtly separated from Cape Town’s southern suburbs by what locals call “the boerewors curtain”, an imaginary line that demarcates the predominantly Afrikaans-speaking northern suburbs from the English-speaking southern suburbs, although with the increasingly multicultural nature of suburban Cape Town this is a generalisation.’ (Welcome to the Cape Summer Edition 2012). Note the use of ‘multicultural’ as code for race.

---

\( ^{i} \) II with a number stands for the individual interview from which the excerpt was taken. FG stands for focus group.

\( ^{ii} \) Meaning ‘boss’ or master and denoting white superiority (wit baasskap)

\( ^{iii} \) A racist paternalistic term used during colonialism and apartheid to denote a black adult male (Nederveen Pieterse, 1992), appropriated by Afrikaner racists.

\( ^{iv} \) Female equivalent of baas.

\( ^{v} \) Afrikaans convention in which all older men are called ‘uncle’ and older women ‘aunt’ irrespective of familiarity or family ties.

\( ^{vi} \) This discursive manoeuvre is done using other seemingly ‘neutral’ ‘issues’ such as education.

\( ^{ix} \) 'Verlig and verkramp were coined by Afrikaner nationalist reformist Willem de Klerk in 1966 denoting liberals that throw all tradition overboard and reactionaries who are out of step with the times. He posited a ‘positive’ identity combining elements of both stances but the press reinterpreted it to denote two political camps (Norval, 1996:187).

\( ^{x} \) While apartheid state encroachment on the churches had occurred substantively already by 1960 under Verwoerd, with the Cottesloe declaration, Katrien’s narrative reveals it remain contested, not static, with subjectivities rising that resist it.

\( ^{xi} \) A system on farms persisting since colonial times in which ‘coloured’ labourers are ‘paid’ in alcohol.

\( ^{xii} \) Female equivalent of baas.

\( ^{xiii} \) Meanings for ‘boss’ or master and denoting white superiority (wit baasskap) were coined by Afrikaner nationalist reformist Willem de Klerk in 1966 denoting liberals that throw all tradition overboard and reactionaries who are out of step with the times. He posited a ‘positive’ identity combining elements of both stances but the press reinterpreted it to denote two political camps (Norval, 1996:187).

\( ^{xiv} \) ‘Verlig and verkramp were coined by Afrikaner nationalist reformist Willem de Klerk in 1966 denoting liberals that throw all tradition overboard and reactionaries who are out of step with the times. He posited a ‘positive’ identity combining elements of both stances but the press reinterpreted it to denote two political camps (Norval, 1996:187).

\( ^{xv} \) While apartheid state encroachment on the churches had occurred substantively already by 1960 under Verwoerd, with the Cottesloe declaration, Katrien’s narrative reveals it remain contested, not static, with subjectivities rising that resist it.

\( ^{xvi} \) A system on farms persisting since colonial times in which ‘coloured’ labourers are ‘paid’ in alcohol.

\( ^{xvii} \) The prevalence of the term is exemplified by a December 2012 commercial holiday supplement to the English language Cape Town newspapers featuring a page headlined ‘Beyond the Boerewors Curtain’, in which the divide is described as follows: ‘The northern suburbs are subtly separated from Cape Town’s southern suburbs by what locals call “the boerewors curtain”, an imaginary line that demarcates the predominantly Afrikaans-speaking northern suburbs from the English-speaking southern suburbs, although with the increasingly multicultural nature of suburban Cape Town this is a generalisation.’ (Welcome to the Cape Summer Edition 2012). Note the use of ‘multicultural’ as code for race.
CHAPTER 8
CONCLUSION: THE VOLKSMOEDER IS ALIVE AND WELL

This chapter delineates the terms of the de-re-articulation of normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid as it jostles with democratic discourses to hegemonise the postapartheid field. It reflects on the (dis)continuities between Sarie’s culturally sanctioned discourse and the discourses surfaced in this study that subjects produce and are produced by – the iterations and the resistances. It also provides some wider interpretations of the relevance for the study to other postapartheid identities, particularly whether and how ordentlikheid may be constitutive of such identities.

In investigating whether and how the subject positions under review have become absorbed in and absorbing of postapartheid discourses of democracy and human rights, or whether and how the Afrikaner nationalist nodal point of the volksmoeder has retained its purchase, the study shows reports of the death of the volksmoeder (R. van der Merwe, 2011; Cloete, 1992) are premature – as is the finding that the apartheid triumph of Afrikaner nationalism had emptied the volksmoeder of her ‘emotional carrying capacity’ (Brink, 2008:13, own translation). Closer to the mark is Brink’s comment that ‘the generally human values that characterise the volksmoeder will […] survive in a different form in the 21st century’ (p.14, own translation). However, these ‘generally human values’ or characteristics are more usefully understood as normative injunctions producing, regulating and disciplining subjects at interstices of race, sexuality, gender and class to produce ‘the Afrikaner woman’. Postapartheid changes in the particularist identity of ‘the Afrikaner woman’, embodied by white, Afrikaans-speaking, middleclass, heterosexual women, are here examined through the prism of ordentlikheid as intersectional nexus. Ordentlikheid serves as performative, in that its naming is iteratively inscribed, embodied and enacted. It (re)invokes what sets this particularist identity apart, over and again.

This analysis finds confirmation of centrifugal pressures within this identity from the late 1960s, as conflicts resurfaced, producing the generative dualism verlig [enlightened] and verkramp [reactionary]. With the contraction of
the apartheid imaginary, the contestations have grown in magnitude. As others (Vestergaard, 2001; Steyn, 2003, 2004; Verwey and Quayle, 2012) have found, Afrikaner whiteness is decentred after apartheid. With the symbolic field in flux, this study finds ‘the Afrikaner’ radically disarticulated and rendered a floating signifier. ‘The Afrikaner’ is open to be filled with any content, as subjects’ iterations in its production paradoxically both refuse and accede to democratic interpellations.

However, the study also finds that constitutive volksmoeder ‘values’ retain their identitary charge for subject positions analysed at the intersectionalities of ordentlikheid. The political underpinnings of the volksmoeder are sedimented, as research participants mis-read the volksmoeder as ‘archaic’ (only applicable to past generations) or as referencing ‘black feminine fecundity’. The sedimented politics allows the shape-shifting operations of volksmoeder iteratives to continue to generate the hegemonic femininity of ordentlikheid, this study finds. These iteratives are: self-sacrifice, servility, silence, sexual access and reproducing white. These are the postapartheid performatives for accomplishment of normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid.

8.1 Spilling from the armoured volksmoeder container

Playwright Yael Farber evoked volksmoeder femininity as follows in her 2012 play Mies Julie: ‘The boeretannies [boer aunties] who every Friday have their hair and nails done like they’re gearing up for battle.’ Postapartheid democratic discourses have female-bodied subjects spilling out of this armoured volksmoeder container. The dislocation of the apartheid imaginary rent the nodal point volksmoeder from its Afrikaner nationalist moorings, infusing it with liberatory meanings and opening ordentlikheid to radical democracy. Notably, the investigation reveals subjects re-imagining but not completely disarticulating from the volksmoeder or from ordentlikheid. Thus, the study finds a multiplication of volksmoeders. Volksmoeder femininity may still be the hegemonic, most revered femininity, but it is being challenged in co-constitutive antagonisms by resistant or dissident femininities, which are notably also drawing on ordentlikheid as identitary resource.
In a territory of unsteadiness, *ordentlikheid* is being de-re-articulated in sometimes contradictory, sometimes complementary ways – due to its heightened contingency in a radically dislocated field it serves as perhaps an excitable instance of what has become a social constructionist truism: that identity, perceived as stable, remains perennially contested. Destabilisation of *ordentlikheid* produces refusals and acquiescences in varying configurations. The analysis of the interviews shows: (1) subjectivities that expel and embrace apartheid elements, at times within the same subjectivity; (2) gender, class and sexuality are less troubled than race; (3) geographical location determines racialisation of spaces, with normative Cape Town-located subjects withdrawing to privatised white spaces, while normative Johannesburg subjects opt for dissolution into hegemonic whiteness, or whiteness incognito.

Subjects are interpellated by discourses of ethical governmentality, here named Ek-thical discourses, which de-re-articulate elements gleaned from the *volksmoeder* and from *ordentlikheid*. At one dissident subject position in this study, lack of accomplishment of normative femininity, as proffered by an antagonising masculine outside, made the subject available for democratic interpellation. Feminism, social justice and equality are articulated with re-remembered elements. In this process, a *volksmoeder* is retained but re-imagined to signify a ‘strong, independent, feminist woman’ and *ordentlikheid* as ‘ladies with good manners who deserve respect and autonomy’ to actively work against racism and hegemonic masculinity in her construction of self and enactment of motherhood.

At another dissident subject position, *ordentlikheid* in the permutation of Calvinism is reinterpreted to privilege questioning of the political ‘roots’ of thinking (both her own and others) as foremost ethical action. Overdetermination of the discursive field produces confusion between antagonisms (the ‘ants’ caught between the ‘Black Peril’ and the apartheid elite) and propels the subject to disidentify with ‘the own’. The ‘questioning’ imperative is articulated with third wave feminism to radically subvert the apartheid inside/outside division, to the extent that the subject surpasses apartheid objectification to recognise and re-humanise the black other. She purposefully transgresses apartheid boundaries to put her body in spaces with
the black other in resistance. Motherhood is recalibrated as feminist inculcation of autonomy in her daughters. Recognition of the other shifts another dissident subject position into a realisation of the workings of whiteness, and particularly the wielding of whiteness by female subjects to temporarily escape gender strictures. The resultant self-conscious subjectivity impels problematisation of whiteness and heteronormative power relations as a continuous self-reflective exercise. This subject position reveals the transformative potentialities of shame in the subject’s reflections on the everyday cruelties propping up whiteness and the resultant psychosocial corrosion.

Notions of individualism and ethical self-creation radically opened a Cape Town subject to disarticulating ‘the Afrikaner’ and pursue identifications across different spaces. Postapartheid democratic discourses are rendered resources in the face of an antagonising masculine outside instructing feminine silence and white reproduction. Psychotherapeutics articulated with understandings of social justice allows another subject position to problematise her own class status and whiteness and withdraw from Afrikaner identity to reproduce in counter-action against re-imposed racial strictures.

Ek-thical discourses incorporate ‘choice’, an element of both postfeminism and neoliberalism, but radically reimagined in terms of ethical governmentality. Choice is contextualised and politicised and understood as contingent on class and race and not generally available to all subjects. While ordentlikheid contains hegemonic identities and dissident identities, these postures are distinguished by accession to interpellation by radical democratic discourses. Dissident identities are here read as resonant with the Derridean concept of différance with its double meaning of ‘to differ’ and ‘to defer’ (Rattansi, 1994:30). Différance upsets the binary classification of identity/difference, allowing for mobility in signification and for transformation. It reiterates that identities are partial closures, and therefore open to reinterpretation (p.30).

The concept of iteration allows for the interview texts to be analysed as in-the-moment productions of self, or subjectivation – effects of and effecting discourses. What is discovered is a play that veers from repetitions to refusals –
but even the repetitions are never exact replicas of previous instantiations of identifications but rather approximations that reveal the normative function of the interpellating discourses. The focus group dynamics exhibited an ease of interchange, which can be ascribed to a sense of perceived homogeneity. The format facilitated performances of identities. An ashamed but recalcitrant whiteness articulated with volksmoeder elements of heteronormative reproduction set the scene for vigorous contestation with resistant subjectivities, constructed in antagonism with apartheid identities. The latter discern disciplinary and expulsion equivalences between Afrikaner nationalist race and gender-sexuality creations and refuse both. Hegemonic femininity seeks to undermine the discernment of such equivalences by denying apartheid’s exclusions of the white feminine other and conjuring especially racial frontiers as means of interpellating dissidents to rejoin the volk. Dissident femininities are antagonised by the hegemonic identity’s obfuscation of the power relations organising these exclusions and expose these relations in retaliation. In another instance, identity management representing ‘non-racism’ gave way to a frenzied performance of whiteness around the focus group table, which revealed the instability of these subject positions and their prevarication between the volksmoeder and its deconstruction. Subjects are the meeting points for contending discourses, conjured by them and conjuring them. The study captures how discourses compete for the same subject position, with overdetermination resulting in the same subject proclaiming contradictory stances, for example social construction and biological determinism; or deconstruction of an ‘amputated’ feminine sexuality and simultaneous reification of hegemonic masculinity and whiteness; or radically undermining the intolerance of Afrikaner group-think while reasserting lesbianism as abnormal. Whiteness may be deeply troubled, evoking defensive re-entrenchments or transformative disposals, but heterofemininity re-fixed unquestioningly. This analysis exposes the possibilities for reconfiguring this hetero-whiteness – for a re-articulation of the elements constituting ordentlikheid – and reveal them as significantly more open and fluid than allowed for in Sarie discourses.
8.2 Volksmoeder femininity means ‘always having to say Sarie’

These rich discursive variations and contestations are not to be found in the analysis of Sarie, confirming Sarielese – the Sarie discourse – as normative. The analysis reveals the political ends of Sarielese, as the subjectivities explored in this research display a diversity beyond Sarie's discursive strictures – identifications in play that both challenge and resist, on the one hand, and conform to and confirm, on the other hand, Sarie's revamped versions of Afrikaner nationalist myths. Sarie discourses suppress the contestations by Ethic subject positions.

Sarie is an ethnicised gateway to western heterofemininity. Its volksmoeder femininity retains its aspirational subaltern white orientation to the 'west' in reproducing white western bourgeois femininity's mainstays of heteronormativity, beauty and domesticity, with latest addition postfeminism. At its 60th anniversary in 2009, the year here under review, the Editor’s Letter yoked Sarie in a signifying chain with Afrikaner nationalist female rolemodels such as Audrey Blignaut and Alba Bouwer and multinational ‘beauty’ companies Dior and Chanel, a manoeuvre that speaks to Afrikaner identity as subaltern identity aspiring to globalised whiteness, to Afrikaner women being verified through accomplishment of the normative ideal of western white heterofemininity. Sarie presents a platform for the Afrikaner nationalist project’s wielding of the Afrikaans language alongside western cultural expressions in a confluence of discourses, which produces an ethnicised feminine subject. Sarie discourses (re)generate and police hegemonic femininity as per sedimented volksmoeder moulds, as continuously (re)articulated in response to historical conditions.

Sarie’s ‘Whitewashing the Blackout’ discourse serves to re-girdle a whiteness in crisis. This crisis is confirmed in discourses delineated in the texts generated in this study. However, where the political intent of the Sarie project comes strongly to the fore, is that the contestation within this whiteness is invisible in Sarie discourses. Sarie merely hints at it by never using the term ‘Afrikaner’ and only ever ‘Afrikaans’. Moreover, Sarie discourses contrive a normalisation of femininity-as-care-of-others through its performatives ‘Give of yourself’ and ‘You can never ever let yourself feel better if you don’t let someone
else feel better’. The male feminine other is recruited, with the proviso of desexualisation, to re-legitimise the volksmoeder discourse of service and self-sacrifice. This injunction implicitly rests on silenced black female others whose bodies perform the bulk of white femininity’s reproduction work. When the black other is brought to intelligibility within Sarielese, it is to exonerate the white miesies [madam] from apartheid culpability. Black others outside the service relationship are silenced. Sarie’s performatives of compulsory conjugal maternity, derived from volksmoeder ordentlikheid, are reinvigorated with elements from neoliberal and postfeminist governmentalities, most pointedly ‘compulsory choice’, to produce its overall discourse: ‘Be good to yourself to be good to (white) others’.

The contours of the postapartheid production of volksmoeder ordentlikheid, as prescribed by Sarie discourses, are:

1. A defiant whiteness produced through the discursive strategies of dissolution into whiteness incognito and ‘whitewashing the blackout’. Sarie conjures a white world in which blackness is blotted out. The black other is only invoked to:
   (b.) To absolve this whiteness of apartheid culpability, hide its racism and verify white goodness and naturalise its deepening white privilege.

Neoliberalism as mode of rationality is deployed to recast apartheid oppression of black people in the rhetoric of ‘the market’ in which subjects find or miss opportunities, as per self-help clichés. These deployments allow this white femininity to suppress the constitutive marginality of the racialised feminine.
‘Good blacks’, the only constructions allowed entry into Sarielese, adhere to the revered sacrificial femininity of the volksmoeder to serve as the workhorse mother, standing in while white femininity pursues consumption.

2. Try-and-try-again compulsory conjugal maternity, through Sarie’s stipulation of ‘sexuality with built-in maternity’, which reworks neoliberal subjection’s obligatory choice, paradoxically, to render hegemonic femininity always already hetero-maternal. When sexuality without maternity is allowed,
volksmoeder ordentlikheid’s particularist distinction lies in its ‘sexualisation lite’ adaptation of postfeminist interpellation – in stark contrast to postfeminist hyper-sexualisation in the west. Different to the black other and the male feminine, the lesbian other is completely sublimated to prevent disturbance of Sarie’s vaunted heternormative fullness. What is the representation that cannot be interrupted at any cost? A sexuality centred on maternal care, both of the masculine and of progeny, subservient to keeping the family intact and that can never be expressed for its own sake.

In another deviation from the white western feminine script, Sarie femininity’s attachment to the masculine other remains central, rather than actualisation of self, which has shifted to central space in comparable women’s magazines in the U.S. and Britain. The Sarie dictum ‘Your say counts’ seemingly suggests ‘empowerment’ but the lines are drawn: The Sarie subject emerges into language only within the terms set by commodified volksmoeder ordentlikheid. Sarie volksmoeder femininity’s neoliberal ambitions of self-production are checked by ‘the Sarie family’ presided over by a masculinity which is akin to that of a (heavenly) father to a child, producing an infantilised femininity. In contrast to the invisibilisation of ‘the lesbian’, a full scope of manhood, from patriarch to father-husband to brother to the male feminine, is deployed to verify volksmoeder ordentlikheid. The male feminine, however, is subjected to a discursive rearrangement called here ‘(Sm)othering Centre’ as it is only entertained in ‘good homosexual’ permutation.

3. Consume self, consume Afrikaans, to access self-actualisation and belonging through acquisition of technologies of femininity, as presented in Sarie and including Sarie itself. White Afrikaans femininity is presented as suffering through unnamed trials and tribulations. Sarie projects itself as a refuge, an Afrikaans white space away. Through (its) consumption, the reader accesses femininity and community. Objects for consumption come in the form of cultural technologies ranging from the magazine itself to its spinoff products (e.g. columnists Nataniël’s retail outlets and Izak de Villiers’ books) to the Afrikaans products it liberally showcases. At play in actualising the Sarie self is repetitive elaboration of induction and grooming into white heterofemininity through consumerism, which the magazine capitalises on through its online-sales of the
accoutrements of normative femininity. In *Sarie*, consumption renders white heterofemininity.

### 8.3 In the image of the *volksmoeder*

Despite concerted myth-making by technologies such as *Sarie* to resurrect a guilt-free, untainted ‘Afrikaans’ identity insulated in a white, bourgeois and heterofeminine world of unaccountability, subjectivities are beset by a radical dislocation of whiteness, with its mutually constitutive heterofemininity in disarray. Subject positions, whether normative or dissident, are all found to be uprooted and therefore susceptible to democratic openings. However, some have been overrun by discourses that promise the return of old certainties. What are defined here as Regrouper discourses reupholster hierarchical exclusions at the sexuality-class-gender-race intersections of *volksmoeder ordentlikheid*, akin to *Sarie’s* normative creation, to produce subjects in its image. As discourses do, Regrouper narratives repetitively bid to re-suture the terrain, especially to re-sublimate the differences previously submerged in the family of the *volk* and renovate ‘the Afrikaner’ spoilt identity while re-asserting its claim to whiteness. The Regrouper discourses found in this study effectively reiterate *Sarielesè’s volksmoeder ordentlikheid*.

Regrouper subject positions under review would not only deny the effects of apartheid on black people but also intra-Afrikaner oppression of women. Ethnicity, whiteness, blackness, femininity and heterosexuality are naturalised, if not primordialised. While age hierarchies (the *tannies* [aunties] and *ooms* [uncles] of Afrikaner ‘familialism’) are reasserted, apartheid culpability is denied by redirecting it to older generations. Regrouper identifications are copy-cat identifications, not only in reiterations of heterofeminine injunctions but using a race-culture slippage, as seen in new right permutations elsewhere in the world, to re-represent racist constructions. It works to re-install masculinity as presiding identity, even as it chafes at the restrictions of heteronormativity.

These subject positions can shift under duress, as when a Regrouper bemoaned the loss of the black other in a face-saving manoeuvre claiming white victimhood. It can be read as a displacement of black people’s actual privation
during apartheid, or as the white self momentarily confessing its melancholia at the loss of the other.

Notably, pressures to abide by ‘a guilt-free Afrikaner’ identity were significantly more heightened in the Cape Town focus groups, where the majority of focus group participants identified as Afrikaners and devoted considerable time to re-recruit the two participants (one in each group) who rejected Afrikaner identity. Given that these participants mostly hail from white enclaves that achieve almost complete racial and ethnic enclosure, it suggests a spatial dimension to the production of normative ordentlikheid. Regrouper strategy among Johannesburg respondents is to disappear ‘Afrikaner’ into colourblind whiteness, or whiteness incognito. Regrouper Cape Town respondents compensate for a lack of state-enforced racism through laagering, or an inward migration to privatised white Afrikaner spaces. It is a space to fantasise about the recuperation of the loss of an autochthonic claim to belonging, or to at least enact nostalgia about it. This enables the continued reiteration and flattening of blackness as antagonising outside to be feared and expelled.

It is a strategy with geographical options, i.e. Cape Town’s northern suburbs behind the ‘Boerewors Curtain’, and through religious and cultural technologies such as Sarie as white space and Afrikaner performing arts production and circuits, which have expanded exponentially in the 2000s. These privatised spaces function in defiance of democratic discourses, in contrast to popular ‘cross-over’ culture and post-racial configurations that displace church, neighbourhood and family as dominant sites of identification, as has been found in some post-apartheid studies (Nuttall, 2004:738-9). In these realms of normative ordentlikheid – replete with ‘family’ and ‘friends’ – remnants of Afrikaner nationalist discourse are re-mobilised. It is a strategy that allows Regrouper subject positions to resist democratic dislocations. White spaces are constructed through performing white. This is a whiteness that keeps itself one step removed from its black others, deploying a policing strategy patrolling the borders of white spaces.
8.4 Natural woman-wife-mother

Volksmoeder remnants are tenacious and reanimated due to the adaptability of the discourse of motherhood. The study finds that the gender-sexuality-class elements of ordentlikheid are less disturbed than whiteness, with only a few Ek-thical exceptions. It demonstrates the operations of subjection: among respondents self-described ‘fulltime mothers’ numbered only two, while another two respondents had recently made adjustments in employment to halftime and flexi-time. All other respondents worked. Thus we see the discursive generation of identity by the forced approximation of a normative ideal which ‘invades, totalises and renders coherent the individual’ (Butler, 1997:84-5). Heteronormative ordentlikheid is composed of stadia towards a vaunted fullness, a phantasm that individuals iteratively attempt to accomplish for verification as feminine subjects. The study finds these steps to verification to be, in sequence: heterosexual engagement and marriage; generation of more than one offspring, with a minimum of one male; offspring’s propagation of more descendants. These stadia have been prescribed in Afrikaner nationalist texts (e.g. Wessels, 1972) and were quoted by subjects representing the Regrouper positionality. This study finds that the political origins of ‘femininity-as-motherhood’ in Afrikaner nationalism have become sedimented out of sight and its articulation with ‘nature’ has intensified. Volksmoeder ordentlikheid prescribes woman-as-natural-carer and ‘instinctual family adhesive’; naturalises ‘difference between the sexes’; and articulates postfeminist ‘choice’ to naturalise the gender division of labour in the domestic realm. The normative effects of these prescriptions are so powerful that non-normative subject positions in the study that have resisted or failed the stadia still confirm the elements legitimised by hegemonic femininity, even when resisting the equation of reproduction ‘with breathing’, or paradoxically admitting its pursuit led to ‘life-long ruin’.ii

While motherhood does have empowering dimensions, as in contemporary African nationalism and nascent Afrikaner nationalisms of the first half of the 20th century, it is still circumscribed within the precincts of male authority (Walker, 1995:421). In its postapartheid revamp, the volksmoeder meets postfeminism in Regrouper strategies replete with contradictions. Compulsory motherhood is normalised with ‘choice’ as ‘the freedom to be a
mother’, rather than ‘a career woman’, akin to what has been called ‘egalitarian essentialism’ (Cotter, Hermsen and Vanneman, 2011:261). It represents a divergence from neoliberal subjectivation in the ‘west’, which constructs maternity as a ‘failed femininity’ because of lack of economic productivity and flexibility, and which commands a prompt return to paid work (Tyler, 2011:22;29). The revamped volksmoeder femininity is not the postfeminist dream of ‘the girl who has it all’ (p.29). Instead, it is achieved by financial dependence on a husband – when economically active, it is secondary to motherhood.

8.5 Lesbian abject

In contrast to the naturalisation of woman-as-mother, ‘the lesbian’ remained invisibilised, apart from a few Ek-thical exceptions. As another co-constitutive relationality, the abjection of ‘the lesbian’ provides volksmoeder ordentlikheid with three modes of replenishment: the necessary dependence of femininity, in opposition to the ‘autonomy’ of ‘the lesbian’; the servitude and self-sacrifice of femininity, in opposition to lesbian claims of masculine benefits of leisure and preferential treatment; sexual curtailment and passivity of femininity, in opposition to the unknown/uncontrollable sexuality and sexual agency of ‘the lesbian’. ‘The lesbian’ lies beyond masculine containment and therefore is erased.

8.6 Reinstalling the king

In the first half of the 20th century, subjects identifying as ‘Afrikaner women’ successfully wielded the volksmoeder to participate in the carving of political space at the identitary nexus of ordentlikheid. By the 1940s, the volksmoeder was turned back on them, rearticulated to legitimise compulsory domesticity for these subjects. Afrikaner nationalist hierarchisation, with its dualisms borrowed from the colonial arm of modernity (McClintock, 1993; Norval, 2003; Nandy, 1983), subverted ‘being active and public mothers to the volk’ into ‘reproducing the volk at home’. While the home in this study is understood as not outside the political, as it functioned as a politicised site of Afrikaner nationalist (re)production, the postapartheid democratic disturbance
in gender relations raises a question as to the counter-strategies that may be deployed to domesticate these subjects again. The postapartheid gender upheaval could be compared with that caused by the South African War and subsequent urbanisation of white Dutch/Afrikaans-speaking women escaping from the strictures of patriarchal families, causing a gender panic at the time: ‘the women [...] don't want to marry – they don’t want to do homework – they don’t want families... when we see things are wrong we have to try to put [them] right (M.E. Rothmann [1925] quoted in du Toit [2003:173], own translation). In postapartheid South Africa, in the face of cracks in gender hierarchies and exclusions caused by resistance by unruly women drawing on democratic discourses, the grip of the patriarch as overseer of volksmoeder femininity has been loosened. Apart from the re-naturalisation of woman-wife-mother, counter-discourses of ‘masculine victimhood’ seek to reassert its grip. Strategies have been deployed to resurrect ‘the Afrikaner man’. These are distinct from the ‘backlash’ against feminism in the US (Faludi 1992), for example, in that these strategies foreground this marked masculinity while invisibilising its political implications and practices of oppression, as opposed to US hegemonic masculinity which obfuscates its operations through its postfeminist re-marking of femininity.

The discourses that emerge in the study figure hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity as revered or even deified; as forged in hierarchies of intra- and extra-masculine feminisation by naturalised violence; a power that cannot be contradicted or second-guessed; militarised; and which acts as final arbiter and enjoys sexual licence – in short: a despotic masculinity delineates volksmoeder ordentlikheid. Its power is normalised in everyday phrases such as ‘man-as-head-woman-as-neck’.

A postapartheid discourse has been mobilised of what an Ek-thical subject called ‘patriarchal masochism’\(^6\): the ‘Afrikaner man’ is construed as humiliated, broken and ‘down and out’ due to his loss of political power. A ploy can be discerned. Feminine subjection is pursued through the conflation of ‘the Afrikaner’ with ‘the Afrikaner man’, in echoes of conflations of representations such as ‘the black man’ and ‘the white man’ in colloquial intercourse and, formerly, in apartheid official speak (Manicom, 1992:462). The renovation of
Afrikaner identity is therefore predicated on the reinstallation of ‘the Afrikaner man’. The iteration of the performative ‘keep the crown on his head’ is not only of femininity as prop to masculinity.\textsuperscript{v} It also enlists femininity in the construction of hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity as symbol of Afrikaner identity in relation to black masculinity’s occupation of its former hallowed halls of power and white English-speaking South African (WESSA) masculinity’s continued occupation of the heights of capital. The impetus of restoring Afrikaner masculinity could be traced to its co-constructive relationship with British/WESSA masculinity and the latter’s projection of ‘masculinity as politically mature adulthood’ (Erlank, 2003:654). Restoring Afrikaner manhood restores Afrikanerhood. The masculine gendering of the volk means that the focus is again on ‘the ideal Afrikaner man’, in a reiteration of early Afrikaner nationalist discourse (Bradford, 2000:219). Eisenstein (2000) points out that ‘woman’ may be instituted as metaphor for the nation, the ‘bordered differentiation’ encapsulating domesticity against which masculinity constitutes itself (p.42-3). The nation is a ‘phallocratic order’ excluding women; ‘woman’ delineates this ‘passionate brotherhood’ – not sisterhood (p.41, 43).

Regrouper identifications, in a flurry to restore Afrikaner ‘hard’ masculinity to its former glory, normalise femininity-as-crutch and rearticulate gender equality with ‘he has the final say and responsibility’. The study shows iteratives of femininity-as-silence in acknowledgement of the male as ultimate authority across different generations. Masculinity-as-final-say co-constitutes a femininity engaged in exhibiting the ‘correct’ class tastes in body and home – a femininity produced through consumption as a mode of subjectivation. This femininity reiterates ‘the wife’ as embodiment of the accomplishment of middle-class status and thus of the achievement of the masculinity of normative ordentlikheid. ‘The wife’ is the symbolic line distinguishing which bodies can and cannot belong to the newly privatised volk. In the privatised spaces of this marked whiteness, hegemonic masculinity can feel like a king once again. But Ekethical subjects defy interpellations by feminine collusion in the make-believe of ‘boys and their toys’\textsuperscript{vi} to pursue fluidities across volksmoeder gender and race borders. The boundaries of ‘amputated sexuality’ are breached in challenges to
heteronormativity – but with an exception, as ‘the lesbian’ remains an unknown country.

In conclusion, the volksmoeder continues to interpellate subjects at the intersectional nexus that is ordentlikheid but she has been rendered many volksmoeders, as has ‘the Afrikaner’ – not ended but being reconfigured, over and again, with democratic potentialities – and without. Some subjects, unbeknownst to themselves, find succour in the volksmoeder’s re-presented performative conjunction of ‘woman-wife-mother’ reproducing white – a conjunction newly boosted by neoliberal and postfeminist privatisation, depoliticisation and ‘choice’. It is a defensive whiteness that draws on global-local strategies to dissolve into hegemonic whiteness incognito, or alternatively to migrate inward to white, Afrikaans cultural enclaves, including using technologies such as Sarie. But the multiplication of the volksmoeder and ‘the Afrikaner’ creates democratic openings for identities akin to what Nelson Mandela identified in Ingrid Jonker, as quoted in the Introduction. For some subjects such potentialities can only be pursued through wholesale rejection of ‘the Afrikaner’ and embracing ‘much wider’ South Africanness or Africanness. Others re-remember the volksmoeder with democratic contents of feminism, social equality and justice while radically subverting the bourgeois-white and heteronormative elements of ‘the Afrikaner’ – to still be called Afrikaners.

8.7 Wider application

Drawing the lens more widely, the analysis demonstrates the productivity of approaching discourse as social practice with material effects rather than instituting a division between discourse and materiality, as realist ontologies do. Individuals are subject to continuous attempts at embodiment of normative prescriptions. The study shows how subjects make themselves and are made through iterations of dominant discourses, also on display during the research process. A radical moment of crisis produces multiple and varied openings for new identitary imaginings, which subjects step into in varied ways. Subject positions are show to be sites of veritable fisticuffs as multiple discourses struggle for hegemony. In this state of pugilism, as the subject seeks to stem the onslaughts of different versions of legitimate living, becoming happens
repetitively but never precisely in the form before the present version. In the subject’s pursuit of verification, its permutations even articulate contradictory elements. In situ de-re-articulations in the research process expose the potential for change as subject positions prevaricate. These generative processes are especially heightened when an imaginary that formerly hegemonised the social field has been dislocated, as in the case of postapartheid South Africa.

Incorporating intersectionality as analytical prism further facilitates avoidance of the culture/materiality division, as class is analysed in co-constructive relation to other categories of differentiation to disentangle subjectivation. Identities are examined as complex interstices of competing understandings, rather than focusing on singular constitutive elements such as race or class, as has been the wont in South African social sciences. It allows the inclusion of apartheid's ‘other others’ (van der Westhuizen 2010). Introducing an othered category into the analysis – femininity – makes the workings of the normative categories more obvious. It reveals myriad micro-strategies, contextually dependent and sometimes contradictory, that are deployed in the maintenance of identities.

This research shows that subject positions are beholden to the discursive resources that are available. The objects of scrutiny in the study are the volksmoeder and ordentlikheid but, moving from the specific to the general, these processes of identification can be extrapolated to all identities in liberalising, democratising South Africa. This mode of investigation could be productively applied to the analysis of African nationalism, South African liberalism, Black Consciousness and other prominent discourses. Ditto respectability more broadly, as similar interpellations are involved in other identities, such as those of coloured people (Salo 2007).

South Africa’s re-insertion into the global circuits of discursivity makes available novel resources which subjects articulate with local narratives to either subvert or reinforce these routes of meaning-making. The study’s use of the concept of ‘liberalising’ invokes processes of globalisation, in which local-global divisions become blurred and global discourses are adapted to reinforce or dismantle local hierarchies. This study finds that liberalisation does not only hold the potential of freedom from apartheid identities but also renders South
African identities available to interpellation by neoliberalism, which has displaced liberalism in the North. Neoliberalism, with its concomitant strategies of decontextualisation and depoliticisation, has supplanted the discourse of Afrikaner nationalism but provides a path to the re-legitimisation of some Afrikaner nationalist elements through the embrace of its ‘post-race’, postfeminist, post-politics dictum. The study's use of ‘democratising’ refers to the discourses that clash with liberalising discourses, in that subjects now can draw on both democratic South Africa’s constitution and a veritable gaggle of global discourses advancing democracy, diversity and difference in ways that radically challenge apartheid’s contortions of difference into oppressive hierarchies of otherness. Further research could be undertaken into the animal/human dichotomy and present-day equivalences of femininity with black/nature/savage/irrational. The legitimisation of interracial families in postapartheid South Africa should also be studied, particularly how the white/black hierarchy reinforces the adult/child hierarchy.

The research shows that subject positions are made available to discourses hegemonising the social field in the North, particularly second-wave feminism’s notion of gender equality; third-wave feminism’s notion of difference; and postfeminist and neoliberal notions of decontextualised and depoliticised ‘choice’ in ‘self-creation’. Specific strategies borrowed from the North and then reworked are: the cultural twist in racism, ‘egalitarian essentialism’, ‘family values’, and the active production of ignorance about white privilege. These resources are articulated with local narratives to both subvert and restore oppressive relations.

With reference to the thesis’s division of orders within and without, the following is found: If an identity has been antagonised in a relationality by an internal other positioned as dominant, a subject can be prompted to radically subvert that identity, or elements thereof, and thereby dislocate the hold of an erstwhile hegemonic discourse and create identitary openings. Therefore, a sense of ‘not fitting’ a dominant identification politicises a subject position and enables relativisation – the locating of self in relation to contending discourses. The subject is rendered available to counter-discourses that precipitate resistance. The Ek-thicals manifest these processes in this study. However, if the
primary antagonism is read as being from an external other, subjects can seek to re-entrench an identity as faithfully as possible to the norms of the order within. This pertains to the Regroupers in this study and how they order ‘within’ to keep the ‘without’ at bay. Therefore, given that ‘the Afrikaner’ is an identity now twice stigmatised – in paradoxical ways, first as not-white-enough and second as apartheid creator and prime beneficiary – Regrouper subjects de-re-articulate elements of democratic discourses (such as freedom and equality) in a bid to re-legitimise normative volksmoeder ordentlikheid. Identities that have been legitimised by the end of apartheid, such as the Ek-thicals in this study, operationalise the availability of democratic discourses to pursue openness to the other and destabilise essentialisms while resisting re-enclosure. Further research could shed light on how subjects constituted as black and/or female and/or working-class articulate these democratic elements.

This study reveals the hardiness of the volksmoeder as symbol amid multiple rearticulations and suggests that examination of the changed resilience of the African nationalist mother of the nation would also be fruitful. This is also suggested by the mother of the nation’s resonances with the continued normative volksmoeder aim of ‘reflecting the figure of man at twice its size’ (Woolf, 2005 [1928]:35), as masculinities compete for victimhood status in postapartheid South Africa. A productive investigation could be undertaken into whether and how African nationalism’s symbolic motherhood buoys woman-wife-mother confluences to restore black masculinities ‘hurt’ by democratising gender relations. Anecdotal evidence suggests that black femininity is subject to intensified contestations last seen in the 1930s (Thomas 2006; van der Westhuizen 2013). The upward class mobility of some black people and resultant burgeoning black middleclass intensifies battles about the definitive version of postapartheid black middleclassness. Discourses in play that could be studied are religious and cultural fundamentalisms, the government’s narrative of ‘moral regeneration’ and the ANC Women’s League ‘motherism’, in which feminism is disavowed and women become deserving of rights in the name of motherhood and in support of men (e.g. Motshekga 2010 and Shisana interview in Batliwala and Rao, n.d.: 18-19). Neoliberal promises of self-production
through consumption among South African identities should also be examined further.

Therefore, postapartheid subjects traverse a turbulent terrain in which global and local discourses are articulated, of which some upset the inclusion/exclusion dynamics of apartheid oppressions, while others seek to re-enforce those dynamics. Subjects avail themselves of both, sometimes simultaneously, as identifications shift. Radical democratic possibilities keep pushing back against resurgent discourses of subordination seeking to empty out the democratic contents of ‘equality’, ‘freedom’ and ‘rights’ in the turf war that is South Africa.

\[^{i}\] This is a term used by Capetonians to refer to the geographical language divide in the city. It refers to a Boer sausage, or sausage associated with ‘Boers’ or Afrikaners.

\[^{ii}\] Yvonne, focus group 1.

\[^{iii}\] Leah, focus group 3.

\[^{iv}\] Andriette, individual interview 1.

\[^{v}\] Iterations range as far back as the Suid-Afrikaanse Vrouefederasie’s [South African Women’s Federation] constitution after the South African War noting women’s role as to ‘support our male leaders’ while the Afrikaanse Christelike Vroueveniging [Afrikaans Christian Women’s Association] organised the intra-Afrikaner hierarchy as: ‘We are bound [...] to support in every way possible those men who are leaders and of the same opinions as us’ (Cloete, 1992:51).

\[^{vi}\] Nita, individual interview 2.

\[^{vii}\] Katrien, focus group 1.
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Appendix A: A short history of the *volksmoeder*

According to Swart (2007:47), historians generally agree that there existed ‘a strong tradition of Boer women’s involvement in the political realm, although without formal rights’. The volk was ‘gendered male’ in the late 19th century, according to Bradford (2000), but the South African War regendered it, as the hardy, neither passive nor pacifist stalwarts of rural household production ‘gatecrashed into a homosocial volk’ (p.207). Women took over as household heads, farmers and activists for independence from the British.

The predominant notions of the ‘Boer women’ in the first couple of decades after the end of the South African War were as tough, self-sufficient survivors in a harsh environment where they continued to preserve racial purity in the face of black barbarism; instigators who pressurised their men folk to remain at war with the British; and as ‘religious, freedom-loving, honourable, selfless and incorruptible’ (Vincent, 2000). In the beginning decades after the South African War, the *volksmoeder* [mother of the nation] was manufactured with the addition of ‘a political charge’ to earlier productions of ‘pioneer woman’, ‘Voortrekker woman’, ‘Afrikaner woman’ and ‘Boer woman’ (du Plessis, 2010:170).

The *volksmoeder* is adjusted according to ‘the pressures arising from African resistance and conflict between Afrikaner colonialists and British imperialists’ (McClintock, 1993:71). But Bradford (2000) adds another factor: Masculinity became recalibrated during the war, with the women acting ‘more manly’ than the men. Boer men were reluctant warriors at the beginning of the war and only eventually forged into a ‘volk of broeders’ partly due to pressure from women to fight. While the women continued to agitate for independence, the Boer leadership – convinced of surrender – reassigned them from heroines to vulnerable victims in need of protection, while promising men reinstated paternalist authority. The rearticulation positioned the defeated *volk* as feminised and the men as having to reassume patriarchal authority, while the women and the feminised language (mother tongue) became symbols for the fledgling *volk*. Patriarchal authority replaced fraternity, and the ‘thousands of Joans of Arc’ became mothers of the nation (pp. 214, 219-220) -- ‘invisibly visible
as a symbolic fantasy’, to address the problem that ‘real, actual women’ pose for the nation (Eisenstein 2000:43). ‘Woman’ is yoked into a chain of equivalence with motherhood, nurturance and care-giving, displacing the actual variance in femininities (p.41).

Victorian domestic ideology facilitated the regendering and recreation of ‘ideal’ womanhood (Brink, 1990:274). The basic unit of Victorian bourgeois society was the ‘patriarchal autocracy’ of the family based on a male formulation of female helplessness and dependence reinforced by a bourgeois wife’s performance as a ‘lady’, i.e. someone who does not work (Hobsbawm, 2003). The performance was of a ‘pretty, ignorant and idiotic slave’ whose only possibility for demonstration of superiority was through her mastery over servants. In colonial South Africa, the ‘drawing room ideal of Victorian domesticity’ pertained only to wealthier sections in the urban centres (Walker, 1995:433). It was a radical departure from frontierswomen who had to be domestically competent, resilient, stoical and engaged with survival (p.433).

The ‘orthodox version’ of the volksmoeder prescribed Afrikaner women’s ‘highest calling and greatest fulfilment [as] to be found in [their] own home where [they] would physically and morally reproduce the nation’ (Vincent, 2000:64). The Nederduits-Gereformeerde Kerk (NGK -- Dutch Reformed Church), a primary member of the volksbeweging [people’s movement], in opposition to women’s franchise in 1920 fenced the vote as belonging to ‘man as head of the family’ and not to ‘woman as helpmate’ (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989:64).

But revisionist feminist studies have challenged the notion of ‘Afrikaner women’ as passive receptacles of Afrikaner nationalist discourse (Kruger, 1990; Bradford, 2000; Vincent, 1999, 2000; du Toit, 2003). Du Toit (2003:155,176) questions contradictions around the agency of Afrikaner nationalist women in some studies (e.g. by Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989; Brink, 1990). She takes issue with Bradford’s (2000) description of the ‘hegemonic gender identity of “the Afrikaner nationalist” is [as] male’, arguing that dominance does not deny subjectivity. She exposes the political effects of vrouesake [women’s affairs] on Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation, for example how the Afrikaanse Christelike Vrouevereniging [ACVV -- Afrikaans Christian Women’s Association] actively participated in the production of Afrikaner nationalist discourse through
manufacturing racialised others. Vincent finds that both middle class and working class women wielded the volksmoeder discourse to remain in the Afrikaner nationalist fold while allowing them activism in the public sphere through the Garment Workers’ Union and the Nasionale Vroue partye (NVPs) [National Women’s Parties] (Vincent, 1999, 2000). Afrikaner nationalist women were heavily involved in racialised welfare activities uplifting poor white people. These activities were carried out by the NVPs, which were entities founded on a provincial basis, and by organisations such as the ACVV. It was intrinsically part of Afrikaner nationalism’s political programme (Vincent, 1999) for the gendered interpellation of subjects as ‘Afrikaners’. Contestation around women’s suffrage meant that the ACVV in 1907 expressed its opposition to the vote as ‘a feminine woman does not vote’, while cultural entrepreneur M.E. Rothmann emphasised maternity before citizenship for women in the 1920s, even as she supported women’s suffrage (du Toit, 2003:166-7, 174). But ACVV women raised the hackles of men by speaking in public, a novelty eventually normalised by emphasising speakers’ maternal and familial characteristics (p.167). Afrikaner nationalist women resisted the NGK’s hostility towards white women’s suffrage by expanding the volksmoeder discourse in the 1920s to argue successfully that they were concerned with the well-being of both family and state (Vincent, 1999:69). Granting the franchise to white women in 1930 had a racial purpose for Hertzog’s National Party: to shore up the white vote, which showed women’s political rights hinged on utility to volk and race (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989:75). Therefore, a woman’s citizenship was mediated through her maternal function to the volk, as her citizenship was mediated through her matrimonial relationship with a man (McClintock, 1993:65). The NP insisted on the absorption of the NVPs after the franchise was granted, a move resisted but eventually succumbed to. After franchise was won, a few NVP leaders that rose through the ranks of the parties went on to occupy political office. After the NVPs’ demise, however, Afrikaner women mostly disappeared from public leadership positions (Vincent, 1999:64). The volksmoeder discourse that permitted political engagement had been re-adapted to re-direct white Afrikaans-speaking women away from politics and the labour market to the
domestic sphere after the NVPs’ merging with the male National Party (pp.68-69):

The volksmoeder ideology proved to be a two-edged sword. On the one hand it conferred a mantle of legitimacy on women’s search for an independent voice in the 1920s. On the other hand the retention of an ideology that ascribed to men and women different social roles and differential access to political power on the basis of assumed biological traits meant that a return to a more conservative version of the ideology loomed as an ever-present possibility. As male nationalists sought to reassert their dominance over [National] party structures and as Afrikaner nationalism shifted in a more authoritarian direction from the 1930s, women’s independent political voice was no longer tolerated and the volksmoeder ideology was used to justify the call for women to submit to male authority and return to the home (p.54).

Afrikaner nationalist women failed to subvert two assumptions of Afrikaner nationalist gender discourse: that women were specifically responsible for the domestic realm; and ‘that women’s social and political roles could be legitimately defined by their gender’ (Vincent, 1999:72). As the Afrikaner nationalist state increasingly took charge of welfare functions, these avenues for women’s political participation were closed down, with the virtual disappearance of Afrikaner women from the public realm. In return for succumbing to interpellation by ‘an exclusive ideology of motherhood and the isolation within the home that it implied’ (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989:64), ‘Afrikaner women’ qualified for whiteness with its concomitant privileges and powers. The accession of the National Party to state power in 1948 was the accomplishment by ‘the Afrikaner’ of ‘white’ ‘nationhood’ at the political pinnacle of a ‘white South Africa’.

After World War II, as happened in the West with the promotion of the ‘cult of domesticity’ (Katz, 2000:144) aimed at getting women out of the workplace and back into the home, the daughters of Afrikaans white female factory workers entered the labour market in smaller numbers than their
mothers. However, apartheid welfare for whites enabled white middle class women formerly active in charity, for the first time, to use their skills for remunerative work (Brink, 2008:12). Ambitious middle class Afrikaner women were still limited, however, to ‘feminine’ jobs due to their ‘nurturing skills’, i.e. nursing and teaching. ‘The creation and defence of the Afrikaner home continued to be the Afrikaner woman’s prime service to the volk into the 1960s’ (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989: 64). A shift is seen in the 1960s, they argue: the home was displaced as ‘key Afrikaner nationalist base’ for defensive nation-building to instead become ‘a focus for the display of newfound prosperity’ (p.65). But Brink (2008, own translation) discerns the continued deployment of the volksmoeder, ‘moulded in a different, more worldly form’ (p.12). While ‘modern’ western white femininity was imported through translations of US books for female adolescents, western sexual interpellation was still intercepted with Afrikaner nationalist tracts aimed at girls, condemning lesbianism and exhorting readers ‘not to break out of the rock from which you are carved’; an embrace of Afrikaner nationalist cultural and religious values is the proviso for ‘social acceptance’ (p.13).

When the Afrikaner nationalist state took the war against the Swart Gevaar [Black peril] and the Rooi Gevaar [Red Peril] across ‘the border’ in the late 1960s, women were instructed by Afrikaner nationalist men to ‘stand together’ with ‘their’ men and to be ‘guardians of the inner room that listen with an intuitive ear to the deepest stirrings of a volk’ (p.13). The ‘can-do’ aspect of the volksmoeder had been replaced by the passivity of the middle class ‘lady’.

During the increased militarisation of South African society in the late 1970s, the National Party (NP) called upon Afrikaner women to be loyal, ‘silent’ ‘spiritual’ soldiers’, ‘a secret weapon’ against the ‘total onslaught’ of ‘Communist terrorism’ (Gaitskell and Unterhalter, 1989:66). In 1986, during the NP’s search for pliant black collaborators, NP woman MP Rina Venter led an outreach programme to black women on the basis of women’s ‘common interests as mothers and creators of life [...] The version of motherhood here is crucial: mothers are still seen in a very domestic limited role, united in a concern for their children’ (p.67).
Appendix B:  A South African history of respectability

In the South African context, Thomas (2006:466-7) places ‘the highly malleable ideology of respectability’ as arising during the 1870s and 1880s when the Cape colonists identified Victorian virtues such as industriousness and cleanliness as synonymous with Englishness. Lester (1998:518-9) nevertheless notes that class-as-respectability served as the primary demarcation among the British settlers after their arrival in 1820, with the gentry and middle classes as ‘respectable’ settlers seeking control over the lower orders. A crisis of class relations developed in which respectable settlers installed ‘their’ women as boundary against the subversion of the class and gender order (Lester, 1998: 520). The class divisions gave way as they invented a transplanted Britishness and shared settler ‘character’, which included industry and enterprise. Women were central to the latter: tightly bound in domesticity, their provision of familiar domestic appearances and household routine reproduced settler identity (Lester 1998:526-9).

‘[S]ex in the colonies was a political act with repercussions’, as colonial control hinged on the racial hierarchy fixed through inclusions and exclusions of persons as ‘white’ or ‘native’ (Scully, 1995: 343), which determined citizen or subject status (Mamdani, 1996). Against the backdrop of a malaise in Victorian masculinity, and given the indivisibility of racial dominance and male power, white domination in South Africa was justified by the ‘threat of [black] sexual invasion [...] as white men attempted to impose their authority over the forces that threatened racialised patriarchy’ (Keegan, 2001:461). This invention frames the similarity that Vincent (1999:65) identifies between early 20th century eugenicists’ admonitions to British women as reproducers of the race to prevent the deterioration of nation and race and the prescriptions that Afrikaner women should preserve ‘the level of civilisation’ of Afrikaners, read as a shrouded euphemism for ‘racial purity’. British women’s proper place was construed to be ‘mothers in the home’. Laws in the Boer republics in the late 19th century forbade sex between all white women and black men, rendering the inviolability of white womanhood as much a prescription to white women as to black men, in
that the former may not transgress racial mores (Keegan, 2001:464). No similar prohibitions existed for white men (p.464).

Norval (2003:257, 260) describes the differentiation of ‘the Afrikaner’ through frontier effects that othered subjectivities manufactured in the discourses of: (1.) British imperialism and ‘South Africanism’, with the latter’s insistence on the equality of Afrikaans- and English-speaking whites; and (2.) African nationalism and its articulation with non-racialism. After the South African War, a discourse of moral panic about imagined sexual violation of white women by black men arose at the time of the founding of the Union of South Africa in 1910. Sexual danger and racial contamination were metonyms for less precise fears about chaos and social disintegration at a time of great economic and social changes, also in gender relations (Keegan, 2001:474). White men felt undermined as patriarchs and bolstered their masculinity by policing white women: ‘Defilement of white women threatened the purity of the race, it was unthinkable that respectable women could ever consent to black men being familiar to them’ (Keegan, 2001:474). Racial othering facilitated ‘a unity of conception of the world’ between Afrikaner women and men about how the social should be organised and the boundaries of ‘proper behaviour’ (Keegan, 2001:477).

Historians of sub-Saharan Africa distinguish the 1920s-1930s as a period of heightened contestation over gender relations across the continent (Thomas, 2006:461). Respectability as key element in constructing middleclassness was central in the Afrikaner middle class production of Afrikaner heterofemininity, as several authors have shown in discrete analyses of the 1910s - 1940s Afrikaner nationalist interpellation of ‘Afrikaners’. Afrikaner culture was defined in middle class terms and ‘belonged to “whites” [...] and the uncertain edges of whiteness had to be assiduously protected. The threat was poorer whites “forgetting” their true, Afrikaner identity, “losing” a “natural” race-consciousness and assimilating with their black inferiors’ (du Toit, 2003:173). Therefore, Vincent (1999:55) finds that middle class volksmoeders in their upliftment work approached white poverty as an oxymoron: ‘poor whiteism was regarded as a temporary irregularity which had arisen as a result of a lack in the moral and political structure of society’. This myth-making to obscure what du Toit’s calls the
'uncertain edges of whiteness' was necessary because the Boers lived 'on the margins of respectability', a cultural non-conformity that became charged after the South African War with the dangers of racial degeneration (Keegan, 2001:464).

Therefore those positioning themselves as middle class set out to draw the boundaries of good and bad, to ensure that the 'right' bodies were included to ensure the safety and security of the nation (volk) (Skeggs, 2008b:37). As is the case with other nationalisms (Hull, 1982:254; Erlank, 2003:659), the volksmoeder project involved cultural entrepreneurs tasking Afrikaner women with maintaining 'Boer manners' (Swart, 2007:51) and providing moral strength to the Afrikaner volk (du Toit, 2003:162). This duty of moral care for the volk extended to the NVPs (Vincent, 1999: 59). In an elaboration of British settler women's maintenance of boundaries between colonised and coloniser, given their assignment as 'colonialism's social border police on subliminal orders from racist patriarchy' (Dagut, 2000:558-9; Lester, 1998:519-520), middle class Afrikaans-speaking women organised in Afrikaner nationalist associations such as the ACVV were concerned with the recruitment and induction of young working-class women to save them from urban 'dangers', particularly miscegenation (Brink, 1990; Hyslop, 1995). Growing numbers of young Afrikaner women worked outside their homes in factories and were being forced to 'die stand en klas van die kleurling' [the station and class of the coloured], wrote cultural entrepreneur M.E. Rothmann in her column in the Afrikaner nationalist daily newspaper Die Burger in the 1920s (du Toit, 2003:172). The middle-class volksmoeders' particular concern should be whether these girls 'in fabrieke en winkels siel en liggaam aanmekaar kan hou – en ordentlik bly' [in factories and shops can survive and remain respectable], Rothmann wrote. The newfound economic power of young working class Afrikaans women posed a threat to the patriarchal strictures of Afrikaner families, which manifested in anxieties that they were sexually and socially out of control, with domestic violence increasing in response (Hyslop, 1995:63). As Skeggs (2008a:17) indicates, to become a viable subject who may speak herself, 'the working-class woman' has to 'fit into a particular mode of telling'. Therefore, 'helping women stay respectable meant “keeping” them blank [white]' (du Toit,
2003:174) and 'rehabilitating' them into the traditional family structures that 'the middle classes held dear' (Hyslop, 1995:64). Hyslop (1995) shows how white women's whiteness was contingent upon their and their children's 'honour', i.e. sexual propriety guaranteed access to whiteness (pp.76-7). Keegan (2001:474) regards 'honour' as a keyword yoked into a chain of equivalence with asexuality, purity, women's subordination and men's dominance.
Appendix C: A short history of white English-speaking South African (WESSA) identity and co-constructions of Afrikaner identity

Between the British seizure of the Cape in 1795 and the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910, English nationalism had been predominant, with Afrikaner and African nationalisms both presenting push-back discourses against English nationalist hegemony, exercised until 1910 (Johnson, 2012:3). British imperialists active in Africa in the 19th century projected themselves as a race-based aristocracy, in a discourse where ‘race’ denoted ‘nation’. For example, Cecil John Rhodes regarded the British as ‘the finest race in the world … the more of the world we inhabit the better for the human race’ (Barber, 1999:27). Victorian scholar Lord Acton described ‘other races’ as constituting ‘a negative element in the world; sometimes the barrier, sometimes the instrument, sometimes the material of those races to whom it is given to originate and to advance’. The British as the ‘makers of history’ and ‘the authors of advancement’ had the ‘duty’ to rule over ‘child-like natives’ ‘not unlike the obligation that decent Englishmen owed to women, children and animals’ (Fryer, 1988:67, 75).

Discursive hints at the subalternity of Afrikaner whiteness can be traced to historical writings about the Dutch settlers in the 1770s and 1780s. Johnson (2012:45-47) finds the application of French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau’s notion of racialised others as ‘children of nature’ in French travellers’ descriptions of both the ‘Hottentots’ and the Dutch settlers. The ‘Hottentots’ in their pastoral ‘state of nature’ are constructed as illustrating the benefits of ‘incultivation’. Similarly, the distance from European civilisation and the ‘pernicious influence of luxury’ nurtured virtuousness in the Dutch settlers as their proximity to nature and rural life meant they were ‘neither stimulated by artifice nor false decencies’ (Pagès, 1782:34 and Bernardin, 1773:205, quoted in Johnson, 2012:46). These descriptors resonate with (self-)manufactured Afrikaner ordentlikheid in the 21st century. Racialisation also included less favourable stereotypes: European travellers depict the trekboers of the late 18th century as ‘miserable and lazy’, differing from the Khoikhoi only in respect of ‘physiognomy and colour’, as their mode of land use and living was the same (Frederickson, 1981:36). Johnson (2012:116-139) discerns a British imperialist

By the late 1800s, the projection of Boers as ‘an inferior or degraded class of colonist’ (Keegan, 2001:460) continued in depictions of the Dutch/Boer settlers as lazy, slow-witted, ‘a simple race’, ignorant, and dirty, with Lord Kitchener concluding that the Boers are ‘uncivilised Afrikaner savages with a thin white veneer’ (Nederveen Pieterse, 1992: 104; Barber, 1999:18; Giliomee, 2004:150).vi Such discursive constructions (Steyn, 2001) exemplifies the racialisation of ‘subaltern forms of whiteness [...] as part of a process of constructing and anchoring a more dominant version set of interests and identities’ (Gabriel, 1998:98).vii In South Africa, Afrikaner nationalist discourse re-de-articulated terms denoting subordination, recuperating the 18th century discourse of Boers-as-unspoilt-children-of-nature to re-inscribe simplicity, ignorance and child and nature analogies as signs of Afrikaner innocence, uncorrupted mentality and closeness to God, as Johnson (2012:126) finds in the 1930s in the midst of Afrikaner nationalist mobilisation. Johnson (2012:130) found in 1960s Afrikaner nationalist histories of the 1795-99 rebellions further recuperations as the ‘rural degenerate’ was overhauled and relaunched as hospitable, brave and fair Christians -- salt of the earth.viii Such inventions served to suture ‘Afrikaner’ with ordentlikheid.

---

vi The oppressive institution of the 19th century bourgeois family sparked the rise of the first wave of feminism (Hobsbawm, 2003:279, 281).

vii The primary concern was about middle-class white English women descending to the level of labour, which subverted the class hierarchy and the respectable patriarchal male’s ability to be the sole provider to his women folk (Lester 1998:520).

viii ‘In 1924, 48 per cent of the total manufacturing work force in Johannesburg were white women, and this figure had risen by 1935 to an astonishing 73 per cent.’ (Hyslop, 1995:62)

ix Social Darwinist notions confirming the intersection of class and race abounded in comments such as that those that have slipped into a lower class where race mixing is rife can ‘climb up’ again (Rothmann in 1920s, quoted in du Toit 2003:173) and that the less qualified and inferior in each race would be prone to miscegenation (Hofmeyr in 1930s, quoted in Hyslop, 1995:73).

x The middle class discourse of family prevalent in 1920s-30s South Africa prescribed a distinct masculine and feminine separation between and within the public and private spheres (Erlank, 2003:656-7).

xi English novels of the late 1800s depicted the Boers as ‘slow-witted’, ‘fatalistic’, ‘childlike’ and a ‘simple race’. Burghers of the ZAR were dishonest, ignorant, backward and lazy. Paul Kruger was dismissed as ‘ignorant’ and ‘dirty’ by British colonial secretary Joseph Chamberlain (Barber 1999:18).
Lord Randolph Churchill used every derogatory perception in circulation at the time: ‘It may be asserted ... that [the Boer] never plants a tree, never digs a well, never makes a road, never grows a blade of corn ... He passes his days doing absolutely nothing beyond smoking and drinking coffee ... His simple ignorance is unfathomable.’ (Nederveen Pieterse, 1992:104) Positive stereotyping dubbed them hospitable, self-sufficient, peaceful, courageous and able to persevere.


Alongside the revamping of 18th century children-of-nature analogies, Afrikaner nationalist discourses ‘whitened’ Afrikaners with appropriations of civilisation, industriousness, Social Darwinist racial hierarchy, Christianity, and racial purity (van der Westhuizen, 2007:53-60).
Appendix D: Subjectivity, subjectivation and agency

Laclau and Mouffe (1985) use the term ‘subject position’, which is the result of the positioning of subjects within a discursive structure (Carpentier and Spinoy 2008:5). Subject positions participate in the ‘open character of every discourse’, which means these positions are never totally fixed (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 113).

Foucault (2004) analysed individuals as not some ‘multiple inert matter … struck by power’ but effects of power in that power allows bodies, gestures, discourses and desires to be identified and constituted as something individual’ (29-30). They are in a position to ‘both submit to and exercise this power’ (p29). Laclau (1990:41) concurs with Foucault that the subject is an ‘effect of power’: ‘The constitution of an identity is an act of power and [...] identity as such is power’ (Laclau, 1990:31, emphasis in original).

Ontologically, the social identities attached to subjects have no hidden ‘deep’ origin as they are outcomes of articulation and therefore contingent (Critchley and Marchart, 2004:4; Laclau, 1990:184). With the accelerated tempo of dislocations in a postmodern, postcolonial context, the subject is both ‘thrown’ into the world of signification with little choice while also grasping that contingency is a characteristic of that world and therefore other options and choices become available (Howarth, 2004:268; Laclau, 2004:323): ‘thrownness does not only show what there is, the givenness of a situation, but also the constitutive fractures of than givenness’ (Laclau, 2004:324). Thus, ‘even if I surrender to my inclinations, I cannot do so without me incorporating them into my maxim’ (Laclau, 2004: 324). Taking a certain course of action and excluding others is not only constitutive of the self but also means repressing other possibilities (Laclau, 1990:171-2).

Every identity is dislocated as it depends on the exterior that both denies it and produces its ‘condition of possibility’ (p.39). Particularistic identities are filled with specific differences, such as race, gender and ethnicity. An identity is forged through ‘presuming and enacting’ its difference/exclusion/antagonism from other identities (Butler, 2000:12,31). The extent of play of meaning within the social as discursive structure, the inevitable distance between subject and
object and the mutual subversion of identities (Carpentier and Spinoy, 2008:7; Butler, 1990:166) means that the constitutive outside ‘can never become fully inside’, thus every identity’s effort at self-closure never succeeds (Butler, 2000:12,30-1). The subject seeks to fill this lack through acts of identification with the hegemonic projects in the discursive structure: ‘the entire process of subjectivation, of assuming different subject positions, is ultimately to enable us to avoid this traumatic experience’ of ‘self-hindering, self-blockage, this internal limit preventing the symbolic field from realizing its full identity’ (Zerilli, 1998: 11). A single subject may identify with multiple subject positions, which turns the subject into a ‘masquerading void’ (Torfing, 1999:148-150).

While the existence of the antagonising force prevents the identity from being fully sutured, it is also impossible not to affirm an identity when threatening it (Laclau, 1990:27). Dislocation is therefore not only negative but opens up new possibilities, as no course of historical action is set in advance (Laclau, 1990:171,173). The failure and contingency of identities create the space for subjectivity, agency, freedom and particularity of human behaviour: ‘I am condemned to be free’, says Laclau (1990:44; emphasis in original), because of my failed identity. Thus, ‘the incompleteness of the structural identity constitutes the subject as the locus of a decision about how to establish itself as a concrete subjectivity with a fully achieved identity’ (Torfing, 1999:149). Therefore, ‘there is no source of the social different from people’s decisions in the process of the social construction of their own identities and their own existence’ (Laclau, 1990:193).

This ‘partial’ determination of the subject by its structural position charts a path between structure and agency (Laclau, 2004:322): ‘while human beings are constituted as subjects within discursive structures, these structures are inherently contingent and malleable. Once their “undecidability” becomes visible in dislocatory situations [e.g. the end of apartheid] when structures no longer function to confer identity, subjects become political agents in the stronger sense of the term, as they identify with new discursive objects and act to reconstitute subjects’ (Howarth, 2004:264). The deeper the dislocation, the more structurally profound the rearticulations will be, which expands the role of the subject and holds the possibility of a polyphony of voices of radically democratic struggles
such as antisexism, antiracism and anticapitalism (Carpentier and Spinoy, 2008:11-2; Mouffe 1985, 1997, 2000).

**Gender and sexing subjectivation**

Butler’s interventions fill a lacuna in the theorisations by Laclau and Mouffe and Foucault as she sexes and genders subjectivation. For Butler, what seems like the coherence or continuity of a ‘person’ is in fact a ‘normative ideal’, a ‘socially instituted and maintained [form] of intelligibility’. Ultimately, identity is ‘a culturally restricted principle of order and hierarchy, a regulatory fiction’ (1990:23, 33). Agency vis-à-vis the construction of sex-gender-sexuality identities is constrained because: ‘[a]cts and gestures, articulated and enacted desires, create the illusion of an interior and organising gender core, an illusion discursively maintained for the purposes of the regulation of sexuality within the obligatory frame of reproductive heterosexuality’ (p.31). As part of this process, the cause of desire is located within the ‘self’, thereby obfuscating its political regulations and disciplinary practices. This ‘displacement of a political and discursive origin of gender identity onto a psychological “core” precludes an analysis of the political constitution of the gendered subject and its fabricated notions about the ineffable interiority of its sex or of its true nature’ (p.185). However, Butler also shows how the destabilisation of sex-gender-sexuality identities can undermine their oppressive effects (pp.174, 185). Heterosexuality is an impossible ideal to embody and the persistent failure to conform fully and without incoherence exposes it not only as a compulsory law (in Laclau and Mouffe’s terms, the moment when sedimented political origins are revealed) but as inevitable comedy, a constant parody of itself (p.166). In the struggle against heterosexism, the replication of heterosexual forms in non-heterosexual contexts exposes ‘the utterly constructed status of the so-called heterosexual original [...] The original is nothing other than a parody of the idea of the natural and the original’ (p.43). Thus the sexualities that emerge are not merely reproductions of a masculinist economy of identity but deviate from their ‘original purposes to inadvertently mobilise subjects that push and expand the boundaries of cultural intelligibility’ (p.40). The multiplicity of the meanings of sex and gender ‘holds the possibility of a disruption of their univocal posturing’ (p.44). Thus the
regulatory fiction of heterosexual coherence can be disrupted and revealed to be a developmental law that regulates the field that it purports to describe (p. 174, 185).

The illusion of originality is a function of the ideology of heteronormativity (Butler, 1990:100), another key concept for the purposes of this study. Heteronormativity is defined as:

‘the institutionalisation of exclusive heterosexuality in society. Based on the assumption that there are only two sexes and that each has predetermined gender roles, it pervades all social attitudes, but is particularly visible in “family” and “kinship” ideologies. Heteronormativity constructs oppositional binaries – for example woman/man, homosexual/heterosexual – and is embedded in discourses which create punitive rules for non-conformity to hegemonic norms of heterosexual identity’ (Steyn and van Zyl, 2009:3).

Butler (2004:41-2) provides a useful elucidation of norms: ‘a norm operates within social practices as the implicit standard of normalisation. Norms may or may not be explicit, and when they operate as the normalizing principle in social practice, they usually remain implicit, difficult to read, discernible most clearly and dramatically in the effects that they produce. […] The norm governs intelligibility [...] imposing a grid of legibility on the social and defining the parameters of what will and will not appear in the within the domain of the social’ (pp.41-2). This is relevant to this study because, while normalisation provides always-incomplete identities with their seeming stability, analysing normalisation from a democratic position can reveal the power relations within a social formation. A discourse theoretical approach is alive to normalisation’s ‘smoothing’ effects on subject positions (Smith, 1998:34, 76, 92, 176). Therefore, as Nagel (2000:118) remarks regarding ethnicity and sexuality, the ‘sexualized foundations of ethnicity’ can be exposed in analysis ‘by examining the ways in which the rule breaking, policing, and punishment of sexual deviants serves both to challenge and to reinforce racial, ethnic, and nationalist boundaries and hegemonies and to strengthen ethnosexual regimes.’

Heteronormativity includes reifying the patriarchal family as ‘pre-political’ (Peterson, 2000:59). Its product is hegemonic masculinity (p. 60),
another term of specific interest to subject formation in this study. Hegemonic masculinity was conceptualised by Connell (1987) in an elaboration of Gramsci’s concept of hegemony with its emphasis on the potential for change rather than totalisation. After criticism, the definition was revised as follows (Connell and Messerschmidt, 2005):

- It is ‘a pattern of practice (i.e., things done, not just a set of role expectations or an identity) that allowed men’s dominance over women to continue’.
- It insists on multiple masculinities in the plural and is to be distinguished from subordinated masculinities.
- Only a minority of men might perform it but it is normative: ‘It embodied the currently most honoured way of being a man, it required all other men to position themselves in relation to it, and it ideologically legitimated the global subordination of women to men.’
- The concept of hegemony exposes compliant femininity and complicit masculinity. The latter refers to men who do not perform masculine dominance but benefit from patriarchy. Hegemony ‘meant ascendancy achieved through culture, institutions, and persuasion’ and does not necessarily require violence. It emphasises historicity, making available gender hierarchies to change through struggle and displacement: ‘…less oppressive… means of being a man might become hegemonic, as part of a process leading toward an abolition of gender hierarchies’ (pp. 832-3).

Peterson (2000) sexualises the concept and foregrounds violence against women and ‘lesser men’: Hegemonic masculinity is heterosexual, conjoined with the regulation of women’s bodies as sexual objects of masculine gratification; combining ‘masculinity as entitlement and control’ in inconsistent, complicated ways with ‘heterosexual practice as … power and violence’ (Peterson 2000: 60). Hegemonic masculinity is bound up with the ‘normalisation of exclusively heterosexual desire, intimacy and family life’, inextricable from the state’s investment in reproduction, enacted through policing of women’s bodies and maintaining the ‘heteropatriarchal household as basic socio-economic unit’; and
it normalises women's subordination and rape of women and feminine men (p. 60).

While Connell did not conceptualise the term in a poststructural frame, the Gramscian use of hegemony resonates strongly with Laclau and Mouffe's application of the term. Indeed, Kiesling (2007:268-9) remarks that hegemonic masculinity can be analysed as an effect of discourse as power/knowledge complex, in which one identity 'is valorised over another'. He finds multiple masculinities, compatible and competing.

Hegemonic masculinity co-constitutive other is hegemonic femininity, which has not been developed as a distinct analytical concept. Gill and Scharff (2011) proposes, as with masculinities, a multiplicity of femininities to destabilise notions of essentialism and emphasise social production. They draw attention to a problematic distinction in gender and cultural studies to study 'women' and 'girls', as opposed to 'masculinities'. They question the lack of investigation into hegemonic femininity in contrast to hegemonic masculinity. Such concepts allow new questions and new insights, they insist. This study examines the volksmoeder as signifier of the most revered femininity of normative ordentlikheid, a hegemonic femininity, in relation to which white Afrikaans-speaking female-bodies subjects are produced, policed and disciplined, activating failures, disruptions and refusals.

---

1 Reification can be defined as: ‘It’s basis is that the relation between people takes on the character of a thing and thus acquires “a phantom objectivity”, an autonomy that seems so strictly rational and all-embracing as to conceal every trace of its fundamental nature: the relation between people’ Lukacs (1971) in Harris (1995:281).
Appendix E: Tables 1-5 with data on research participants

This section contains all the tables with data, as referred to in Chapter 3 on Methodology.

Table 1. Number of respondents per age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Nr of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55-65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Marital and parental status of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Married (currently or previously) without children</th>
<th>Married (currently or previously) with children</th>
<th>Never married; not in relationship and no children</th>
<th>Never married; in relationship and no children</th>
<th>Never married; in relationship; with children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Respondents’ links to education system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents trained as school teacher and never worked as one</th>
<th>Respondents working as teacher, or retired (all &gt;55 yrs old)</th>
<th>Respondents working as university lecturer</th>
<th>Respondents with mother as teacher</th>
<th>Respondents with father as teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents reported the normalisation of education as 'the ideal career for a woman':

Yvonne (47): I wanted to study law my whole life or music the guidance teacher told me... maybe you should study teaching... I would become a murderer if I became a teacher it's not me women were absolutely forced into that 'it's the ideal profession for a woman... the boer omies [uncles] on the farm whose daughters were working after [completing school] and then actively searched for a man preferably a farmer with a farm and then they said to my dad why do you spend so much money on your girl children's ... education because they will just marry and have kids
Katrien (42): I was forced into teaching because it was according to my mom the ideal profession... [I told them] you can force me to study it but I will never teach and I established my own profession afterwards

Table 4. Respondents' professions outside teaching/lecturing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner of small hospitality business (Jhb, Pta)</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management-level post in large multinational firm (communications) (Jhb)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-level post in small/large multinational company (media)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level post in large multinational firm (media – Jhb; training – CT; telesales – CT; financial services – CT)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other self-employed (editor – Jhb &amp; CT; labour consultant – CT; welder – CT; handyman - CT)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior academic post</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level academic post</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Respondents' locations

Only two of the six respondents had spent both their childhood and adult years in one location. The interviews phase of the study therefore includes respondents that had lived in five of the country’s nine provinces and in a neighbouring state (Namibia, while it was under South African apartheid control).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Childhood years (mostly)</th>
<th>Adult years (mostly)</th>
<th>Location at time of interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monte Vista, Cape Town</td>
<td>Sea Point, Cape Town</td>
<td>Brackenfell, Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloemfontein, Free State province</td>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>Welgemoed, Cape Town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thohoyandou, Limpopo province; Stellenbosch, Western Cape</td>
<td>Johannesburg</td>
<td>Mondeor, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm near Wolmaransstad, North West province</td>
<td>Potchefstroom, North West province; Stellenbosch, Western Cape</td>
<td>Melville, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempton Park, East Rand (Gauteng province); schooling in Pretoria</td>
<td>Kempton Park, East Rand (Gauteng province)</td>
<td>Kempton Park, East Rand (Gauteng province)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windhoek, Namibia</td>
<td>Pretoria</td>
<td>Illovo, Johannesburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Consent form for focus group interviews (as translated – original Afrikaans below)

Consent form

I hereby agree to participate in a focus group discussion for the purpose of a research study conducted by Christi van der Westhuizen in fulfilment of her PhD in Sociology at the University of Cape Town. I grant permission for my contribution to be used for the purpose of the research, including publications, and agree to the discussion being audio recorded to ensure accuracy. I am aware that I can withdraw from the process at any time and can decline to answer questions. I am also aware that my identity will be kept strictly anonymous.

Participant’s name: __________________________
Participant’s signature: __________________________
Date: __________________________

Information sheet

Full name: __________________________
Profession: __________________________
Position: __________________________
Telephone: __________________________
Email: __________________________
Postal address: __________________________

Demographic information

Age ______
How would you describe the suburb where you live? Lower middle class, middle class, well-off? __________________________
Are you married/in a long-term relationship and, if so, how long?
______________________________________________
Do you have any children and, if so, how old are they?
______________________________________________
Toestemmingsvorm

Ek stem hiermee in om aan ‘n fokusgroepsbespreking deel te neem vir die doel van ‘n navorsingstudie wat deel vorm van Christi van der Westhuizen se PhD in Sosiologie by die Universiteit van Kaapstad. Ek gee toestemming dat my bydrae vir die doel van die navorsing, insluitend publikasies, gebruik kan word en stem in dat die gesprek opgeneem word om akkuraatheid te verseker. Ek is bewus dat ek ter eniger tyd van die proses kan onttrek en kan weier om vrae te beantwoord. Ek is ook bewus dat my identiteit ten strengste anoniem gehou sal word.

Deelnemer se naam: ________________________________
Deelnemer se handtekening: ________________________________
Datum: ________________________________

Inligtingsvorm
Volle name: ________________________________
Beroep: ________________________________
Posisie: ________________________________
Selnr en Telnr: ________________________________
E-pos: ________________________________
Posadres: ________________________________

Demografiese inligting
Ouderdom _____
Hoe sou jy die buurt waar jy woon, beskryf? Laer-Middelklas, Middelklas,
Welaf? ________________________________
Is jy getroud/in ’n langtermyn-verhouding en, indien wel, hoe lank?
________________________________________
Het jy enige kinders en indien wel hoe oud is hulle?__________
Appendix G: Consent form Individual Interviews (as translated – original Afrikaans below)

Consent form

I hereby agree to participate in an interview for the purpose of a research study conducted by Christi van der Westhuizen in fulfilment of her PhD in Sociology at the University of Cape Town. I grant permission for my contribution to be used for the purpose of the research, including publications, and agree to the discussion being audio recorded to ensure accuracy. I am aware that I can withdraw from the process at any time and can decline to answer questions. I am also aware that my identity will be kept strictly anonymous.

Participant’s name: ______________________________

Participant’s signature: _________________________

Background information:

Highest academic qualification (self): __________________

Highest academic qualification (mom): ________________

Highest academic qualification (dad): ________________

Highest academic qualification (partner): _____________

Occupation (self): _____________________________

Occupation (mom): _____________________________

Occupation (dad): _____________________________

Occupation (partner): __________________________

Years worked outside home (self): ______________

Grew up mostly in (town/city and province’s name):

____________________________________________________________________________________________

As adult mostly lived in (town/city and province’s name):

____________________________________________________________________________________________
Toestemmingsvorm

Ek stem hiermee in om deel te neem aan ’n onderhoud vir die doel van ’n navorsingstudie wat deel vorm van Christi van der Westhuizen se PhD in Sosiologie by die Universiteit van Kaapstad. Ek gee toestemming dat my bydrae vir die doel van die navorsing, insluited publikasies, gebruik kan word en stem in dat die gesprek opgeneem word om akkuraatheid te verseker. Ek is bewus dat ek ter eniger tyd van die proses kan onttrek en kan weier om vrae te beantwoord. Ek is ook bewus dat my identiteit ten strengste anoniem gehou sal word.

Deelnemer se naam: ________________________________

Deelnemer se handtekening: ________________

Agtergrond-inligting:
Hoogste akademiese kwalifikasie (self): ________________
Hoogste akademiese kwalifikasie (ma): ________________
Hoogste akademiese kwalifikasie (pa): ________________
Hoogste akademiese kwalifikasie (wederhalf): ________________
Beroep (self): __________________
Beroep (ma): __________________
Beroep (pa): __________________
Beroep (wederhalf): ________________
Jare gewerk buite huis (self): __________
Grootgeword meestal in (dorp/stad en provinsie se naam):
____________________________________________________________________________________________
As volwassene meestal gewoon in (dorp/stad en provinsie se naam):
____________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix H: Schedule of questions for focus groups

Introduction
Let’s go around quickly and can each person please introduce herself and just tell us briefly about her background?

Democracy
1. Introductory question: How do you feel about SA at the moment as a democratic society?

   Related questions for further prompts:
   1.2 How has the advent of democracy and the bill of rights in SA changed your lives?
   1.3 What is different now to how things were before?

Whiteness
2. What does it mean to be white in SA today?

   Further prompts:
   2.1 How has your life changed as a white person in comparison to how it was under apartheid?
   2.2 Do you think black people are better off now than before and if so, explain?
   2.3 Tell us about experiences about what it means to be white?

3. How much of a difference does it make to be an Afrikaans-speaking white as opposed to an English-speaking white in SA today?

   Further prompts:
   3.1 Zuma said Afrikaners are real Africans as opposed to white English-speakers. How true is it that Afrikaners feel more rooted to SA?

4. Do you identify as an ’Afrikaner”? Explain

5. Would you call yourself an African? Explain
**Femininity**

6. How is it to be a woman in democratic SA?

*Further prompts:*

6.1 To what extent are you enjoying the benefits of gender, sex, pregnancy and marital status and sexual orientation being protected in the bill of rights? Is it different to you than for your mothers?

7. Would you describe life since 1994 as different for men compared to women, and why?

*Further prompts:*

7.1 Prompts: How is life since 1994 different for white women, compared to white men?

8. What does it mean to be ‘feminine’? / What does it mean to be ‘masculine’? (real man/real woman? What does society think and what are your own ideas?)

**Heterosexuality**

9. How have things changed in terms of sexual relations since 1994?

10. How do you think women’s sexuality has changed since 1994?

*Further prompts:*

10.1 Are they expressing it differently? And younger women?

10.2 Is it okay for a woman who is interested in a man to make the first move and why? Sarie says you have to wait for them to make move?

11. Sarie says it has become more acceptable for a woman and man to live together without being married. To what extent is this true for Afrikaans-speakers?

12. How important is it for a woman to have children today?

**Middleclassness**

13. What does it mean to be ‘middleclass”? / What does it mean to be ‘poor”?

*Further prompts:*

13.1 What words would you use to describe it?
14. What has shifted for Afrikaners regarding class and the global consumer society?
15. How important is aspirational consumption? Explain.
16. What is your view on poor white Afrikaners?

**Summing up**
17. Volksmoeder: Is she still relevant? How has the role changed? Has she been displaced by the African nationalist mother of the nation?
18. Where is the Afrikaner woman positioned now? What is her role?
Appendix I: Schedule of questions for individual interviews

These questions are based on findings that emerged from the *Sarie* analysis and the focus group analysis.

**Gender / Race:**

Q: Some respondents said there were no differences between opportunities for Afrikaner women during and after apartheid. What do you think of that?

Q: What do you think of the expression ‘the woman is the neck and the man is the hand’? Some said it is automatic, others that it is manipulation. What are your thoughts?

Q: How do you understand the relations between black and white women? Do they have shared interests? Why were black women scarcely mentioned in the focus groups?

Q: Gay men seem more acceptable than lesbian women. Do you agree and how do you understand it?

Q: The dad determines the values in the family. Is this also your experience?

Q: In a focus group it was said that the food always had to be ready on the table when dad arrived, while in another there was absolute silence around the table. How do you make sense of these experiences?

Q: Domestic violence was only mentioned once in the focus groups. However, there are books today that show sexual violence inside Afrikaner homes during and after apartheid as a serious problem. Are you aware of this and is it true in terms of your own experience?

**Afrikanerhood / Race:**

Q: Is to deny that you are an Afrikaner not a way to avoid responsibility for apartheid?

Q: Do you think it is possible to expand the Afrikaner identity to re-include previously ejected people like Bram Fischer etc.?

Q: Can one reimagine the Afrikaner identity on the basis that Afrikaners are *ordentlik*?
Class / Race:
Q: ‘Afrikaners are obsessed with material goods’, it was said in one focus group.
What do you think about that, and why would it be so?
Appendix J: The patriarch, overseer of the volksmoeder

While nationalism is generally seen to be symbolised by ‘woman’, some have examined it as a masculine phenomenon (A.D. Smith, 1998). A reciprocal elaboration exists between hegemonic masculinity and nationalism: nationalist politics as accomplishment of masculinity makes available scripts ‘by men, for men and about men’ in which women are ‘supporting actors’ whose roles are determined by men (Nagel, 1998: 243,249, 251). Masculinity is a ‘centrepiece of all varieties of nationalist movements’ (Nagel, 1998:249).

Masculinity in Afrikaner nationalism was initially construed from the white Boer gender reconfiguration during and after the South African War (Bradford, 2000). Male opposition to British suffragism mobilised a discourse of domesticity, naturalisation of the gender division and the spectre of ‘manly women’, as ‘feminine women would not want to vote’ (du Toit, 2003:167). It crafted a signifying chain linking ‘the divine with men. For women, worshipping God entailed obedience to men – and silence in public’ (p.166). These were resurrected components of 17th century Puritan morality that equated the male head of the household with the authority of the male God, and with 19th century bourgeois morality and their productive reciprocities of:

- nation-state as object;
- respectability as bourgeois demarcator;
- and family within which patriarchal domination reflects the domination of the state over its subjects (Hull 1982:248-9).

McClintock (1993:69) analyses the ‘Great Trek’ as showpiece of Afrikaner nationalist historiography, with each trek ‘figured as a family presided over by a single epic male patriarch’. These meanings were conjured by the 1938 commemoration where each wagon bore the name of a great Great Trek male leader – except one, dubbed Vrou en Moeder [woman/wife and mother], symbolising woman’s ‘national identity [as] lying in her unpaid services and sacrifices, through husband and family, to the volk’ (McClintock, 1993:69). Vrou in Afrikaans indicates both ‘woman’ and ‘wife’. The conflation woman-wife-mother was fabricated in an Afrikaner nationalist poem about a demonstration of 4000 Afrikaner women agitating for the release of Boer general de Wet. In
contrast with the ‘active, women-led demonstration against the state’ (Swart, 2007:50), Cilliers sung the praises of passive, patriarchally disposed femininity: ‘I see her wait, patient, without word /I see her win, for husband and son and brother/ because her name is Wife and Mother’. The traction of the trope was demonstrated when Afrikaner women quoted the poem in a petition handed after a protest march in which 7000 participated to the Union Buildings in 1940 (Swart, 2007:54). Men represented the ‘political and economic agency of the volk’ while women were the keepers of tradition and moral and spiritual mission, a gendered division of labour signified by the volksmoeder (McClintock, 1993:71).

The shifting charge of ‘woman’ in Afrikaner nationalism is captured by Cloete’s (1992) comparative analysis of two promotional pamphlets (1926;1961) on the phallic Vrouemonument [Women’s Monument]. The monument was erected in Bloemfontein in 1913 to commemorate the women and children who died in British concentration camps during the South African War. The 1926 pamphlet was a text of mobilisation drawing on Victorian prescriptions of frail, tender, delicate and refined women offering their lives for ‘the freedom of the fatherland’. The 1961 text reflects male Afrikaner nationalists’ ascension to state power in that it made few appeals to either volk or women and rather listed the names of 51 men involved in the unveiling and the ‘physical erection of the monument’ (pp.48,50).

Afrikaner nationalist women’s political retreat after the 1930s and concomitant dilution of woman as volk symbol is further contextualised by discourses exalting ‘the patriarchal family tradition’. A normative text by Afrikaner nationalist ideologue Geoffrey Cronjé (1945;1958;Maritz, 2012) was reproduced with few changes and distributed from 1940s-1960s to address the ‘crisis in the Afrikaans urban family life’ (Cronjé, 1945:325;1958:171). The patriarchal family as ‘social cornerstone’ was the ‘purest volk inheritance’, synonymous with order and discipline, a bulwark against volksvreemde [alien to the volk] influences; its weakening caused instability, permissiveness and ‘spiritual-cultural impoverishment’ (Cronjé, 1945:325;1958:159,163). The Afrikaner patriarch ‘embodied the highest spiritual values of the young and energetic Boer nation: [...] its spiritual nobility [...] morality, volk pride, racial
consciousness, love of freedom [...] and whatever else was beautiful and noble and good in the character of the Boer nation. With the high authority vested in him [...] the plain boer patriarch lent authority to the pure values and virtues of the volk...’ (Cronjé, 1945:325;1958:42,163); the patriarch ensured that his son ‘maintained the mores of the volk and was an ordentlike mens’ (1958:41). Cronjé’s text, ostensibly an exposition on Boer family ways, issued a contradictory appeasement: the woman ‘acted as help to the man even though she did not lead [...] her place was not inferior even though the man was of much more “acknowledged worth”...’ (1958:57). The patriarch was the ‘ruler, priest, educator and manager of his family’ and its ‘central authority’ (p.38).

These ‘puritan’ norms of hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity, constitutive of ordentlikheid, were retained even as increasingly urbanised Afrikaners became more affluent and oriented to consumerism and materialism to signify success (du Pisani, 2001:158-161). Male-only occupation of political office and associated social and economic benefits during apartheid bolstered Afrikaner hegemonic masculinity's authoritarianism. The ‘male role of breadwinner’ and ‘man as priest’ continued to be emphasised during apartheid. Elements sutured are conformism to the group’s rules, abidance by leaders’ authority, ‘a self-image of moral superiority’, abjection of difference, and militarism (p.165). Public exposure of domestic violence since the 1960s disturbed the ‘good father’ projection (p.164). Du Pisani cannot detect a hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity after 1994 due to the loss of political power and contraction of power within the household despite elements remaining (p.172). Reading hegemonic Afrikaner masculinity against the performatives of its ‘crisis’, wrought by democracy, visibilises this masculinity as not only borderpolice with despotic licence but also the investment in it as symbolic pivot and carrier of Afrikanerhood.

---

1 The Dutch settlers (Voortrekkers) that left the Eastern Cape frontier in 1838 on what was later invented as the ‘Great Trek’ consisted of the following: ‘The basic unit was the white family head, plus white dependents, plus servants and “apprentices” [...] [following] the leadership of an important man’ (Curtin 1999: 69-70). This form suggests the reactivation of remnants of the frontier masculinity of the nomadic Dutch settler farmers (trekboere) in the late 1700s (p. 49): ‘Government was the informal authority of the male family head effectively ruling over his family and Khoikhoi servants, with a strict racial hierarchy of dominant whites and subordinate African servants.’
Appendix K: Dates and places of data collection

The following focus groups were conducted:

Focus group (FG 1), Bellville, Cape Town on 29 October 2011
Focus group (FG 2), Melkbosstrand, Cape Town on 5 November 2011
Focus group (FG 3), Craighall Park, Johannesburg on 12 November 2011
Focus group (FG 4), Emmarentia, Johannesburg on 12 November 2011

The following individual in-depth interviews were conducted. Names supplied are pseudonyms:

Johannesburg:

25 May 2012:
Individual interview (II 1): Andriette (age 56)
Individual interview (II 2): Nita (age 62)

28 May 2012:
Individual interview (II 3): Nerina (age 32)
Individual interview (II 4): Pieta (age 35)

Cape Town:

31 August 2012:
Individual interview (II) 5: Ansie (age 57)

3 September 2012:
Individual interview (II) 6: Katrien (age 42)
Appendix L: Recuperative racism in white spaces

The use of a racist term in a Facebook group, which caused a ‘huge debacle’, served as peg in Focus Group 2. This analysis reveals the operationalisation of what could be called a recuperative racism in white spaces, a racism reiterating this whiteness as supreme through a discourse nostalgically invoking apartheid everyday racism:

Corlia (59): Who of you still remember the word ‘boy’ [...] one day I’m driving this brand new Jetta of mine [...] in Pretoria and here comes this black man young man a boy on a bicycle [...] I am talking now of the ‘70s ‘80s he sped [...] into my car the bicycle falls this way he falls there and I stop [...] and I say to him ‘you shouldn’t ride on the pavement’ and [...] there he rides again [interjection: did you explain to the insurance] fortunately he wasn’t hurt he was totally confused when he fell [I] explained to my husband [...] ‘listen ‘n boy rode into my car’ we spoke in those years of a boy remember a boy was a garden boy it was the man who came to your house and worked in your garden after the debacle [she asked who remembered the word ‘boy’ in a Facebook Afrikaans literary group] my old dictionary says it’s a worker my ou verklarende woordoek se^ dis ‘n werker [Anke {46} laughs] [unidentified: a black man was called a boy] a garden or domestic worker

Lida (42): You shouldn’t go and look in the dictionary you’ll find gruesome things in the dictionary

Corlia: I [...] ask them ‘do you still remember the word boy’ because I realised how many words we don’t use any more [Liesl {64}: Yes, hey] and there’s a deathly silence yes of course we remember it and there weren’t really negative connotations attached and I say to them ‘it wasn’t an abusive name it was a [Liesl: it’s like klonkie] it was a benoeming [naming/designation] ‘boy’ means the man that comes to work in your garden (FG2)

In this iterative performance, whiteness rewrites the meaning of ‘boy’, a racist paternalistic term used during colonialism and apartheid to denote a black adult male (Nederveen Pieterse 1992), of which the appropriation from white English-speaking South African parlance is an ordentlikheid manoeuvre. This Regrouper discourse’s fixing of whiteness is revealed by its fixation on a term denoting black inferiority despite its wielding of injured innocence and ‘mere reminiscence’ about ‘terms no longer in use’. She justifies her use of the word based on its citation in the Afrikaans dictionary in use during apartheid. The obsessive repetition of the word ‘boy’ (eight times just in the above quoted excerpt) exposes the operation of power as re-iteration. In this case it is white power which is regenerated with every citation of the white supremacist norm.
Following Butler (1997), the moment for political agency to dislodge the law comes with every iteration. Her assumption of a position to reprimand the accident victim, instead of first ascertaining whether he is injured, confirms this as an example of the operation of whiteness. Ultimately, Corlia attempts to renew a whiteness for deployment in the here and now. Its operation as corrective to earlier elements deployed by another subject is shown by

- the assertion that 'boy' has no 'negative connotations' – Elsebeth had pointed out the hierarchising operation of racism
- Liesl latching the word 'klonkie' onto it – which was used by Elsebeth.

Corlia's naming of the unnameable, or what the democratic decentring of white power has rendered unnameable in public spaces, let loose a dynamic in the focus group. Only one utterance (about gruesome things in dictionaries) at first directly resisted Corlia's interpellation. Momentarily, at least, other subject positions shifted closer to that of Corlia's, as her discourse elicited an eruption of white performatives:

- Three examples were given of 'coloured' people using racist terms (klonkie and meid) to describe each other, which is a normalising manoeuvre (for example, Lida: Says Koos, 'that Griet that [Liesl: meid] meid angers me so maak my so kwaad' now now he can call her that but I can’t) and reiterates black subordination ('even "they" affirm their own inferiority').
- A respondent who is a former ANC member confirmed Corlia's reminiscence as just a memory and criticism thereof as 'forced political correctness'.