Texts in Black and White:

Co-constructing Racialised Identities in Post-Apartheid South Africa

Thesis presented for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in the Department of Psychology
UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

Itai Gartushka

Supervised by
Professor Don Foster

September 2019

DECLARATION

By submitting this thesis, I declare that the content thereof is my own work; that it has not been submitted for the purposes of obtaining a qualification at any other university; and that all the sources used or quoted have been attributed, cited and referenced.

Signed by candidate

Itai Gartushka

13 August 2020

ABSTRACT

This thesis poses the following question: are post-apartheid racialised identities constructed relationally? More specifically, this thesis investigates the co-construction of black and white racialised identities within the realm of South African public discourse. To this aim, it draws on editorials and letters to the editor which appeared in the *City Press* and the *Sunday Times* newspapers from 1994 to 2011. Informed by Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, the analysis focuses on the relationality between blackness and whiteness through a consideration of two major discourses. These discourses, labelled *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness*, are presented as templates for post-apartheid racialised identity construction. The analysis is comprised of three interrelated parts. The first part demonstrates that the respective templates construct racialised identities in terms of oppositional views regarding the apartheid past and the emerging post-apartheid future. Nevertheless, as each template contains references to the racialised other, it is suggested that racialised identity is co-constructed independently within each template. The second part shows that the way in which blacks and whites are positioned is constructed through constant reference across the two oppositional templates. In turn, it is suggested that racialised identity is co-constructed interdependently between the templates via an endless cycle of opposition. The third part delves into black and white subjectivities, revealing that the templates are neither wholly independent nor wholly interdependent. Instead, it is suggested that racialised identity is co-constructed through a set of entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements between blackness and whiteness. In this way, the thesis elucidates the post-apartheid tensions and complexities that exist around black and white racialised identity co-construction. Moreover, given that the vast majority of existing studies have presented black and white racialised identities as independent constructions to be examined separately within the respective fields of blackness and whiteness studies, this thesis highlights the fruitfulness of simultaneously utilising these otherwise disparate fields of study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

> *The power of the text lies in this life of its own. We are like parents, identifying utterly with our precious creation, but never able to actually be it. This other life can seem to dominate our own, so that one of the things that intimidates us on beginning is knowing that we have no way of knowing exactly how things will turn out, no way of predicting exactly how our text will grow up, no way of knowing for sure whether we have begun a monster or a miracle.*
>
> (Anderson, 2003, p. 2)

The above extract is drawn from an essay which formed part of the prescribed coursework reading during my first week as an undergraduate student. At the time, I could not yet grasp how (despite our best efforts to subdue or tame the text when we write) the text ultimately manages to retain a life of its own. Nor, indeed, could I imagine how the life of the text which forms this thesis would come to dominate my own. At times, it seemed as if this text was set to become a permanent fixture in my life. I would not have been able to complete this text without the assistance of the following people:

The staff at the University of Cape Town's Interlibrary Loans kindly assisted in sourcing material which was not available at the University's Library. In particular, I thank Anita Visser for making me aware of the SA Media database; your assistance in obtaining access to the required newspaper material spared me from having to deal with a whole host of additional bureaucracy.

Professor Don Foster gave generously of his time to supervise this thesis; you had the demanding task of steering me through the twists and turns of bringing this text to life. Thank you for guiding me gently; for your encouragement during times of uncertainty about how the text will grow up; and for your meticulous attention to detail. I am most grateful for all that you have taught me.

My mother witnessed the emergence of the many fragments of labour which have gone into producing this 'precious creation'. It has been a longer and more complicated journey to the finish line than expected. Thank you for being patient and for putting up with my constant refrain of "I have to work on my thesis".

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

In carrying out this study, I faced a constant underlying question: how do I write about racial identities some 25 years after the end of apartheid? Although racial identities have been rendered fluid and open to (re)interpretation since 1994, they are still grounded in a context that "remains racialised at the political, economic, social and psychological levels" (Stevens, Swart & Franchi, 2006a, p. 6). Furthermore, they are constructed in a context where neither the term 'race' nor 'non-racialism' is "precisely defined in any national legislation or any international instrument to which South Africa is party" (Stone & Erasmus, 2012, p. 22).[1] It is also not readily apparent how the continued use of racial categorisation in post-apartheid legislation has shaped racial identities. Certainly, policies such as Affirmative Action and Black Economic Empowerment have caused South Africans to debate the relevance of using racial categories in post-apartheid. However, the impact of these policies on racial identities is difficult to capture. From one perspective, writers such as Alexander (2007) have contended that the continued use of racial categories results in the reinscription of race and the perpetuation of racial identities. From another perspective, writers such as Seekings (2008) have remarked that "it is hard to imagine that South Africans' acute consciousness of race would vanish if the state was to abandon such administrative categorisation" (p. 8).

Given that this study cannot solve these context-based complexities, I reframed my question to ask the following: how do I engage with racial identities in a critical manner? There is a consensus among South African academics that racial identities are socially constructed. To take a typical example, Haupt's (2012) book is prefaced by a note stating that "racial identities are culturally, historically, and politically constructed" (p. xv). Similarly, in more nuanced terms, Erasmus's (2001) edited collection is prefaced by an editorial note which maintains that "there is no such thing as the Black 'race'. Blackness, whiteness and colouredness exist, but they are cultural, historical and political identities" (p. 12). While this study agrees with the premise that racial identities are socially constructed, it is also cognisant of the fact that the

[1] For a collection of articles grappling with the meaning of non-racialism, see the special issue of *Politikon* (volume 39, issue 1), prefaced by Kathrada (2012).

majority of ordinary South Africans see racial identities in an entirely different light. Summing up the matter succinctly, Alexander (2007) has pointed out the following:

> We must remember, however, that even though they are constructed, social identities seem to have a primordial validity for most individuals, precisely because they are not aware of the historical, social and political ways in which their identities have been constructed. (p. 93)

While racial identities have historically been fluid, MacDonald (2006) has contended that they were "frozen bureaucratically" (p. 47) by the apartheid state. In a sense, cases involving the Race Classification Appeal Board (see Ratele, 2009) reveal that such freezing was not absolute; some people certainly questioned and challenged the validity of the racial identities that were assigned to (or imposed on) them by the apartheid state. Nevertheless, following Erasmus (2008), it is possible to state that "for the most part, people came to see themselves in terms of these [racial] categories, thus making them subjectively real" (p. 172). Put another way, apartheid successfully entrenched racial identities because it relied on the "bureaucratization of 'common sense' notions of racial difference" (Posel, 2001b, p. 87).

In an echo of Erasmus's (2001) quote above, I draw on the work of American scholar Blum (2002) to assert the following: "races are not socially constructed; they simply do not exist. Racialized groups, however, are socially constructed, by the historical process of racialization" (p. 163). Elaborating in a later work, Blum (2015) recognises two things about the (racial) groups commonly referred to as 'black' and 'white' groups. First, he notes that they are defined by "distinctive social and historical experiences" (p. 27). Second, he notes that "racial groups were regarded and treated as if they were actual races . . . and this treatment, which can be called 'racialisation', deeply shaped the different groups' sociohistorical experience" (p. 28). Hence, talking about racialised identities allows one to acknowledge a process wherein races were treated *as if* they were real.

This brings me to several points regarding the style in which this thesis is written. Firstly, I have opted to use the term 'racialised' rather than 'racial' when coupled with the word identity or identities. While somewhat clumsy, the term serves as a reminder that black and white races are not real. In some instances, however, I have opted to refer to blackness and whiteness. To be clear, I use black and white racialised identity interchangeably with blackness and whiteness. Thus, for instance, the label of *Bold New Blackness* refers to the construction of

black racialised identity, and the label of *Enduring Whiteness* refers to the construction of white racialised identity.

Secondly, given that race and racial categories possess a supposed 'realness' for many people, I am mindful of the risk of inadvertently reinscribing race through this study. The majority of theses and dissertations on the topic of race in South Africa have taken a rather formulaic approach to guarding against this. They usually include a footnote which asserts that the given work understands race as a social construction; as something social as opposed to biological. Instead, I have opted to specify my understanding of race within this preface. Moreover, most writers attempt to remind the reader of their understanding of race throughout their text. They thus refer to 'race' or *race* rather than race. However, I concur with Blum's (2015) opinion that the use of inverted commas or italics for this purpose can be bothersome to the reader. Hence, I have deliberately opted to simply write race. Lastly, a comment about the labels used to describe the racialised groups which form the focus of this study. As a look into the country's history reveals, different label pairings have been used to describe black and white people at different times. While it is nowadays common to use the label 'black African' rather than 'black', the question of who is African remains contentious, with some whites claiming that they too should be referred to as Africans, hence 'white Africans'. Referring to 'black/s' and 'white/s' is not only stylistically simpler but also enables a clearer and more elegant discussion of racialised identity co-construction.

Finally, a few notes about the labelling of the data sources. Instead of referring to *the City Press*, I have followed the newspaper's convention of referring to itself as *City Press*. To avoid cluttering the body of the analytic chapters with long data-identifiers, I have referred to the newspaper data extracts by a shortened code in square brackets in the following format:
Newspaper title: CP = *City Press*; ST = *Sunday Times*.
Data type: E = Editorial; L = Letter.
Date of publication: 02/01/94 = Day/Month/Year.
Thus, for example, the reference [ST/E/02/01/94] denotes a *Sunday Times* editorial which appeared on 2 January 1994.

The list of data sources is, therefore, organised with reference to these shortened codes. For editorials, the title and original page number details are provided. For letters, the author's name and area of residence are provided, along with the title and original page number details.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

> *The meaning of race and the nature of racial identity are far more complex and ambiguous now than they have ever been before. The categories "black," "Afrikaner," "white," "colored," and "Asian" are no longer pre-fixed.*
>
> (Mbembe, 2008, p. 6)

Since 1994, South Africa has engaged with the implications of a decades-long immediate past of white racial domination under apartheid, and a history of racial discrimination entrenched over three centuries of colonialism. By the time of its repeal, apartheid's voluminous legislation had forged a thoroughly racialised society where race and racialised order shaped virtually all aspects of daily life. For instance, under the Population Registration Act, no. 30 of 1950, apartheid had classified South Africa's population into race groups, and then separated these groups by assigning them to racially segregated residential spaces under the Group Areas Act, no. 41 of 1950. The Reservation of Separate Amenities Act, no. 49 of 1953, had further ensured limited contact between race groups by segregating public facilities, while in more private spheres the Immorality Amendment Act, no. 21 of 1950, and the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act, no. 55 of 1949, respectively forbade sexual intercourse and marriage between whites and members of other race groups.

Against this racialised backdrop, more than two decades after the official end of apartheid, issues pertaining to race remain ever-present in messy and complex ways. Much of the complexity is rooted in the fact that while apartheid's legislation has been repealed, the new Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, Act no. 108 of 1996 (substituted by section 1(1) of the Citation of Constitutional Laws, Act no. 5 of 2005), has retained various references to race. As Stone and Erasmus (2012) summarise, race and race categories form part of legislation that 1) prohibits and thus aims to protect against unfair racial discrimination, 2) allows for fair discrimination based on race for the purpose of racial redress (e.g., the Employment Equity Act, no. 55 of 1998, and the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act, no. 53 of 2003),

and 3) specifies that data on race must be collected for monitoring the progress of racial redress (e.g., for the South African census).

Post-apartheid legislation prohibiting unfair discrimination has been widely lauded, particularly the Constitution's equality clause as contained in section 9. For instance, sub-section 3 of section 9 not only prohibits unfair discrimination on the basis of race, but also on the basis of "gender, sex, pregnancy, marital status, ethnic or social origin, colour, sexual orientation, age, disability, religion, conscience, belief, culture, language and birth" (Constitution, 2012). However, post-apartheid legislation allowing for fair discrimination on the basis of race has generated new areas of racial contestation. Questions about the implementation and merits of Affirmative Action (which falls under the Employment Equity Act of 1998) have led to heated debates, particularly within the context of higher education (e.g., Benatar, 2008; Soudien, 2010a). On a closely related level, efforts aimed at speeding up the progress of racial transformation and redress have exposed many everyday issues that remain racialised, and these issues have in turn become entangled in often fierce, and seemingly unresolvable, debates. For example, recurrent debates about the racial composition of national sports teams (particularly historically white, Afrikaner-dominated rugby) reflect the existence of a broader lack of transformation across sporting codes (see Desai, 2010). Attempts to remove the symbolic legacy of colonialism and apartheid through the renaming of streets and towns have often caused contestation (see Jenkins, 2007). In this vein, the 2015 student protest, under the banner of the #RhodesMustFall campaign, called for the removal of the statue of Cecil Rhodes at the historically white University of Cape Town. The statue's eventual removal generated much local debate and attracted international attention, fuelling debates about the need to decolonise various South African institutions – especially historically white universities. In 2016, under the banner of the #FeesMustFall campaign, the impetus generated by the latter campaign also prompted university students across the country to demand free education and reiterate demands for decolonisation. These kinds of debates and conflicts are reflective of yet another level; namely one which pertains to the experience of race in the post-1994 context. This level is perhaps the trickiest to capture. Unlike apartheid's generally predictable association of whiteness with privilege and blackness with oppression, the post-apartheid setting presents a much more muddled picture of racialised privilege and oppression (Durrheim, Mtose & Brown, 2011). Broadly speaking, blacks working and learning within formerly-white institutions feel alienated, and report that they experience racism and discrimination within these settings because of enduring white privilege, while whites, in turn,

claim that they are marginalised and discriminated against under a so-called reverse apartheid which favours blacks (Ansell, 2004; Cornell, 2015; Jansen, 2009). In sum, these various levels collectively constitute what Durrheim, Mtose and Brown (2011) have succinctly referred to as a context of 'race trouble'. This troubling context, in turn, forms the setting for the academic sphere's engagement with race, to which I now turn.

Since South Africa's transition from apartheid to democracy in 1994, scholars from a wide range of academic disciplines have devoted considerable attention to questions around race. A massive extant body of race-related literature thus reflects various attempts to capture and examine how race functions within the post-apartheid context. This literature also includes an astounding amount of material examining the progress of democratic change since 1994. In this vein, the recent twenty-year milestone of democracy has prompted the emergence of various edited works (e.g., Meyiwa, Nkondo, Chitiga-Mabugu, Sithole & Nyamnjoh, 2014; Vale & Prinsloo, 2014). Alongside this, one may also add works which have debated and assessed the progress of reconciliation amongst South Africans (e.g., Du Toit & Doxtader, 2010; Lefko-Everett, Govender & Foster, 2017). A review of how this expansive (and indeed ever-expanding) literature sheds light on race, warrants a large separate work in its own right. Hence, the review presented within the confines of this study is by no means exhaustive. Instead, the review presented in this chapter offers a broad outline of the main facets of the race-related literature, while the next two chapters provide increasingly detailed reviews of the literature pertinent to the core focus of this thesis. Moreover, I note that South Africa's race literature is located within a vast international literature. The local literature's interest in topics ranging from racial prejudice to whiteness can be traced to global (mainly North American) influences. Nevertheless, the South African literature has also shaped and become part of the international literature, and this is particularly evident in the field of comparative historical analysis. While an analysis of such a nature falls way beyond the scope of this study, I note that some works (e.g., Hamilton, Huntley, Alexander, Guimarães & James 2001; Marx, 1998) have attempted to tease out similarities and distinctions between the racialised contexts of Brazil, South Africa and the United States.

Mainstream books, intended primarily for laypersons, evidence considerable blurring between the voices of academics, social commentators, journalists, politicians and the like on issues of race. For example, Fisher's (2007) interviews with prominent and ordinary South Africans, and Holborn's (2010) interviews with opinion leaders in various fields, offer a broad sweep of

opinion on issues of race and racism that have emerged since 1994. In one vein, books such as McKaiser's (2012) *A Bantu in My Bathroom!* have attempted to encourage debate on issues which include race. In another vein, books such as Dlamini's (2009) *Native Nostalgia* have attempted to stimulate debate around our understanding of the experience of the apartheid past. From an altogether different perspective, humorous books such as Kilpatrick's (2010) *The Racist's Guide to the People of South Africa*, playfully present entrenched stereotypical understandings of the country's race groups.

Within the public sphere, debates about race-related issues are predominantly influenced by the occurrence of racially-charged events. Incidents involving inter-racial violence (see Holborn, 2010), and more commonly those involving allegations of racism, tend to spark outrage followed by contentious debates about the state of race relations and racial transformation. One infamous example is the video of the so-called Reitz Four incident, which surfaced in 2008. Made by four young white male students at the University of the Free State, the racist video was a statement about racial integration at residences and depicted five black workers participating in a so-called initiation ceremony (for a contextually-grounded analysis of this incident see Bryson, 2014). To this, one may add a multitude of smaller public outcries about racism which have arisen from social media posts on platforms such as Facebook and Twitter.

Though scholars have noted and commented on incidents such as the Reitz Four (e.g., Soudien, 2010b), the academic literature on race constitutes a distinct sphere with particular lines of focus. A large portion of the academic literature reflects a continuation of the traditional emphases of race research within social science disciplines such as psychology and sociology, albeit in a now different socio-political context. For instance, the measurement of race attitudes – a trend which began in the 1930s and persisted throughout apartheid – has continued to attract interest in the post-apartheid era (e.g., Durrheim, Tredoux, Foster & Dixon, 2011). Similarly, the closely related work on racialised intergroup contact since 1994 (e.g., Durrheim & Dixon, 2010) has its roots in studies carried out during apartheid. In a context now free of formal segregation, work in this line has explored (de)segregation not only at the broad level of urban areas (e.g., Ballard, 2002; Christopher, 2001) but also at the micro-ecological level (for a review see Foster, 2005). The work of Seekings and Nattrass (2005) has explored the changing relationship between race and class in post-apartheid, thus reflecting a re-exploration of the race-class debate of the 1970s and 1980s (for overviews on the matter see Posel, 1983; Posel,

Hyslop & Nieftagodien, 2001). Such lines of work, therefore, not only shed light on how race works within the new post-apartheid context but also lend themselves (within certain contextual limitations) to interesting longitudinal comparisons.

The studies mentioned above on whites' and blacks' attitudes towards each other, as well as those on contact between whites and blacks, are noteworthy in that they explicitly convey that various types of relationships exist between blacks and whites. I argue, however, that the majority of such studies are limited in that they do not pay attention to questions about racialised identities. Next, I therefore turn to the literature on racialised identity.

LOOKING AT RACIALISED IDENTITY

> *Who are we if we are no longer blacks, coloureds or whites?*
> (Vourc'h, 2006, p. xv)

The demise of apartheid in 1994 necessitated a reformulation of identity for all South Africans, and an ever-expanding cluster of literature has consequently focused on how post-apartheid social identities are being made and remade. The titles of edited books such as Distiller and Steyn's (2004a) *Under Construction: 'Race' and Identity in South Africa Today*, Jones and Dlamini's (2013a) *Categories of Persons: Rethinking Ourselves and Others*, and Zegeye's (2001) *Social Identities in the New South Africa,* readily convey the impact of post-apartheid on identity. An enormous range of books have thus examined the shifting of various facets of identity, including national identity (e.g., Chipkin, 2007; Peberdy, 2009), cultural identity (e.g., Kriger & Zegeye, 2001) and sexualities (e.g., Van Zyl & Steyn, 2005; Steyn & Van Zyl, 2009). In more specific terms, the new deracialised era has had a significant impact on racialised identities. As Klandermans, Roefs and Olivier (2001) have put it:

> South Africans are no longer just Blacks, Coloureds, Asians or Whites, but Zulus or Xhosas, Hindus or Muslims, English or Afrikaans speaking, male or female, lower class or upper class, living in Gauteng or the Eastern Cape, supporting political parties such as the ANC, IFP, DA or UDM, to mention only a few of those many social categories people are members of. (p. 91)

On one level, the expansion of possibilities for identification across a range of social identities suggests that racialised identities may have become less important in post-apartheid. Indeed, survey work by Klandermans et al. (2001) indicates that while 47% of respondents chose to

describe themselves using racial categories in 1997, this figure jumped down to 27% in 1998, then down to 17% in 1999, and down further still to 12% in 2000. While survey data from the Reconciliation Barometer (Wale, 2014) indicate that racialised identities have become stronger in the subsequent period – from 11,8% in 2003 to 13,4% in 2013 – the percentage of South Africans who associate most strongly with identities based on race has remained considerably lower than the figures reported by Klandermans et al. during the late 1990s. At the same time, however, this is not to assert that racialised identities have been rendered insignificant in the post-apartheid era. On another level, notwithstanding the need for racial redress, the post-1994 state has been criticised for following "apartheid designation by continuing to understand our society as made up of four essentially different races" and thus for displaying "a severe lack of imagination when it comes to thinking about society beyond racial categories" (Hendricks, Kramer & Ratele, 2019, p. 309). Moreover, the extant corpus of studies on racialised identities, which forms a distinct facet of the race-related literature, attests to, and is reflective of, the continued relevance of racialised identities in post-apartheid.

While this thesis limits itself to the study of black and white identities, it is worthwhile to note that the literature on post-apartheid racialised identity consists of five separate fields, namely: black, Chinese, coloured, Indian and white identity. As demonstrated by various monographs and edited collections (e.g., Adhikari, 2005; Erasmus, 2001; Peach, 2011; Van der Ross, 2015), there has been consistent research interest in coloured identity (for an array of material comprising this field see Louw, 2011). Though they are much smaller fields, there has been some research on Indian identity (e.g., Ebr.-Vally, 2001; Vahed & Desai, 2010) and Chinese identity (e.g., Park, 2008, 2011).

The bulk of existing research, however, has focused on the country's white minority, resulting in the creation of a comparatively extensive and voluminous whiteness literature. The reasons for this focus are various. Most glaringly, the fact that the post-1994 era no longer supported white racial privilege generated a host of questions around how whites were adjusting to living in a non-racial, democratic context. Moreover, the idea that whiteness encountered a so-called crisis following the end of apartheid, fuelled the perception that whiteness required urgent examination. One cluster of research has, therefore, examined whites' adjustment to the new dispensation. In this regard, Steyn's (2001b) book, *Whiteness Just Isn't What it Used to be: White Identity in a Changing South Africa*, served as the first major exploration of post-apartheid white identity. Stemming from such work, a related cluster of research has

concentrated on examining white resistance to post-apartheid transformation, and how white privilege is defended and perpetuated via discursive means (e.g., Steyn & Foster, 2008). Another reason for the focus on whiteness is that apart from research into poor whites during the 1930s (see Louw & Foster, 1991), South African scholars have paid scant attention to whites. The early 1990s, however, saw South African scholars being timeously nudged towards studying whiteness by the seminal writings of whiteness scholars from the United States, particularly Frankenberg's (1993) book, *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness.* As a result of this influence, studies about whites and examinations of whiteness are now found within an array of academic disciplines (see Chapter 2). In addition, books such as *Stuff South African White People Like* (Lander & Engler, 2014), demonstrate that interest in whites has become popularised.

Despite having a predominantly black population, South Africa's academic literature does not contain an extensive and defined field of 'blackness studies'. At best, it is comprised of studies scattered across various disciplines which can be cobbled together (see Chapter 2). When compared to the development of black psychology within the United States (see Ratele, 2004), South African psychology's contribution towards the study of blackness has historically been sorely lacking, with mainstream apartheid-era research on blacks having focused predominantly on labour productivity (Manganyi, 1973). Against this background, post-apartheid research on blackness remains limited. Except for the work of Mtose (2008) and Durrheim and Mtose (2006), as well as the unfinished work of Ndlovu (2012), there have been few attempts to investigate newly-emerging forms of post-apartheid black identity from a general perspective. Instead, recent research on blackness has focused quite heavily on the experience of being black within higher education settings (e.g., Cornell, 2015), with some studies within this cluster comprising PhD research (e.g., Kiguwa, 2014; Serote, 2011). The general lack of academic material on blackness means that novels, such as Matlwa's (2007) *Coconut*, and autobiographical reflections on being black (e.g., Ndlovu, 2013; Wa Azania, 2014), provide useful supplementary material on the complexities and dilemmas of contemporary black identity.

The fields of whiteness and blackness comprise a strand of literature which has shed direct light on the construction of post-apartheid racialised identities. However, since it focuses on specific (and thus isolated) racialised identities within separate fields, this literature has almost entirely neglected to ask substantial questions about the relation *between* racialised identities.

Given that this neglect is not readily acknowledged, one finds few observations about the co-construction of racialised identities while sifting through the literature. One observation is contained in Ansell's (2004) article. She notes that "whiteness and blackness as constructed categories of identity developed and evolved together throughout the centuries of colonialism and apartheid, constructing imagined notions of 'selfhood' and 'other'" (p. 7). Another observation is contained in the introductory chapter of Jones and Dlamini's (2013b) edited collection. They note that "talking about whiteness is not just about what it means to be white – it's also talking about 'blackness' and 'colouredness' and 'Indianness'" (p. 12).

While insightful in their own right, these kinds of observations are difficult to work with. The first problem is that they are scattered across disciplines and thus isolated. A lack of coherence between perspectives and approaches means that isolated works do not (or cannot) productively build on one another in a way that furthers our insight into how racialised identities are co-constructed. This problem is even evident within single works such as Jones and Dlamini's (2013b) edited collection, where "the chapters straddle academia, popular culture and journalism" (p. 12). The second and consequent problem is a lack of available empirical work showing how racialised identities are being co-constructed in South Africa. Within whiteness studies, academics such as Steyn (2004a) have been aware that South African whiteness has been co-constructed in terms of contestation between English- and Afrikaans-speaking whites. However, very few academics have attempted to take the notion of co-construction further by exploring co-construction in terms of blackness and whiteness. Where examples of such work exist (cf. Ansell, 2004; Fourie, 2008; Matthews, 2011; Robus & Macleod, 2006), the scope of analysis is limited (see Chapter 3). The third problem involves a rigid approach to studying whiteness. Writing within the field of whiteness, Nuttall (2001) has asserted that "both 'whiteness' and 'blackness' are ideas, lived experiences, and practices in the making. New studies now are needed urgently in order to help us understand the complexity of both, and to deconstruct often somewhat ossified versions of each" (p. 136). However, Nuttall's observation has not prompted researchers working within the field of whiteness to provide substantial contextualisation in terms of blackness, nor has it prompted them to include the concept of blackness in their analytical frameworks in a relational way. Moreover, considering the relative paucity of existing studies, it seems not to have prompted research on blackness in its own right.

In light of these problems and corresponding gaps in the literature, this study asks the following question: what is the relation between black and white racialised identities? More specifically, it asks: how are black and white racialised identities respectively, co-constructed in terms of each other, in the democratic, non-racial, post-apartheid context?

To be clear, the choice of focusing on blacks and whites does not imply that the study of race in South African society ought to be reduced to the study of 'blacks' and 'whites'. In this regard, the scholarship on race in the United States has faced a growing critique for its adherence to what Perea (1997) has termed "the Black/White binary paradigm of race" (p. 1213). Perea defines this paradigm "as the conception that race in America consists, either exclusively or primarily, of only two constituent racial groups, the Black and the White" (p. 1219). Within the South African context, a move away from this paradigm is exemplified by a recent study by Bob, Furusa and Little (2016), which deliberately focused on blacks, coloureds and Indians. Moreover, Perea argues that this pervasive paradigm has led scholars to either neglect all other racialised groups, or to produce limited understandings of such groups.[1] Indeed, the five separate fields on racialised identity mentioned above reflect unequal levels of research interest. Nevertheless, large-scale South African surveys on race-related issues continue to note and comment on the opinions and perceptions of all race groups. Alongside the deep awareness of race entrenched via apartheid, contemporary efforts to monitor race-based transformation have helped ensure that all race groups generally attract research interest and thus remain visible.

The focus of this study stems from an interest in how the new dispensation has affected not only the white minority but simultaneously also the black majority. In framing its focus along the rather neat lines of white minority and black majority, this study does not mean to suggest that other race groups have not been profoundly affected by the new dispensation. On the contrary, as Adhikari (2002) has suggested, due to their historically "intermediate status in the South African racial hierarchy" (p. 6), coloureds may be particularly affected. In this connection, there is a popular perception among some coloureds that they were not white enough to benefit from white privilege during apartheid, and that they are not black enough to benefit from policies of racial redress in the post-apartheid present. These kinds of perceptions

[1] For further discussion on the black/white binary, see the special issue of *Critical Philosophy of Race* (volume 1, issue 1), particularly the introductory article contained therein by Gines (2013).

suggest the fruitfulness of examining the co-construction of racialised identities across blackness, colouredness and whiteness. In presenting university students' experiences of interracial relationships, Jansen's (2017) book, *Making Love in a War Zone: Interracial Loving and Learning After Apartheid*, offers a glimpse into the possibilities of research in such a direction. Indeed, a project focusing on the simultaneous dynamics operating around blackness, colouredness and whiteness has the potential to reveal fascinating insights about racialised identity co-construction. However, the resources required for such a project would far exceed the space and time limitations of a PhD thesis. Moreover, it should be pointed out that this study's focus does not imply that blackness and whiteness can only be co-constructed in terms of each other. Indeed, the existing literature suggests that these respective racialised identities can also be co-constructed in terms of those others whom we may not immediately think of as constituting the racialised other. For example, Teppo's (2004) work illustrates that South Africa's mainstream whiteness has been constructed as a privileged and desirable positioning via numerous efforts to uplift the country's poor white population. Likewise, the work of Mtose (2008) shows that an ostensibly authentic blackness among rural blacks is constructed in contrast to a so-called inauthentic blackness among urban blacks. Once again, while these facets constitute interesting avenues for research on racialised identity co-construction, they fall beyond the scope of this PhD thesis.

To define the focus of this study another way, the central question underpinning this study arose from my sense of frustration with regard to the whiteness literature's failure to shed light on both whiteness and blackness (see Chapter 2). Thus, by focusing its attention on the co-construction of black and white identities, this study works towards addressing a significant gap in the South African race literature. In spurring on an almost non-existent link between the respective bodies of literature on whiteness and blackness, I hope that this study will encourage scholars to expand research in new directions. This study also contributes to the existing literature. First, it adds to the paucity of direct academic literature on contemporary black identity construction. Second, it provides a fresh take on white identity construction, and thus serves to deepen the already extensive literature on post-apartheid whiteness.

HANDLING RACE

> *Middle class South Africans, both black and white, frequently express the belief that drawing attention to race as a societal issue is anachronistic and harmful. To name race is taken to be racist.*
>
> (Steyn, 2001b, p. xxxi)

Amid on-going suspicion and mistrust between race groups, and people's fears of being perceived as racist towards others or of offending others, race remains an extremely sensitive topic to research in contemporary South African society. In addition to this, it is not uncommon to find significant contestation around race-related research. Virtually absent from reference lists in the contemporary South African whiteness literature, Crapanzano's (1985) ethnographic study on whites serves as a classic example of the risks of (improperly) conducting a study on race.[2] Moreover, as Hendricks et al. (2019) point out, troubling studies which "use race as a biological marker or characteristic associated with inferiority or superiority" (p. 310) continue to emerge, particularly from the biomedical sciences. A most recent example is an article which appeared in the journal *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, wherein the authors asserted that "colored women in South Africa have an increased risk for low cognitive functioning" (Nieuwoudt, Dickie, Coetsee, Engelbrecht & Terblanche, 2019, p. 321). The article evoked outrage and criticism from both the academic and public spheres, prompting the editors of the journal to retract the article (see Le Grange, 2019).

Against this backdrop, I faced a tricky question: how do I best examine the ways that blacks and whites are co-constructing racialised identities? While I will go on to discuss the challenges of researching race in the contemporary context in greater detail (see Chapter 4), it is worthwhile to provide a preliminary rationale regarding my choice of data for this study.

First, I considered the core aspect of obtaining data from both blacks and whites. Underscoring the challenging dynamics of bringing blacks and whites together, some researchers have taken the precaution of conducting focus-group interviews by selecting groups on the basis of same-race participants who know each other, and using a facilitator of the same race as the participants to conduct the interviews (e.g., Durrheim & Mtose, 2006; Erasmus & De Wet,

[2] During 1980/1 Crapanzano studied whites living in a village outside of Cape Town (the site of the study was subsequently revealed as Franschhoek). While the book received favourable reviews in the United States, it came under heavy criticism from South African anthropologists, namely for generalising from an unrepresentative sample of whites and for betraying informants' confidentiality (Hugo et al., 1990).

2003). Individual interviews have similarly relied on matching participants and interviewer by race (e.g., Lea, 1996; Mtose, 2008). Second, alongside this, I considered the sort of picture different approaches might yield. While it is possible to conduct focus group interviews or individual interviews in a manner which reduces complex racial dynamics, I contend that – within the constraints of the current study – only a relatively small number of participants could be interviewed. Therefore, I went on to seek data which not only minimised the complexities around racial dynamics but also provided a large-scale, generalisable picture of identity co-construction. Furthermore, rather than attempting to rely on people's recollections of racialised identity construction going back to the transition of 1994, I went on to seek data which could shed light on identity construction as it was happening at the time.

Accordingly, I opted for publicly-available data, in the form of editorials and letters to the editor, drawn from two English-language national Sunday newspapers (i.e., *City Press* and the *Sunday Times*) over the period 1994 to 2011. Although these data have limitations (see Chapter 4), Holborn's (2010) study on race over the period stretching from 1994 to 2009, demonstrates that South Africa's English-language newspapers are a rich source of data on race. Further, a number of studies have demonstrated that letters to the editor in the Afrikaans press (Fourie, 2008; Steyn, 2004a, 2004b), and letters to the editor (Gartushka, 2009) and columns (Steyn & Foster, 2008) in the English press, provide appropriate data for the study of whiteness.

This study recognises that newspapers serve an important role in leading and setting the agenda for public debate (Firmstone, 2003). As Holborn (2010) points out, apart from people's everyday lived experience, the media are an important source of information about race and racialised issues, and thus the media "have a unique power to set the agenda for discourse on race" (p. 2). At this point, it is important to highlight some further delineations of this study. First, despite the existence of a substantial debate on the matter (see Chapter 4), this study does not engage with the question of whether or not the South African media are racist. Second, existing large edited collections have explored the South African media's role in shaping identity (e.g., Wasserman & Jacobs, 2003; Hadland, Louw, Sesanti & Wasserman, 2008a). In line with such work, this study recognises that "the media do generate, corroborate and accelerate identity formation, just as they diminish, overshadow and negate it" (Hadland, Louw, Sesanti & Wasserman, 2008b, p. 3). However, while it sees newspapers as a useful source through which to examine constructions of racialised identities, this study does not seek to directly investigate how the newspapers chosen for analysis construct racialised identities,

nor does it seek to contribute towards the literature on the South African media. Third, despite the availability of generalised demographic data on the newspapers' readership, this study does not address how such data may influence identity construction. Furthermore, the choice of English-language newspapers is not linked to a desire to draw direct conclusions on how English-speakers (namely letter-writers) are constructing their identities. The influence of such factors on identity construction would be better addressed using a specifically-selected sample. Thus, although it draws on data which appeared in newspapers, this study focuses on the co-construction of black and white racialised identities.

OUTLINE OF CHAPTERS

The next chapter, Chapter 2, reviews the literature which has explored black and white racialised identities in South Africa since the early 1990s. Following a brief historical sketch on the study of race during apartheid and up to the present, the chapter begins with a review of the literature on whiteness. The purpose of the latter review is twofold: it seeks not only to illustrate but also to question the predominant ways that South African whiteness has been studied. In showing that there is a tension between two broad approaches to whiteness within the literature, I argue for a shift away from existing lines of focus. Specifically, I raise questions about what light the whiteness literature sheds on blackness, and in so doing reveal that blackness has not formed a meaningful part of the analysis of whiteness. Next, the chapter turns to a review of the blackness literature. Following a few comments on the historical background to the literature, I explore works which collectively constitute the field of blackness studies in South Africa. While arguably somewhat disparate, the works on blackness share a commonality in that they are saturated with references to whiteness. In conclusion, having reviewed the two bodies of literature, I argue against the predominant approach which keeps the study of whiteness and blackness separate.

Whereas the purpose of Chapter 2 was to argue that whiteness and blackness ought to be considered relationally, the purpose of Chapter 3 is to delve into the main forms that the relationship between whiteness and blackness has taken. To this aim, the chapter unpicks a range of race-related literature which simultaneously reveals aspects relating to both whiteness and blackness. As such, the literature reviewed here is different from that which was considered in the previous chapter. First, the chapter begins with an overview of the traditional strands of

mid-twentieth century research on race in South Africa. Although these strands of research evidence a strong interest in relations between blacks and whites, I argue that these strands have largely neglected to ask questions about racialised identities – particularly how racialised identities are being co-constructed. Second, then, the chapter moves to consider a broader range of race-related research which sheds light on racialised identity co-construction. While the insights gathered in this section are drawn from a wide array of sources, the discussion draws these together to form a coherent picture. Here, I argue that blackness and whiteness are not only constructed relationally through co-presence but also through opposition. That is, blackness and whiteness are constructed as binary opposites. The chapter, therefore, offers a lens through which one can begin to consider black and white identity co-construction in post-apartheid.

Chapter 4, the methods chapter, serves to structurally transition the thesis from the literature-based material reviewed in chapters 2 and 3, to the analysis-driven studies presented in chapters 5, 6 and 7. As such, it is comprised of two interlinked parts. On one level, the chapter serves to contextualise the material which will be analysed in the three chapters which follow it. I, therefore, not only introduce the two newspapers from which the data were drawn but also discuss the type of data being analysed; namely editorials and letters to the editor. While this thesis is not concerned with the country's print media per se, I nevertheless devote attention to how issues of race in the media and broader social context might shape the data being analysed. On another level, the chapter is about finding a suitable method for analysing the relation between black and white racialised identities as might appear in the data. Here I briefly sift through options for approaching the study of media texts and texts in general. Based on the central aim of this thesis, I argue for the applicability of an approach which draws on Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. Alongside this, I detail how the material was analysed and reflect on how I carried out the analysis.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 represent the analytic chapters of the thesis. All three chapters seek to reveal the dynamics around post-apartheid racialised identity construction. More specifically, the chapters focus on revealing how two particular discourses co-construct black and white racialised identities; discourses which I respectively label *Bold New Blackness* (*BNB*) and *Enduring Whiteness* (*EW*). Despite being linked by a common focus, each of the three chapters sets specific analytic tasks.

The purpose of Chapter 5 is to present the central tenets of *BNB* and *EW*. The chapter begins by broadly contextualising these two discourses against other discursive threads and perspectives present within the data set. Following this, the analysis turns to questions about what the two discourses under consideration are capable of achieving. Stated in the simplest terms, it is shown that *BNB* is primarily concerned with the construction of post-apartheid black identity and that *EW* is primarily concerned with the construction of post-apartheid white identity. Hence, the discourses of *BNB* and *EW* are understood as templates for constructing racialised identities in post-apartheid. Importantly, however, these templates are also shown to be oppositional. On the one hand, by looking towards the new, unfolding post-apartheid future, *BNB* promotes the re-construction of racialised identities. On the other hand, by looking back towards the apartheid past, *EW* promotes the maintenance of existing racialised identity constructions. Given that the templates construct racialised identities in contrasting ways, I suggest that each template works independently. Nevertheless, when looking at the racialised references contained within each template, it is evident that both templates construct racialised identities through references to the racialised other. The chapter, therefore, concludes that black and white racialised identities are co-constructed *within* each template, that is, at an individual template level.

If Chapter 5 provided a somewhat abstract consideration of the templates of *BNB* and *EW*, Chapter 6 provides a more practical consideration of how these templates can be utilised to construct racialised identities within the unfolding post-apartheid context. This is not to say that I aim to provide an evaluation of the success of these discourses as templates; instead, I aim to reveal how these discourses attempt to construct racialised identities in a context characterised by the fluidities and uncertainties of transition. The analysis thus focuses not only on how blacks and whites are positioned from the perspective of each template but also on what possibilities for action are made available from these positions. It is shown that whereas *BNB* attempts to reposition blacks, EW attempts to maintain whites' positioning. That is, if the template of *BNB* seeks to reposition blacks as leaders of a predominantly black country, the template of *EW* seeks to maintain whites' positioning as bosses over blacks. Moreover, whereas *BNB* asserts that blacks are best suited for crafting a successful post-apartheid future for blacks, *EW* asserts that whites are best suited for creating a successful future for all. Given what appears to be an endless cycle of opposition between the two templates, I suggest that the templates work in interdependent – rather than independent – ways. The chapter, therefore,

concludes that black and white racialised identities are co-constructed through constant interaction *between* the two templates.

Chapter 7 focuses on racialised subjectivities. More specifically, it aims to reveal what *Bold New Blacks* and *Enduring Whites* can experience. In bringing together the contrasting conclusions of chapters 5 and 6, I move away from the task of establishing whether the templates of *BNB* and *EW* are strictly independent or interdependent. Instead, I move towards revealing how racialised identity is co-constructed through these templates' independence *and* interdependence. In line with Chapter 5, it is shown that oppositional racialised experiences are shaped by entangling blacks and whites in ways which either reflect the unfolding post-apartheid future or the apartheid past. Put differently, while *BNB* promotes a new entanglement between blacks and whites, *EW* promotes the maintenance of the existing entanglement between blacks and whites. Further, given that there exists a tension between the past and the future, it is shown that oppositional racialised experiences are shaped by dis-entangling blacks and whites. In other words, *BNB* shapes distinct experiences for *Bold New Blacks*, and *EW* shapes distinct experiences for *Enduring Whites*. Again, in line with Chapter 5, this suggests that each template can 'manufacture' racialised identities independently. However, keeping the racialised other out through dis-entanglement risks eroding the very basis for racialised identity co-construction. In line with Chapter 6, it is shown that oppositional racialised experiences are also shaped by constantly referring to the racialised other, or through a re-entanglement of black and white. In other words, what it means to be a *Bold New Black* does not arise without reference to what it means to be an *Enduring White*, and what it means to be an *Enduring White* does not arise without reference to what it means to be a *Bold New Black*. This suggests that the templates 'manufacture' racialised identities interdependently. The chapter, therefore, concludes that black and white racialised identities are co-constructed through a set of entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements.

Chapter 8 draws the various parts of the thesis together in the form of a conclusion. Following a brief reiteration of the purpose of the study, the data on which it is based, and the method of analysis, the chapter provides a summary of the findings from chapters 5, 6 and 7. It then goes on to discuss these findings in light of the literature presented in chapters 2 and 3. Further, the chapter reflects on the strengths and limitations of the study and makes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

> *Whiteness without blackness; freedom without slavery; civilization without barbarity? The former deprived of the latter becomes meaningless.*
>
> (Garner, 2006, p. 262)

The preface of MacCrone's seminal 1930s book – *Race Attitudes in South Africa* – opens with the assertion that "the racial situation . . . has become almost an obsession in the minds of many both within, as well as to some extent beyond, the borders of the Union" (MacCrone, 1937, p. v). In a review of the accumulated race attitudes literature over seventy years later, Durrheim, Tredoux, et al. (2011) echo MacCrone's assertion by concluding that "South Africa remains a society obsessed by race" (p. 276). At an empirical level, much evidence exists to support the statement that many issues and everyday aspects of post-apartheid life remain racialised (Holborn, 2010; Jansen, 2009), and it is, therefore, reasonable to conclude that South Africans generally remain obsessed by race. However, this conclusion obscures the extent to which the obsession with race has been taken up within the academic realm. Although South Africa has been described as a laboratory for social scientists interested in the study of race (Heaven, 1977; Mann, 1971), the obsession with race among South Africa's social scientists has been surprisingly myopic and therefore limited.

First, taking a historical perspective, it is a paradox that apartheid South Africa's deeply racialised context produced a substantial yet analytically limited literature on race. In this connection, Posel et al. (2001) have noted that while race is an omnipresent factor in the many academic works that were written about and within the context of apartheid, the vast majority of these works neglected to probe aspects such as the social and theoretical meanings of race, or how power operates in racialised discourse. Particular aspects have also been neglected within the discipline of psychology. For instance, in a content analysis of articles in the *South African Journal of Psychology*, Durrheim and Mokeki (1997) found that during the 1970s, race was approached from a scientific perspective which failed to problematise its meaning, while the early 1980s saw a decline in articles on race despite increasing racial tensions within the

country. More broadly, Duncan's (2001) analysis of 22 South African psychology journals and monograph series (from their inception until 1989) revealed that out of 1980 articles, only 48 (or 2,4%) dealt with racism – an astounding finding in the context of apartheid.

Thus, Tobias's (1961/1972) *The Meaning of Race* forms an exception as one of the few South African works to indicate and critically assess understandings of race during the height of apartheid, as does Boonzaier's (1988) chapter on race which appeared towards the end of apartheid. A handful of contemporary studies have, therefore, attempted to expand historical understandings around race via the use of archival sources. For instance, some have explored the historical meanings of race employed for official racial classification and reclassification during apartheid (Erasmus & Ellison, 2008; Posel, 2001a, 2001b). Others have focused more specifically on the meanings of whiteness during apartheid (Ratele & Loubscher, 2010; Roos, 2009; Walker, L., 2005). Yet others have gone even further back, shedding light on whiteness from roughly the mid-nineteenth to mid-twentieth centuries. In this vein, the works of Bickford-Smith (1995) and Dubow (1995, 2006) have explored the rise and underpinnings of whiteness in South Africa, while Morrell's (1992) edited collection has focused more specifically on poor whites in Southern Africa.

The post-apartheid period has seen increased, but not altogether successful, attempts at a more thorough discussion on race. South African psychology has seen attempts to interrogate the concepts of race and racism (Foster, 1993a), to reflect on its racist practices during apartheid (Duncan, Stevens & Bowman, 2004; Louw & Foster, 2004) and to chart ways of moving forward appropriately in the post-1994 period (Duncan, Van Niekerk, De la Rey & Seedat, 2001; Nicholas, 1993; Stevens, Franchi & Swart, 2006b). Referring back to Durrheim and Mokeki's (1997) analysis, it is also evident that the late 1980s and early 1990s saw a shift towards discussions on race which took a political perspective, wherein greater emphasis was placed on the effects of apartheid and racism, particularly on black people. Despite these changes, Stevens (2003) has reported with concern that "only approximately one quarter of the publications in the South African Journal of Psychology address 'race' directly or indirectly from 1990 to 2000" (p. 191). More crucially, he notes that "very few articles reflexively examined the understandings of the 'racialised' terms that were utilized, and proceeded to employ them uncritically, either overtly as the apartheid state did, or as unquestioned constructs and symbols" (p. 200). Both these problems may be linked to the earlier-mentioned neglect of

examining race during apartheid. As Distiller and Steyn (2004b) have commented, there remains a "lack of vocabulary" (p. 3) with which to discuss race in the post-apartheid era.

Hence, there is a general lack of systematic engagement with the question of what race means or how it is commonly understood in contemporary South Africa. In one of the few texts to touch upon this issue, Erasmus (2008) has noted that South Africans tend to discuss issues of race in ways that either deny its significance via a discourse of colour-blindness or emphasise its continued importance via a discourse of essentialism. On one level, there is a debate on the appropriateness of using race as a criterion in effecting post-apartheid transformation and social redress. For instance, within the field of education, contributors to a special issue of the *South African Journal of Higher Education* (see Soudien, 2010a) have debated the use of apartheid race categories as indicators for advantage and disadvantage in the context of university admissions policy. On another level, there is a closely-related debate about the direction in which the meaning of race is, or should be, heading. Again, the field of education has provided analyses of how understandings of race are shaped within the context of now racially-desegregated schools (Dobly, 2001; Soudien, 2012). More broadly, works such as Erasmus's (2017) *Race Otherwise*, Mangcu's (2015) *The Colour of Our Future*, and Maré's (2014) *Declassified*, have, in various ways, attempted to provide new avenues for thinking about, and perhaps even moving beyond, race. The on-going nature of these debates illustrates that what race means post-1994, and by extension how it should be used, are issues that remain highly contested.

The second limitation emerges from the observation that, before the 1990s, very few studies shed direct light on white South Africans. During the early part of the twentieth century, the 'problem' of poor whites was one of the few issues to stimulate direct research – mainly in the form of commissions – on a particular segment of whites (Bottomley, 2012). The most notable example of such work is the Carnegie Commission's investigation, which in 1932 produced a five-volume report on various aspects of South Africa's poor white problem (Louw & Foster, 1991; Teppo, 2004). In a different vein, the work of Van der Merwe, Ashley, Charton and Huber (1974) provides a survey of white South African elites during the late 1960s. Based on a 1977 British Broadcasting Corporation documentary, Harrison's (1981/1986) book, *The White Tribe of Africa*, traces white Afrikaners' rise to power – with the caveat that the South African edition of the book omits quotations from banned persons. Lastly, there are a few apartheid-era examples of anthropological studies on whites (Crapanzano, 1985; Du Toit,

1974; Van den Berghe, 1964). It was only by the late 1990s that the North American field of whiteness studies began stimulating academic debates on race in South Africa, and on South African whiteness in particular (Posel et al., 2001). This brings us to the core of the second limitation, for, in as much as the field has expanded discussions on race in South Africa by providing a much-needed vocabulary, it has also constrained the scope of discussion through this vocabulary. For example, Distiller and Steyn (2004b) refer to whiteness and blackness in order "to specifically discuss structural and experiential positions *within* the artificial construct 'race'" (p. 5, my emphasis). The effect of this practice is that discussions have primarily ceased to explore the meaning of race itself, and instead devote their attention to particular aspects of race – namely whiteness or blackness. My discussion now turns to these aspects.

INTRODUCING WHITENESS

It has become common practice to begin reviews of whiteness studies by detailing the founding North American texts of the late 1980s and early 1990s (e.g., Steyn, 2003). While not discounting the importance and influence of texts by authors such as Dyer (1988), Frankenberg (1993) and McIntosh (1988), I steer away from such a template-type approach in the following review. First, the recognition that the field of whiteness studies has now come of age (Steyn & Conway, 2010) follows both from the field's international spread over the past 30 years, and its spread and application to various academic disciplines. These advances have meant that the practice of lengthily discussing the theoretical justifications for looking at whiteness has now become superfluous. For example, in an introductory article to an issue of *Ethnicities* focusing on whiteness, Steyn and Conway (2010) point out that "the contributors move beyond justifying their conceptual existence in the field to exploring new empirical and theoretical perspectives with confidence" (p. 284). Second, a review of the vast literature produced over the past 30 years far exceeds the scope and space limitations of the current study. As Gallagher and Twine (2017) remark, "the scholarship within this field [has] exploded with hundreds of scholars examining every conceivable facet of whiteness" (p. 1600). The enormity of a now interdisciplinary field is most clearly illustrated via so-called bibliographies. Compiled circa 2004, the Infinity Foundation's *Bibliography of Whiteness Studies* is a 182-page list of a wide array of material on whiteness, ranging from books, essays, journal articles and pamphlets, mainly from the North American context (Infinity Foundation, n.d.). At 143 pages long, including introductions by various scholars, a more coherently structured and modestly-titled

list, *Towards a Bibliography of Critical Whiteness Studies*, confirms that the study of whiteness has been taken up by a host of disciplines and that interest in the field has spread on an international scale (Engles, 2006). Third, this review is also shaped by the idea that the North American, or mainstream, literature is of limited comparative value to the South African context.[1] Following Teppo (2004), it is argued that "transferring a North American discourse [on whiteness] without significant critique to a South African context . . . is not viable" (p. 74). As such, I only touch upon the main trends in the North American whiteness literature and briefly comment on the unique contextual aspects of South African whiteness in comparison to North America.[2]

Trends in the international whiteness literature

Broadly speaking, the field of whiteness studies can be understood as "an interdisciplinary intellectual project aiming to unmask the power and structural advantages associated with whiteness as a social identity and location" (Bonds & Inwood, 2016, p. 717). Several authors have usefully attempted to provide overviews of roughly the same pool of North American literature, albeit from different perspectives and with different objectives in mind. Thus, although none of the available overviews is exhaustive, collectively they shed light on the literature's different facets.

From one perspective, the literature may be divided into waves. Hill (1997) locates the "'first wave' of white critique" (p. 2) within the literature of the early 1990s, that sought to expose and thus undo the invisibility of whiteness. Further, Hill identifies the emergence of a second wave of literature in the late 1990s. Here whiteness is marked by acts of terror carried out by whites such as Oklahoma City bomber, Timothy McVeigh. For Hill, this "face of terror" creates tension as whiteness attempts to remain ordinary but instead is rendered "terrifyingly ordinary" (p. 3).

However, Twine and Ghallagher (2008) have shown that whiteness studies may be divided into three temporally broader waves. They identify the first wave as emerging from the early twentieth-century work of W.E.B DuBois. This work recognised "how whiteness operates as

[1] For a comparison of the racialised histories of South Africa and the United States, see Fredrickson's (1981) now-classic work, *White Supremacy*.

[2] I note that there are examples of studies on whiteness in other African contexts, particularly on white farmers in neighbouring Zimbabwe – e.g., Huges (2010) and Pilossof (2012).

the normative cultural center that is for many whites an invisible identity" (p. 9) and how this invisibility is in turn linked to the maintenance of white supremacy. Twine and Ghallagher's second wave reflects Hill's first wave. This wave has seen contributions from critical race scholars including feminist theorists, critical legal theorists and historians, many of whom are black. Their focus has been on exposing the invisibility of whiteness by showing how it has been defined and redefined to maintain the material and social advantages of being white. The third wave is characterised by contemporary studies that adopt new and diverse research methodologies. Importantly, these studies interrogate how whites are constructing their identities in a number of international contexts which no longer automatically support whiteness (Twine & Ghallagher, 2008).[3]

From another perspective, according to Nayak (2007), the critical whiteness literature may be divided in terms of three distinct frameworks or approaches. The materialist approach has drawn on the work of Marxist labour historians and is aimed at abolishing whiteness. By contrast to the materialist approach of 'destruction', the work of feminists has aimed to reveal race as a social construction through 'deconstruction'. Lastly, by contrast to the deconstructive approach's focus on language and discourses, the psychoanalytic approach aims to uncover what is unconscious and unspoken about race, such as guilt and anxiety (Nayak, 2007).

From yet another perspective, the literature may be divided according to how it conceives of whiteness. Taking a sociological approach, Garner (2006) has shown that the literature in the United States contains at least five conceptions. Although some of the literature has understood whiteness in terms of invisibility, Garner maintains that this conception is problematic because it may be linked to that of absence and consequently even emptiness – factors which have traditionally led social scientists to ignore whiteness. Instead, he argues in favour of a contrasting set of literature which maintains that whiteness possesses content. The latter allows for three further conceptualisations to emerge, and these in turn highlight that whiteness operates as a set of norms; that it provides resources for those who are seen as white; and that class, ethnicity, gender and sexuality interact with whiteness to make it internally hierarchical (Garner, 2006).

[3] For a discussion on this third wave, which takes into account the accumulation of further studies, see Garner (2017), as well as the response by Ghallagher and Twine (2017).

Drawing on the above overviews, it is apparent that there are not only multiple approaches to studying whiteness but also multiple conceptualisations of whiteness. Thus, as Schooley, Lee and Spanierman (2019) observe, it is appropriate to speak of the existence of "various multifaceted, multidisciplinary definitions" (p. 531) of whiteness. Indeed, in the opening of his book, *Whiteness: An Introduction*, Garner (2007) stresses that "whiteness has no stable consensual meaning" (p. 1). Put differently, this means that "the concept [of whiteness] is slippery and elusive" (Kincheloe, 1999, p. 162). Following Nakayama and Krizek (1995), the difficulty in 'pinning down' the concept lies in the fact that "there is no 'true essence' to 'whiteness'; there are only historically contingent constructions of that social location" (p. 293). Although we may certainly attempt to 'pin down' the meaning of whiteness by focusing on specific historical periods, Kincheloe (1999) acknowledges the inherent difficulty in tracing a continually-shifting, fluid concept over time. As Frankenberg (1993) puts it, "whiteness changes over time and space and is in no way a transhistorical essence" (p. 236).

Despite the lack of a definitive, single definition of whiteness, it is possible to draw on the literature in a way which serves to clarify my usage of the term. To begin with, in line with the argument presented in this thesis, the following conceptualisations highlight that whiteness is underpinned by relationality. According to Kincheloe (1999), "most observers agree that it [whiteness] is intimately involved with issues of power and power differences *between white and non-white people"* (p. 162, my emphasis). Similarly, Schooley et al. (2019) affirm that "most conceptualizations of Whiteness centralize power, status, and identity associated with racial hierarchy" (p. 531). To take a broader conceptualisation, Helms (2017) sees whiteness as "the overt and subliminal socialization processes and practices, power structures, laws, privileges, and life experiences that favor the White racial group *over all others*" (p. 718, my emphasis). As Frankenberg (1993) explains in even broader terms, whiteness

> is also a relational category, one that is coconstructed with a range of other racial and cultural categories, with class and with gender. This coconstruction is, however, fundamentally asymmetrical, for the term "whiteness" signals the production and reproduction of dominance rather than subordination, normativity rather than marginality, and privilege rather than disadvantage. (pp. 236-237)

Since I shall go on to expand on the question of relationality or co-construction in the proceeding sections (and more especially in Chapter 3), I wish to briefly turn my attention to clarifying the connection between whiteness and white identity. In Leonardo's (2009) view, it is possible to distinguish between 'whiteness' which is "a racial discourse" and "the category 'white people' [which] represents a socially constructed identity, usually based on skin color" (p. 169). In the context of this thesis, however, I argue that the discourse of whiteness and the construction of white racialised identity are very closely coupled. As will be shown in the analysis chapters, the white racial discourse of *Enduring Whiteness* provides a template for the construction of white racialised identity. Thus, while I am aware of the distinction which Leonardo makes, I will at times use whiteness and white identity interchangeably. Moreover, in Garner's (2007) view, "whiteness as an identity exists only in so far as other racialised identities, such as blackness, Asianness, etc., exist" (p. 2). I, therefore, argue that the meanings of whiteness and blackness (and by implication, of white and black racialised identities) emerge in relation to each other (see Chapter 3). More specifically, the meanings of *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness* will emerge alongside each other in the analysis chapters.

Whiteness in South Africa

In their preface to a special issue of *English in Africa* – focusing on whiteness studies in South Africa – West and Schmidt (2010) take the view that "whiteness studies offer the possibility of revealing the largely invisible ways in which white identity continues to suggest normativity, even as this identity is undermined by contesting positions or critiqued from within its own self-regulating discourse" (p. 10). This view rightly captures the tenuous position that post-apartheid whiteness occupies; it not only has to justify its position within a context that allows voices of opposition to be heard but also to do so in ways that present its interests as compatible with the democratic ethos (Steyn & Foster, 2008). Yet, by conceiving of white identity as suggesting normativity in largely *invisible* ways, this view overlooks important particularities and, therefore, offers a historically decontextualised entry point into post-apartheid South African whiteness studies.

In contrast to whiteness in other contexts, South African whiteness cannot be described in terms of an invisibility of racial privilege. As Stevens (2007) has pointed out, in countries such as the United States and Australia, whites are positioned as a numerical majority. This positioning has not only made it easier to present whites' dominance within economic, political and social spheres as normative but has also enabled whiteness to function less defensively (Stevens,

2007). By contrast, whites in South Africa have always been positioned as a numerical minority among a black majority. This has not only made South African whites more aware of their whiteness than whites in contexts such as the United States (Steyn, 1999) but also fuelled whites' fears about losing control to (and of) the black majority (a fear commonly referred to as the black peril or *swart gevaar*). Efforts to strengthen and enlarge the white population during the twentieth-century thus included the social upliftment of poor whites (Bottomley, 2012; Teppo, 2004) and carefully-considered immigration policies aimed at attracting so-called desirable whites (Peberdy, 2009). Despite such efforts, whites' grip on power remained uncertain and, stemming from this position, South African whiteness emerged along lines which emphasised an on-going defence against a perceived black threat (Stevens, 2007; Steyn, 2001b).

Moreover, as Epstein (1998) has observed, the very measures designed to reinforce and protect whites' power and privilege, paradoxically served to expose the existence of whites' power and privilege. A point to be emphasised is that despite experiencing their power and privilege as normal, white South Africans have always been aware that they received such entitlement because they were white (Steyn, 2001a). For example, Ratele (2009) reminds us that apartheid's 'whites only' signs contributed to the glaring obviousness of white racial privilege. In this regard, Biko's (1978/2009) view of white South Africans highlights the visibility of white privilege to whites and blacks alike:

> Basically the South African white community is a homogenous community . . . of people who sit to enjoy a privileged position that they do not deserve, are aware of this, and therefore spend their time trying to justify why they are doing so. (p. 20)

South African whiteness studies

Given the radical changes that have occurred since the end of apartheid, the direct literature on post-apartheid whiteness is perhaps not as voluminous as one might expect. Writing in 2000, Steyn attributed the lack of literature to a "still embryonic" (p. 6) recognition that South African whiteness requires examination, while more recently Stevens (2007) has remarked that the field is simply "much less developed" (p. 426) in South Africa than in the United States. However, since the late 1990s, there has been a steadily-growing academic interest in South African whiteness. In this regard, Steyn's work on post-apartheid whiteness (see Steyn, 1999, 2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005, 2007; Steyn & Foster, 2008), particularly her book (2001b), *Whiteness Just Isn't What it Used To Be: White Identity in a Changing South Africa*,

has been influential in both stimulating and shaping debate. Some large-scale indications of this interest include the first academic conference devoted to the question of race in South Africa, *The Burden of Race? "Whiteness" and "Blackness" in Modern South Africa*, which took place in 2001 (Posel et al., 2001). More pertinently, the country's first colloquium on South African whiteness studies, *Interrogating Whiteness: Literary Representations of 'Race' in Africa*, was held in 2008, resulting in the publication of a special issue of *English in Africa* (see West & Schmidt, 2010). In 2013, an interdisciplinary workshop entitled *WHITEWASH 1: Negotiating Whiteness in 21st Century South Africa*, examined "the construction of whiteness in culture, theory, politics, society, space and lived experience in post-apartheid South Africa" (WHITEWASH 1 Programme, 2013, endnote). As evidenced by presentations at the Apartheid Archive Conferences in recent years (see Apartheid Archive Project, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2014), the Apartheid Archive Project (AAP) has also generated an interest in whiteness. Moreover, work within the AAP has generated material in the form of a book entitled *Race, Memory and the Apartheid Archive: Towards a Psychosocial Praxis* (Stevens, Duncan & Hook, 2013), as well as several journal articles.[4]

Schmidt and West's (2010) article, (misleadingly) entitled "Whiteness Studies in South African Literature: A Bibliography", provides a further indication of the extent of interest in whiteness. Although it is by no means an exhaustive list, the article usefully provides a list of 140 books, chapters and journal articles drawn mainly from literature studies. Interest in whiteness has also generated controversy. For instance, Van der Westhuizen's (2007) book, *White Power and the Rise and Fall of the National Party*, was temporarily banned after Eugene de Kock obtained an interim court order (later reversed) to recall the book and halt distribution and sale (Mhlana, Ndlovu & Van Schalkwyk, 2007). "Attempt[ing] to critically reflect upon what it is to be white in a country like South Africa" (p. 323), a paper by Vice (2010), entitled "How do I live in This Strange Place?", generated significant debate. Although published in an international journal, locally, the *South African Journal of Philosophy* devoted a special issue to engage with Vice's paper (see Jones, 2011). Less predictably though, Vice's paper also generated intense debate within the public domain, prompting the *Mail & Guardian* to publish responses as part of a special report on whiteness (Mail & Guardian, 2011). In addition to this cluster of direct

[4] Some material from this book also appeared in a special issue (volume 40) of the journal *Psychology in Society* (see Stevens & Laubscher, 2010). Material from the AAP has also appeared in a special issue (volume 16, issue 1) of the journal Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society (see Hook & Long, 2011), and a special issue (volume 40, issue 4) of the *South African Journal of Psychology* (see Bowman, Duncan & Sonn, 2010).

literature on whiteness, Stevens (2007) affirms the existence of a cluster of so-called indirect literature. In other words, insights about whiteness may also usefully be gleaned from a much larger and general body of work which encompasses issues of race and racism in South Africa.

Exploring post-apartheid whiteness

Post-apartheid white identity has been explored on several different levels that span various disciplines. The earliest level of exploration is characterised by discussion articles whose function was not only to highlight the relevance of examining whiteness in the post-apartheid era but also to suggest how such work might proceed. From anthropology, Sharp and Boonzaier (1995) posed some preliminary research questions regarding whites' new post-apartheid positioning, adding that "how white people make sense – or fail to make sense – of this changing world is a subject that needs to be added to the anthropological agenda in South Africa" (p. 64). From women's studies, Holland-Muter (1995) called upon white women to examine their whiteness, suggesting that they should consider how white privilege has shaped their lives, what it means to be white, and how being white may shape their efforts at promoting social change. However, in a discussion of how white women are defensive towards engaging with their complicty in a system of racism, Bennett and Friedman (1997) exposed the idealistic nature of the type of white, self-reflexive examination that Holland-Muter proposes.

Indeed, a range of studies have examined the discursive ways in which some whites have attempted to preserve and defend post-apartheid white privilege. Recurring themes across these studies indicate that post-apartheid whiteness is not only characterised by on-going privilege but, more importantly, also by an active defence of privilege.

Five years into democracy, Statman (1999) discussed the contrast between the lives of privileged, wealthy whites residing in the upmarket suburb of Sandton, and the lives of poor blacks residing in the neighbouring township of Alexandra. Pointing to indifference amongst many privileged whites to this contrast, Statman argued that whites' existence in a 'bubble' of privilege is underpinned by two mutually-reinforcing discourses: a discourse of amnesia concerning the racial inequalities and atrocities of the apartheid past, and a discourse of denial concerning the persistence of inequality in the present. A study by Ballard (2004a) that investigated how whites in Durban conceived of the links between apartheid's injustice, black poverty and white privilege, sheds further light on how some whites use discourses of denial to obscure how they benefitted, and continue to benefit, from white privilege. In a similar vein,

a study by Wale and Foster (2007) that looked at wealthy whites' talk about issues of poverty and development, found that the discourses used to talk about these issues served to defend white privilege.

With reference to the above studies, Steyn's concept of *white talk* (Steyn 2001a, 2003, 2004b, 2005; Steyn & Foster, 2008) forms a useful way to encapsulate the discursive strategies used by some whites to maintain white privilege despite the end of apartheid. As Steyn (2005) describes, white talk operates in ways which "obscure what is disadvantageous [for whites] to reveal, and to display what is disadvantageous to conceal" (p. 127).

In another line of work, studies have attempted to map whites' responses to the changes brought about by the new dispensation. If the apartheid era can be described as the consolidation of a project aimed at creating a 'white man's land' (Peberdy, 2009), then the post-apartheid era can aptly be described in terms of what López (2005) has called an era of 'post-mastery whiteness'. In a national survey of 1012 whites, conducted in 1987, Hugo (1988) found that 91,2% of Afrikaans-speaking whites, and 84,4% of English-speaking whites, disagreed with the statement 'life for whites would carry on as before' following black majority rule. Indeed, shortly prior to the 1994 elections, whites anticipated that they would face a future in which their lives would no longer be shaped by the advantages of the automatic race-based privilege granted to them under apartheid (Appelgryn & Bornman, 1996).[5]

In a report entitled *How White South Africans Have Dealt With the Apartheid Past*, Theissen (1997) suggested that whites face narrow choices. Drawing on data from a telephone survey of 124 randomly-selected whites from across the country conducted during 1996, Theissen argued that whites' post-apartheid responses could be classified along two opposing lines. On the one hand, approximately a quarter of whites surveyed exhibited what Theissen terms a 'post-apartheid syndrome'. This group of whites were more likely to glorify the apartheid past through a denial of black oppression, to support racist views, and to hold negative attitudes towards the new dispensation's values of non-racialism and democracy. On the other hand,

[5] It is difficult to assess how much racial advantage whites expected to shed. As Van der Westhuizen (2007) notes, during the period of political negotiations prior to the 1994 elections, whites had varying conceptions of how much power the National Party would hand over to the African National Party. The perception among some whites that then-president F.W. De Klerk had 'sold out', suggests that at least some whites feel that their post-apartheid positioning shifted to a greater degree than anticipated.

whites below the age of 30 were more likely to form part of what Theissen terms a 'rainbow generation'. Whites within this group were more willing to address the atrocities of the apartheid past and showed greater support towards the new dispensation (Theissen, 1997).

Subsequent works, however, have provided a much less dichotomous picture of whites' post-apartheid responses. Using a questionnaire aimed at revealing how whites have gone about negotiating their identities after the end of apartheid, a study by Steyn (2001b) discerned five discourses, or narratives, of whiteness from 59 whites. Collectively, these narratives illustrated that whites are positioned on different points along a continuum of possible responses. Insofar as the extremes of this continuum are characterised by whites who respectively resist and accept the changes brought about by the new dispensation, Steyn's study reflects a similar picture to that of Theissen's. Importantly, however, Steyn's study has shown that between these two extremes fall positions characterised by varying levels of acceptance and rejection towards post-apartheid change.

More recently, Jansen (2009) has posited that white Afrikaners have responded to the issue of the apartheid past in three main ways. One group has displayed an outright denial of the oppression and atrocities of the past, thus rendering the history of apartheid as unremarkable. Although another group of whites has been partially willing to acknowledge the horrors of apartheid, whites within this group remain eager to link this acknowledgement with a desire to forget the past. Yet another group consists of three sub-groups of whites who all readily acknowledge the horrors of apartheid. Here, similarly to Steyn's (2001b) findings, each sub-group is positioned differently in relation to past atrocities and in relation to a commitment towards transformation in the present (Jansen, 2009).

Third, in a slightly different vein, Soudien (2010c) has identified three discourses that varyingly reflect how white privilege is articulated among the country's white school-going youth. The first discourse, labelled 'global whiteness', is found mainly among white, middle-class English-speakers whose lifestyles are similar to whites in Western countries. This discourse encourages dissociation from the now black-run country and emigration after completing school. The second discourse of 'old-new South African whiteness' is found mainly among white Afrikaners whose identity and sense of belonging remains rooted in South Africa. Yet a lack of racial integration at most Afrikaans-medium schools, and influence from the older generation, has contributed to the maintenance of white identities that have not shifted

to accommodate an understanding of a country now governed by a black majority government.[6] The third discourse of 'new South African whiteness' reflects newly-emerging forms of white identity. These forms are characterised by an awareness of whites' role in shaping the country's history, and that having privilege entails responsibility which ought to translate into a commitment to the broader community (Soudien, 2010c).[7]

The range of reactions seen among whites confirms that South African whiteness is better understood as a set of 'whitenesses' than a unitary whiteness (Steyn, 2001b). Indeed, in an interview with West (2010), Njabulo Ndebele credited Jansen's (2009) influence in shifting his understanding of whiteness (see Ndebele, 2000) from one that was "too sure of itself" to a recognition that whiteness is "fractured" (West, 2010, p. 118).

Beyond the fracturing of white reactions to the new dispensation, fracturing can be seen along several distinct yet inter-related lines that in effect produce a myriad of fractures within South African whiteness. While these fractures fall beyond the scope of this study, they challenge the very idea that South African whiteness is an even terrain of privilege and sameness, and therefore require brief mention.

One major fracture is characterised by the distinction between the country's Afrikaans- and English-speaking whites. Steyn (2004b) describes the differences between Afrikaner and English white talk as follows:

> For English South Africans white talk in many ways serves a maintenance function. Afrikaans white talk, by contrast, is engaged in a much more active and aggressive constitutive role . . . (de)(re)constructing a positionality for the Afrikaner in the new society from a position that is experienced as weak in relation to both the African Other, who possesses demographic power, and the English Other, whose brand of whiteness comes with a powerful global backing. (p. 162)

Despite these significant differences, the majority of studies tend to speak of 'white South Africans' or simply 'whites', thus making it difficult to explicate the particular focus of the literature. Nonetheless, alongside Giliomee's (2009) major work, a number of studies have

[6] See Jansen (2009) for a lengthy discussion on how knowledge and views about apartheid and race are passed on from one generation to the next.
[7] Soudien's (2010c) article also appears as a chapter which is contextualised in his book (see Soudien, 2012).

focused on white Afrikaner identity in the new dispensation (Alberts, 2012; Davies, 2009; Fourie, 2008; Korf & Malan, 2002; Marx & Milton, 2011; Steyn, 2004a, 2004b; Verwey & Quayle, 2012; Vestergaard, 2001). By contrast, comparatively few studies have directly examined English-speaking whites (Foley, 1992; Lambert, 2008, 2009; Salusbury & Foster, 2004; Sennett & Foster, 1996).

Further major fractures are found along the following fronts. In terms of socio-economic status, Visser (2003) sees South African urban geographers' neglect of poor, urban whites in post-apartheid as indicative of the mistaken assumption that "white citizens are basically all the same, and can hardly be seen as a 'margin' to be engaged with" (p. 230). Similarly, in showing that poor whites have never enjoyed the same secure sense of privilege and respectability granted to their well-off counterparts, Teppo (2009) concludes that "it is high time to start looking at a [*sic*] white identity as something that has many different levels and shades. It is time to finally cut off the associations between wealth, pigmentation and respectability" (p. 232).

On another front, Ratele (2009) has illustrated how the apartheid state employed immorality laws which blended sexuality and whiteness to create "a racial, antagonistic, and sexually conflicted, masculine whiteness and a soft, subordinate, and supposedly asexual feminine whiteness" (p. 172). The context of the apartheid-era South African Defence Force shows not only how the state constructed white masculinity and citizenship, but also how the state created privilege and oppression within whiteness by attempting to enforce white heterosexuality (Conway, 2004; Jones, 2008; Van Zyl, De Gruchy, Lapinsky, Lewin & Reid, 1999).

On yet another front, there are works which have explored the fracturing of whiteness along gendered lines. For instance, white women's apartheid and post-apartheid self-narratives (Horrell, 2009; Nuttall, 2001), their post-apartheid experiences (Bennett & Friedman, 1997; Holland-Muter, 1995) and various literary writings on white women's identity (West, 2009) have attracted academic attention. A further fracturing of post-apartheid gendered whiteness is seen in works which delve even further by examining the identities of white Afrikaner women (De Beer, 1997; Van der Westhuizen, 2013).

Critiquing the studies

The preceding discussion reveals a tension between two broad understandings of whiteness, which may be read as a problem. Notwithstanding the important contribution of the above studies on the on-going defence of white privilege, the manner in which these studies have considered whiteness reveals a twofold problem.

Firstly, as Stevens (2007) asserts, a focus on "'the white identity crisis', 'white identity politics', and 'reverse racism and white marginalisation'" is linked to the risk of "generating a more palatable way of thinking around 'race' and shifting it to a place of greater comfort in which there is often the denial of privilege" (p. 428). For instance, Van Rooyen's (2000) book, subtitled *The Story of South Africa's White Exodus,* is a prime example of how overlooking (or indeed denying) white privilege allows for the construction of whites as victims of the post-apartheid dispensation.[8]

Secondly, by associating whiteness with privilege, these studies have conveyed an essentialised concept of whiteness. In the approach started by writers such as Dyer (1988) and McIntosh (1988), the purpose of looking at whiteness is to decentre it from its normative position of power. The bulk of South African studies concerned with white privilege have, therefore, intentionally looked at whiteness as a site of privilege in order to critique and attempt to disrupt its privilege. In Frankenberg's (1993) words, they have done so with an understanding that to look at whiteness "is to look head-on at a site of dominance" (p. 6).

However, this approach runs into difficulties in the contemporary South African context where white power can no longer be taken for granted. As Ratele and Laubscher (2010) point out, an examination of racialised power in post-apartheid South Africa requires a sharper, more nuanced approach than the crude assumption of white power:

[8] For a critical review of the problems with Van Rooyen's book, see Schönfeldt-Aultman (2009).

> In a country where most political offices are occupied by black people, it is crucial to be clearer in our talk of race and power, to consider the different manifestations of privilege with a little more sophistication, and *to work against the easy and ready ascription of whiteness with fabulous and encompassing powers*. A textured analysis of the power of whiteness will have to take into account much more than the economic and structural, and include, for instance, how racialised power produces desire and violence, and vice versa. (p. 85, my emphasis)

In sum, the South African whiteness literature is torn between adhering to the mainstream view of attaching privilege to whiteness and acknowledging the existence of a multiplicity of whitenesses characterised by varying degrees of privilege. From a methodological perspective, while it places the researcher on firm ground insofar as the purpose of research is concerned, associating whiteness with privilege risks presenting an essentialised view of whiteness. By contrast, the analytical usefulness of whiteness (as suggested by the mainstream literature) disintegrates the moment the researcher adopts a more contextually-based, non-essentialist view of whiteness that does not assume privilege. For Hartigan (1997) the solution to this problem involves steering away from "homogenizing accounts" of whiteness, whilst acknowledging that "the [conceptual] power of whiteness lies in its ability to describe the coherence of privileges that white people, generically, have developed" (p. 502).

However, this solution runs into several difficulties. First, I argue that the idea of coherent, generically developed privileges across whiteness is diametrically opposed to, and thus cannot be reconciled with, the idea of whitenesses characterised by varying degrees of privilege. Second, pinpointing a coherent set of privileges would necessitate homogenising the very category of 'whiteness' in South Africa. Following Steyn (2001a), we might alternatively look at whiteness in particular sorts of contexts. Yet the deeper we look at South African whiteness, the more we see that it is multi-faceted, and this moves us away from finding something generalisable. Thus, while a coherent set of privileges might be found among, for example, so-called resistant whites, a focus on such a group brings us back to the problem of essentialising whiteness.

As a way out of these problems, I argue that the discussion ought to shift away from the narrow confines of merely looking at whiteness, and towards a more inclusive approach that also looks at blackness. To be clear, this is not to espouse a return to the historical trend of leaving

whiteness unexamined. However, given South Africa's black majority population, a sole focus on whiteness needs to be weighed up carefully. First, as Dyer (1997) has cautioned, studies focusing on whiteness can perpetuate the historical trend of highlighting white people's concerns. Put differently, studies on whiteness may inadvertently draw attention away from black people's concerns. Second, in questioning the practical usefulness of whiteness studies in combating racism, as well as its general usefulness for black people in the South African context, Ratele (2007) has argued that

> the concept of whiteness does not appear to [be] the best way to proceed in thinking about the life of race and continuing the struggle against racism. While it may offer some possibilities in thinking about a privileged white subjectivity, I think it offers close to nought to black people, indigenes, and people of colour. (p. 435)

The neglect of blackness in whiteness studies

Rather than proceeding to ask what studies of whiteness in South Africa have collectively offered to black people, I approach the matter slightly differently by asking what understandings of blackness are put forward in this literature. Fishkin (1995) has written that the new academic views that emerged in the United States during the late 1980s and early 1990s, were responsible for a change in that context where "our ideas of 'whiteness' were interrogated, [and] our ideas of 'blackness' were complicated" (p. 429). While it may be said that our ideas of whiteness in South Africa have indeed been interrogated, it is difficult to assert that our ideas of contemporary blackness have been sufficiently complicated. The possibility for complicating blackness arises from the recognition that, like whiteness, the meaning of blackness has shifted in the new dispensation.

At first sight, seeking understandings of blackness within whiteness studies may appear to be a fruitless exercise since the field is concerned with *whites*. However, it must be remembered that the shift in black power in relation to white power has been highly relevant to post-apartheid whiteness studies. As Steyn and Foster (2008) have written, "the central question for whiteness . . . [has become] how to maintain its advantages in a situation in which black people have legally and legitimately achieved political power" (p. 26). In a similar vein, Twine and Gallagher (2008) have suggested that the latest international trend within whiteness studies is to focus on "how white privilege is maintained even as the prerogatives of whiteness are challenged by the new interracial social movements, progressive social policies, democratization projects and multiculturalism" (p. 5). This approach certainly forms a useful

lens insofar as attempts to interrogate white power within the contemporary non-racial democracy are concerned. However, I argue that this approach yields very limited understandings of blackness. Black people have generally only been considered relevant to South African whiteness studies insofar as their new position in the democratic context is seen as the source of white resistance or white discontent. Put differently, such studies treat blackness as something that merely forms an analytical backdrop to the study of whiteness. For instance, Blaser (2008) sees Steyn's (2001b) study of post-apartheid white identity as one example of studies which "focus primarily on understanding 'white' identity in itself and consider the relationship between racial identities as marginal to their analysis of whiteness" (p. 88). Similarly, Motsemme (2002) has observed that "most of the South African works . . . rarely link white women's positionalities and the ways these are entangled in the distortion of black female bodies and voices. They have rather unveiled whiteness as another kind of racial specificity" (p. 653). Since these studies undertake little, if any, direct analytical engagement with blackness, they cannot further (or complicate) our understanding of blackness.

Speaking about the young democracy's future, Ndebele (2000) has stated that "white South Africa will be called upon to make greater adjustments to black needs than the other way round" (p. 52). This statement seems to reflect a core assumption in the approach informing South African whiteness studies; scant attention is paid to black people because whites' (re)positioning is assumed to be the major site of change. This stance may partly be explained by the manner in which desegregation has taken place. Desegregation has radically altered relations between black and white South Africans. However, the race-based material inequalities of apartheid have had a profound effect on how desegregation has taken place. In the main, black people have attempted to move away from under-resourced and under-serviced traditionally black areas, and into better-resourced, traditionally white, areas. This, as Durrheim (2005) has argued, has resulted in an almost entirely unidirectional flow of desegregation. In this regard, Ballard's (2004a, 2004b, 2004c, 2005, 2010) work on desegregation in traditionally white suburbs lends strong support to the idea that established notions of white identity have come under profound pressure.

Nevertheless, I argue that the whiteness literature has failed to contextualise the changes experienced by whites relative to the changes experienced by blacks. According to Durrheim and Mtose (2006), being white remains a relatively unproblematic identity while "being black in the new South Africa continues to be a troubling subject position" (p. 168). This contention

is supported by a much larger study on identity post-1994. With reference to patterns of identification among race groups, Klandermans et al. (2001) have noted that "whites had a more stable and clear position in the South African society than the blacks, coloureds and Asians. The end of apartheid destabilised the position of the latter three. They had to redefine their identity" (p. 101). Admittedly, this could merely suggest that more research attention should be devoted to blackness. However, the matter becomes more complex when we consider that struggles for redefinition within black identity may be linked to black identity's embeddedness in whiteness. In this regard, Mtose (2008) has argued that in contemporary South Africa, "the ambivalence of black identity construction emerges from its encounter with whiteness and encounter with racism" (p. 157).

This leads me to conclude that there is indeed a major problem with the approach taken by the whiteness literature. To borrow from Blaser (2008), the literature "contradicts conceptions of 'racial' identities that look at the ways in which they were constructed and defined in relation with the other" (p. 88). However, before I can proceed to explore the possibility of an approach that considers how white and black identities might be related or co-constructed, it is necessary to review the blackness literature. I turn to this task next.

INTRODUCING BLACKNESS

Despite having a predominantly black population, South Africa's academic literature does not contain an extensive and defined field of 'blackness studies'. The general lack of research on blacks is thus another paradox of the country's analytically-limited literature on race. A review of apartheid-era research on blackness reveals that most of the research is a product of direct white influence. That is, white economic interests generally dictated the focus and extent of whites' research on blacks. As Manganyi (1973) has correctly observed, studies on blacks have generally only "been considered valuable to the extent that they have offered clues relevant to the possible harnessing of the black labour force for the benefit of industry and commerce" (p. 9). Indeed, "the most intensive psychological research on Africans and the development of sophisticated tests for expropriating African labour" (Bulhan, 1993, p. 23) emerged from the country's National Institute for Personnel Research (NIPR).

In this regard, Terre Blanche and Seedat's (2001) analysis of 836 NIPR project titles from 1946 to 1984 is revealing. It not only looks at the changing racial terminology used to label black

people over time but also at how these labels were linked to particular descriptions, which were in turn coupled or matched with prescribed roles deemed suitable for black labour. Their analysis found that from 1946 to 1962, references to 'Africans' were associated with a discourse seeking to reveal Africans' supposed essential nature, while references to 'natives' were associated with a functionalist discourse concerned with how best to exploit this nature among the labour pool – namely via the development of procedures for classifying and selecting labour. With the use of the term 'Bantu' from 1959 to 1973, the essentialist discourse was expanded to accommodate aspects including Bantu motivations, preferences and expectations. Likewise, the functionalist discourse began to include scope for worker education and advancement to supervisory positions. Lastly, as the label 'black' came into dominant use from 1974 to 1984, there was a further shift towards training and educating blacks for managerial and supervisory roles.

While there are clear shifts in the picture of blackness that emerges from these racialised discourses, there is also a static element which leads Terre Blanche and Seedat to conclude with a cautionary note:

> Despite this clear progression from manual (native), to semi-skilled (Bantu), to skilled (black) work, the [black person] nevertheless remains the objectified other who must be scrutinised to ensure that he or she can be appropriately placed as a servant of the [white] industrial economy. (p. 73)

Closely linked to the interest in black labour, is a line of anthropological research focusing on blacks living in urban settings. During the early 1960s, a trilogy of books emerged as a series entitled *Xhosa in Town*, these collectively forming parts of a larger project entitled *Studies of the Bantu-Speaking Population of East London, Cape Province*. Here we find the first major demographic survey on urban blacks (Reader, 1961), which subsequently underpins a focus on black migrant workers (Mayer, 1961/1971), as well as on those considered truly urbanised (Pauw, 1963/1969). Similarly, Wilson and Mafeje's (1963) study of the social groups living in the black township of Langa, near Cape Town, distinguishes three broad categorisations of blackness: the rurally-based migrant labourers, the semi-urbanised who are attempting assimilation into urban life, and the truly urbanised 'townsmen'. However, as Packard's (1989) analysis of South African medical discourses reminds us, these categories were entangled in myths that constructed urban and rural blackness in ways that served both segregationist policies and the labour requirements of industry.

On the whole, apartheid-era social science research neglected to shed light on black people's lived experiences, to the extent that it "render[ed] blacks and their psychosocial experiences invisible" (Seedat, 2001a). Among white researchers, one significant exception is Cock's (1980) work, *Maids and Madams*, which highlighted experiences of exploitation among black female domestic workers. A further aspect to note is that the voices of black academics were excluded or rendered very faint within mainstream publications. For example, as Seedat (2001b) has shown by looking at authorship by race across seven psychological journals from the period 1948 to 1988, only 4,3% of authors were black while 90,9% were white. It is therefore highly significant that published material about the black experience during the 1970s has come from blacks themselves. First, the work of Manganyi (1973) stands out not only because it is written by one of the few black clinical psychologists during apartheid, but also because it looks directly at the experience of being black. Second, the Black Consciousness writings of Biko (1978/2009) shed light on the black experience from a politicised perspective. Third, one may add autobiographical works such as Mathabane's (1986/1998) *Kaffir Boy,* detailing life in the township of Alexandra during the 1960s and 1970s.

Blackness post-1994

The post-1994 era has created the possibility for both a radically altered and a more varied lived experience among black South Africans. Despite this, research about contemporary blackness has not expanded at the same rate as research about whiteness, and thus substantial dedicated studies are sorely lacking. Mtose's (2008) PhD study, *An Emerging Black Identity in Contemporary South Africa,* forms the only major direct investigation of post-apartheid black identity.[9] Based on autobiographical interviews, it is limited to a small sample of 20 women and 15 men, restricted to the Eastern Cape, Kwazulu-Natal and Gauteng. The sample is further stratified in terms of 25 adults and 10 young adults, allowing the study to compare and contrast black people's experiences both during and after apartheid. It is a loss that Ndlovu's (2012) PhD study, *Questioning Constructions of Black Identities in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Cross-Generational Narratives*, was incomplete at the time of his death. As the available document is an amalgam of published material, unpublished papers, and work done towards the PhD, it provides limited insights on black identity. Although Carton, Laband and

[9] Despite its significance as the only completed PhD study on the subject in South Africa, Mtose's work has not been widely disseminated. It is unfortunate that the two published articles stemming from her PhD (see Mtose, 2011; Mtose & Bayaga, 2011) appear with numerous grammatical errors in an online journal of dubious standing.

Sithole's (2008) substantial edited book, *Zulu Identities: Being Zulu, Past and Present*, sheds light on black identity, its emphasis is primarily on questions around Zulu identity.

More broadly, the existing literature on blackness is fragmented across perspectives from different disciplines, making it difficult to define the boundaries of South African blackness studies as a field. New insights about a changing blackness may thus be gleaned from scattered research. One line of research has focused on the emergence of the so-called 'black diamonds'[10] (Donaldson, Mehlomakhulu, Darkey, Dyssel & Siyongwana, 2013; Nemavhandu, 2008; UCT Unilever, 2006, 2007). Another line of research, predominantly within the field of education, reveals how young black school-goers construct new and adaptive racialised identities (Dolby, 2001; McKinney, 2007; Soudien, 2012). The impact of apartheid on black children (Foster, 1993b, 1994), and the impact of apartheid and the democratic transition on black adolescent identity (Stevens & Lockhat, 1997) are issues that have received some attention. There have also been some explorations of blackness via the lens of gender. The work of Ratele (1998a, 1998b, 2003) has engaged with questions about black masculinity. Similarly, several authors have explored black women's racialised experiences of the post-apartheid present, as well as their experiences and accounts of the apartheid past (Ginsburg, 2011; Mkhize, 2005; Motsemme, 2002; Sullivan & Stevens, 2010). Questions about the struggle to attain an 'authentic' black identity have perhaps best been addressed by blacks writing about their own experience (Ndlovu, 2013; Ratele, 2013; Wa Azania, 2014) and within works such as Matlwa's (2007) novel, *Coconut*. In a more specific domain, the experience of blacks within higher education settings has generated sustained research interest. This domain has explored the experience of black students at Medical School (Erasmus & De Wet, 2003; Perez, Ahmed & London, 2012; Serote, 2011), and the experience of black students (Cornell, 2015; Kiguwa, 2014; Sennett, Finchilescu, Gibson & Strauss, 2003) and black academic staff (Jawitz, 2012; Ngazimbi, 2006) within universities.

South African blackness studies

The field of blackness studies in South Africa is hence best understood as an amalgam of literature consisting of insights taken from different perspectives. Certainly, as has already been argued concerning whiteness, blackness itself is not monolithic. As such, borrowing from different perspectives is necessary in order to reveal that the nature of blackness is fractured

[10] The term 'black diamonds' refers to members of the country's expanding black middle class.

rather than essentialised. Nevertheless, we can discern several main, though interlocking and overlapping, debates or lines of interest running through this amalgam.

The first line of interest concerns the theorisation of black identity. A cursory reading of discussions about South African blackness reveals that scholars generally refer to colonialism, apartheid and the black liberation struggle as key events in the shaping of black identity. Upon closer scrutiny, however, it is evident that different scholars hold different views about the impact of these events.

With regard to colonialism, there is broad agreement that whites' arrival markedly changed the identities of the native population. In Abdi's (1999) view, "before the arrival of the first European settlers, one can safely assume that the indigenous population were the source of their [own] identity" (p.149). Similarly, Ratele (1998b) asserts that "in the early seventeenth century black men were other things: AmaZulu, AmaXhosa, AmaNdebele, AmaSwati, Basotho, Batswana, Khoi and San, and so on . . . they were bound together by explicitly cultural bonds" (p. 38). The point of contention centres around questions on whether it is possible for blacks to revert to a seemingly more authentic identity as it existed before colonial arrival. On the one hand, Abdi (1999) holds the view that "the authentic identity of Africans was deformed and deconstructed in a manner that effectively responded to the needs of the colonizing European groups" (p. 160). In this view, it is possible to seek out an authentic identity not imposed by whites. On the other hand, Ratele's (1998b) stance is that "black people got their colour when white colonialists conquered and defined them" (p. 38). In this view, black identity was not deformed but instead formed following interaction with whites.

These two opposing views are labelled by Mangcu (2008) as 'racial nativism' and 'syncretic adaptation'. In terms of the former, he notes that "racial nativism . . . harkens to purist, essentialist conceptions of identity" (p. xiii). In terms of the latter, Mangcu explains that:

> By syncretism I mean the dynamic processes of identity formation that have always underpinned black people's encounter with European modernity. The condition of being native or African or black was always a product of bargaining and contestation of the often derogatory definitions given by colonialists and missionaries alike. There was no essentialised African identity that was pure and untouched by the cultures with which one interacted. (p. xiii)

The implications of these two views are discussed in terms of the third line of interest.

The second line of interest involves questions about blackness in terms of damage and resilience. In a discussion on the images of blacks portrayed by whites, Nederveen Pieterse (1992) shows that over the period stretching from early colonialism to apartheid, images of blacks have been mainly negative.[11] In the context of such negative images of blacks, as well as widespread black oppression, the South African literature has not entirely overlooked the question of black damage. For a handful of scholars, the task has been to draw conclusions about the effects of apartheid in general, and racism in particular, on blacks. In her study on black identity, Mtose (2008) draws attention to some of the most salient commonalities among black participants' apartheid-specific experiences. These shared, pervasive experiences contain narratives relating to poverty, material lack and economic inequality compared to whites; segregation of facilities and residential spaces; and victimisation and physical violence at the hands of white individuals as well as the police – namely via police raids, arrest and detention.[12] Thus, as Mtose (2008) demonstrates, it is clear that encounters with whiteness and with racism are central to the experience of being black. What the literature fails to provide, however, is an unambiguous picture of the effects of such encounters.

A perspective that is particularly evident in the writings of black scholars from the 1970s holds that black people have been damaged by racism and apartheid. For instance, Biko (1978/2009) has alluded to damage by commenting that "all in all the black man has become a shell, a shadow of a man, completely defeated, drowning in his own misery, a slave, an ox bearing the yoke of oppression with sheepish timidity" (p. 31). Similarly, Manganyi's (1973) work has focused on the negative effects of the black experience on the body. More broadly, South African psychology has portrayed blacks as victims. As Duncan (2001) illustrates, South African psychologists have tended to focus on the negative psychological and socio-economic consequences of racism on black peoples' well-being.

The problem with such focus, as Duncan (2001) correctly notes, is that it overlooks the potential for resistance to racism on black people's part. A contending perspective thus places much greater emphasis on protective factors which reduce or minimise the potential for damage. The most significant protective factor appears to be a rejection of the legitimacy of

[11] See Duncan (1996) for an illustration of negative images of blacks in the media during the early 1990s.
[12] These narratives correspond to the general descriptions found in Mathabane (1986/1998).

racial domination (Foster, 1993b). As Cock (1980) points out in her apartheid-era study, black domestic workers were not only highly aware of being exploited but also "do not accept the legitimacy of their own subordination" (p. 7). Mangcu (2008) provides further evidence in the same vein when he writes:

> I never internalised the idea that we black people were inferior to whites, which probably explains my sense of revulsion to terms such as 'previously disadvantaged'. I was not disadvantaged; I was oppressed. I truly believed we were equal and to be treated in any other way made me furious. (p. 22)

Thus, in a review of the available South African literature, Foster (1993b) concluded that "while there are some traces of the mark of oppression, the major modality in South Africa appears to have been protection and resistance" (pp. 138-139).

Yet another perspective attempts to blend the two preceding perspectives. In a discussion on black adolescent identity, Stevens and Lockhat (1997) have argued that "the extreme positions of 'damage' versus 'resilience' are too simplistic" to capture the "multiple and sometimes contradictory social realities" (p. 253) experienced by blacks growing up in the turbulent political period between 1970 and 1990. Their contention is supported by two retrospective studies which provide some insight into the complexities of the black experience during apartheid.

A study by Ginsburg (2011) sheds light on the racial and spatial geographies of domestic work in Johannesburg's Northern suburbs during the 1960s and 1970s. Drawing on interviews with approximately 60 black former domestic workers, Ginsburg shows that these women's narratives are replete with descriptions of the oppressive effects of apartheid on their lives: the hardship of leaving children behind in homelands, the risks of seeking work in white Johannesburg without proper permits, of working for low wages, enduring racism and abuse from employers, and living in small, dark and often damp rooms. However, their narratives also reflect small acts of resistance to oppression. When alone in whites' homes, some workers broke the rules by drinking out of their employers' glass cups and eating off their china plates (instead of the enamel mug and plate assigned for their use), by resting on their sofas and beds, or by bathing in their tubs. Many workers defied both their employers and apartheid law by secretly accommodating partners and family members in their rooms. Moreover, support networks amongst workers served to share information which could offer protection against

the system, such as where and when one might likely encounter a policeman checking for passes (Ginsburg, 2011).

Perez, Ahmed and London's (2012) study of the experiences of 52 black alumni who trained at the University of Cape Town's Medical School before 1994, similarly reveals a mixture of oppression and resistance. Prohibited from attending to white patients until 1985, 64% of participants reported that such racially discriminatory practices had a negative impact on their training. In addition, most white staff members were perceived as upholding such discriminatory practices. However, black students expressed resistance by entering white wards and other areas restricted to whites, boycotting classes, not attending graduation ceremonies and organising separate class photographs (Perez et al., 2012).

The third line of interest concerns discussions about black authenticity, and here a tension between the positions of racial nativism and syncretic adaptation become apparent. Contemporary blackness is caught up in tension between ways of being that position blacks as authentically black, and ways of being that are associated with whiteness and thus position blacks as inauthentically black. Academically, the terms 'black-black' and 'white-black' (Durrheim & Mtose, 2006; Mtose, 2008) have been used to denote black authenticity and inauthenticity respectively, whilst the terms 'coconut' or 'Oreo cookie' are used in everyday discourses to literally denote someone who is perceived as black on the outside but white on the inside (issues around black authenticity are touched upon further in Chapter 3).

CONCLUSION

The above sections have illustrated that there is a discontinuity between the study of whiteness and blackness in South Africa. At this juncture, it is necessary to settle on an approach to the study of racialised identity. A review of the whiteness literature has shown that almost no attention has been paid to the possible ways that post-apartheid whiteness might be constructed in relation to blackness. This literature thus implies that white identity construction is not significantly affected by blackness. Read differently, the whiteness literature presents an implicit argument *against* the need for a relational approach to the study of racialised identity. By contrast, a review of the blackness literature has shown that this literature contains multiple references to whiteness. In demonstrating that contemporary black identity construction is significantly affected by whiteness, this literature presents an implicit argument *for* taking a relational approach to the study of racialised identity.

We are thus left with questions about how to adequately grasp black and white racialised identity construction. Can we adequately study whiteness without simultaneously looking at blackness? Is it only while specifically looking at blackness that we ought to take cognisance of whiteness? I argue that such questions are best answered by considering the context in which these identities operate. Thus, in concluding this chapter, I consider why current contextual factors call for a relational approach.

Writing of race in the contemporary context, Durrheim, Mtose and Brown (2011) have argued that "the boundaries determining us from them have become blurred" (p. 23). Two aspects of this blurring have already been alluded to, namely: discerning the location of racialised power, and the ability for blackness to assimilate into whiteness. The third aspect centres on the observation that far from doing away with the distinction between (white) racist perpetrators and (black) victims of racism that existed under apartheid, the post-apartheid era has complicated the relationship between the two (Durrheim, Mtose & Brown, 2011).

This is most clearly evident when the imperatives of race-based transformation clash with the ethos of non-racialism. The result is that, on the one hand, policies such as Affirmative Action simultaneously bolster black people's claims of on-going racial inequality, and position them as victims deserving of measures aimed at addressing the injustices of the apartheid past. On

the other hand, claims of black victimhood have been met with resistance, mainly from the white youth, who see themselves as marginalised and discriminated against, and thus as victims of transformation policies which they consider as incompatible with the nation's non-racial ethos (Ansell, 2004; Durrheim, Mtose & Brown, 2011; Jansen, 2009).

It is in light of this contextual setting that we can appreciate Stevens's (2007) assertion that "perhaps it is not in the critique of whiteness, but in the simultaneous critical deconstruction of blackness and whiteness where the future of anti-racist research and theorising lies" (p. 429). The trajectory that Stevens suggests seems to be echoed in what Hunter, Swan and Grimes (2010) have called "a relational analysis" of race which "focuses on the inevitable interdependence of blackness and whiteness" (p. 411). This, in turn, accords with the relational approach advanced by Blaser (2008) mentioned earlier. Since it is able to take cognisance of the context's inherent race-based complexities, I maintain that a relational approach is best suited for the study of racialised identity in contemporary South Africa. Next, therefore, I turn to the task of shedding further light on the relationality between blackness and whiteness.

CHAPTER 3

CO-CONSTRUCTING RACE

> *Race relations loom so large on the South African scene that it is not possible to understand South African society without understanding the dynamics of race relations.*
>
> (Lever, 1975, p. 41, as cited in Heaven, 1977, p. 68)

Whereas the previous chapter focused on introducing the respective strands of literature on whiteness and blackness, this chapter aims to gather the literature which has focused on blacks and whites simultaneously. While the notion of an intergroup relationship between blacks and whites is neither entirely novel nor foreign to South African social science disciplines, including psychology and sociology, the relationality between blacks and whites has received scant attention. This chapter, therefore, attempts to elucidate the main forms that the relationality between blacks and whites has taken. The first part of the chapter searches for points of relevance within the traditional areas of South African race research. Here the discussion moves through literature which focuses on the dynamics of race relations, including race-based intergroup attitudes and racialised intergroup contact. The second part of the chapter sifts through a much more diverse body of race-related literature which focuses on identity. Here the discussion brings together fragments which collectively suggest that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed not only through co-presence but also through opposition. From this, I present a lens through which to consider the co-construction of black and white racialised identities.

The literature which sheds light on the dynamics of race relations in South Africa provides a useful starting point for thinking about the relationality between blacks and whites. However, this literature is also incredibly challenging to grapple with. Firstly, several different lines of research can reasonably be understood as falling within the scope of 'race relations'. As only those lines deemed most pertinent to this study are discussed below, this chapter's discussion does not claim to provide an exhaustive review of the race relations literature. Secondly, most of these lines span decades of voluminous literature across changing socio-political contexts.

Consider just the pre-1994 output of the South African Institute of Race Relations. Starting with the publication of its 1935 *Race Relations Survey* in 1936, by 1995 the Institute had published its first *Survey* issue to cover the post-apartheid era and its 58th issue overall (see Sidiropoulos et al., 1995). Now regarded as archival sources, the annual *Survey* issues published during apartheid contain a wealth of material across all race groups.[1] Among a host of other special publications, the Institute has repeatedly published detailed works chronicling the post-1948 laws affecting race relations (e.g., Horrell, 1978, 1982), as well as a 50-year overview of race relations across an array of social spheres (Hellmann & Lever, 1979). The result is that the literature on race relations before 1994 is simply overwhelming. Given this study's post-1994 focus, only a limited portion of this literature is touched upon in order to provide historical context.

RACIALISED RELATIONS

Relations of conflict

Hellmann (1979) has described South African race relations as an "endemic . . . problem from the moment the earliest settlers, after landing in the Cape, first encountered Hottentots and Bushmen [*sic*]" (p. 1). Indeed, the history of contact between racialised groups in South Africa has commonly and correctly been described as characterised by conflict (Foster & Finchilescu, 1986; Mynhardt & Du Toit, 1991). At first sight, the running theme of conflict seems to suggest that the historical significance of race – the source of the 'problem' – has been relatively stable and thus simple to analyse. However, this is not the case. It is, therefore, worthwhile to preface the discussion on race relations with a few brief points which illustrate the fluid meanings around race in the South African context.

Firstly, to begin with, it needs to be emphasised that, over the last three and a half centuries, the significance of race in South Africa has been repeatedly shaped and reshaped by a multitude of social, political and economic factors. Importantly, race has not always served as *the* primary marker of difference between groups. With reference to the period following whites' arrival in the Cape in 1652, MacDonald (2006) concedes that there existed an awareness of race insofar as black bodies were differentiated from white bodies. Yet he has also pointed out that the meaning of race was by no means settled at this stage, and that other multiple forms of

[1] See, for example, Ratele's (2009) use of material drawn from *Survey* issues published during the 1960s.

identification co-existed and competed with skin colour. Put differently, in a context characterised by fluidity, hierarchical differences could emerge not only between 'whites' and 'blacks' but also between 'civilized' and 'savage', 'settler' and 'native', or 'European' and 'African' (MacDonald, 2006). I will return to the question of exploring the meanings attached to these differences in the second part of this chapter.

Secondly, therefore, South Africa's racial order has a long and complicated history. Without delving into an analysis of this history, it is important to note that there exists a complex debate regarding the continuity (or discontinuity) between apartheid's framework and prior historical policies and practices. Maylam (2001) has put the matter succinctly:

> Any stress on discontinuity in the history of the South African racial order might lead to the conclusion that apartheid, post-1948, was an aberration, a monstrous departure from what had gone before, rather than a culmination of a long history of racial oppression. Such a view tends naturally towards the demonisation of the National Party . . . and a softer stance on pre-1948 patterns of discrimination and oppression. However, an emphasis on the continuities, on the steady growth of the racial order over time, serves to mitigate the evils of apartheid. Does it not make those who laid the building-blocks of the racial order no less guilty than those who strove to bring that order to its hideous completion? (p. 6)

Thirdly, these complexities notwithstanding, it is clear that soon after 1948, apartheid effected a systematic racialised order which permeated virtually all aspects of everyday life (see Posel, 2001a). But here too one finds complexities. Indeed, the practices around racial classification, which underpinned apartheid's racialised order, were fraught with uncertainties which in turn led to cases of absurdity.[2] In an examination of the legislation pertaining to race and race classification in South Africa from 1910 to 1960, Suzman (1960), for example, noted that

> the absence of uniformity of [racial classification] definition flows primarily from the absence of any uniform or scientific basis for race classification. Any attempt at race classification and therefore of race definition can at best be only an approximation . . . In the final analysis the legislature is attempting to define the indefinable. (p. 367)

[2] For a detailed discussion on race classification and reclassification under apartheid, see Bowker and Star (1999).

The problem of attempting to define the indefinable was most evident in cases where a person's racial classification was in dispute; particularly in borderline cases between 'white' and 'coloured'. As Bamford (1967) notes with reference to the Population Registration Act, classification via the criterion of 'appearance' was problematic in cases where a person was "neither obviously white nor non-white", leading classifiers to resort to the criterion of 'general acceptance' based on evidence gathered about a person's "employment, residence, use of public places and vehicles, schools, friendships, and franchise" (p. 41).

Despite all its uncertainties and inconsistences, it is this deeply racialised period of apartheid that provides a backdrop to post-1994 race relations. But here too there are complexities. While surveys on race relations may ordinarily be expected to provide a focused picture, it is evident that results within the transforming post-apartheid context have not been clear-cut. For example, in a summary of opinion polls and surveys about race and race relations conducted over the period 1994 to 2008, Holborn (2010) noted that three different polls conducted during 2001 provide different results. Therefore, she concluded that different data collection methods across surveys make it "hard to suggest definite trends in perceptions of race relations" (p. 127).

Keeping this in mind, what do the existing surveys tell us about people's perceptions of the state of race relations since 1994? Across all race groups, a national survey conducted in 2001 by the Human Sciences Research Council indicates that 42,1% of respondents felt that race relations had improved, while 14,9% felt that relations had deteriorated. Breaking down these findings according to the two racialised groups of interest, we see that 42,9% of blacks and 39,3% of whites felt that relations had improved, while 11,7% of blacks and 33,4% of whites felt that relations had deteriorated (Grossberg, 2002). The available data from the South African Social Attitudes Survey (collected during 2003), show that approximately 90% of blacks, and approximately 70% of whites, felt that race relations had improved since 1994 (Orkin & Jowell, 2006). Most recently, the South African Institute for Race Relations (IRR) released results from national opinion surveys conducted in 2015 (IRR, 2016) and 2016 (IRR, 2017). In 2015 and 2016 respectively, 54% and 54,5% of all respondents believed that race relations had improved, while 20,4% and 13,4% of all respondents believed that race relations had become worse. Looking at these findings by race for the same years, we see that 33,5% and 46,5% of whites thought that relations had improved, whereas 59,7% and 58,7% of blacks thought that relations

had improved. Moreover, we see that 40,6% and 21,3% of whites thought that relations had deteriorated, whereas only 14,6% and 13,4% of blacks thought that relations had deteriorated.

The finding that South Africans generally perceive an improvement in race relations since 1994 is significant. This positivity suggests that a new post-apartheid landscape of possibility has indeed been opened up for new forms of racialised identity construction. Moreover, differences between blacks' and whites' perceptions regarding the state of race relations can, at first sight, be read as binary oppositions that may serve to underpin identity co-construction. For example, referring to the South African Social Attitudes Survey of 2003, Orkin and Jowell (2006) declared that "there is still ample evidence of persistent racial divisions in South African attitudes" (p. 292). However, these divisions should not be taken at face value. As Orkin and Jowell (2006) concede, divisions based on class, race or both, are a long-standing feature of most democracies. Thus, it is unclear how much significance these apparent divisions hold. Moreover, Friedman and Erasmus (2008) have provided a critique of the existing South African surveys on race and redress. First, in line with Holborn (2010), they note that different surveys have yielded opposing results on the same issues. Second, they point out that survey questions have not always yielded useful insights about race and redress. Third, they observe that some surveys have collapsed the categories black, coloured and Indian, while other surveys have not. Thus, it is difficult to discern 'black' opinion. Taking these factors into account, I argue that surveys do not offer the most viable route towards understanding racialised identity co-construction.

Race attitudes

Studies measuring race-based intergroup attitudes form an important line within South Africa's traditional research on race. Such studies comprise a fairly extensive literature, dating from the 1930s (see MacCrone, 1937) to the present. Historically, this literature has mainly been interested in the study of whites' attitudes towards other race groups, and therefore comparatively fewer studies exist on the topic of blacks' attitudes (for reviews see Durrheim, Tredoux, et al., 2011; Foster & Nel, 1991; Heaven, 1977; Louw & Foster, 1991). In a review of findings from the early 1930s until the late 1980s, Foster and Nel (1991) have shown that race attitudes have followed stable patterns. Whites have expressed negative attitudes towards blacks, with Afrikaans-speakers' attitudes being more negative than those of English-speakers'. While blacks have expressed negative attitudes towards white Afrikaans-speakers, they have expressed fairly favourable attitudes towards white English-speakers. In a review

incorporating findings since the end of apartheid, Durrheim and Tredoux et al. (2011) have indicated that while whites' negative attitudes towards blacks have recently declined, blacks' attitudes towards whites have remained stable.

Collectively, studies and reviews of studies within this line of research have simultaneously examined white and black attitudes (often alongside other race groups). Moreover, these studies have done so in a way which avoids the lumping together of responses from blacks, coloureds and Indians. As such, they have been able to reveal clear patterns of racialised rankings by both white and black groups. However, a comparison of rankings across groups does not tell us much. For example, as Foster and Nel's (1991) review makes clear, the studies *do not* show "that black attitudes to whites constitute a *mirror* of white attitudes to blacks" (p. 153, original emphasis). Moreover, the lack of focus on identity means that these studies cannot shed light on how racialised identities are co-constructed.

Contact

Spurred on by the now-classic 1950s work of Gordon Allport on the 'contact hypothesis', as well as the introduction of apartheid's racially-divisive legislation (Louw & Foster, 1991), another line of traditional research on race has focused on examining contact between blacks and whites (for reviews see Foster & Finchilescu, 1986; Mynhardt & Du Toit, 1991). In reviewing studies on black and white contact conducted from the 1960s through to the early 1980s, Foster and Finchilescu (1986) concluded that

> existing contact between black and white South Africans generally takes the form of domination, with substantially unequal status and an absence of co-operative or common goals, which allows little opportunity for intimate or personalized relations. (p. 130)

Drawing on four surveys conducted between 2001 and 2006, Durrheim and Dixon (2010) have remarked that "the data from all surveys consistently show that blacks have much lower levels of contact with whites than whites have with blacks" (p. 276). As they summarise:

> On average, roughly 45% of the black population (range 37% to 60%) have no casual contact (e.g. conversations) with whites, whereas roughly 7% (range 2% to 12%) of whites have no casual contact with blacks. Even higher levels of racial isolation are apparent with regard to intimate contact, where over 60% of blacks (range 58% to 75%)

> and 30% of whites (range 26% to 39%) have no intimate contact with members of the other group. (pp. 267-277)

When viewed and understood within the context of post-apartheid racial desegregation, this brief picture of contact begins to provide a contextual grounding for thinking about identity co-construction. Based on census data from 1996 and 2001, analyses by Christopher (2001, 2005a, 2005b) have revealed that the pace of desegregation across South Africa's towns and cities has been generally slow and uneven. Remarkably, even though formerly whites-only areas have been subject to the greatest impact of reintegration since the end of apartheid, whites remained the most segregated of all groups (Christopher, 2005b). Rather than proceeding to consider attitudinal research on desegregation, I concur with Durrheim (2005) that "it is a mistake to ask the question: what are black and white attitudes toward desegregation?" (p. 456). As Durrheim has elaborated, "*desegregation* is not a single thing that blacks and whites simply experience and then develop attitudes towards. On the contrary, the lived experience of desegregation is different, depending on whether you are black or white" (p. 456, original emphasis).

Over the past twenty years, South African studies concerned with questions about contact and desegregation have become increasingly cognisant of the importance of incorporating questions around identity (see Dixon & Reicher (1997) for a critique nudging contact hypothesis research in this direction). In terms of the focus of my discussion, these studies have come to recognise that "intergroup contact . . . acquires meaning within everyday practice and argumentation as individuals try to make sense of others' co-presence" (Dixon & Reicher, 1997, p. 361). The full sophistication of these studies thus lies in their ability to show that "desegregation transforms not only the relationship between self and other but also the relationship between self and place" (Durrheim & Dixon, 2005, p. 180). Put differently, this literature is noteworthy because it begins to indicate how the co-construction of black and white racialised identities might work; namely, that co-construction is underpinned by a spatial dimension. While it is not my intention to pursue an analysis of co-construction in this vein, it is useful to discuss this literature in a bit more detail because it indicates that black and white racialised identities *are* being co-constructed within the South African context.

Apartheid's legislation not only classified people according to race but also designated particular spaces for them. As Foster (2000) has noted, "bodies and spaces . . . are inextricably intertwined in the process of racialization: these bodies 'belong' in these locales, those bodies

are consigned to the other spaces" (p. 63). While the creation of racially-exclusive spaces can be traced to examples such as late 1800s Durban (Popke & Ballard, 2004), apartheid's large-scale efforts were much more systematic than earlier attempts. Certainly, the quest for absolute separation between race groups could never be achieved due to whites' reliance on black labour. Nevertheless, apartheid's notorious forced removals (see Western, 1996) sought to create congruence between bodies and spaces. In addition, apartheid-era civil engineers shaped the country's physical landscape in ways which not only gave rise to but also defended the distinction between racialised spaces. As Manning (2004) has described it: "three highway ring roads circumscribe the city as a form of laager defence against 'alien' invasion" (p. 529). The idea of a distinction between racialised spaces is important to bear in mind. The construction of 'white' spaces, for example, was underpinned by the idea of creating a suitable place for European settlers to feel at home. Set against the supposed chaos and backwardness of uncivilised Africa, these 'white' spaces were defined by civilised order and European modernity; hence a 'Europe in Africa' (Ballard, 2004b; Popke & Ballard, 2004; Manning, 2004; Statman, 1999).

Durrheim (2005) has pointed out that whereas whites have historically entered and occupied spaces that were inhabited by blacks, the contemporary context has seen blacks entering formerly white spaces. In line with this change, several studies focusing on residential desegregation have investigated how whites respond to blacks' presence either within or in close proximity to formerly whites-only suburbs. Indeed, some whites' responses to desegregation are noteworthy because they indicate a relationality between blacks and whites. One white response has been to defend against black entry into white suburbs – particularly against the entry of poor black squatters (Ballard, 2004a). In this regard, Ballard (2004b) has highlighted that blacks' presence within informal settlements located on the edges of a white suburb in Durban, not only altered white residents' sense of place but also disrupted their notion of themselves as civilised, modern, Western individuals. Another response has been 'white flight' – a move to gated communities which remain largely racially-exclusive or in other words 'white' (see Hook & Vrdoljak, 2002). As this type of withdrawal does not entail leaving the borders of South Africa, Ballard (2004c) has termed it 'semigration'. Both responses suggest that a change in terms of blacks' presence impacts on whites' sense of identity. Next, I turn to a more detailed exploration of racialised identity co-construction.

RACIALISED IDENTITY CO-CONSTRUCTION

It was as if their identity was incomplete until contrast with their opposites completed them.
(MacDonald, 2006, p. 41)

Black and white in opposition

The literature on race and racialised identity contains scattered statements declaring that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed. For instance, as noted in Chapter 1, Ansell (2004) has stated that "whiteness and blackness as constructed categories of identity developed and evolved together throughout the centuries of colonialism and apartheid, constructing imagined notions of 'selfhood' and 'other'" (p. 7). However, in accepting that "European colonists became whites only in parallel with their identification of those they colonized as blacks" (Thiele, 1991, p. 84), I am left with questions about how this co-construction has come about. Particularly, what respective meanings have been attached to being black and white? Dubow (1995) has cautioned that "words, images and metaphors are acutely revealing, but their meanings are subject to constant change and without careful contextualisation they are apt to suggest connections that do not or did not exist" (p. 7). Nevertheless, it is instructive to begin delving into the question of co-construction by considering some of the words that have historically been attached to blacks and whites.

Looking at racialised discourses about the self and the other, Biakolo (2002) has provided a summary tracing the oppositional ways in which Europe and the white self has been constructed versus Africa and the black other: savage vs. civilized; pre-logical vs. logical; perceptual vs. conceptual; oral vs. written, and religious vs. scientific. Taking such binary oppositions as a point of departure, it can reasonably be argued that when authors such as Ansell (2001) and Thiele (1991) talk about the construction of blackness and whiteness as happening *together* or in *parallel*, they are referring to processes which are rooted in opposition. However, lists of binary oppositions are not sufficient when it comes to explaining how these opposing constructions work in context. Thus, some elaboration is required.

Fusco (2003) has pointed out that "whiteness often requires otherness to become visible. White people look whiter when there are non-white people around them" (p. 38). If the meaning of whiteness is established through its pairing with something unlike itself, then it is worthwhile to look at the pairing of white with black. One way to do this is to examine the connotations of the colours black and white. For example, in writing about race and racism, Pfeifer (2009) has

tabulated and compared the respective linguistic connotations of the colours black and white. In so doing, she has revealed that the oppositional meanings attached to these colours have been mapped onto blackness and whiteness to construct racial difference. As she explains:

> The dualism of black and white that is so crucial to Western racism is not really "black and white" at all but . . . the epic struggle between good and evil. The colors function as signifieds in a symbiotic relationship in which white knights in shining armor engage in romantic battle over fair maidens. In these idylls of innocence, contrast the shining tradition of courtly love to its evil nemesis, the treacherous black knight, his rogue minions of the dark side, the black wizardry of the sorcerer, the obligatory descent into sadomasochistic dark dungeons. (p. 539)

Another way to look at the pairing of black and white is to examine how the labels 'black' and 'white' have been used for racialised identity construction. In his book, *Why Race Matters in South Africa*, MacDonald (2006) considers the type of labels that colonists used to describe themselves, namely 'white' or 'European'. He observes:

> In calling themselves "white" . . . colonists were defining themselves through contrast with others, negatively. Being white – as opposed to being European – said little about cultural traditions, political practices, social and economic arrangements, or who whites were positively. It identified skin color. . . . But skin color served to identify whites only because other people were not white. Whites were defined by who they were *not* (browns or blacks). (p. 41, original emphasis)

In stating that "the term 'white' is embedded in relationality, with whites depending on blacks for collective definition" (p. 41), MacDonald echoes the point made by Fusco (2003) above. However, MacDonald argues that skin colour, while necessary, was not sufficient to construct racial difference:

> In dividing society between whites and blacks, it [the state] simultaneously was dividing South Africa between citizens and noncitizens. Yes, it was advantaging whites and disadvantaging blacks. But inasmuch as whites were citizens and blacks were noncitizens, it also is true to say that the state was advantaging citizens, who were whites, and was disadvantaging noncitizens, who were black. Moreover, color alone did not distinguish between those inside and those outside the protection of the state. What forged the boundaries between the ins and outs, what differentiated members from non-members, what accorded status, power, and material benefits to whites and

> denied them to blacks, what made "whites" "white" and "blacks" "black" was not solely color (or culture). It equally was citizenship in the state. Citizenship is what gave content to color. White and black were identified by color, but what it meant to be white and black was defined in substantial measure by state power. (p. 47)

What becomes apparent, then, is that blacks and whites are located within a mutually-dependent relationship which Pfeifer (2009) has variously labelled in terms of a 'dualism', 'oppositional pairs of categories, 'binary oppositions' or a 'white-black dichotomy'. It is this oppositional status of black and white which is most strikingly apparent in the contemporary era. Perhaps the most well-known example of this comes from then-Deputy President Thabo Mbeki's 'two nation' speech. Delivering the opening speech on a debate about reconciliation and nation building at the National Assembly on 29 May 1998, Mbeki stated that:

> South Africa is a country of two nations. One of these nations is white, relatively prosperous, regardless of gender or geographic dispersal. It has ready access to a developed economic, physical, educational, communication and other infrastructure. . . . The second and larger nation of South Africa is black and poor, with the worst affected being women in the rural areas, the black rural population in general and the disabled. This nation lives under conditions of a grossly underdeveloped economic, physical, educational, communication and other infrastructure. (Mbeki, 2004)

The idea that blacks and whites comprise two nations has also been highlighted in research which captures the perceptions of ordinary South Africans. For example, Ansell (2004) analysed 154 written public submissions (roughly equally divided amongst whites and blacks) about racism, which were invited by the South African Human Rights Commission prior to the South African National Conference on Racism in 2000. The submissions revealed that whites' and blacks' thinking about issues – such as the legacy of apartheid, and racism and non-racialism in the new dispensation – differs to the degree that their respective stances could be seen as "two nations of discourse" (p. 7). Similar findings have been echoed more recently in surveys (see Wale 2013, 2014) which indicate that blacks' and whites' perceptions about the meaning of the apartheid past and the need for redress remain polarised.

Following Mbembe (2008), another way to view the oppositional relationship between blacks and whites is through the notion of 'mutual ressentiment'. As he explains:

> The two defensive logics of black victimhood and white denialism collide and collude, often in unexpected ways. Together, they gradually foster a culture of mutual *ressentiment*, which, in turn, isolates freedom from responsibility and seriously undermines the prospect of a truly non-racial future. Furthermore, the logic of mutual *ressentiment* frustrates blacks' sense of ownership of this country while foreclosing whites' sense of truly belonging to this place and to this nation. (p. 7)

Utilising Mbembe's notion, a research report by Ramphalile (2011) sought "to investigate the discursive interrelatedness of racial subjectivity formation" (p. 2). The report thus focused not only on a discourse of 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness rooted in a logic of 'white denialism', but also on a discourse of 'patriotic' blackness rooted in 'black victimhood'. The relationship between the two was therefore found to be as follows:

> What the 'patriotic black' subject represents to the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white is an agitator driven by vengeance and an emotional racial solidarity and is hell-bent on not only sabotaging the individual and collective efforts of white South Africans but also on 'teaching whites a lesson'. What the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subject represents to the 'patriotic black' is a pessimist when it comes to the capabilities of blacks to govern, and also a spurious non-racist that is reluctant to accept genuine change and therefore disinclined to go along with efforts that seek to enforce it. (p. 74)

Using contributions to an online forum from two successive cohorts of black and white university students enrolled in a first-year politics course, Matthews (2011) explored notions around contemporary white identity. Focusing on the topic of Afrocentricity, the forum generated debate about who may be defined as 'African' and showed that while some whites claimed that they could call themselves 'Africans', a significant number of blacks opposed the legitimacy of this claim. At the level of description, the study reiterates the persistence of oppositional thinking between blacks and whites. At a theoretical level, however, the study is novel because it attempts to blend black voices into the debate about contemporary white identity. Borrowing Frankenberg's (1993) notion of 'anti-racist forms of whiteness', Matthews's discussion grapples with how whites might forge a truly post-apartheid identity that is acceptable to black people. Here, however, Matthews reaches an analytical dead-end, encountering an "insoluble" problem since "whites cannot continue to insist that they are not African, but insisting that they are African seems fraught with difficulties too" (p. 12).

While not attempting to solve this specific problem, I argue that it is the myopic use of the relational approach – rather than the relational approach itself – which leads Matthews to a problem. First, there is a need to be cognisant of, and thus to interrogate, how whiteness views blackness, and vice versa. For instance, drawing on letters to the editor published from 1990 to 1992 and in 2004, in the Afrikaans-language *Beeld* newspaper, Fourie (2008) examined the impact of the country's wide-spread changes on white, Afrikaans-speakers' identity. On the one hand, Fourie found that the meaning of being a white Afrikaner had changed over time. However, on the other hand, Fourie found that there was little change in the way white Afrikaners saw themselves *in relation to* black people or in the way they perceived blacks:

> It seems as if no major revision of the perception of the Other has taken place. Rather, letter-writers have adjusted their perception of black people only insofar as it became practically relevant to do so for survival in the new South Africa. Very few, if any, fundamental changes in terms of the perception of racial or cultural superiority have taken place. (p. 240)

While this indicates how some whites view themselves in relation to blacks, there are few indications of how blacks view themselves in relation to whites. Nevertheless, Sibanda (2012) has indicated that the relationship with whiteness is detrimental for blackness:

> The existence of whiteness necessitates the existence of blackness, which is its life force, but also its binary opposite. However, the fact that blackness and whiteness are mutually sustaining does not mean that they are mutually beneficial. The existence of blackness enables whiteness to continue not merely as whiteness but as the superior other, its ability to sustain this position of dominance is contingent on the continuance of blackness. Blackness on the other hand does not require whiteness for its continuance, in fact the existence of the ideology of whiteness acts as an inhibitor to the actualisation of blackness because it is negatively constructed. (p. 78)

Second, following from this indication of a hierarchical relationship, we are prompted to ask further questions about the sorts of meanings that are attached to contemporary blackness and whiteness; we thus come back full circle to the question of meaning. A study by Robus and Macleod (2006) explored the prevalent discourses around race in the context of the incorporation of a historically-white university campus into a historically-black university. They identified a discourse (articulated by both whites and blacks) termed 'white

excellence/black failure'.[3] This discourse associated white students and the white urban institution with competence, and black students and the black rural institution with failure. Within this discursive construction, overcoming black failure on an institutional level required a move into white urban space or the ability to attract white students, while on an individual level it required inclusion into a white institution, along with hard work and the shedding of black identity (e.g., by being middle class) (Robus & Macleod, 2006).

The latter point links up to questions about new meanings around race, particularly those meanings which might be opened up by the post-apartheid context. In this vein, McKinney (2007) has pointed out that "labelling practices such as the use of the coconut label are extremely interesting . . . . [because] they simultaneously challenge and destabilise static categories of 'race' as produced by apartheid while attempting to police racial boundaries" (p. 19). Two important implications emerge from the use of a cultural rather than a biological conception of race in the construction of racial boundaries. First, a cultural understanding of race and racialised identity allows for a fluidity that enables black assimilation into whiteness – something that was almost impossible to achieve in the past. Second, however, a cultural understanding may also paradoxically serve to reinforce a limited, essentialist notion of what supposedly constitutes an authentic racialised identity (Durrheim & Motse, 2006; Soudien, 2010a).

One major cultural dimension used to construct boundaries between so-called white-blacks and so-called black-blacks (see Chapter 2) is English language proficiency. As McKinney (2007) has discussed, black learners attending former Model C schools[4] tend to possess a high level of English proficiency. The ability to speak 'white' or 'proper' English is a source of prestige which disassociates black learners from the stigmatised, 'broken' English spoken by many black learners in township schools. By contrast, black learners attending township schools, whose English proficiency tends to be considerably lower, tend to place a higher emphasis on African language proficiency. These learners consequently criticise and exclude the latter for 'acting white' and construct a black-black position for themselves via African language proficiency (McKinney, 2007).

[3] Likewise, Mtose (2008) noted traces of this discourse among her black participants' talk.

[4] The term 'Model C' refers to former whites-only government schools which became semi-private shortly before 1994. Located within historically 'white' areas, the majority of former Model C schools boast good facilities, are well-resourced and are associated with a high standard of learning.

In a similar vein, Durrheim and Mtose (2006) found that young, upwardly mobile black people were able to position themselves as 'white' due to their level of education, English language proficiency and wealth. Moreover, they actively disassociated themselves from black-blacks (i.e., economically poorer blacks) by buying expensive goods and engaging in activities associated with white culture. Thus, Durrheim and Mtose argue that there is a hierarchical dimension that positions both whites and white-blacks as superior to black-blacks. As Soudien (2010) notes, "emerging black privileged groups [are] struggling to articulate their identities in relation to both white people and poorer black people, among whom they often live" (p. 365). In other words, black people may find themselves confronted by the need to fit into both a 'white' and a 'black' world in the now desegregated context.

These complexities around blackness point us back to the very question of the relationality of blackness to whiteness. As Stevens, Bell, Sonn, Canham and Clennon (2017) have remarked in their article on black subjectivity, "a central question that emerged very early on within our conversations was the extent to which blackness could exist outside of whiteness, or whether it is always relationally tethered to whiteness" (p. 463). In the same article, Stevens has presented the following view:

> I have always thought that trying to conceive of blackness outside of a relational frame is premised on another kind of essentialism – one where we hope to retrieve a core of blackness that may have existed prior to the imposition and creation of the forms of blackness that are so integral to modes of racialised oppression within modernity. For me, this core does not exist as a form of blackness itself, and so is irretrievable. *The relational origins of blackness as a binaried opposition to whiteness within the colonial matrix of power means that the two cannot be separated, even if this tethering is not always immediately visible.* Blackness may be appropriated and redefined, but may not exist as a subjectivity that is unencumbered by whiteness. (p. 464, my emphasis)

Indeed, this view echoes Mangcu's (2008) notion of 'syncretic adaptation'. Hence, it is reasonable to assert that although blackness has experienced significant shifts within post-apartheid, it remains relational to whiteness and thus co-constructed.

CONCLUSION

This chapter's discussion has sought to shed light on the relationality between black and white racialised identity in South Africa. First, the traditional lines of research on race were reviewed. While these provide answers relating to various facets of black-white dynamics, they have largely neglected to delve into aspects around identity. Thus, second, in order to gain insight into racialised identity co-construction, the discussion turned to a broader range of race-related literature. Although such literature is fragmented, the discussion has arranged the material into a coherent picture to show how racialised identity can be co-constructed. Indeed, the same kind of picture is reflected in more general terms elsewhere. For example, in considering the construction of identity, Hall (1996) has written that:

> Identities are constructed through, not outside, difference. This entails the radically disturbing recognition that it is only through the relation to the Other, the relation to what it is not, to precisely what it lacks, to what has been called its *constitutive outside* that the 'positive' meaning of any term – and thus its 'identity' – can be constructed. (pp. 5-6)

The literature presented in this chapter has, therefore, served as a lens through which to view racialised identity co-construction. Firstly, this lens allows one to illustrate a somewhat obvious but essential point: co-construction relies on the co-presence of blacks and whites. Thus, one cannot be constructed without the other. Secondly, it allows one to reveal that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed in opposition to one another. That is, they are defined as binary opposites. Next, I turn to consider a method for examining the co-construction of black and white racialised identities within the chosen data corpus.

CHAPTER 4

METHODS

This chapter provides a background to the methods which produced the three analytic chapters which follow. First, the discussion explains why I chose the data which underpin this study. At the same time, it puts the data in context; a step which according to Burman (2003) not only serves to justify its selection for analysis but also helps to reduce the risk of under-analysis. While an examination of the media does not form the focus of this thesis, the discussion refers to certain media-related aspects and how these may influence the data being analysed. Second, the chapter aims to explicate how I went about analysing the data. Accordingly, it outlines an analytical procedure based on Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. Drawing mainly on the work of Willig (2008), I provide a step-by-step description of how, with the aim of elucidating black and white racialised identity co-construction, I approached the analysis of editorials and letters to the editor. Lastly, I reflect on the manner in which I carried out the analysis, as well as the ethics of carrying out the current study.

RACE AND THE SOUTH AFRICAN MEDIA

Data on multiple levels

The data on which this study is based can be considered on multiple levels. First, on one level, this study looks at how post-apartheid racialised identities are co-constructed within public rather than private discourses. For example, as Myers and Williamson (2001) have observed, by comparison to the kind of racist discourse one might find in private conversations, public discourses on race offer more muted expressions of racism since "people censor and sugar coat their racial perceptions in public talk" (p. 5). Although public talk may offer a less revealing picture on issues around race, everyday material has the benefit of being intended for public consumption. As such, it bypasses a host of complex ethical considerations which apply to material drawn from private talk (see further discussion on ethical considerations, below). Moreover, public discourses provide a much more accessible entry point for the study of

racialised identity. Although racialisation remains deeply-embedded within South African society, South Africans tend to feel uncomfortable about research which delves into the topic of race (see Chapter 1). As Vice (2011) has put it, "the subject [of race] is too close to the bone for many and too much is at stake and too confused – race is the unacknowledged elephant in the room that affects pretty much everything" (p. 324). This idea of confusion leads us back to Distiller and Steyn's (2004b) assertion that we lack the vocabulary to talk about race (see Chapter 2). Indeed, Durrheim, Mtose and Brown (2011) have suggested that there is a connection between people's inability to express themselves about race, their trepidation about the topic, and their preference to avoid the topic altogether:

> We prefer not to speak about it. We prefer not to think about it. We hardly have a language to express ourselves properly. We are scared of giving offence, of saying something that might be seen to be racist or that reflects oversensitivity to racism. (p. 56)

Thus, against this backdrop, it can be extremely tricky to carry out research which tackles the topic of racialised identity head-on. For example, in an anthropological study on poor whites in Cape Town, Teppo (2004) provided a candid description of how her research topic provoked strong reactions from whites:

> I encountered disturbing reactions every time I discussed the topic of my thesis with middle-class people. Most white middle-class people whom I met confronted the topic with embarrassment, contempt or sarcasm, and even straightforward aggression, although I also experienced their attempts to relieve the social tension generated by the topic by joking. (p. 66)

I experienced similar reactions to the topic of my thesis. Although I was often careful to qualify that I was looking at newspaper-based material (and hence not seeking to recruit participants), the mere mention of my research topic within casual conversation tended to prompt negative responses from whites. While some showed genuine interest and engaged in conversation, most whites seemed suspicious of my intentions and quickly changed the topic of conversation. Often this was done through some form of dismissal or put-down which emphasised that looking at race was deemed unimportant or superfluous. As one person said to me: "So after you do all that, you can say 'there are white and black people in South Africa'". These kinds of reactions seemed to confirm that public discourses were the most suitable entry point for the study of racialised identities.

Second, considered on another level, the study looks at how racialised identities are co-constructed within public discourses which appeared in two major weekly newspapers. For the sake of contextual clarity, it is necessary to differentiate between two clusters of studies which have made links between race and the South African media.

On the one hand, there are studies which have focused on issues of race *within* the media. To take an example focusing on print media, in an analysis of 186 articles on the issue of public violence, which appeared in *The Star* newspaper in early 1993, Duncan (1996) found negative representations of blacks, which led him to argue that such discourses may serve to maintain racism. Thus, although the South African media industry has undergone major changes since 1994, various studies have continued to highlight that race remains a key factor on at least two different levels. On one level, there is a debate on the question of whether the media promotes racism. This debate stems from the South African Human Rights Commission's inquiry into media racism in 1999 (following charges of racism in the media by the Black Lawyers Association and the Association of Black Accountants of South Africa); an event which served to highlight the potential role of the media in perpetuating racism (Berger, 2002; Steenveld, 2008). The two preliminary reports that were commissioned attracted criticism from academics on methodological grounds (Thomaselli, 2000), and findings therein of media racism generated fierce reactions by the media (Berger, 2002), with many reactions framed within a discourse of denial (Durrheim, Quayle, Whitehead & Kriel, 2005). This contestation meant that the Commission's subsequent efforts at addressing the issue of racism in the media had limited success (Berger, 2002). Nor, for that matter, has a consensus been reached on the issue of media racism (Durrheim et al., 2005), possibly because of disagreement on which definition of racism ought to be applied in assessing racism (Steenveld, 2008).

On another level, there is a closely-related debate concerning the extent of the media's race-based transformation. In reviewing the media transformation debate that occurred amongst academics from around the year 2000 (academic engagement with this topic largely ceased from about 2003), Duncan (2011) noted disagreements in terms of how transformation ought to be defined and measured, with this showing up the difficulty of assessing conflicting conclusions on the extent of media transformation. However, a Z-Coms report on media ownership and control, prepared for the Media Development and Diversity Agency (MDDA, 2009), offers a more clear-cut perspective by stating that:

> The print media landscape in the post 1994 South Africa has not transformed much in terms of ownership and control and is still majority owned and controlled by the white shareholders. In spite of various interventions by the state through promotion of transformation processes and BEE, the majority of print media in South Africa is still owned / dominated by a few companies and individuals. (p. 21)

While I am aware that these debates are relevant to the data chosen for analysis, the current study does not locate itself within this cluster of studies. Although I will go on to note some details pertaining to the 'racialised image' of the two newspapers chosen for analysis, this study does not attempt to assess whether the newspapers chosen for analysis are responsible for promoting racism, nor does it attempt to assess the extent to which they have transformed since the end of apartheid.

On the other hand, there are studies which have focused on race while drawing on newspapers *as data sources*. Thus, such studies do not focus on the media *per se*. Collectively, however, these studies not only demonstrate the appropriateness of using data from newspapers to study race but also reveal the richness of such data. The broadest example is Holborn's (2010) extensive study on race relations, which covered material from 1994 to 2009, and drew on English-language newspapers to assess trends in terms of racial sentiment, racial tension, racism and racial rhetoric across a variety of topics. More pertinently, others have drawn on newspapers in order to investigate post-apartheid racialised identities. Drawing on 720 randomly-selected letters to the editor with a socio-political theme from the years 1990 to 1992, as well as the year 2004, which appeared in a weekly Afrikaans-language Sunday newspaper, *Beeld*, Fourie (2008) examined white Afrikaners' self-typification and their typification of blacks in post-apartheid. In a similar vein, drawing from a corpus of 437 letters to the editor published during 2001 in a weekly Afrikaans-language Sunday newspaper, *Rapport*, the work of Steyn (2004a, 2004b) investigated the discourses employed by white Afrikaners to secure their whiteness and resist post-apartheid transformation. Using two popular columns published during 2000 in a weekly English-language newspaper, the *Sunday Times*, Steyn and Foster (2008) have looked at discourses of white resistance to post-apartheid transformation. Also focusing on discourses of white resistance towards a variety of post-apartheid transformation issues, Gartushka (2009) has drawn from a corpus of 3905 letters to the editor published during

2007 in two daily English-language newspapers, the *Cape Argus* and the *Cape Times*. It is within this cluster of studies that the current study is located.

Third, considered on yet another level, this study examines how racialised identities are co-constructed within public discourses which appeared in particular kinds of media texts. It is likely that shifts in public discourses about race have shaped the manner in which race is talked about in editorials and letters to the editor about race. As Posel et al. (2001) have noted, a lack of academic engagement with the meaning of race is "a factor in the limited range and depth of much of the public debate" (p. xii) on issues of race up until around the year 2000, when serval factors served to enhance public debate. First, it is widely agreed that the change from Mandela's to Mbeki's presidency in 1999 signalled a shift from an emphasis on reconciliation, to that of racial redress and racial transformation (Ansell, 2004; Holborn, 2010; Posel et al., 2001). In turn, this shift has stimulated public debate on the place of race in post-apartheid. Second, Posel et al. (2001) have argued that the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the late 1990s served to sensitise South Africans to the issue of race further. To this one may also add the South African National Conference on Racism, which took place in Johannesburg in 2000. Third, the inquiry into media racism, mentioned above, served to further stimulate both academic and public debate around race. However, while these factors have broadened the range of debate, they have not necessarily increased its depth. As Vice (2011) has remarked, "an honest and sincere public dialogue about race has not yet happened in South Africa" (p. 324). Hence, it is possible that the texts examined in this study offer a somewhat muted reflection of racialised issues.

Against this backdrop, how do the editorials and letters to the editor deal with issues of race? While a newspaper's selection of news stories is in itself a process that deems what is newsworthy for readers, editorials serve an even greater function in terms of highlighting which issues warrant attention (Firmstone, 2003). As Firmstone explains:

> Editorial comment represents a newspaper's decision to select a specific issue on which the newspaper wishes to contribute an opinion. The treatment of these contributions as separate is necessary because *newspapers intentionally use editorials as an outlet in which to identify issues as key concerns* and to make direct calls for action on political actors in a way that is purposively distinct from day-to-day 'objective' news coverage in the rest of the newspaper. In this way editorials are used to set out the political identity of a newspaper. (p. 6, my emphasis)

Editorials can, therefore, be understood as providing a particular stance on topical matters, including those around race. I suggest that, even more so than in the case of daily newspapers, editorials appearing in weekly newspapers by necessity reflect on the week's most pertinent topics or issues. Hence, in the context of this study, I considered editorials as texts which signalled topics of importance. At the same time, I was cognisant of the fact that racialised topics may not have been deemed important throughout the period under consideration. Consider the following two editorials from *City Press*.

> We are forever accused of bringing back and reminding people of apartheid – even though the majority of the people in this country want to put it behind them and get on with their lives. Yes, racism is too sad a reminder to be brought back to the fore – even just by talking about it – considering the damage it has done to the hearts, minds and souls of the people of South Africa. [CP/E/22/03/98]

> For far too long many of us have behaved, like ostriches, burying our heads in the sand and pretending all is well. For far too long we pretended racial polarisation had died with the new dispensation of 1994, notwithstanding that its legacy goes back many decades and beyond. We all committed a cardinal sin by wanting to wish it away instead of addressing the wrongs of our past head on. [CP/E/12/11/00]

These editorials support the idea that a shift in public discourse occurred by the year 2000. Whereas the editorial from 1998 maintains that racism – as a sad topic that appears only to cause damage – is something that the majority of South Africans do not want to talk about, the editorial from 2000 maintains that racial issues should be acknowledged and directly tackled. Thus, it is possible that editorials published during the first few years of democracy deemphasised issues around race.

Letters to the editor form an important part of public debate within democratic societies; they provide an avenue for individuals to express their opinions on various issues and to air their concerns about public institutions and governance (Cox, 2006; Hynds, 1992, 1994; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2002). Thus, the letters section is popular with readers to the extent that, except for front-page news stories, it is often the most-read section of a newspaper (Cox, 2006). Even though letters may not be representative of the general population, they do reflect a range of views and opinions within society on topics of public concern (Hynds, 1992; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004). Indeed, given that letter editors strive to stimulate debate by including the broadest possible spectrum of opinions (Richardson & Franklin, 2003; Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004), I

incorporated letters to the editor into the data corpus as a means to enrich the corpus. Although it is possible to contend that people who write letters to the editor are highly opinionated (Popke & Ballard, 2004), it is also possible to maintain that letters expressing strong opinions not only attract readership but also fuel public debate on contemporary issues (Cox, 2006). Indeed, the arguments contained within the letters appearing in the letters section become relevant to a given topic of debate through publication (Richardson, 2001).

Nevertheless, I acknowledge that there are limits to the type of debate permissible within the letters section. Although it is possible that some editors redraft racist letters in an attempt to present a somewhat broader range of views (Richardson & Franklin, 2003), blatantly racist letters are generally not seen as enhancing debate and are, therefore, automatically excluded from publication (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2004). Indeed, none of the letters in the data corpus contained the kinds of racial terms which the majority of South Africans would consider highly offensive. The fact that people report the continued use of such terms is highlighted in analyses of slightly different forms of text. For example, in an analysis of public submissions on racism to the Human Rights Commission, Ansell (2004) reported that a white writer experienced being called a "white cockroach" while a black writer experienced being called a "kaffir". Such experiences were, however, not expressed within the letters pages of the newspapers analysed in this study.

Lastly, the influence of editorial processes on the material being analysed, particularly letters, raises questions about the nature of the data. These questions are located within a contentious debate about the distinction between so-called naturally occurring and contrived data (see Speer, 2002). Some, including discursive psychologists such as Potter (2002), hold that natural(istic) material is defined as data which the researcher has not influenced and that such data are preferable to contrived material. Potter (2002) has devised a 'test' for what is deemed to be 'natural' data: "I have suggested a (conceptual) dead social scientist's test – would the data be the same, or be there at all, if the researcher got run over on the way to work?" (p. 541). Following Potter's 'test', this study's data are deemed natural. Others, such as Speer (2002), however, assert that "*all* data can be natural or contrived depending on what one wants to *do* with them" (p. 520, original emphasis). Seen through this study's interest in how racialised identities are co-constructed within the broad public sphere, the data can likewise be considered natural. At the same time, it is also possible to assert that letters are influenced by newspapers' editorial processes, and hence that they are contrived *before* reaching the researcher. Following

Richardson's (2001) view, I maintain that it is best to take the position that "letters to the editor represent the intersection of 'everyday talk' and 'mediated discourse'" (p. 148).

Selection of newspapers for analysis

At the time of data selection and collection, South Africa's newspaper industry was comprised of the following four dominant media houses: Avusa, Caxton, Independent News & Media (INM) and Media24. They collectively owned 205 newspaper titles (MDDA, 2009), accounting for 88% of the country's newspaper circulation (Duncan, 2011). The selection of newspapers for analysis was guided by the need to obtain material which, as far as possible, was reflective of the public discourses circulating in post-apartheid society. This requirement translated into several exclusionary criteria, which I describe below. While historical data on readership, circulation and the like may have provided a slightly different picture, I made selection decisions based on newspapers' standing as of, or around, the year 2011.

First, community and regional newspapers were excluded because they tend to prioritise local and provincial issues over national ones. Daily newspapers were also excluded because they correspond to major urban regions. Moreover, following the All Media and Products Survey (AMPS) for January to December 2010, produced by the South African Audience Research Foundation (SAARF), daily newspapers attracted slightly fewer readers (29,4% of adults) than weekly newspapers (33,4% of adults) (SAARF, 2011). National, weekly newspapers were, therefore, deemed to be the most suitable sources for analysis, and these were taken as the starting point for data selection. According to the Omnicon Media Group's 2011 edition of Media Facts (OMD, 2011), the following ten national, weekly newspapers were in circulation at the time of data selection: Avusa's *Sunday Times* and *Sunday World*; INM's *The Sunday Independent*; M&G Media's *Mail & Guardian*; Media24's *City Press*, *Rapport*, *Soccer Laduma*, *Sondag* and *Sunday Sun*; and TNA Media's *New Age*.

Second, I grouped the ten newspaper titles by the language of publication. This revealed two Afrikaans-language newspapers and eight English-language newspapers. On one level, this distinction was made in order to acknowledge underlying differences between the two groups of newspapers. For example, as Giffard (1976) has pointed out, compared to apartheid-era Afrikaans-language newspapers, English-language newspapers tended to voice stronger criticism against the apartheid government. Thus, although this study is not primarily concerned with the study of newspapers, I decided that the newspapers selected for analysis

should all be published in the same language. On another level, it was crucial to make this distinction due to implications for the study of racialised identity. As noted in Chapter 2, South African whiteness is comprised of both English- and Afrikaans-speaking whites. The studies cited earlier in this chapter serve to indicate that English-language publications have been used to study English whiteness, and Afrikaans-language publications have been used to study Afrikaner whiteness. As this study does not focus on the co-construction of English and Afrikaner whitenesses, it was only necessary to select one brand of whiteness for analysis. Since there were more English-language than Afrikaans-language newspapers, and given that these had the benefit of not requiring translation from Afrikaans to English, I opted to exclude the Afrikaans-language newspapers (i.e., *Rapport* and *Sondag*).

Third, in terms of equivalence, six of the eight English-language newspapers are published on Sundays (*Soccer Laduma* is published on Wednesdays, and the *Mail & Guardian* is published on Fridays). *Soccer Laduma* is a sports newspaper aimed mainly at poor, black, male readers. It was thus excluded because of its narrowly-targeted readership and its narrow scope of content.

Fourth, although the existing literature supported the idea that English-language newspapers are appropriate data sources for the study of white identity, it was not clear whether these data sources were appropriate for the study of black identity. As such, I sought to select at least one English-language newspaper aimed at black readers. Three newspapers had relevance in this regard: *City Press* (established in 1982), the *Sunday Sun* (established in 2002) and the *Sunday World* (established in 1999). From one perspective, selection between the three newspapers was tricky; in 2010, the *Sunday Sun*'s readership (2 371 000) exceeded that of *City Press* (1 867 000), while the *Sunday World*'s nearly matched it (1 680 000) (SAARF, 2011). From another perspective, however, selection between the three newspapers was clear-cut: two of the newspapers had only been published since 1999 and 2002, and thus did not cover the start of the democratic period. Hence, as *City Press* had the most extended historical coverage, it was selected over the *Sunday Sun* and the *Sunday World*.

Fifth, I considered the question of readership across the remaining newspaper titles. The *New Age* (established in 2010), was excluded because it lacked historical coverage and no readership figures were available at the time of data selection. With a readership of 3 800 000 in 2010, the *Sunday Times* far exceeded the readership of *The Sunday Independent* and the *Mail &*

Guardian (107 000 and 428 000 respectively) (SAARF, 2011). Hence, the *Sunday Times* was selected over *The Sunday Independent* and the *Mail & Guardian*.

Sixth, having reduced the list from ten to two national newspapers, I considered *City Press* and the *Sunday Times* in greater depth.

City Press, established in 1982, is a newspaper which provides local and international news content, with sports, business, opinion and analysis sections. For an account which traces the rise of *City Press*, the interested reader is referred to Kalane's (2018) *The Chapter We Wrote: The City Press Story*. Following the AMPS for 2010, *City Press* had a readership figure of 1 867 000 or 5,5% of total adults (58,8% male; 42,2% female), making it the third most-read weekly newspaper of similar content in the country (SAARF, 2011). It is published by Media24, whose majority shareholder is Naspers – a multinational company listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange, which has various media-related interests, including internet services, pay-television, digital content technology and print media (Naspers, 2011). As a result of restructuring at Naspers in 2000, Media24 (formerly Nasmedia) became an independent company involved in newspaper, magazine and book publishing, as well as printing and distribution (Media24, 2012). Apart from *City Press*, Media24 also publishes two major national weekly newspapers in English (*Soccer Laduma* and the *Sunday Sun*) and two in Afrikaans (*Rapport* and *Sondag*), as well as daily regional newspapers in English (e.g., the *Daily Sun* and *The Witness*) and in Afrikaans (e.g., *Die Burger*, *Beeld* and *Volksblad*), and an extensive array of community newspapers (OMD, 2011). Media24's newspapers accounted for 39% of the country's newspaper circulation around the time of data selection (Duncan, 2011).

The *Sunday Times*, established in 1906, is a newspaper which delivers content similar to *City Press*. For a historical overview covering a century of the *Sunday Times*, the interested reader is referred to Dreyer (2006). Following the AMPS for 2010, the newspaper had a readership of 3 800 000 or 11,2% of total adults (54,1% male; 45,9% female), making it the country's most widely-read weekly newspaper. Its readership is predominantly black (66,9%) but includes a fair number of white readers (17,7%) (SAARF, 2011).

At the time of data collection, and thus within the period with which this study is concerned, the *Sunday Times* was owned by Avusa Limited (formerly Johnnic Communications) – a listed company on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (in 2012, Avusa was acquired by another

company and renamed the Times Media Group). Avusa's vision is described in terms of a desire "to be the preferred media and entertainment content provider" (Avusa, 2012, ¶2) via its various media, book, entertainment, digital and retail solutions divisions. Along with the *Sunday Times*, Avusa media also published another major weekly national newspaper, the *Sunday World*, as well as various regional dailies (e.g., the *Daily Dispatch*, *The Herald,* the *Sowetan* and the *Times*) (OMD, 2011). Collectively, Avusa's newspapers accounted for 14% of the country's newspaper circulation around the year 2011 (Duncan, 2011).

City Press and the *Sunday Times* respectively represent examples of South Africa's 'black' and 'white' press. They were, therefore, deemed to be appropriate data sources for answering questions about the co-construction of black and white racialised identities. Steenveld (2008) has remarked that these newspapers have retained a "racialised identity" at a time "when the 'race' of their owners and the journalists who produce the copy are no longer significant markers of their differences" (p. 295). Indeed, the MDDA report, mentioned above, supports the idea that there is no clear relationship between race-based ownership and a newspaper's racialised identity. In the first case, only 16,48% of 'white press' *Sunday Times* owner Avusa was owned by whites. Historically-disadvantaged individuals owned a further 25,5%, and the remaining 58,2% was listed. In the second case, 85% of 'black press' *City Press* owner Media24 was white-owned, while 15% of ownership belonged to historically-disadvantaged individuals (MDDA, 2009). Attention thus needs to be focused on the fact that, for instance, *City Press* is marketed as a newspaper "aimed at discerning, educated, economically active black readers" (Mysubs, 2011). This type of purposive marketing is thus the most likely factor responsible for reinforcing the 'blackness' associated with *City Press*. Correspondingly, black readers accounted for 95,1% of its 2010 readership profile (SAARF, 2011).

Seventh, I employed a final criterion to determine the appropriateness of the two newspapers as data sources. Given that "the South African newspaper market is veering dangerously towards excessive concentration" (Duncan, 2011, p. 349), it was clear that the newspapers selected for analysis should each come from different owners. The coupling of *City Press* and the *Sunday Times* met this criterion.

Data collection and preparation

Due to the massive data corpus envisioned for this study, data collection had to take several constraining factors into account, namely: the need for unrestricted access to as complete an

archive collection as possible, in a format that was practical to work with, and which required a minimal financial cost to obtain. Initially, I attempted to obtain the required data from the Cape Town branch of the National Library of South Africa. However, this option was ruled out due to the high cost of obtaining copies of the material and a lack of clarity regarding the completeness of the Library's holdings.[i] The data set was subsequently obtained in digital format from the SA Media press cutting service database (located at www.samedia.uovs.ac.za). Access to the database was obtained via the University of Cape Town's Library subscription. During February 2012, I downloaded all database entries marked with the keywords 'letter' (for letter writers) and 'editorial' respectively, selecting *City Press* and the *Sunday Times* for the period 2 January 1994 to 25 December 2011 (see discussion on the periodisation of this study, below).

I downloaded all entries in Portable Document Format (PDF) file format. To ensure that the data were handled systematically, I downloaded the different types of material from each newspaper separately. Moreover, entries were downloaded into separate folders which distinguished between the two newspapers and between letters and editorials for each year. The individual entries in each folder were then combined into single PDF files which listed entries chronologically.

ANALYTICAL PROCEDURE

My engagement with the texts began with what De Wet and Erasmus (2005) refer to as a 'close reading' of the data set. This reading is a thorough reading aimed at familiarising the researcher with the contents of the entire data set. By enabling themes to be understood in the context of the data set as a whole, the reading forms a practice which helps minimise a haphazard assignment of codes to the data (De Wet & Erasmus, 2005). To give a picture of the task at hand, the period under consideration covered 938 Sundays and thus a combined total of 1876 editions across the two newspapers. The material downloaded from the SA Media database consisted of around 8 000 different texts. Over 700 texts were discarded; these included letters and editorials identified from the business section of the *Sunday Times*, open letters published in both newspapers, as well as material which was mislabelled on the database. The data set with which I engaged thus consisted of 7 140 pieces of text. Of these, 2 784 were editorials

(*City Press* = 1 368; *Sunday Times* = 1 416) and 4 356 were letters (*City Press* = 2 022; *Sunday Times* = 2334) (see Appendix 1).

Given the sheer volume of data, I initially skimmed through all the texts in order to obtain a broad overview of the content. This initial engagement made it clear that repeated unfocused readings of the entire data set were neither practical (due to the limited timeframe allocated for the thesis), nor productive (due to the amount of analytically irrelevant material in the data set). In order to avoid becoming overwhelmed by the volume of data, I decided first to become deeply familiar with subsets of the data. For this purpose, I started by reading through all *City Press* editorials chronologically. I began with *City Press* because I was unfamiliar with the newspaper. I chose to begin with editorials rather than letters because their more coherent and focused topic-structure allowed me to build a more precise overview of the data. Moreover, the editorials allowed me to get a direct feel of each newspaper's 'voice'. In this regard, the following letter-writer's comments capture the position or role that *City Press* is expected to take: "as a black newspaper we expect you to be alert to the potential harm that a careless remark such as you made can cause to the interests of the black community" (CP/L/03/03/02). Indeed, while reading *City Press*, I noted a recurrence of editorials which not only attempted to speak on behalf of black people but also to advance black people's interests within the emerging democratic context. As such, *City Press* editorials carried what can best be characterised as a 'black voice'.

For reasons of equivalence in material type, I proceeded to read the *Sunday Times* editorials thoroughly. Here, by comparison, I noted the absence of a 'black voice'. Nor, for that matter, was there an overt indication of a 'white voice'. Instead, these editorials appeared to speak on behalf of all people in a racially-neutral way. This reading was followed by thorough chronological readings of letters in *City Press* and the *Sunday Times*. By comparison to the editorials, the letters covered a much broader range of topics and varied widely in terms of length and style.

My reading revealed that there were three different categories of text running through the four subsets of data. First, despite the country's deeply racialised history, and current efforts regarding racial transformation, I most frequently encountered texts which made no mention of race or racialised issues. Since texts in this category could not shed any light on racialised identity construction, they did not warrant inclusion for further analysis. Second, by contrast,

I encountered texts which directly mentioned race. These texts dealt not only with race and racism as topics in their own right, but also mentioned blacks, whites or both within a wide variety of everyday topics. These texts were gathered for further analysis. Third, I encountered texts which were located between these two extremes. Although these texts did not contain direct references to race, they implied or invoked race in subtle ways. Debates about the emerging post-apartheid future featured strongly here, and questions about the country's transformation often hinted at underlying racialised issues. This hinting was more overtly evident within the context of debates about policies such as Affirmative Action and Black Economic Empowerment. These kinds of texts were also gathered for possible further analysis.

Having established these categories, I returned to re-reading the entire data set for the purpose of coding. Coding the texts allowed me to pull out irrelevant material and thus reduce the data corpus to a more manageable size for further re-readings. Next, having selected texts to work with, I was left with the following question: how do I engage with the given texts in a manner which would best reveal whether blackness and whiteness are co-constructed? This question was, in turn, broken down into two parts: 1) what are the possible approaches for examining the texts, and 2) which of these approaches is most suitable for answering this study's research question?

Initially, I considered approaches which were explicitly concerned with the study and analysis of print media texts. For example, the influential work of Van Dijk signalled some possible directions. In terms of analysing opinions within texts such as editorials, Van Dijk (1998) has provided suggestions for examining the links between ideology, opinions and media discourse. In terms of looking at race, Van Dijk's now-classic studies have examined the perpetuation of racism in the press, highlighting how the reproduction of racism operates in public discourses (Van Dijk, 1991, 1993). Although such studies touched upon aspects which I was seeking to explore, the approaches which they offered were not sufficiently suited to the focus of my study.

I then turned to consider other possible approaches for examining texts. While space constraints do not permit a detailed discussion of the plethora of existing approaches, it is useful to briefly contextualise the chosen method of analysis against the broader field of discourse analysis. Providing a general overview, Gill (2000) has indicated that "there are probably at least 57 varieties of discourse analysis" (p. 173). While overwhelming in number, these varieties are

bound together by a shared rejection of the idea "that language is simply a neutral means of reflecting or describing the world, and a conviction in the central importance of discourse in constructing social life" (Gill, 2000, p. 173). In an overview concerned with discourse analysis in psychology, Parker (2013) has described the field according to eight approaches: Conversation Analysis, Ethnomethodology, Narrative Analysis, Thematic Analysis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, Semiotic Analysis and Political Discourse Theory. Moreover, he has proposed that these approaches can be grouped according to four different, micro to macro, levels of analysis. Again, in an echo of Gill, Parker (2013) has remarked that the "many varieties of discourse analysis" reflect the "different forms in [which] different disciplines" have taken up the task of focusing on language (p. 223).

Writing within the framework of qualitative research in psychology, Willig (2008) has noted two main forms of discourse analysis: Discursive Psychology and Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. These, as she explains, may be utilised to answer different kinds of questions:

> While discursive psychology is primarily concerned with *how* people *use* discursive resources in order to achieve interpersonal objectives in social interaction, Foucauldian discourse analysis focuses upon *what kind of* objects and subjects are constructed through discourses and *what kinds of* ways-of-being these objects and subjects make available to people. (pp. 95-96, original emphasis)

As this study is concerned with the manner in which black and white racialised identities are being co-constructed, I turned my attention to an approach which focused on the construction of objects. Indeed, following Parker (1992), discourse can be understood as "*a system of statements which constructs an object*" (p. 5, original emphasis). I thus opted to draw on the perspective of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis in order to examine how black and white racialised identities were being co-constructed in public discourse.

Textbooks on qualitative research methodology tend to stress that no ready-made formulae exist for carrying out qualitative research. For example, reflecting on her own learning, Willig (2008) has written of having "replaced the metaphor of research-methods-as-recipes with a view of the research-process-as-adventure" (p. 2). More specifically, as Macleod (2002) has stated, "I wish to emphasise that there is no definitive method of discourse analysis, and that therefore any methodological discussion or practice contributes to the constant construction and re-production of the intellectual and research activity called 'discourse analysis'". Given

that the 'doing' of discourse analysis does not readily translate into recipe form, it is generally understood that finding a way to carry out analysis requires a measure of both creativity and flexibility. Indeed, writing about the difficulties of explaining how to go about analysing texts, Gill (2000) has related the following:

> Somewhere between 'transcription' and 'writing up', the essence of doing discourse analysis seems to slip away: ever elusive, it is never quite captured by descriptions of coding schemes, hypothesis and analytical schemata. However, just because the skills of discourse analysis do not lend themselves to procedural description, there is no need for them to be deliberately mystified and placed beyond the reach of all but the cognoscenti. . . . There really is no substitute for learning by doing. (p. 177)

However, learning by doing is problematic. As Potter (2008) acknowledges, a lack of procedural description means that the skills needed for doing analysis are not only difficult to acquire but also require time to learn. As he has elaborated, analysis has "an important element of craft skill; it is sometimes more like sexing a chicken than following the recipe for a mild Chicken Rogan Josh" (p. 204). In response, other scholars have recognised that proceeding without a so-called recipe is daunting and indeed makes analysis appear to be an opaque and mystic process. More specifically, in an attempt to ameliorate the elusiveness of doing discourse analysis, several scholars employing Foucauldian Discourse Analysis have offered procedural guidelines. These vary in both complexity and purpose. For example, in presenting a set of "steps to take in using the Foucaultian [*sic*] notion of discourse" (p. 42), Kendall and Wickham (1999) have acknowledged that their seemingly-simple five steps are located within their book's complicated discussion. Concerned with the analysis of visual material, Rose (2012) has provided a seven-point strategy "for the interpretation of the rhetorical organisation of discourse" (p. 220). Adapting the work of Rose, Waitt (2010) has offered a similar seven-stage "methodological template" (p. 217) intended for use by geographers. Within the discipline of psychology, Parker (1992) and Willig (2008) have provided guidelines best suited for the current study.

De la Rey (1997) has noted the suitability of using Parker's (1992) guidelines within the South African context, and South African scholars such as Macleod (2002) and Wilbraham (1994) have utilised Parker's guidelines with supplementation. In a study which focused on examining discourses about personality disorder in an array of texts (academic articles, newspaper articles and parliamentary debates), Vingoe (2007) made use of Willig's (2001) guidelines. Vingoe's

usage of Willig's 2001 guidelines has in turn been incorporated into Willig's expanded 2008 guidelines. While my analysis relied primarily on Willig's (2008) steps, I drew selectively on Parker's (1992) guidelines for supplementation as noted below.

Certainly, some have cautioned against reliance on such guidelines. As Morse, Barrett, Mayan, Olson and Spiers (2002) have pointed out, one has to be mindful of "overly adhering to instructions rather than listening to data . . . or following instructions in a rote fashion rather than using them strategically in decision making" (p. 18). However, in keeping with the view that qualitative work can be conducted with rigour (see De Wet & Erasmus, 2005), I argue that the guidelines relied upon here allowed me to systematically sweep through the massive data corpus, and thus helped ensure that all the data were carefully considered. Moreover, these guidelines had the advantage of providing a level of methodological transparency, which would have otherwise been difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, following Gill (2000), I underscore the fact that it remains difficult to provide the reader with a neatly-defined explication of how the data were analysed. The description provided below thus endeavours to provide a structured account of a fluid and 'messy' analytic process.

On the one hand, there is a discernible link between the steps provided in Willig's (2008) guidelines and the focus of this study's analytic chapters. Broadly speaking, steps one to three guided the introductory analytic work presented in Chapter 5, steps four and five guided the further analytic focus of Chapter 6, and step six guided the concluding analytic task of Chapter 7. On the other hand, it would be misleading to suggest that a strictly linear, sequential process was (or indeed could be) followed. In the context of this study, Willig's steps are best understood as a set of mutually-supportive tasks. Certainly, I applied step one in order to select the texts used in all three analytic chapters. However, further steps also enabled me to reapply step one with greater insight. Overall, I applied the steps in ways that were best suited to particular texts; even texts examined within the same analytic chapter could not all be analysed according to the same sequence of steps. My understanding of the data set also deepened while writing up the analytic chapters. My reading of one text often prompted me to revisit previously-analysed texts, and this allowed me to apply different steps or to simply re-apply steps in different ways. Hence, the idea of key tasks provides the most accurate reflection of how I engaged with the steps presented in Willig's (2008) guidelines.

Willig's (2008) first step of analysis entails identifying the various ways in which the discursive objects of interest are constructed in the text. Carrying out this task, therefore, meant grappling with the question of how to find references to racialised identity in the text. Reflecting on the qualitative research process, Seibold (2002) has described how theory both guides and is guided by data analysis. In this way, qualitative data analysis is understood as an iterative process: it is the point where one's procedure and framework interact by simultaneously shaping each other. The paucity of direct theory on identity co-construction led me to rely on a conceptual (rather than a theoretical) framework, defined as "the linking of concepts selected from several theories" (Neiswiadomy, as cited in Seibold, 2002, p. 4). If the purpose of this analytical task was to identify references pertaining to black and white racialised identity, then the purpose of my framework was to help identify these references. Guided by the literature presented in chapters 2 and 3, my framework included concepts such as 'blackness' and 'whiteness', as well as 'black identity' and 'white identity'. However, the close reading of the texts revealed that there existed a gap between the way the study's literature-based chapters conceptualised the discursive objects of interest and the way these objects appeared in the data corpus. For example, the concepts of 'blackness' and 'whiteness' were virtually absent from the texts. Moreover, the texts contained very few direct references to black and white identity. Where references to identity existed, these tended to construct a racially-neutral national identity for 'South Africans'. Thus, for example, the texts spoke not only of the post-apartheid 'nation' but also of the 'rainbow nation' or 'miracle nation'. While references to 'race', 'races' and 'race groups' pertained to racialised objects, it was usually unclear whether such references pertained to blacks, coloureds, Indians or whites. Given this lack of specificity, such references were not considered analytically useful.

Addressing this gap meant reconciling understandings drawn from academic discourses with the understandings contained within public discourses. Indeed, the gap only closed at the point where the academic literature investigated apartheid's race categories or everyday understandings of race. A useful example in this regard is Terre Blanche and Seedat's (2001) analysis of the shifting racial terminology used to label black people (i.e., as 'Africans', 'natives', 'Bantus', or 'blacks'). While some texts referred to 'African/s' or 'black African/s', the majority of texts referred to black people as 'black/s'. Similarly, most of the texts referred to white people as 'white/s'. Only a small handful of texts referred to whites as 'European/s' or 'Caucasian/s'. Nevertheless, I could not merely rely on identifying obvious references such

as ‘black’ and ‘white’. As Willig (2008) maintains, it is essential to identify “both implicit and explicit references” (p. 115) to the discursive objects.

Implicit references appeared on various levels. On one level, the conceptual framework aided in elucidating contemporary references to black people in the texts. For example, ‘model-c’ and ‘coconut’ are both post-apartheid terms used to refer to particular constructions of blackness (see McKinney, 2007). On a similar level, post-apartheid legislation has been responsible for bringing about new references which stand in for direct racialised references. For example, in light of the Employment Equity Act of 1998, some texts referred to people who are not white as members of ‘designated groups’ or as ‘affirmative appointees’. Similarly, some texts referred to black people as ‘beneficiaries’ of Affirmative Action and Black Economic Empowerment.

On another level, in the case of *City Press*, familiarisation with the texts revealed that particular kinds of references served as substitutes for the otherwise seemingly ubiquitous use of the reference ‘black/s’. While *City Press* sometimes substituted ‘the African people’ for ‘black/s’, the newspaper tended to refer to ‘us African people’, ‘our African people’ and ‘our black people’. References to ‘our people’ or ‘our’ thus implied ‘black/s’. Such references also suggested that the newspaper attempted to consider issues from a black perspective. Furthermore, the notion that *City Press* attempted to speak on behalf of blacks was constantly reinforced through references to ‘we blacks’ or ‘we black people’. References to ‘we’ thus stood for references to ‘blacks’.

On yet another level, the texts themselves provided hints that made implicit references visible. In some instances, as the underlined words indicate, hints came in the form of qualification in the text:

> The gap between the haves (mostly whites) and the have-nots (mostly blacks) is wide. [CP/E/15/05/94]

In other instances, as the underlined words indicate, implicit references to blacks and whites had to be gleaned from the context of the text:

> South Africa’s transition from apartheid misrule to non-racial democracy has been hailed by many as a miracle. Many asked how the jailed and the jailer, the hunted and the hunter, the oppressed and the oppressor could live together in harmony? Yet they did and still do. [CP/E/19/09/04]

Willig's (2008) second step "aims to locate the various discursive constructions of the object within wider discourses" (p. 115). In other words, the task here was to contextualise the constructions which emerged from the texts. I began by sifting through the various constructions and grouping them into clusters. On one level, it was possible to discern that racialised identity is constructed in terms of an overarching black category or in terms of an overarching white category. Thus, the constructions could simply be clustered in terms of blackness and whiteness. This suggested corresponding discourses of blackness and whiteness. However, on another level, it was possible to discern differences *among* the objects which were respectively categorised as 'black' and 'white'. Thus, there were not only multiple references to constructions falling within the categories of 'black' and 'white' but also multiple ways to construct 'black' and 'white' via different discourses. Therefore, the clusters which emerged remained murky and had to be refined through repeated engagement with the text across different tasks.

Willig's (2008) third step pays attention to "the discursive contexts within which the different constructions of the object are being deployed" (p. 116). Accordingly, this task was concerned with the action orientation of the texts; it interrogated the function of the constructions in order to understand what could be achieved or gained by constructing objects in particular ways (Willig, 2008). Constructions of racialised identity were surrounded by an array of references to the apartheid past and the emerging post-apartheid present. For example, references to 'the apartheid government', 'the apartheid system' and 'apartheid South Africa' existed alongside references to 'the ANC government', 'the new South Africa' and 'the new democratic South Africa'. As Parker (2013) remarks, "any approach which pretends to be Foucauldian is also necessarily historical, to do with the time of phenomena, how they have come into being, how they maintain themselves, and what forces may eventually lead to them disintegrating and disappearing altogether" (p. 231). As will be shown in the proceeding analytic chapters, the analysis paid attention to how references to the past and the present could be utilised in ways which were either transformative or anti-transformative. Thus, one way to see function was in terms of whether constructions served to change or preserve identity. For example, it became apparent that one cluster attempted to construct new, post-apartheid identities, while another cluster attempted to preserve old, apartheid-era identities.

Another way to see function was in terms of racialised focus. It was possible to distinguish between 'black' as constructed in terms of a discourse focusing foremost on black identity, and 'white' as constructed in terms of a discourse focusing foremost on white identity. That is, distinct clusters appeared to be concerned with particular racialised identities. At the same time, however, it was clear that references to black identity were not altogether separate from references to white identity, and *vice versa*. Willig (2008) suggests that alongside looking at what is gained by constructing an object in a particular way, it is also important to consider an object's relation to other constructions in the text. This aspect was especially useful in providing a comparative dimension which fed into questions of co-construction. I thus noted constructions of blacks and whites which appeared together, or in relation to each other, in the same texts. To cite only a few examples, such pairings included references to "the oppressor" and "the oppressed" (CP/L/24/10/04a); "our people" and "the oppressors" (CP/L/23/06/02); "disadvantaged South Africans" and "the oppressors" (CP/L/16/12/01); and "European colonialists" and "African people" (CP/L/14/01/01). These pairings, in turn, suggested that the texts attempted to co-construct racialised identities.

Willig's (2008) fourth step entails considering the available subject positions within the discourses. As Parker (1992) has pointed out, the objects identified within a text may also simultaneously be identified as subjects. This task was thus premised on the understanding that blacks and whites were not only objects but also subjects who occupied particular positions. By sifting through the texts, it emerged that blacks were not merely 'black/s' or 'African/s' or 'the majority'. Some were positioned as 'poor black people' or 'poor African people' or 'the long deprived African majority'. Likewise, whites were not simply 'white/s'; they occupied particular positions: 'white supremacists' or 'white racists' or 'progressive whites'. More pertinently, however, it emerged that blacks and whites were positioned in relation to each other. At a very concrete level, the numerical distinction between the country's racialised population groups served as a subject position. Many references to black people emphasised their belonging to a numerically-dominant group: 'the majority', 'we the majority', 'the African majority', 'the African masses', 'the masses', 'the masses of our people' and 'the Azanian masses'. In line with this, some texts referred to whites as part of 'the minority'. This pairing of black and white subject positions was extended and carried through the texts in various ways. For example, references to 'the oppressed masses' or 'the oppressed Azanian masses', begged questions about the positioning of the white minority. Texts which spoke of most whites as "haves" and most blacks as "have-nots" (see CP/E/15/05/94, above), or of

whites as jailers, hunters and oppressors, and blacks as jailed, hunted and oppressed (see CP/E/19/09/04, above), served to reveal whites' positioning in relation to blacks' positioning and *vice versa*. Through such texts, I was able to consider further whether a particular discourse was advocating for the construction of identities in terms of continuity or discontinuity with the apartheid past.

In a closely-related fifth step, Willig (2008) is concerned with practice; namely looking at how discourses affect subject positions by enabling or constraining possibilities for action. Thus, given the available subject positions which were identified, the task here was to ask what could be said and done by blacks or whites within a particular discourse. For example, could blacks or whites speak from a position of authority within a particular discourse? Did the discourse open up or close down opportunities for blacks and whites, respectively? Did the discourse advocate for black or white leadership in order for the country to successfully navigate into the emerging post-apartheid future? Answers to these kinds of questions were once again useful in establishing whether a discourse was aiming to preserve or reconstruct apartheid-era identities within the post-apartheid era.

The collective insights gained from the above tasks enabled me to return to the task provided by Willig's (2008) second step. As Parker (1992) has noted, "a discourse is a coherent system of meanings" (p. 11) which presents a picture of the world. The labels I used to describe the discourses that emerged from the texts evolved as my analysis deepened over time. Moreover, as Parker (1992) has pointed out, the description the analyst opts for when labelling a discourse about race (e.g., as racist) reflects their moral or political stance. The discourse I labelled *Enduring Whiteness* emerged from clusters of text which had a predominant focus on whiteness, were aimed at blocking transformation, and thus attempted to preserve apartheid-era constructions of racialised identity. The discourse I labelled *Bold New Blackness* emerged from clusters of text which had a predominant emphasis on blackness, were aimed at effecting transformation, and thus attempted to forge distinctly post-apartheid versions of racialised identity.

Willig's (2008) final step considers subjectivity further, focusing on "what can be felt, thought and experienced from within various subject positions" (p. 117). The task here was thus to present a picture of blacks' and whites' possible subjective experiences. More specifically, I sought to present a picture of what *Bold New Blacks'* and *Enduring Whites'* subjective

experiences might be. At the same time, given that this step also focuses on the link between discourse and subjectivity (Willig, 2008), this task drew on insights gathered from other tasks. I thus considered subjective experiences *within* the respective frameworks of the world presented by the discourses of *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness*. In light of these frameworks, I considered, for instance, who might be positioned as the oppressed or as the oppressor, as the victim or as the perpetrator. From this, I considered how the past and the unfolding present might shape what *Bold New Blacks* and *Enduring Whites* can experience.

Periodisation and selection of extracts

Given that each editorial and letter is overtly linked to a date of publication which anchors it in time, it is necessary to devote some attention to the issue of time. First, the rationale underpinning the periodisation of this study. Although April 27th 1994 is commonly used to mark the start of the democratic period, January 2nd – the first Sunday of 1994 – was chosen as the starting point for this study so as not to omit comments regarding the significance of April 27th. The last Sunday of 2011 – December 25th – was chosen as the endpoint as it followed the approval of the proposal for the current study. As has been hinted above, the first decade or so of democracy could reasonably be divided into different periods (e.g., in terms of change in the presidency or public shifts in awareness regarding race and racism). Indeed, my initial plan was to devote different analytic chapters to different temporal periods. However, my subsequent engagement with the data revealed that many race-related themes stretched across the eighteen years under consideration. An attempt to artificially separate the data in terms of temporal chunks would have, therefore, amounted to not 'listening' to the data with care.

Second, this brings me to the issue of the data which were obtained, and the fact that letter and editorial counts fluctuated over different years (see Appendix 1). While the number of letters a newspaper publishes may likely vary over time depending on space constraints, the intensity of public debate and the like, it is reasonable to assume that the number of editorials published should remain fairly consistent across time. The possible reasons for the unevenness in letter counts could not be fruitfully investigated within the scope of the current study; it was impossible to firmly establish whether count differences across time were due to fluctuations in the public's willingness to participate in public discourse, shifts in editorial policies, omissions in the database from which the data were obtained, or a combination of these factors. Concerning the editorials, it seems plausible to assume that the unevenness in numbers is due to omissions in the database. Although years which evidence lower counts imply that race and

racialised issues were less discernible because some material was missing, I maintain that lower counts had a negligible impact on the overall picture presented by this study. Simply put, this study aims to present a broad picture of emerging black and white racialised identities during the first eighteen years of democracy. It does not endeavour to show how specific temporal or socio-political periods are linked to, or influence, racialised identity construction. I have nevertheless endeavoured to be mindful of publication dates when selecting extracts for inclusion in the analytic chapters that follow. For instance, I acknowledge that an assertion made in 1994 may not necessarily reflect the state of things in 2011. Thus, whenever possible, the analysis illustrates several extracts selected across time. Nevertheless, in some instances, I have opted to present a single extract on the basis that it provides a succinct illustration – regardless of the date of publication.

Researcher positionality and research ethics

Having provided a picture of the tasks involved in carrying out the analysis, it is also necessary to provide a picture of how my own positioning has shaped the manner in which those tasks were carried out. The following discussion weaves together my reflections on the analytic process which underpins this study, particularly my positioning as a white researcher undertaking an analysis of black and white racialised identity co-construction.

At first sight, it may appear quite fitting that the major works which directly stimulated the field of whiteness studies are works which were produced by white scholars (e.g., Dyer, 1988; Frankenberg, 1993; McIntosh, 1988). The same sort of pattern is evident within the South African context, where many of the academics who prompted an interrogation of post-apartheid whiteness (e.g., Steyn, 2001b), as well as those who have contributed towards on-going lines of research in this vein, are white. However, as Burnett (2018) reminds us, whites writing about whiteness "is the social science equivalent of insider trading" (p. 74). Indeed, Hook (2011) highlights that whites' involvement within whiteness studies – particularly whites' attempts to critique whiteness – raises potential problems. As he puts it: "what emerges here is the difficult issue of complicity in what one critiques, the prospect, in other words, of one's investment in precisely what one attempts to distance one's self from" (p. 26).

In line with this, I begin by offering some comments on how I am positioned in relation to the data corpus. Broadly speaking, the material spans and reflects issues and debates which form part of the context in which I grew up; from a child of 12 in 1994 to a young adult of 29 in

2011. Most of the strands of material were, therefore, familiar to me through daily life. Such familiarity can be seen as advantageous insofar as it enhanced my ability to understand the data in context. At the same time, however, I am cognisant that I may have chosen some data sources over other potential sources precisely because I sought to maintain a sense of familiarity. For example, my decision to opt for English- rather than Afrikaans-language newspapers, may reflect a turn towards opinions which were broadly more familiar to me.

The issue of familiarity, in turn, leads me towards the more specific question of how I – as a white researcher – am invested in the discourses which I proceed to analyse. On one level, having moved to South Africa at the age of seven, I have somewhat of an outsider's experience regarding the country's racialised context. Unlike the young white Afrikaners which Jansen (2009) describes, for example, I have not grown up with an inter-generational narrative about apartheid and its racialised order from my parents and grandparents. Thus, by extension, following the end of apartheid, I have not experienced the deep feelings of loss – such as the loss of political power, established roles, control and a sense of 'home' – which Steyn (2001b) has reported among whites. In this sense, therefore, I am positioned somewhat differently than most other whites.

On another level, I have nevertheless grown up within the very context which I proceed to analyse. The central question of this thesis arose in part from my own observations and curiosity about the racialised dynamics within South African society; particularly the distinctions between black and white people's positionings around me. One of the most striking realisations for me upon arriving in South Africa was that blacks, rather than whites, carried out menial labour – typically as gardeners and domestic workers. The lingering 'logic' of apartheid's racialised order has in many ways continued to serve as a backdrop to my everyday life; indeed, the discourses under consideration in this study emphasise the inherent tension between black and white people's positioning. My sense of being white has thus been formed through contrast to the black other.

The latter point brings me back to the matter of grappling with issues around racialised identities, particularly black identity. Several white academics have questioned whether it is appropriate for whites to engage with issues which concern South Africa's black majority. For example, Vice's (2010) contentious article suggests the following as a possible positioning for post-apartheid whites to adopt:

> One would live as quietly and decently as possible, refraining from airing one's view on the political situation in the public realm, realizing that it is not one's place to offer diagnoses and analyses, that blacks must be left to remake the country in their own way. Whites have too long had influence and a public voice; now they should in humility step back from expressing their thoughts or managing others. (p. 335)

Writing in a vein which draws on the perspective of Black Consciousness, Matthews (2011) has pointed out that:

> Biko is adamant at times that white people need to leave black people alone, giving them space to lead their own struggles (see for example 1970/2004). While white people will not be able to learn anti-racism without listening to and talking with black people, it is important that this contact not be intrusive and it is difficult to determine exactly how to ensure that it is not. It is also necessary that white people who wish to be involved in anti-racist struggles take seriously the point made over and again in black consciousness writings about how anti-racist struggles must be led by black people. (pp. 12-13)

At the very least, these points should urge whites to tread carefully and sensitively around issues which concern blacks. In the context of this study, I posit that the relevant question is not so much whether I – as a white researcher – *ought* to engage with issues around blackness but rather *how* such engagement might best be carried out. Drawing on the literature which suggests that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed (see Chapter 3), I have attempted to be mindful of my positioning within whiteness as well as my positioning in relation to blackness. My awareness of being white has not only been formed through contrast to the black other but also through the absence of the black other. For example, I attended schools in a formerly whites-only area, with an almost all-white teaching staff, and a predominantly white learner population (with more coloured learners than black learners). The area in which I reside continues to remain essentially white and upper middle-class; aspects which recall Statman's (1999) notion of living in a 'bubble' of white privilege. Indeed, even in the post-apartheid context, it is not possible to 'shed' or escape the privileges of being white. Yet unlike the whites which Statman describes, I have attempted to interrogate – rather than reinforce – the kinds of discourses which maintain a resistant brand of whiteness in post-apartheid.

Certainly, as an insider to whiteness, I have not been sealed off from discourses centred on 'hot topics' around transformation, such as Affirmative Action and Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment, which are articulated not only via the media but also within everyday conversations. These discourses fuel uncertainties and anxieties around the construction of post-apartheid white identity, and the discourse of *EW* is one such discourse. Crucially, however, the literature on whiteness, and race in general, has provided me with a lens through with to interrogate the racialised context around me. Over the last decade or so, this literature has shaped my thinking about the everyday racial discourses which circulate within South African society; it has not only provided me with the tools to identify discourses of whiteness but also prompted me to think critically about how these discourses serve to maintain white privilege despite the end of apartheid (e.g., Steyn & Foster, 2008).

Thus, following Frankenberg (1993), I see my engagement with discourses on whiteness as a (re)affirmation of the assertion that – even some 25 years after the end of apartheid – whites ought to be concerned with how whiteness continues to operate. As Frankenberg puts it,

> to speak of whiteness is, I think, to assign *everyone* a place in the relations of racism. It is to emphasize that dealing with racism is not merely an option for white people – that, rather, racism shapes white people's lives and identities in a way that is inseparable from other facets of daily life. (p. 6; original emphasis)

However, Dyer (1997) rightly points out that engaging with questions about how whiteness operates may lead to unintended consequences:

> I dread to think that paying attention to whiteness might lead to white people saying they need to get in touch with their whiteness. . . . The point of looking at whiteness is to dislodge it from its centrality and authority, not to reinstate it. (p. 10)

Expanding on Dyer's point, Ahmed (2004) explains that "whiteness studies would here be about white people learning to love their own whiteness, by transforming it into an object that *could be* loved" (n. p., original emphasis). In writing about whiteness, and more specifically in analysing a resistant white discourse such as *EW*, I have been mindful of inadvertently producing work which could feed a resistant brand of whiteness. Thus, I have been alert to the possibility of producing work which could in effect serve to re-centre whiteness. Engaging with a discourse which articulates notions of white victimhood can, for example, lead one to equate whiteness with a position of victimhood. This may ultimately result in the legitimisation of resistant white discourses (see, for example, Van Rooyen's (2000) work as noted in Chapter

2). I have attempted to minimise such possibilities by pairing the analysis of whiteness with an analysis of blackness; hence, to present whiteness in a context which is not divorced from blackness. Thus, in bringing the discourses of *EW* and *BNB* in dialogue with each other, I have attempted to produce an analysis which displays how assertions of privilege, or the lack thereof, are contested and responded to in context across the two discourses.

Lastly, as an extension of the issues discussed above, it is worthwhile to briefly comment on the ethics of carrying out the current research. As the University of Cape Town does not require ethics clearance for studies which draw on material in the public domain, the Department of Psychology merely had to confirm that ethics clearance was granted for this study (see Appendix 2). Nevertheless, I believe that it is appropriate to provide the reader with some clarity on how the material was handled and in turn presented in the analysis.

In presenting the 'voice' of the data, I hold that there is a useful and crucial distinction to be made between speaking *for* and speaking *of* racialised groups. In writing this thesis, I have endeavoured to speak *of* both blackness and whiteness; not *for* blacks and whites. This study, in other words, speaks of discourses of blackness and whiteness. It focuses on particular constructions of blackness and whiteness; that is, the discourses of a *Bold New Blackness* and an *Enduring Whiteness*. These discourses are not presented as speaking for *all* blacks or *all* whites. Indeed, this study does not intend to give expression to the narratives or voices of either blacks or whites. Although it may be argued that these discourses do represent some blacks and some whites, my focus throughout the analytic chapters remains on the constructions within the texts – and not on the authors of the texts. This is yet another reason for why I have chosen to only note letter-writers' names at the end of the study in the list of data sources, and merely label the extracts in terms of source and publication date within the analytic chapters.

Barring some examples within the data corpus (predominantly in *City Press*), letter-writers included their names for publication, and thus willingly and knowingly identified themselves in material which was to become publicly-available. Nevertheless, I have endeavoured to approach the letters with a critical rather than a judgemental eye. Indeed, looking at whiteness is not intended as an exercise at 'catching out' or labelling racist whites. As Wander, Martin and Nakayama (1999) have pointed out, "the shift from race to whiteness is an important conceptual shift in that it allows us to identify the ways that white privilege functions without having to name anyone racist" (pp. 22-23). Hence, amongst other things, my analysis of the

discourse of *Enduring Whiteness* is geared towards highlighting how white privilege continues to persist despite the end of apartheid.

In lamenting the fact that "post-apartheid society has not been able to move away from apartheid racial categories" (p. 309), Hendricks et al. (2019) call on researchers to seek "creative avenues for transformative knowledge" (p. 311) around race. Thus, firstly, in examining the co-construction of racialised identities via texts which distinguish between the categories of black and white, I have been particularly wary of carrying out an analysis which falls into a class of problematic "studies that reinforce colonial and apartheid difference" (Hendricks et al., 2019, p. 311). Secondly, by presenting the discourses of *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness* in dialogue with each other, I have endeavoured to shed new light on the dynamics of the construction of racial difference in post-apartheid.

Nevertheless, I acknowledge that there are limits to the analysis presented in the following chapters. While I have focused on presenting two major constructions of blackness and whiteness, this should not be taken to imply that the constructions of *BNB* and *EW* represent the only possibilities open to blacks and whites in post-apartheid. Moreover, the following analysis chapters do not claim to provide an exhaustive or definitive picture of the discourses of *BNB* and *EW*. In his discussion on discourses of white privilege among young whites, Soudien (2010a) has acknowledged that "discursive frameworks have limitations and can easily become caricatures" (p. 354). Indeed, I am cognisant of the risk of presenting narrow, rigid and essentialised characterisations of blackness and whiteness. As templates, the discourses under consideration can admittedly be seen as manufacturing racialised stereotypes to some extent. In this regard, it is important to note that my depiction of *Bold New Blacks* and *Enduring Whites* has been shaped by the available data sources. As indicated earlier in this chapter, the depth and breadth of these constructions is shaped by a host of editorial factors as well as shifts in public discourse. The picture of blackness and whiteness presented within this study is, therefore, inescapably tied to the manner in which the chosen newspapers have portrayed racialised identities. Keeping this and the scope of the study in mind, I have endeavoured to select texts which collectively present the widest possible picture of blackness and whiteness *within* the bounds of the chosen data corpus.

CONCLUSION

This chapter has served as a bridge between the literature-based material reviewed in the previous chapters, and the newspaper material which is presented in the next chapters. While the next chapter will contextualise the data under consideration further, this chapter has endeavoured to provide a broad contextualisation of the data. Accordingly, it has not only highlighted existing debates and issues around race in the South African print media but also compared the newspapers selected for analysis against other existing newspapers. Moreover, this chapter has detailed the method used to analyse the texts presented in chapters 5, 6 and 7. It is to the first of these analysis chapters to which I now turn.

---

[i] The National Library would not permit digital scanning of their printed newspaper edition holdings without prior written approval (which I did not seek) from the relevant newspapers. However, I was told that such approval would not be necessary if I requested printouts sourced from the Library's microfilm holdings. The cost of obtaining low-quality digital scans was quoted at R10 per newspaper page, while the cost of obtaining printouts was quoted at R12,25 per printed page. Assuming that each letter and editorial section respectively took up one page across the required 18 years for two newspapers (i.e., 2 pages x 938 weeks/editions x 2 newspapers), the cost of scanning would be R37 520 while that of printing would be R45 962.

In a telephonic conversation with the Cape Town branch in November 2011, I verified that the Library held the required material. In January 2012, I requested the material from 1994 as a preliminary sample and was informed that one of the bound volumes of the *Sunday Times* (from January to April 1994) was missing. I subsequently visited the Cape Town branch to ascertain how much of the required material was available. Despite my enquiries, it remained unclear how much of the required material was available in either the print edition or microfilm format. Bizarrely, I was told to e-mail a request specifying the date of every single newspaper edition I needed across the entire 18 year period. My two e-mails of March 2012, requesting clarification regarding the completeness of the Library's holdings, have gone unanswered. Hence, aside from the prohibitively high cost of obtaining the material, it is possible that large chunks of material are missing from the National Library's holdings.

CHAPTER 5

LOOKING FORWARD AND (NOT) LOOKING BACK: TWO TEMPLATES FOR RACIALISED IDENTITY.

> *We cannot be outside, above, or beyond the past and the present. Nor can we be outside, above, or beyond race.*
>
> (Erasmus, 2017, p. xxiii)

This chapter aims to explore racialised identities within the emerging post-apartheid era. Having sifted through references to racialised discursive objects across the data corpus, the analysis seeks to illustrate how some of these objects are constructed by drawing on two specific discourses. The first discourse – *Bold New Blackness* (*BNB*) – is primarily concerned with black identity, while the second discourse – *Enduring Whiteness (EW)* – is primarily concerned with white identity. Having identified these discourses, the analysis considers what the constructions contained within the discourses are capable of achieving. It is shown that racialised identities can either be reformulated along newly-imagined post-apartheid lines, or maintained along old-established apartheid lines. Whereas *BNB* promotes the reconstruction of black racialised identity due to the end of apartheid, *EW* promotes the preservation of white racialised identity despite the end of apartheid. Hence, it is argued that these two discourses can be understood as oppositional templates for post-apartheid identity (re)construction. In closing, it is observed that racialised identity is constructed within each template via references to both blacks and whites. The chapter, therefore, concludes that racialised identity is co-constructed at an individual template level.

Before presenting the analysis, it is necessary to provide some contextual grounding. First, I wish to clear away the following question: what lines of thought about race, and by extension, racialised identity, are evident across the entire data corpus? This is a complex question, and space constraints only permit that it be addressed briefly. The existence of various discursive threads underscores not only the possibility for the existence of different lines of thought around race but also the possibility for diverse interpretations of data through the use of

different discursive lenses. Thus, when it comes to race, the data corpus may be read in a variety of different ways along different discursive lines. Second, following from this, alongside the existing literature (see Chapter 2), the data make it clear that a multitude of different kinds of *blacknesses* and *whitenesses* may be studied. In order to usefully support the remaining analytic chapters, I have opted to cut through such multiplicity and focus on two major discourses – one about black identity and one about white identity – that are sustained across the data corpus.

MAPPING THE DISCURSIVE TERRAIN

A terrain of multiple discursive threads

A vast body of literature has drawn attention to the multiple threads of discourse that exist in the New South Africa. Speaking about the post-apartheid context, Gqola (2001) has observed that "alternate discourses emerged and grew in visibility in the newly liberated space. They participated in the 'undoing' of apartheid and in challenging its most insidious lies. These discourses contribute to the creation of new realities, new 'truths'" (p. 96). Indeed, the post-1994 era has seen the emergence of an array of new discourses, and these have been responsible for introducing and proliferating a host of new or revised ideas, concepts and terms. In line with this, Shepherd and Robins (2008a) have recognised the need to compile "a guide to the keywords and key concepts that have become central to public and political discourses in post-apartheid South Africa" (p. 1). For a comprehensive picture, the interested reader is referred to Shepherd and Robins's (2008b) edited book, *New South African Keywords*, as well as an earlier book by Boonzaier and Sharp (1988).

While my focus is restricted to two discourses which shape racialised identity construction, I acknowledge that these discourses are located alongside other discourses. Although it is tricky to pin down the characteristics of the fluid post-apartheid social reality, it is possible to state, as Foster (2000) has, that "non-racialism, non-sexism, democracy and nation-building" form "four sets of core values" (p. 58) on which the New South Africa is founded. These core values certainly form an important contextual basis for the construction of racialised identity, yet they are not central to my analysis. The reasons for this may be outlined as follows. First, although the concept of non-racialism has a usage that dates back to the 1955 Freedom Charter, there is no established definition of its meaning. Citing factors such as the Constitution's failure to include a definition of the concept, Everatt (2012) asserts that non-racialism in effect "has no

real post-apartheid meaning" (p. 10). A series of 18 focus groups, conducted throughout the country in 2011, reflect the difficulty of grasping what ordinary people understand by non-racialism: "if South Africans are asked to talk about non-racialism, they talk about race and racism" (Everatt, 2012, p. 6; for a fuller discussion see also the special issue of *Politikon* in which Everatt's article appeared). Second, notwithstanding efforts at creating a non-sexist society, South African feminist writers have asserted that race, class and gender constitute inseparable axes of difference (De la Rey, 1997) which together produce people's lived experience. Thus, for example, it is recognised that a white, wealthy woman's lived experience differs from that of a black woman who is poor. I reiterate that these axes of difference deserve attention within other larger studies. Third, while the emergence of democracy has served to reposition South Africans of all races, writers such as Muthien (1999) have warned that "for as long as race coincides with inequality, democracy cannot flourish" (p. 15). The question of how race and class are related has received attention within major works such as Seekings and Nattrass (2005). Nevertheless, the debate on the significance of race versus class remains heated. Last, given that apartheid forged a deeply divided population of separate 'nations', it is understandable that post-apartheid researchers have repeatedly questioned whether (alongside other axes of identity) racialised identities are incompatible with the goal of fostering a national identity. In summarising results from social psychological studies, Eaton (2002) has concluded that "sub-national ethnic, racial or linguistic identities are compatible with an overarching sense of national identity" (p. 46). Similarly, citing a host of other authors' findings concurring with her own, Roefs (2006) has confidently declared that her "chapter confirms that national identity and sub-group identities can co-exist without impeding one another" (p. 93). Thus, it is possible to study racialised identities independently of national identity.

Sifting through the terrain

The discourses examined in this study's analytic chapters incorporate at least some of the above-mentioned core values in their construction of blackness or whiteness. Such incorporation allows constructions of racialised identity to be presented as being in line with the ethos of the new dispensation. However, these values remain sufficiently flexible so that different discourses can utilise them for different aims. As a sweep across the data set indicates, there are two perspectives on race from which to choose. From one perspective, there is a saturation of race across a wide range of topics which is taken to indicate the significance of race on multiple levels. In some instances, this saturation is attributed to the historical legacy of apartheid, which continues to affect people's lived experience in the present. Thus, issues of

race in post-apartheid may be read via a discourse which points to the lingering effects of apartheid's racialisation. In other instances, it is asserted that the contemporary context has re-energised race in its own right. That is, efforts aimed at racial transformation may be read via a discourse focusing on post-apartheid racialisation or even, as some South Africans assert, a discourse of 'reverse apartheid'. From another perspective, there is a push against this saturation via a de-emphasis on race. This occurs not only via omission and thus silence about race but also through discourses which explicitly deny the significance of race after 1994. The following editorial extract, for example, illustrates precisely such denial.

> Today, black and white, we proudly speak of one South Africa that knows no skin colour. [CP/E/06/06/99]

As a more detailed discussion on these perspectives by Erasmus (2008) affirms, South Africans tend to see race in terms of two opposing perspectives. Some people see race as "nothing and nowhere", and thus hold a colour-blind perspective which asserts that "the concept [of race] should be abandoned in the interests of building a society in which race no longer matters" (p. 173). This perspective, in other words, enables people to dismiss, deny or ignore the on-going significance of race in post-apartheid. Other people, by contrast, see race as "everything and everywhere", and thus hold an essentialist view which asserts that since "race predetermines everything we do, are and can be . . . race always is and always will be a central social fact in South African society" (p. 175). This perspective, in other words, enables people to assert the on-going significance of race despite the end of apartheid.

At this point, it becomes clear that a meaningful reading of the data cannot proceed without the use of particular lenses which delineate and bring specific things into focus. Simplifying the labels suggested by Erasmus, I posit that discourses on race can either be understood as those which assert race as sameness or as difference. Unlike texts which present race as difference, texts which present race as sameness render race as neutral and thus meaningless; they obscure rather than illuminate the construction of racialised identities through an emphasis on colour-blindness. My reading thus focuses on texts that see race as difference; these texts reveal the manner in which the (co-)construction of racialised identities occurs in post-apartheid. Where necessary within the analysis, such analytical work provides a context to illustrate how an emphasis on sameness serves to impede post-apartheid racialised identity (re)construction.

Delineating a terrain of clashes: April 27th 1994

The 27th of April 1994 – the date of South Africa's first democratic elections – undoubtedly marks a pivotal turning point in the country's history, having brought about a host of political, social and economic changes. On the 24th of April 1994, both *City Press* and the *Sunday Times* took the opportunity to provide editorial comment on the upcoming elections; the former printing two shorter texts and the latter printing one longer text. While my analysis is not directed at linking a particular newspaper to a particular discourse, I begin and thus ground my discussion by looking at how these two newspapers offer different views of April 27th. Both newspapers share the purpose of guiding South Africans into an uncertain post-election, post-apartheid future, and, in this sense, the texts are most usefully read as templates which provide preliminary specifications about living in the New South Africa. The view offered by each newspaper hence forms an entry point for exploring the new era's significance for identity construction – for the way that racialised discursive objects can be created – and for illustrating how the era's significance remains open to different interpretations and thus different purposes.

The texts below reveal that there is a consensus among both newspapers insofar as the first democratic elections are understood as a moment of great significance. Whether characterised as a "turning point" in the country's history or as "lay[ing] the foundation for the future", it is clear that these elections are understood as an event which will affect current and future generations of South Africans.

> The children of this country, their children and children thereafter will look back on this day as the turning point in the history of South Africa. [CP/E/24/04/94b]

> South Africans will go to the polls . . . in millions . . . to vote because this election, and this election alone, must lay the foundation of the future for them, for their children and their children's children. [ST/E/24/04/94]

But although there is a consensus about the significance of the elections, a more extensive reading indicates that there are divergent views about the reasons for their significance. That is, each newspaper heralds April 27th from a different perspective. By way of introduction, I consider each of these perspectives in brief.

> The final midnight curtain of 342 years of oppression will be closed on the morning of Wednesday April 27 when all of us go to the polls to cast our votes. [CP/E/24/04/94a]

> We, the people of South Africa, declare for all our country and the world to know that as from Wednesday a truly new South Africa will be born. After 342 years of white oppression, millions of us will, for the first time, cast our votes to determine our future and destiny. [CP/E/24/04/94b]

The first *City Press* editorial extract may be read in two similar ways. The reference to "the final midnight curtain" suggests the end of a long theatrical performance, or event, lasting 342 years, characterised by the historical oppression of colonialism and more recently that of apartheid. Likewise, though in more visually concrete terms, the reference to "the morning of Wednesday April 27" suggests the end of oppression through the rising of the sun, the bright start of a new era which is contrasted to apartheid's last sunset and its final dark "midnight". Either way, the text simultaneously heralds the end of apartheid and the start of something new and thereby creates a temporal demarcation which positions the past and the future against each other. The second editorial extract similarly declares that April 27th marks the birth of "a truly new South Africa" after 342 years of oppression. While the declaration is seemingly voiced on behalf of the racially-diverse and thus non-specific "we, the people of South Africa", the reference that follows to "millions of us" makes it apparent that the declaration aims to highlight the significance of change for blacks and not simply for all South Africans. The use of the word "after" marks the closing of an era where *blacks* experienced "342 years of *white* oppression". Consigned to the past, an era characterised by blacks experiencing oppression gives way to an "after" era. Now no longer oppressed, blacks (i.e., "us") can cast their (i.e., "our") votes "for the first time" and thus participate in shaping their future. Crucially, the fixity of the demarcation between the past and the emerging future as something "final" and "closed" makes it possible to envision a host of new possibilities for black identity. From this perspective, heralding the end of apartheid serves to signal the start of a new context. This new context, in turn, acts as a catalyst for the emergence of a discourse concerned with the reformulation of apartheid-era black identity; a discourse which I label *Bold New Blackness* (*BNB*).

> This election is the occasion for celebration because it is like no other. It is the ritual by which South Africans liberate themselves from the bitter, blood-soaked past, and accept the fate that history has fashioned for them: one people, many races, many languages, many clashing beliefs. [. . . .] We have much to celebrate. Apartheid, in retrospect, is taking on the character of a bad dream: did we really have officials sticking pencils into people's hair to determine where they might live and whom they might marry? Did we really have Kafka-esque army of bureaucrats busily rubbing out "black spots" on the map, tearing people from their homes and their roots to dump them in desert places? [ST/E/24/04/94]

In the above *Sunday Times* editorial extract, April 27th marks the start of a new context defined in terms of a "celebration". This celebration forms part of a "ritual" process which enables "South Africans [to] liberate themselves" from a "bitter, blood-soaked past". This ritual of liberation certainly points towards the intention of forming a demarcation between the past and the future. However, at the same time, the ritual suggests a distancing and disconnection from a past described as "bitter, blood-soaked". Indeed, likening the apartheid past to "a bad dream" substantially weakens any contrast which could otherwise be made between the past and the emerging future. The context of a dream, alongside the repeated question "did we really?", creates a haziness, a sense of uncertainty and doubt regarding whether events such as racial classification and forced removals really took place. While differences in terms of race, language and belief are acknowledged, the text glosses over these differences by conceiving of South Africans primarily as "one people". Two observations can, therefore, be made here. There is an overall vagueness about the past, and thus about what South Africans are liberating themselves from. Linked to this is a general lack of racial specificity of experience. Notwithstanding the mention of "black spots" being rubbed out (that is, the forced removal of blacks from areas designated for whites) in the context of a bad dream, it seems that all South Africans, regardless of race, have equal reason to celebrate their liberation. Seen on its own, the *Sunday Times* extract does not seem to articulate a basis for racialised identity (re)construction. However, compared against the editorials from *City Press* mentioned above, it is apparent that an opposing perspective is being articulated. In considering its comparatively loose demarcation between the past and the future, and its lack of specificity regarding racial experience, I argue that the *Sunday Times* editorial is reflective of a perspective concerned with preserving apartheid-era white identity; a discourse which I label *Enduring Whiteness* (*EW*).

The unfolding post-apartheid future, therefore, leaves the following question open: how to craft racialised identity, how to fill it with content? In attempting to answer this question, it is crucial to state upfront that the data corpus reflects several possibilities for identity construction. It would be short-sighted, for instance, to assume that post-apartheid racialised identity construction can occur in terms of change but not in terms of continuity with the past. Post-apartheid possibilities can usefully be identified following Soudien (2001), who recognises the existence of an "official discourse" that reflects "the ideologies, views and perspectives of whichever political group is in power" (p. 312). In turn, Walker, M. (2005) has used Soudien's discursive lens as a tool to distinguish between the official discourse articulated before 1994

(under National Party (NP) rule) and that articulated since 1994 (under African National Congress (ANC) rule). I adopt a simplified version of this lens to distinguish between discursive attempts at perpetuating the apartheid past versus attempts at creating a new post-apartheid future. At the same time, I also wish to distinguish between discourses which are respectively primarily concerned with blackness and whiteness. Since I will show that the distinctions of past/future and black/white map onto each other, I proceed to treat these discourses as templates which specify directions for racialised identity construction.

A BOLD NEW BLACKNESS

The texts drawn from *City Press* have hinted at a path for post-apartheid black identity construction. By stating that the end of apartheid may be understood as the shedding of a long historical context that created a black identity characterised by oppression, they suggest that post-apartheid black identity ought to be constructed in terms of a lack of oppression. Put differently, following the template of *BNB*, the preliminary task is to clear the way for a distinctly post-apartheid construction of black identity.

Defining apartheid

I have indicated that the potential for identity reformulation is signalled via heralding the end of apartheid. However, the task of clearing the way for a new version of black identity extends beyond mere heralding; it requires engagement with the identity created by apartheid. The perspective from which apartheid is viewed is, therefore, of crucial importance. As the following examples illustrate, apartheid is described as "an evil system" and "a crime against humanity".

> Apartheid was an evil system that bred intolerance. It told white people they were a chosen race, superhuman and tasked by God to lead the inferior African and black people out of barbarism. [CP/E/18/09/05]

> Apartheid – a crime against humanity – and its depictions belong to the dustbins of hell, from where there is no coming back. Millions of blacks were humiliated by apartheid. [CP/L/23/10/94]

The condemnation of apartheid is presented not only in sharp and unequivocal terms but also in distinctly racialised ones. Apartheid was an unacceptable system *because* it positioned

people hierarchically based on race. Alongside the assertion that apartheid was an unacceptable system, there is an assertion that the type of black identity constructed under apartheid is unacceptable. The first extract above begs comment about a co-construction between "superhuman" whites and "inferior" blacks. However, for the moment, I simply consider that being black during apartheid meant being positioned as inferior to whites and consequently being subjected to humiliation. In these texts, therefore, apartheid's version of black identity is deemed undesirable and is thus wholly rejected. Hence, the construction of an alternate version of black identity – one free of humiliation – becomes a necessary goal rather than an optional quest.

Nevertheless, the achievement of this goal requires a careful engagement with the apartheid past. On the one hand, apartheid must be consigned to the past to make way for a new identity, hence the reiteration of a demarcation via the idea that "there is no coming back". On the other hand, the apartheid past cannot be ignored. This is so not only because its condemnation forms the very justification for the construction of a new black identity, but also because such construction can only proceed via reference to (or, as I will show, in *negation* to) the apartheid past.

In terms of the past, the recognition that blacks were oppressed, humiliated and treated as inferior to whites raises questions about the implications of apartheid for black people. It is thus necessary to consider how black identity under apartheid can be viewed within the discourse of *BNB*. The following editorial provides a more detailed account of life under apartheid.

> The old South Africa [. . . .] divided black people into ethnic groupings in order to rule them for ever. It is this system that placed them in the reserves and in the locations where many of them died of starvation and exposure to heat and cold. But the majority of our people could not voice their anger and dissatisfaction at all these injustices. They did not have a vote or a voice to speak on their own behalf. [CP/E/24/04/94a]

To be black under apartheid meant being (re)moved to reserves and locations where living conditions were harsh. Thus, beyond aspects such as humiliation, it is evident that apartheid inflicted worse things on blacks: death through starvation and exposure to the elements. By noting such "injustices", the text reiterates the message that blacks' positioning under apartheid was unacceptable, thereby bolstering efforts towards contemporary black identity

reformulation. But, more than this, the text begins to answer an important question: how did blacks view their positioning during apartheid? The text points to a sense of voicelessness amongst blacks regarding their lived experience, where blacks' voicelessness is attributed to neither having the right to "vote" nor having "a voice to speak on their own behalf". Crucially, however, voicelessness does not equate to an acceptance of apartheid's status quo. Rather, voicelessness merely holds back the expression of blacks' "anger and dissatisfaction" at the injustice of apartheid.

> The struggle against apartheid was met with severe repression by a government armed with a "total strategy" which included elimination, detention, torture and various other types of restrictions on individuals and organisations. [CP/L/13/02/94]
>
> The black nation is an angry nation. So many wrongs were perpetrated against blacks during National Party rule, so all that people do out there is a display of their emotions. It's a cauldron that's been simmering for years. [ST/L/17/04/94]
>
> In the past, we didn't enjoy freedom of expression. Hence we were unable to put the message across. Things have changed now. We have the liberty to tell it like it is. [CP/L/17/04/05a]

Here it is evident that those who participated in "the struggle against apartheid" had to fight against the repressive apartheid state, and that such participation risked being silenced or made voiceless through state-actioned violence. What makes the new democratic context remarkably different is that it allows blacks to "put the message across". More particularly, it has allowed "an angry nation" of blacks to voice their "emotions" regarding the "many wrongs" inflicted against them by apartheid; they are now no longer voiceless. The post-1994 condemnation of apartheid should thus not be seen as something new, but as a continuation of pre-existing black anger likened to "a cauldron that's been simmering for years".

> If blacks in this country did not believe in themselves, how do you explain, for example, the self-liberation process that we have just undergone or are going through at the moment? For the last so many decades, if not centuries, black people have been engaged in the process of removing their shackles. [CP/L/12/03/95]

By asserting that black people have been in a "process of removing their shackles" over "many decades, if not centuries", the above letter reaffirms the view that blacks never accepted their positioning under apartheid, nor under colonialism. This is indicative of a deep, long-standing condemnation of apartheid amongst blacks; a factor which motivates the shedding of apartheid-inscribed identity. As an aside, it is possible to speculate that black people's ability to "believe

in themselves" and sustain a "simmering" anger over the injustice of apartheid, are factors which have served to protect black South Africans against psychological damage (see Foster, 1993b).

A bold post-apartheid future

Although the past is deemed to be significant within this discourse, an overall greater significance is placed on the future. Consider the following examples.

> We know how bitter and angry many of our people are about the past, but is this not the time to say the past must be buried, once and for all, and a new era be ushered in? [. . . .] Together, hand in hand, let us in unison loudly proclaim that apartheid is finally over and a new democratic South Africa is born. [CP/E/24/04/94a]

> Apartheid social engineering was a violent system that bulldozed individuals physically and emotionally, denuding them of compassion, a sense of belonging, love and respect for human life. As a result, many South Africans travelled under the yoke of hopelessness, anger and disillusionment. The after-effects of such an evil system cannot be underestimated, but will continue to ravage some members of future generations. But that is history. The positive side of that history is that when we went to the polls in 1994 and when we adopted our democratic constitution two years later, we signed a covenant with ourselves. In unison, we said, "Never again!" Never again are we to succumb to a system, or tenets of social engineering, that will advantage one section of society while oppressing another. [ST/E/21/11/10]

> [Whites'] regime has fallen and we, as Africans will, never allow them the opportunity to repeat such filthy politics again. We have toiled, we have mourned and we have triumphed. Never again will we allow such inhumanity to prevail against our people, never again will such heinous acts of terror against fellow South Africans be permitted. [CP/L/08/05/05]

These examples demonstrate that the dawn of a new era is used to calm rather than fuel blacks' anger about the past. In this regard, it is vital to establish what is meant by the idea that "the past must be buried" so that "a new era [can] be ushered in". To be clear, the idea of burying the past does not mean that what happened in the past is disregarded. In line with earlier texts, these texts describe apartheid in unequivocally negative terms: as an "evil" and "violent system that bulldozed individuals physically and emotionally". Likewise, these texts acknowledge blacks' "bitter and angry" feelings about the apartheid past. The deep condemnation of apartheid presented here not only marks apartheid as undesirable but also pushes apartheid firmly into the realm of "history". In other words, it allows for the assertion "that apartheid is finally over and a new democratic South Africa is born". Moreover, it allows for blacks to be positioned as those who have "triumphed" against whites, and by extension for blacks to be

positioned as victors rather than victims. As the reiteration of "never again" across two of the texts suggests, either positioning gives blacks the control to never allow apartheid to be repeated. In this way, apartheid can be kept firmly in the past.

Though they do so in various guises, the texts presented thus far either assert that there is a fixed demarcation between apartheid and post-apartheid or take for granted the demarcation's existence. This fixed demarcation can be understood as one pillar of *BNB*, and it's function for identity construction is revealed in relation to a second pillar. Consider the following letter extract.

> South Africa has made an irreversible break with apartheid and those who believe they can return to those dark days of racial oppression are living in a fantasy world. [ST/L/26/02/95]

The demarcation referred to as "an irreversible break with apartheid", works to support a prescriptive aspect within *BNB*, namely by shaping the form that black identity takes. Echoing an earlier extract about the end of oppression (see CP/E/24/04/94b), the above extract asserts that the "dark days of racial oppression" must be kept out of the post-apartheid context. If a return to oppression, as seen under apartheid, is not possible except "in a fantasy world", then the world of post-apartheid is defined by the absence of oppression. By implication, the second pillar of *BNB* prescribes that black identity construction must proceed in contrast to its apartheid-era construction.

> Those who want to cling to past injustices must be told there is no more room for them in the new country. They must accept the changes that have taken place or, hard as it may sound, they must take their baggage and get onto the next flight out of South Africa. [CP/E/24/04/94a]

> It is shameful that whites want to ensure the continuation of defunct apartheid policies. [CP/L/08/05/05]

With the demarcation described above having been established, it can be asserted that there is no place for anything reminiscent of apartheid within the new dispensation. Equally, then, it can be asserted that "there is no more room" for "those who want to cling to past injustices". While the first text above refers to the latter in racially-neutral terms (i.e., as "those" and "they"), the second text usefully serves to clarify that it is most likely "whites" who are being referred to in the first text. Any efforts at clinging to apartheid-era elements are considered unacceptable because they risk introducing the "dark days of racial oppression" into the new

context. As such, there is a strong condemnation of a 'white' agenda aimed at perpetuating "defunct apartheid policies", and whites who pursue this agenda are considered "shameful". Simply put, within this discourse, whites have a choice between accepting post-apartheid change or leaving on the next flight out of the country.

Here it is important to clarify that post-apartheid change hinges on the end of white privilege as seen under apartheid. Consider the following examples.

> The new democracy is all about a reinstatement of social justice for the majority and a diminution of exclusive privileges for the white minority. [CP/L/17/03/96]
>
> The dismantling of apartheid means the dismantling of white privilege and power over the rest of South Africa. [CP/L/22/11/98]

If the presence of white privilege defined whiteness under apartheid, then its absence defines whiteness in post-apartheid. The end (i.e., the "dismantling") of the white minority's privilege brings an end to white rule over the black majority, and this, in turn, opens up the possibility for blackness to reposition itself. What becomes apparent here is that the repositioning of black identity requires a simultaneous process of repositioning white identity by ending white privilege. Put differently, the parameters for an acceptable (reconstructed) post-apartheid white identity, need to be specified in order to construct a distinctly post-apartheid version of black identity.

> Some South Africans desperately need lessons about the art of living in a rainbow nation. These are the misguided souls who must be dragged kicking and screaming into post-apartheid South Africa, and forced to make it their patriotic duty to understand what it means to co-exist with their compatriots who suffered injustices under apartheid. [CP/E/04/02/96]
>
> We believe [racist] incidents like this [by whites towards blacks] are widespread. [. . . .] If some people won't change, we will force them to. After all, our constitution supports us in this. [CP/E/12/11/00]

The first editorial contrasts "some South Africans" and "their compatriots", adding that the latter "suffered injustices under apartheid", and thus refers to whites and blacks respectively in indirect terms. It sees whites, whose resistance towards the new dispensation is displayed by "kicking and screaming" while being "dragged" into post-apartheid, as "misguided souls" who can seemingly be reformed through "lessons". Importantly, such lessons are described as

"forced" rather than optional and are centred on learning to "co-exist" with blacks. In line with this, the second editorial asserts that the actions of racist whites towards blacks will no longer be permitted. Indeed, racist whites who resist change will be "force[d]" to change. Together, these editorials suggest that whites must now assume a position of equality with blacks rather than superiority as seen under apartheid (e.g., no longer as "superhuman" whites as shown in CP/E/18/09/05).

Nevertheless, it appears that some whites are unclear about the "lessons" which they are required to learn, hence the following white letter-writer's request for "a set of guidelines".

> Nelson Mandela and others at the ANC conference called for whites to commit fully to the reconciliation and the transformation process. Whites must do more, they say. Maybe they are right. I hear them and I want to do something about it. But I have a serious problem. As a middle-class, moderately well-off, self-employed white citizen, I do not know what it is that I am supposed to do. What is it that the ANC . . . are demanding or want from me? In what way am I supposed to change my everyday life? I think they should publish a set of guidelines to point the way for my daily transformation. [ST/L/28/12/97]

The following letter constitutes an apt reply in terms of guidelines.

> White people have to start taking responsibility not only for their role in the apartheid regime but also for playing a role in the continuation of the degradation of black people. If they are not willing to help eradicate the poverty that many black people face, perhaps reparation is a better course than reconciliation. [CP/L/24/10/04b]

In line with an emphasis on the past as articulated within *BNB*, whites are required to acknowledge, and thus take responsibility for, their role in the oppression of blacks during apartheid. Moreover, whites are required to acknowledge, and take responsibility for, how they continue to negatively impact black people in the present. Underlying these guidelines is an assertion that whites have a duty to help change blacks' positioning for the better; they must be "willing to help". Thus, as in a previous example (see CP/E/24/04/94a), the text contains a warning that whites who do not support change for the benefit of blacks should leave, or be made to leave, the country.

Whites, from this perspective, can be distinguished according to their willingness to support change.

> I have nothing against whites . . . I have good relations with my white colleagues and a few of them are my friends. However, I am not blind to what some of them are. They are ruthless racists who don't give a hoot about a black life. They claim that we (blacks) accuse them of being racists. [. . . .] There is no time that the same whites admitted and accepted that they were, and still are, racists. How are we supposed to believe that they have changed if they have never viewed themselves as racists? [CP/L/17/04/05a]

While blacks may have "good relations" with non-racist whites, racist whites "don't give a hoot about a black life" and, therefore, continue to see blacks as "inferior" and themselves as "superhuman" (see CP/E/18/09/05). Racist whites are those who have neither "admitted" nor "accepted" that they were or are racist towards blacks. Given that racist whites do not see themselves as racist, blacks are hard-pressed to believe that such whites have changed, and this makes white racists problematic within the new dispensation.

> Those who cannot accept a non-racial and democratic South Africa are racists and this country will have no room for them. [CP/E/05/06/94]

> We are tempted to tell these white racists to emigrate to Europe if they cannot accept the non-racial, democratic new South Africa. [CP/E/25/02/96]

These extracts pull together the threads seen in previous examples. From the perspective of *BNB*, racist whites are defined as those who "cannot accept" a "non-racial" and "democratic" South Africa. Unlike misguided whites (who can be reformed through a forced adherence to guidelines and lessons), racist whites cannot be reformed into accepting or working towards post-apartheid change. As racist whites' identities are seen as incompatible with the new dispensation, there is "no room for them" in the country, and it is suggested that they should "emigrate to Europe". This demonstrates that although *BNB* is a discourse about the construction of post-apartheid black identity, it contains clear parameters on what constitutes an acceptable form of post-apartheid white identity. Next, I look at how post-apartheid white identity is constructed within the discourse of *EW*.

AN ENDURING WHITENESS

Considered on its own, the *Sunday Times* editorial extract, presented earlier, does not appear to be about white identity construction. Indeed, my assertion that the text represents a discourse aimed at preserving apartheid-era white identity seems poorly supported. My presentation of the text has been deliberate and serves to illustrate a point. As Dyer (1988) acknowledges in his ground-breaking article on the representation of whiteness in mainstream film, the difficulty of attempting to write about whiteness is that it "seems not to be there as a subject at all" (p. 44). As he elaborates, thinking about whiteness

> is difficult, partly because white power secures its dominance by seeming not to be anything in particular, but also because, when whiteness *qua* whiteness does come into focus, it is often revealed as emptiness, absence, denial or even a kind of death. (p. 44)

Although the accumulated literature on whiteness has demonstrated that whiteness *is* 'there' for one to write about (see Chapter 2), the analytical task of (re)exposing whiteness remains tricky and calls for flexible, creative approaches (see Twine & Gallagher, 2008). Frustratingly, I note that many letter and editorial texts *do* seem to be about whiteness, but, at the same time, these can appear either too vague or too neutral in content. They may thus easily evade analysis. If the texts about blackness could simply be analysed via a direct route, then those about whiteness cannot. Nevertheless, I assert that it is possible to subject texts concerned with white identity to very similar lines of questioning. Thus, taking what has emerged in the previous section, and using it as a scaffold, I proceed to interrogate texts on whiteness in a comparative manner.

Escaping apartheid

I have pointed out that within the discourse of *EW*, apartheid has been described as "a bad dream". The details of this bad dream are elaborated on as follows.

> People were put into jail without trial or sentence, and some of them were systematically beaten to death, like Steve Biko, while the law and the medical profession looked the other way. People were blown to bits with letter bombs and their friends retaliated by putting bigger bombs in public places. Blood and guts were, literally, strewn across our streets. [ST/E/24/04/94]

Much more than a bad dream, the extract provides a gory picture which can be described as a nightmare: people being imprisoned "without trial or sentence" and "systematically beaten to death"; people being "blown to bits" by bombs leaving "blood and guts" laying about. This extreme, nightmarish depiction of life under apartheid heightens the earlier-mentioned significance of the ritualistic, liberating effect of April 27th. Nightmares, in other words, are not things to be remembered, and April 27th is presented as the remedy for ridding South Africans of a nightmarish past.

Moreover, it appears that there is no reason to remember the nightmare of apartheid. As the following letter declares, apartheid is dead, and this implies that the nightmare has been banished, never to recur.

> The National Party broke apartheid to pieces years ago, crushed it to a fine powder and buried it. The strongest nail in its coffin was when President F W de Klerk plucked up the courage to unban certain political parties and release political prisoners, some of whom now call him a murderer. And yes, he is one because he has murdered apartheid. [CP/L/03/04/94]

The breaking, crushing and burying of apartheid suggests another sort of ritualistic process: the slaying of the monster of apartheid. Significantly, the white NP and its white president "murderer" F. W. de Klerk are given credit for this deed. From this perspective, whites are absolved from all of apartheid's horrors because they courageously killed it, and apartheid belongs in the past because it is long-dead. However, while here it is declared that De Klerk, and whites, brought apartheid to an end, the following example shows that the discourse of *BNB* provides a different view.

> He [De Klerk] led a party that implemented apartheid, a system that was declared a crime against humanity by the United Nations Organisation. It would be a grave error to credit De Klerk for our democracy. The truth of the matter is that De Klerk and his party were forced to capitulate to democracy by political pressure that was exerted by democratic forces both within and outside the country. They simply could no longer govern because of sanctions, boycotts and the armed struggle. The efforts by our country's youth and workers were also effective in the struggle for democracy. [CP/L/04/05/97]

Expanding on an earlier text about blacks having "triumphed" over apartheid (see CP/L/08/05/05), the above letter introduces De Klerk as the leader of those who "implemented apartheid". If he can be considered a "murderer", this is only because he was "forced" to yield to "pressure" to introduce democracy. From this perspective, those who stood behind

"sanctions, boycotts and the armed struggle" are responsible for breaking and crushing apartheid. More specifically, the reference to the "youth and workers" indicates that black people were responsible for forcing democratic change.

Nevertheless, despite this counter-discourse, the preceding examples present the apartheid past as a non-issue. Consequently, the specifics of actions carried out by the apartheid regime are rarely spelt out within the discourse of *EW*. Moreover, the scattered characterisations of apartheid that may be drawn from examples across the data corpus are at best consistently vague. The editorial extracts below illustrate a distinct way of subsuming descriptions of apartheid within discussions that blend ideas about the past and the future.

> The point is that the need for stability, now that apartheid has been so unequivocally consigned at last to history's trashcan, outweighs all else. [. . . .] The new government has great tasks ahead of it. Its success will depend as much on its readiness to preserve as to change the past. [ST/E/01/05/94]

> Throughout his speech Mr Mandela was speaking in terms of the larger goal of transforming South African society. His objective, it was clear, was not to preserve elements of an unacceptable past, but to preserve the instruments of good government for the purposes of change. [ST/E/19/02/95]

> It would be fatal to allow this very young democracy to become mired in endless recriminations about the past. [. . .] The central task is the creation of a society and a government which will not replicate the sins of the past. [. . . .] The past must be consigned quickly to the past. Then let us grasp the future. [ST/E/26/02/95]

> Our common enemy is the ugly past we left behind in 1994 and whose every trait and habit we passionately hate. [ST/E/30/01/05]

Descriptions of apartheid as something "so unequivocally consigned at last to history's trashcan", or as something "left behind in 1994", position apartheid firmly within the past. But while "at last" might suggest that apartheid's demise has long been anticipated, even hoped for, a direct condemnation of apartheid is notably absent. Since apartheid is positioned within the past, apartheid is merely understood as part of "an unacceptable" and "ugly" past, or as something representing "the sins of the past". By stating that "endless recriminations about the past" should be avoided for the sake of the newly-emerging democracy, these editorials block meaningful examinations of the past. Such blocking can be observed on two levels.

First, I note that the defining characteristics of apartheid are not stated. Despite being described as "passionately hate[d]", apartheid's characteristics (i.e., "every trait and habit") are not spelt out and thus remain unknown. The immediate purpose of rendering apartheid's characteristics unidentifiable is to protect the apartheid past from direct condemnation. But, more than this, the purpose is to permit the omission of guidelines regarding how "not to preserve elements of an unacceptable past" or indeed how "not [to] replicate the sins of the past". I argue that such omission essentially leaves open the possibility for maintaining a measure of continuity between apartheid and post-apartheid. How this works is best illustrated in comparison to the perspective offered within *BNB*. Consider the following examples.

> A great number of white South Africans have a high regard for the perpetrators of apartheid, and thus still uphold the evils and principles of the apartheid regime. [CP/L/24/10/04b]
>
> Generally speaking, the white folk in this country do not believe that apartheid was wrong. For one to embark on corrective measures, one has to first acknowledge that wrongdoing did take place. [CP/L/12/07/98a]
>
> We still have to hear former NP leaders tell the nation that they are sorry for the harm they caused during the apartheid era. [CP/E/08/12/96]

In looking at the discourse of *EW*, it is apparent that a lack of condemnation towards apartheid can be understood as a symptom of whites' general view of the past; they do not believe that apartheid was wrong. On the contrary, many whites "have a high regard for the perpetrators of apartheid". Thus, whereas blacks view apartheid as an "evil" system to be rejected (see CP/E/18/09/05), whites do not. Whites' denial regarding the wrongs of apartheid serves to render a discussion about post-apartheid transformation meaningless; if no tangible "wrongdoing" took place in the past, no "corrective measures" are necessary now within the present. Whereas the perspective of *BNB* can be drawn on to assert that apartheid-era NP leaders must "still" apologise "for the harm they caused", the perspective of *EW* can be drawn on to assert that since the NP crushed and murdered apartheid (see CP/L/03/04/94), NP leaders have nothing to apologise for. A lack of direct condemnation – of the type seen within *BNB* – therefore suggests that the discourse of *EW* is not intended to promote post-apartheid change.

Second, this brings me to a more detailed aspect made visible in comparison to the discourse of *BNB*: descriptions of apartheid within *EW* seldom contain references to racialised objects. Consider the gory, nightmarish description of apartheid again (see ST/E/24/04/94). The text

states that imprisonment and bombs under apartheid merely affected "people". The only racialised reference pertains to the death of a well-known black person; Black Consciousness leader Steve Biko. More broadly, the discussion drawn from the three editorial extracts about the past is entirely devoid of references to either blacks or whites. Here the omission of racialised references not only neutralises apartheid's impact along racial lines but also obscures a racialised hierarchy characterised by black disadvantage and white advantage.

Once again, the perspective of *BNB* provides an illuminating critique of the stance evident within *EW*. Referring to what can aptly be described as white amnesia, *BNB* enables one to (re)expose apartheid's racially hierarchical foundation.

> Only amnesiacs will have forgotten that our legal system favoured whites against blacks; that is provided jobs to whites and kept blacks out; that the education system favoured whites while educating blacks for perpetual servitude; and that blacks could not enjoy full ownership of their houses, however small, while whites enjoyed the privileges of lily-white suburbia. [CP/E/09/05/99]

The overall lack of condemnation of apartheid within *EW* means that there is very little impetus for rejecting or shedding apartheid-constructed racialised identities. From this, it can be stated that the discourse of *EW* can be used to minimise the impact of the new dispensation on white identity. Key to this task is the maintenance of continuity with the past. By emphasising post-apartheid "stability", this discourse defines the new government's ability to succeed in terms of its "readiness" to both preserve and change the past. Rather than reading this as an impossible call to somehow change the past, this should be read as a basis for an as yet unspecified prescription: the extent to which the new government ought to remain faithful to past ways of doing things (i.e., "stability") versus how far it ought to deviate from these ways (i.e., "change").

Stabilising post-apartheid change

Given that the discourse of *EW* is generally vague about apartheid in relation to the past, it is surprising to find the problems created by apartheid raised in relation to the post-apartheid future. The following extract is thus revealing.

> Ahead lie mountainous problems. Apartheid has left many of our people poor, unemployed, illiterate, homeless, sick and criminal, and the elections will fill no bellies and heal no illness. The minorities, still flocking to the banner of the National Party, try to cling to privilege or fondle fears of the future. [ST/E/24/04/94]

Contained within the same editorial heralding April 27th as a celebration, the idea of celebration briefly gives way to the reality of the post-apartheid future. The set of problems created by apartheid translate into problems affecting the poor and the sick. These problems, however, are once again portrayed in ways which obscure race-based inequality; at best, "our people" implies that black people are being referred to. More telling is the observation that "minorities", understood as whites, "try to cling to privilege" as the post-apartheid future unfolds. The pertinent question that arises from this concerns not so much how these problems will be solved, but by whom and to what effect.

In this regard, it is recognised that the post-apartheid future will unfold predominantly in terms of black-led control; specifically, the control of President Nelson Mandela.

> Mandela has already sketched the themes of his administration as conciliation, nation-building, and upliftment of the poor. He has shown himself benign, free of vengefulness, and generous in his negotiations with his new political partners. [. . .] To give effect to his intentions, Mr Mandela knows, the government must first restore confidence in South Africa's future, especially among such key elites as local and foreign investors, technocrats and managers, and skilled professionals. [ST/E/08/05/94]

Mandela's emphasis on (re)conciliation and nation-building – broadly understood as the intention of fostering unity across the South African populace – not only fits well with the perspective of *EW* but also provides fertile ground for its articulation. Here the idea of unity is articulated in raceless terms, thus steering the discussion away from issues to do with past and present racial inequality.

This is not to say that Mandela's stance is strictly incompatible with the perspective of *BNB*. Consider the following examples.

> All is being done in the spirit of national reconciliation, preached by President Nelson Mandela with good intentions and hope for a better future. Those who have violated human rights do not show any signs of remorse and would gladly do it all over again. They are happy Mr Mandela is an understanding African, and not a terrorist who belongs in a prison cell, as they always thought. [ST/L/06/08/95]

> If this country is to be healed, all those who were involved [in apartheid atrocities] must say: Yes, we did it and we are sorry. President Mandela's hand of friendship in burying the past and building a new South Africa must be appreciated. [CP/E/02/02/97]

Seen against an earlier extract about racist whites (see CP/L/17/04/05a), the reference to people who carried out human rights violations without remorse, can be understood as an indirect reference to whites who cannot be reformed. From the perspective of *BNB*, it would be best if such whites would emigrate. Although this suggests that Mandela's stance as "an understanding African" is problematic because it may impede change, his ability to offer a "hand of friendship" may nevertheless serve to promote change. Once again, this serves to highlight that there is an assumption that some whites will be reformed; that they can and must participate in post-apartheid change. If, as asserted within *EW*, Mandela is "free of vengefulness", this is only because whites are expected to show remorse for past injustice. From the perspective of *BNB*, "burying the past" remains conditional on whites admitting guilt; if whites admit guilt, then healing and post-apartheid change can begin.

Through the incorporation of references to Mandela, *EW* is presented as a template that is seemingly compatible with the ethos of the new dispensation. Nevertheless, it maintains the potential to neutralise black control and perpetuate a position of power for whiteness.

> The NP is still of the opinion that it is in the interests of South Africa, at this stage, to play a stabilising role in a government of national unity. For millions of South Africans, as well as for foreign governments and investors who have South Africa's interests at heart, Mr de Klerk's presence in the government of national unity is a guarantee that this government will act in a responsible manner. [ST/L/07/08/94]

While it avoids any overt mention of race, the above extract is deeply racialised. In line with earlier extracts advocating for "stability" and the restoration of "confidence", it is asserted that the NP is best suited for fulfilling "a stabilising role" within the new government. In this regard, it is (white Deputy President) De Klerk's presence, and not (black President) Mandela's presence that counts, and it counts for seemingly raceless groups of people who are collectively defined as those "who have South Africa's interests at heart". Although it is factually correct that "millions of South Africans" voted for the NP in 1994, support for De Klerk is exaggerated; the ANC attracted much greater support overall, leading to the conclusion that Mandela's presence should matter a great deal more to a majority of South Africans (namely blacks). But

even so, there is a much more complex issue connecting black and white here. By the logic of the previous extract, if Mandela is "to give effect to his intentions" of fostering unity, then he "must first restore confidence" in the country's future. The idea of "confidence" bears a close similarity to that of "stability", and this provides an entry point for whiteness despite a context of black political control. De Klerk's presence stands as a "guarantee" for a responsible government, an ingredient supposedly essential for confidence among "foreign governments and investors". Thus, if Mandela can only succeed by restoring "confidence", and if De Klerk serves to guarantee confidence, then whiteness becomes positioned as the essential driving force behind the country's successful future. The potential is therefore created where the same whiteness that created the "mountainous problems" of apartheid can appear as the remedy to the "empty stomach[s]" of poor blacks (see ST/L/28/06/98, below).

Securing a firm positioning for whiteness therefore hinges on the question of change, and the extent to which it is implemented within the post-apartheid context. Indeed, the example below reiterates that the perspective of *BNB* is cognisant of the fact that whiteness can utilise Mandela's "good intentions" to block or even undo any post-apartheid change.

> The good intentions of Mr Mandela are taken for granted and used to turn back to the old ways. [ST/L/06/08/95]

However, Mandela's reconciliatory stance needs to be understood within a broader picture.

> It is Mr Mandela's foresight and flexibility that has made him such an accomplished and respected man, compared with the dwell-in-the-past brigade who thrive on a vindictive lust for change. [ST/L/16/07/95]

Following from this and a previous text (see ST/E/08/05/94), Mandela is portrayed as "benign, free of vengefulness" and possessing "foresight and flexibility" – aspects which make him "an accomplished and respected man". Here then, Mandela is distinguished from those who "dwell-in-the-past" and have "a vindictive lust for change". Thus, within *EW*, a distinction is drawn between the 'soft' approach of Mandela and the 'hard' (radical) approach that emanates from *BNB*.

It is notable that the need to defend against the 'hard' approach towards effecting change, leads to the adoption of an argument which takes an overtly racialised perspective. For example, speaking about the state of education, the following letter advocates

> building on what was good in the old "white system", rather than flushing out all that is worth saving just because it was already happening when the National Party was in power, thereby sacrificing the country's next generation of school-children to mediocrity or worse on the altar of change for the sake of political currency. [ST/L/22/01/95]

The point I wish to illustrate here is that the white education system under the NP is presented as an example of something to be built upon rather than destroyed, as something that contains "good" elements that are "worth saving". Put another way, it is about preserving a system designed to generate and protect white privilege. From the perspective of *BNB*, the question, therefore, centres on what the old system can provide for black people. The extract below provides one illustration of how the apartheid government served the needs of whites while neglecting the needs of blacks.

> For 46 years the Nat [i.e., Nationalist] government did nothing to provide decent homes for blacks. Instead, they looked only to their own. [CP/E/06/03/94]

The picture that emerges here is that of two diametrically opposed templates. As a further illustration, consider the issue of racial transformation along economic lines.

> The ANC appears to think it a crime to be rich, although it is probably only a crime to be rich and white. The ANC will no doubt counter by saying the rich got that way by grinding down deprived and oppressed blacks. But there will always be rich . . . and to destroy the rich is to destroy the country. [ST/L/02/01/94]

> The issue here is not about blacks taking away the wealth of whites, but equitable redistribution of our national income. It's only logical that reconciliation cannot be built on an empty stomach. Therefore, white South Africans, if they are committed to nation-building and reconciliation, must walk some extra miles in assisting the government in its quest for parity in the allocation of national wealth. [ST/L/28/06/98]

The template of *EW* presents whites as targets of imminent post-apartheid change. Whereas being "rich and white" is seen as a "crime" by the ANC, being rich and black is not. Curiously, the unequal relationship between blacks and whites is acknowledged via an imagined response by the ANC: the oppression of blacks creates benefits for whites. Nevertheless, the assertion that "there will always be rich" serves to present whites' otherwise problematic privileged

position as seemingly natural and thus inevitable. Furthermore, since the destruction of rich whites is equated with the destruction of the country, a reconfiguration of whites' positioning is presented as wholly undesirable – for whites *and* blacks. This reiterates that *EW* is concerned with protecting and maintaining a position of privilege for whites in the new dispensation. By contrast, the template of *BNB* does not present the process of "redistribution" as "blacks taking away the wealth of whites". Here, rich whites are not being destroyed but rather reformed to suit a post-apartheid context. Furthermore, *BNB* does not present the gap between poor blacks (i.e., those with an "empty stomach") and wealthy whites as natural or inevitable. On the contrary, whites' privileged positioning puts the onus on them to "walk some extra miles" for the sake of creating equality between race groups. This once again reiterates that post-apartheid whites are expected to commit to "nation-building and reconciliation", and thus work towards supporting change for the benefit of the black majority.

The following letter provides another example of how post-apartheid change may be halted via the discourse of *EW*.

> A top [ANC] member has declared that the needs of blacks would be addressed before those of whites, because blacks had been deprived. Where is their commitment to a non-racial South Africa? Needs should be addressed in order of urgency, not on the basis of race. Nor would a wealth tax, affirmative action, and other vengeful measures still to be devised against whites, be in keeping with the ideal of equal rights and a free society. [ST/L/09/01/94]

Since the idea of addressing blacks' needs first is reflective of the template of *BNB*, it is an idea which is contrary to the template of *EW*. Within *EW*, a lack of condemnation for the apartheid past allows for a portrayal of blacks' and whites' experience of apartheid as equal. Two consequences follow. First, if blacks have not been "deprived", their "needs" are no different from those of whites. Hence blacks' needs do not warrant special attention and no "restructuring" is required. Alternatively, by drawing on the value of non-racialism, it can be argued that race should have no significance and hence the legitimacy of blacks' needs can similarly be denied. Second, within a perspective that sees no past wrong-doing to correct, corrective measures become "vengeful measures". Once again, transformation efforts which impact on whites can be rejected based on the post-apartheid ethos of "equal rights" within a "free society". Hence, it can be seen that minimising post-apartheid's impact on white identity entails minimising change for black identity.

CONCLUSION

As one letter-writer has observed, "the new dispensation is all about the past, the present and groups of people" (ST/L/19/07/98). Indeed, this chapter has shown that perspectives about the apartheid past and the post-apartheid present constitute key elements in the formation of South Africa's future since 1994. Moreover, it has shown that these perspectives can be differentiated along racialised lines. Through showing this, the chapter has revealed two different templates for post-apartheid racialised identity construction. By way of conclusion, and as a bridge to the next chapter, I summarise the central tenets of these templates.

I have shown that, as a template for identity construction, *BNB* aims to reformulate black identity and thus reposition blacks in post-apartheid South Africa. It attempts to clear the way for a new version of black identity in two related ways. First, it sharply condemns apartheid and thus presents apartheid-era identities as wholly undesirable. Second, it uses the idea of a new era to forge a firm demarcation between the apartheid past and the post-apartheid future. This, in turn, opens the opportunity to construct what is envisioned as a truly post-apartheid version of black identity. However, at the same time, this template recognises that apartheid-era identities will not crumble spontaneously.

Thus, taking an overtly racialised perspective, *BNB* envisions a process for enabling identity change, one wherein the new democratic government "must meet the aspirations of the masses, [and] whites should be willing to make sacrifices and face up to the restructuring ahead" (ST/L/23/01/94). The government is, therefore, tasked with effecting change for black people (i.e,. "the aspirations of the masses") through policies such as Affirmative Action and Black Economic Empowerment. This "restructuring" can further be understood as an agenda that puts black people's (i.e., "the masses'") aspirations first. At the same time, it is also apparent that "restructuring" remains dependent on whites' willingness to "make sacrifices". For example, whites are encouraged to "face up to" (and not resist) the surrender of white privilege. Hence, it can be seen that the task of constructing post-apartheid black identity is linked to the task of reformulating white identity.

I have also shown that the template of *EW* aims to preserve the privileged position of white identity despite the end of apartheid. Given that apartheid-era racialised identities will not crumble spontaneously, it attempts to reduce the impact of efforts aimed at post-apartheid

change, and thus maintain a measure of continuity for white identity. First, by offering a vague condemnation of apartheid, *EW* establishes a weak demarcation between the past and the future. Second, by largely excluding racialised objects when talking about the past, it avoids discussions such as those about black victims and white oppressors, and thus presents a racially-neutral past. Third, it harnesses the very ethos of the new dispensation – with its emphasis on non-racialism – to block post-apartheid change.

My choice of labelling the discourses presented in this chapter as *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness* was driven by a desire to emphasise the primary focus of each discourse; that is, on blackness and whiteness respectively. However, by this stage, it should be apparent that my labelling practice has also been driven by a desire to dispel the idea that each discourse is a pure consideration of blackness *or* whiteness alone. These labels, in other words, help to emphasise that whether one looks at the construction of blacks or whites, one inevitably finds references and connections to the racialised other. Nevertheless, it must be borne in mind that this chapter has merely illustrated that post-apartheid blackness and whiteness are co-constructed at an individual template level. What remains to be examined is whether such co-construction extends relationally between these templates. I turn to this type of examination in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

BALANCING CHANGE AND CONTINUITY: A BLACK GOVERNMENT IN A WHITE COUNTRY?

> *The White man, is the master in South Africa, and the White man, from the very nature of his origins, from the very nature of his birth, and from the very nature of his guardianship, will remain master in South Africa to the end.*
>
> Speaker at the House of Assembly Debates
> (March 15, 1950, col. 3610, as cited in Posel, 2001b, p. 98)

> *Unless we move fast, we will soon be the laughing stock of our neighbouring countries, who are beginning to say South Africa has a black president and a black government in a white country.*
>
> [CP/E/23/07/00]

This chapter aims not only to grapple with the question of whites' positioning after the end of apartheid but also with the question of blacks' positioning following the start of post-apartheid. Whereas Chapter 5 considered the templates of *BNB* and *EW* from a somewhat abstract perspective that focused on content, this chapter takes a more practical perspective which considers these templates' implementation within the post-apartheid context. Specifically, this chapter's analysis delves into the tension between the envisioned template version of identity and the emerging version constructed in context. Moreover, whereas Chapter 5 suggested that opposing yet independent templates could simply be used to 'manufacture' black and white identities, this chapter aims to reveal the overwhelmingly interdependent nature of these templates. The analysis tackles the issue of interdependence through an exploration of subject positions. It not only identifies the subject positions made available to blacks and whites within each template but also considers the possibilities for action which such subject positions offer. Whereas *EW* positions whites as best suited to run things for their benefit, as well as the supposed benefit of all South Africans, *BNB* positions blacks as best suited to run things for their benefit. It is thus shown that the templates of *BNB* and *EW* construct racialised identities in response to each other. In turn, it is suggested that black and white identities are caught up in an endless cycle of opposition across the two templates. The chapter, therefore, concludes that racialised identity is co-constructed interdependently between the two templates.

DEFINING POST-APARTHEID

Having described the templates of *BNB* and *EW*, it is important to note that these templates must inevitably be implemented within the emerging post-apartheid context. As the following example indicates, the country's new constitution provides a legislative framework which enables progress by giving content to, and thus concretely defining, the future.

> Post-apartheid South Africa needs to move forward. Our country needs a blueprint for the future. And that blueprint is a constitution. [CP/E/05/05/96]

However, even with this legislative "blueprint" in place, post-apartheid remains a racially-troubled and unpredictable context. Far from doing away with race, the new Constitution has included race as the basis for post-apartheid transformation (see Chapter 1). As I will show throughout this chapter, this racially-troubled context is shaped by the clashing of oppositional discourses that respectively advocate for change and continuity. To be sure, as pointed out in the editorial extract below, the intensity of race relations did not escalate to the level of a "race war".

> Although racial divisions still run deep five years into the new political order, everyone's nightmare – the possibility of a race war – is no longer even a remote possibility. [CP/E/03/01/99]

Nevertheless, these "racial divisions" have remained significant even beyond the first five years of democracy. In this regard, the data corpus is peppered with examples which indicate that race relations remained problematic throughout the period under consideration. On one level, incidents of racism have periodically captured national attention and stirred debate. A key example is the Reitz Four incident noted in Chapter 1. On another level, sporadic incidents of inter-racial violence have further troubled the state of race relations (for an overview see Holborn, 2010).

The point that I wish to emphasise is that the meaning of the term 'post-apartheid' is not as firm as it might first appear. In talking about the New South Africa, Shepherd and Robins (2008a) observe that there are both continuities and discontinuities between the pre-1994 and post-1994 periods; periods which they nonetheless speak of as apartheid and post-apartheid.

On a practical level, writers concerned with race have grappled with the question of how to define the demarcation between pre-1994 and post-1994. Writing about race after 1994, Dixon and Durrheim (2003) have commented that "in a society such as South Africa, it would be misguided to pretend that the past does not continue to define the present" (p. 20). Indeed, in a study on race in higher education, Walker, M. (2005) has shown that "student identities were formed at the nexus of competing discourses of transformations, or preserving the apartheid past, of language, culture and colour" (p. 51). Taking a stance similar to Shepherd and Robins (2008a), Maré (2014) has noted that the contemporary era of democracy sees both similarities and dissimilarities with the past. Yet he argues that an analysis of race in South African society should be tackled via the use of the terms 'pre-1994' and 'post-1994', and not apartheid and post-apartheid. By contrast, others have asserted that it is not possible to talk of two separate periods. For instance, Van der Westhuizen (2013) has employed the term 'postapartheid' (without a hyphen) as a way to show that "no radical division can be made between apartheid and what follows" (p. 9).

For the purpose of this study, I favour the term 'post-apartheid' over 'post-1994'. The term post-apartheid serves as a reminder that the context under analysis *is* different from apartheid. This difference is what enables the possibility to reformulate racialised identities. The term also serves to keep apartheid as a factor relevant to the analysis. It allows me to look at the construction of a contemporary version of black identity which is rooted in opposition to the apartheid past. Likewise, it allows me to look at the ongoing maintenance of a version of white identity which, despite the emerging post-apartheid present, remains rooted in the apartheid past. Put differently, it allows the analysis to explore a context that Norval (1995) sees as characterised by tension:

> Any new imaginary attempting to fashion a truly post-apartheid society would have to think its own formation in terms of the tension inherent in the term 'post-apartheid'. The latter 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. The 'beyond' has to be constituted with reference to the horizon of which apartheid formed the articulating principle. Such an imaginary would retain it as its other, as a signifier of closure which has to be resisted. (p. 43)

Revisiting April 27th

Having considered in the previous chapter how the two different templates draw on the elections of April 27th to construct an envisioned future, it is now apt to consider some assessments of April 27th.

> Those who thought that the April 1994 election was going to bring down the white oppressive regime and bring liberation were mistaken. [CP/L/15/05/94]
>
> April 27 was a joy for most black people who were oppressed by the past regime. Their hope had rested in the new government's major goal as promised before the election – to address the inequality of the past. However, it would seem things did not go as promised. [CP/L/07/08/94]
>
> On April 27 last year the world saw long queues of our people who were desperate to vote for a democratic government. We voted. Our grandfathers, grandmothers and the disabled went to vote. What do we get for that? Very little it seems. [CP/L/15/01/95a]

These letters are noteworthy for their display of criticism very soon after the April 27th elections. In supporting a construction of black identity which is free of oppression, the letters argue that a failure to eliminate inequality and a "white oppressive regime" means that "very little" has been achieved in this regard. Blacks, in other words, have not been repositioned following April 27th. While it may reasonably be argued that change cannot be expected to occur with immediate effect, these letters are but one strand amongst multiple other strands of criticism and discontent. The following are a few examples, selected across time, which refer to apartheid's lingering presence after 1994.

> No-one can deny that the legacy of apartheid is still very much with us and appears set to stay with us for a long time. [CP/E/03/09/95]
>
> There is no denying that it will take a long time to address the legacy of apartheid. [CP/E/29/07/07]
>
> Seventeen years have passed since the first democratic elections, but changes are not happening at the speed required to address the imbalances of the past. [CP/E/07/08/11]

What do the lingering "imbalances of the past" and the "legacy of apartheid" mean for the two discourses under consideration? Described through the lens of *BNB*, factors that are reminiscent of apartheid can be understood as clouds that cast shadows against the light of the rising post-apartheid sun (see CP/E/24/04/94a). From the perspective of *BNB*, if apartheid is far from gone in the new dispensation, then the demarcation between the past and the future

does not hold as firmly as envisioned. As the construction of a distinctly post-apartheid version of black identity occurs in negation to apartheid, any residue of apartheid that cannot simply be cleared away is problematic. It suggests that a suitable context for reformulating black identity has not been fully forged. From the perspective of *EW*, by contrast, apartheid's lingering presence points towards a measure of continuity between the past and the present. It suggests that some measure of apartheid-era white identity preservation has been achieved in post-apartheid. Taking these two perspectives together, I assert that the legacy of apartheid has the following consequences: 1) blackness has to work against an entrenched whiteness in order to effect change for black identity, and 2) whiteness merely has to defend its existing status in order to maintain continuity for white identity.

REFORMULATING POSITIONS

I have argued that a reformulated version of black identity can only be constructed within a context that is free from the past. Hence, I have shown that the purpose of *BNB* as a template is to carve out a post-apartheid social order which is distinctly different from that of apartheid. But what about blacks' positioning within this new context? In this connection, it is worthwhile to note that surveys by the Institute of Race Relations have asked South Africans to respond to the following statement: South Africa is now a country for black Africans and whites must take second place. The 2001 survey (which falls in the middle of the period covered by this study) indicates that 50% of all respondents, and 53% of blacks, agreed that whites should come second (IRR, 2017). Indeed, the following editorial extract suggests that the New South Africa is expected to bring about a radical change in positioning for black people.

> Come rain, sun-shine or a Third World War, our people will dominate the government of South Africa after April 27. [CP/E/02/01/94]

April 27th 1994 is envisioned as the start of an era where blacks (i.e., "our people") are going to "dominate" within the sphere of government. Moreover, the start of this era is seen as something inevitable and unstoppable (i.e., "come rain, sun-shine or a Third World War"). As my discussion will show, the discourse of *BNB* seeks to construct a context wherein blacks, as the country's numerical majority, occupy most of the country's key decision-making positions. The aim is thus to establish a country led by blacks by putting blacks first.

> Isn't it time that Africans be promoted into more positions of decision making? Everywhere you go in the city centre and in the suburbs [of Pretoria], whether into banks, restaurants, shops, businesses, movie houses, police stations or municipal headquarters, the only people you deal with are whites. And the person of authority you ultimately have to deal with to get a decision on anything is white. In a city where Africans comprise approximately 77 percent of the population they should be the ones making the decisions. [. . .] Africans need to use their numerical leverage to their advantage. [CP/L/13/11/94a]
>
> Despite the 1994 elections, whites still call the shots in the army, the police services, the intelligence service and the economy in general. [CP/L/08/12/96]

Both these letters capture how blacks and whites are positioned in the early post-apartheid period. In contextualising these letters, it is important to recall that apartheid's systematic racialised ordering sought to maintain the oppression of a black majority while upholding the power and privilege of a white minority. Unsurprisingly, within that context, black and white contact occurred in terms of highly unequal levels of status (see Foster & Finchilescu, 1986). From this, it becomes evident that the challenge for reconstructing black identity is rooted in the fact that the post-1994 context does not automatically reposition blacks. Instead, such repositioning must follow from the country's overall transformation efforts. Put another way, the residue of historically-entrenched white privilege hampers the task of swiftly repositioning whites, thus keeping the positioning of blacks mostly static. The first letter shows that the activities of daily life entail an inevitable interaction with whites. Here whites are not simply positioned as people "to deal with"; they are positioned as those "to deal with *to get a decision on anything*". The second letter provides the same picture from a broader perspective. Here too, whites are in positions of "authority" and control; they are the ones who "call the shots" within various state domains and the economy.

These letters also introduce two mutually-supporting arguments for shifting black and white subject positionings, or for putting blacks ahead of whites. The first letter uses a racialised headcount to present the absurdity of current positionings: although blacks form over three-quarters of the population, whites fill positions of authority everywhere. I label this line of argument *Blacks First*. The second letter uses the context of the new dispensation to object to current positionings: "despite the 1994 elections", which brought about democratic change, whites "still" remain in positions of authority. I label this line of argument *1994 Contradiction*.

The preceding examples have illustrated that where whites are in control, blacks are not. Moreover, blacks appear to be excluded from domains under white control; hence, they are

observing rather than participating within a system dominated by whiteness. Nevertheless, as would be expected within a context undergoing transformation, black exclusion cannot be maintained indefinitely. The following letter extracts provide insight into blacks' positioning within white-controlled domains.

> Not a single black police officer can claim to hold a position of authority in the SAP [South African Police] except for the window-dressing kind of three black generals we have. All three have been given positions that carry little authority. Male Afrikaners run the police force from the police headquarters down to the last police station. White civilians dominate civilian ranks that include few if any blacks. [CP/L/29/05/94]

> The senior posts in the SANDF [South African National Defence Force] are still held by whites of the former apartheid SADF [South African Defence Force]. [. . . .] Recently there was a so-called golf day where whites didn't turn up for work but blacks were supposed to go to work. [. . .] Whites are still living in the apartheid era. [CP/L/03/11/96]

> [The Department of Justice] is still predominately white-dominated, despite the government's gospel of supporting a rainbow nation. Of all the attorney-generals only one is black. High-key positions in Pretoria are exclusively held by whites. It is they who are in charge of appointments, consequently we have a small number of black prosecutors and magistrates. [CP/L/20/07/97]

> We are teachers on the ground, but whites are our bosses. Not as school principals, but they run the whole education department. Conscious of that, they always make a point that there are a few blacks among them. These are the ones they will always use for publicity purposes. [CP/L/10/01/99]

Elements of *1994 Contradiction* run through these letters. It is apparent that, despite the end of apartheid, whites "still" remain in control of a wide range of domains including the police, the army and the departments of justice and education. To be white continues to equal having the ability to "dominate" and hold "authority". Whites hold "high key positions" which place them as those who are "in charge". As "bosses", whites can "run" institutions and departments. Whites' positioning, in turn, allows them to control blacks' entry into white spaces, and then limit blacks' positioning to roles that "carry little authority". Thus, blacks are merely included for the sake of "window-dressing" and "publicity purposes". Indeed, the following editorial serves to illustrate that blacks and whites disagree about what counts as transformation.

> What white South Africans regard as transformation is often not viewed in the same glowing light by their black countrymen, who often feel that they are strangers in the domain of another when they enter these "transformed" white institutions. [ST/E/14/05/00]

From the perspective of *BNB*, it becomes evident that there is a need to significantly shift the positioning of the black majority.

> We have said it before and we are saying it again now: there will never be harmony and lasting peace in this country unless black people, who are in the majority, have jobs, proper roofs over their heads, schools for their children and health facilities on their doorsteps. [CP/E/10/09/95]

> South Africa has more black people than whites. Surely, among the millions of blacks in the country, there is talent to match those currently participating [in the Olympic Games] in Athens. [. . .] How long must we wait to see more blacks representing South Africa in rugby, cricket, tennis and other sporting codes that were previously dominated by the white minority? [. . . .] Why have they [blacks] been denied an opportunity to shine on the world stage and represent their country? It is an embarrassment to all of us South Africans to see an almost all white team representing our country at the Olympics. [CP/L/22/08/04]

> Three black officials were stopped from working as traffic officers while a white officer was given the opportunity to continue to work as a traffic officer regardless of the necessary qualifications. [CP/L/21/09/03]

> I also want to back people who say that promotions favour whites. I am a teacher who possesses a remedial education diploma. But a white person was appointed to lead the remedial education course in my area. I am not a racist but I feel that when one white person is employed or promoted, nine blacks must also receive the same favour at the same time. [CP/L/15/01/95b]

Central to the first two extracts is an empirically obvious assertion: blacks outnumber whites in South Africa. The assertion consequently makes particular subject positions available; 'majority' for blacks and 'minority' for whites. Both extracts offer possibilities for black people to reposition themselves based on this assertion; that is, how to use their majority status as "numerical leverage to their advantage" (see CP/L/13/11/94a). One option is to literally use blacks' numerical majority as leverage against the white minority, and thus to invoke old apartheid-era notions of the black peril or *die swart gevaar*. In this vein, the editorial sets up a contrast between a black "majority" and an implied white minority, where whites are characterised as 'haves' and blacks as 'have-nots'. It warns that as long as blacks do not have the same access to employment, living conditions, education and healthcare as whites, the country's "harmony and lasting peace" will remain at risk. The route for changing blacks' have-not positioning is, therefore, envisioned in terms of a confrontation with the white minority.

An alternative option is to passively use blacks' numerical majority as a fact that troubles whites' current positioning within the democratic context. As the first letter declares, it is "an

embarrassment" to see whites dominating the Olympic team of a country "that has more black people than whites". Here it is evident that the discourse of *BNB* does not construct blacks as inferior to whites. "Among the millions of blacks", it is declared, "there is talent to match" that of the mostly-white Olympic team. Thus, the "embarrassment" can further be understood in terms of "den[ying blacks] the opportunity to shine" like their white counterparts. Hence, it is asserted that blacks are excluded *despite* their equal ability to succeed, and it is this fact which makes whites' over-representation troubling. The second letter notes that a white person was allowed to continue working as an officer while three black people were not. Such practice perpetuates the over-representation of whites and can similarly be seen as an "embarrassment". The appropriate route for changing blacks' positioning is outlined in the third letter. Complementing the two previous letters, it provides a clear formula for addressing the problem of "promotions [that] favour whites" within a country that has more blacks than whites. By suggesting that for every white person who is appointed, nine black people ought to be appointed, the letter attempts to create a new context that accurately reflects the country's demographics. In other words, it presents an argument for putting *Blacks First*.

This strand of *Blacks First* takes its cue from race-based policies of redress such as Affirmative Action. It assumes that black entry into white-controlled domains will not only serve to correct racially-skewed demographics but also automatically allow blacks to reposition themselves.

> Affirmative action appointments who stay for a six-figure sum, a six-cylinder car and house with a pool get frustrated at being given authority to choose only their own secretary, order expensive office furniture and a big tropical pot plant to keep them out of mischief by watering it every morning. [ST/L/06/08/95]

At first glance, the above letter suggests that blacks' post-apartheid positioning is radically different from their apartheid-era positioning. The image of blacks as poor, unemployed and spatially segregated (see Mtose, 2008) is stripped away and is replaced by the image of a black executive who earns "a six-figure sum", drives "a six-cylinder car" and lives in "a house with a pool" – probably in a previously whites-only upmarket suburb. However, these new possibilities are tethered to old realities. While put somewhat tongue in cheek, the letter points out that, in a white-controlled domain, a black executive's authority remains limited to watering the pot plant each morning.

The same kind of picture is replicated at a managerial level. As the following letter maintains, black managers have the authority to discipline whites working under them. But to attempt to assert authority by disciplining a white person is to risk dismissal. Black executives and managers are thus essentially rendered powerless because they work in a setting where whites are their "bosses".

> In most companies you will even find that black managers are afraid of disciplining their white subordinates. Some of these black managers even end up losing their jobs if they try to discipline their white underlings. [CP/L/01/11/09]

The two preceding letters reinforce what has already been illustrated; blacks are only there for "window-dressing" and "publicity purposes". It is, therefore, apparent that the goal of placing blacks in positions of authority cannot be achieved in a context where whites remain in authority. If troubling whites' positioning does not automatically result in the repositioning of blacks, then it follows that whites must be displaced to make space for blacks. Thus, the following strand of *Blacks First* asserts that blacks ultimately ought to be the ones in positions of authority.

> It is also important that a clear message has been sent to the outside world that they must come to realise that South Africa is a predominantly black country and therefore, all things being equal, it was inevitable that it would have a black finance minister. [CP/E/31/03/96]

> These people clearly resent a black government and are still very much the same people who enjoyed the privileges of living under apartheid. But whether these people like it or not we will eventually have our country back, all of it. We are the future people of this country and many of us will influence a lot of things as policy-makers and leaders. [CP/L/06/05/01]

While similar to the idea that "South Africa has more black people than whites", the idea that South Africa is "a predominantly black country" is considerably more forceful. Whereas the former refers to the black "majority" in order to appeal for change, the latter sends "a clear message" about how things must be in a "black country". Thus, within the context of a "black country", having a black person in the position of finance minister is viewed as something that is "inevitable". This notion of inevitability is directly reliant upon the temporal demarcation constructed within the discourse of *BNB* (see Chapter 5). Here the demarcation between the past and the future serves to define contrasting positionings for blacks and whites within different eras. Blacks are positioned as the "future people" in the unfolding post-apartheid era. However, this positioning is predicated upon whites' positioning as people of the past; they are

the "people who enjoyed the privileges of living under apartheid". Now, within a democratic South Africa, whites have become "resent[ful of living under] a black government" which does not support white privilege. Crucially, "whether" whites "like it or not", they no longer have control over blacks. In this new era, blacks are destined to follow an inevitable path; they (i.e., "we") will "eventually" reclaim all of their (i.e., "our") country, that is, a "black country". Thus, this strand of *Blacks First* posits that blacks will ultimately replace whites in positions of authority as they gain "influence" as "policy-makers and leaders".

At the same time, it is pointed out that whites – particularly white grey-haired men – are attempting to block blacks' ability to move onto this inevitable path.

> The "white grey-haired men" are doing nothing to transform Denel [a state-owned aerospace and defence technology enterprise] to reflect the demographics of our country. [. . . .] The grey-haired white men don't want to share their expertise with blacks. They don't want to see change taking place at Denel. They want to see only whites running the company as if they own it themselves. A consultant was hired to train 10 blacks to become supervisors. Having completed the course, they don't perform a single supervisory task. They are doing what they used to do before they were trained. [. . .] The white grey-haired men don't want to see blacks grow. They do not have the interests of their black employees at heart. They are pretenders who hate change. [ST/L/17/11/96]

> Most white businesses seem reluctant to uplift the standards of living of black people. No one can dispute that whites benefitted from apartheid and it is time they give back what they acquired, by sharing whatever skills they possess with their black counterparts. [ST/L/26/08/01]

These texts do more than simply reiterate a now pervasive theme of white bosses limiting blacks' positioning. First, they illustrate that whites are deliberately keeping blacks out of positions of authority. For example, even after they have been trained as "supervisors", blacks are not promoted and thus continue "doing what they used to do before". In other words, blacks' positioning remains the same regardless of the level of training they receive. Second, they illustrate that as "pretenders who hate change", these white bosses are highly problematic. As noted in the previous chapter, within *BNB*, it is maintained that whites who remain in the country have a duty to help change blacks' positioning for the better. By not sharing their skills with blacks, whites are not only keeping blacks out of positions of authority but also acting against a prescriptive aspect of *BNB*.

> Without what she [Minister of Public Enterprises, Stella Sigcau] disdainfully calls the "white grey-haired men" who hold down key posts in this country, there would be no water in the taps, no electricity in the cables and no aircraft in the sky. [ST/L/03/11/96a]

> Pushing a number of black faces just to "mirror the demographics of South Africa" will lead to the exodus of white experts to other countries keen to use their skills; the demise of the defence industry; and the loss of billions of rands earned in foreign currencies. Starting at the top is not the solution. Young, capable black people of both sexes must be selected and sent to university to study. They can then be fed into the defence industry for further development and recognition and reward through performance – not just for being black. This cannot happen overnight. [ST/L/03/11/96b]

The fact that whites "hold down key posts in this country" is one which has already been articulated within *BNB*. But whereas the template of *BNB* asserts that whites' positioning ought to be changed, the template of *EW* asserts that whites' positioning ought to be maintained. If *BNB* suggested the easy formula of appointing nine black people for every one white person (see CP/L/15/01/95b), it did so because it holds that blacks are as competent as whites (see CP/L/22/08/04). However, the template of *EW* does not construct blacks and whites as equals. Instead, whites – particularly "white grey-haired men" – are constructed as those who are best suited for positions of authority. As "white experts" possessing "skills", these men are cast as essential for the normal running of things; they ensure that water runs from the taps, electricity flows from power cables and aircraft fly in the sky.

The argument presented against efforts at eliminating a status of *1994 Contradiction* is multi-pronged, and centres on reducing the agenda of black inclusion to the mere act of "pushing [in] a number of black faces". First, it is suggested that "black faces" are simply included because they are black – regardless of the level of skill they possess. Indeed, "black faces" are associated with "demise" and "loss" rather than gain. Second, the act of "pushing" in "black faces" is equated with the act of pushing whites out. Whites are notably not referred to as 'white faces' but as "white experts" who possess "skills". Thus, black inclusion is said to result in an "exodus of white experts" who are deemed essential to the normal running of things. Third, attempts to "mirror the demographics of South Africa" are, therefore, deemed to be counter-productive or even disastrous because whites (and not blacks) are skilled. At best, the discourse of *EW* allows for the possibility that, at some unspecified future point (i.e., "not overnight"), blacks will be capable of running things. Fourth, however, the achievement of this future point seems very far away since (as per previous examples), whites are reluctant to share their skills with blacks and hence to offer "development". Furthermore, it is difficult to see how black

advancement can take place when (as per previous examples) blacks who gain new skills are not promoted or given the opportunity to use those skills. The criteria of "recognition and reward through performance" thus serve to block rather than enable black advancement. Fifth, the insistence that "starting at the top is not the solution", further shields the current generation of whites in key posts. Such whites can, in turn, continue to limit blacks' entry into positions of authority, thereby perpetuating white privilege.

It is, therefore, not surprising that yet another strand of *Blacks First* asserts that blacks can do it on their own; they do not need to rely on whites in order to reposition themselves.

> Why must black business and professional people rely on white counterparts to hire them? Why can't the best talents in the townships not be encouraged to become employers rather than employees? [. . . .] It is time for black businessmen to do a lot more self-affirmation rather than just waiting for the white man to do everything for him and then complaining when that white man does not do what he is told. [CP/L/04/12/94]
>
> The time has come for blacks to stand up and roll up their sleeves in order to help themselves. [CP/L/27/10/96]
>
> The time has come to desist from creating a black middle class which depends on the patronage of white capital to survive. [CP/L/16/12/07]

As an example drawn from the start of the post-apartheid period, the first letter may (in hindsight) be read as forecasting a major problem encountered by blackness over the next decade or so: the hindering of black advancement within white-dominated domains. This strand of *Blacks First* attempts to bypass the problem by severing ties with whiteness and encouraging black self-reliance. Indeed, this strand best illustrates the very boldness and confidence that characterises the version of black identity envisioned within the template of *BNB*. By repeating across extracts that "the time has come", *BNB* re-heralds the new era and thus the possibilities that have opened up for blackness. Blacks are urged to "desist" from "depend[ing]" on, and "waiting" for, whites "to do everything for" them. Thus, within this strand, complaints about whites' resistance towards doing something for blacks are seen as fruitless. Instead, blacks are urged to "stand up and roll up their sleeves in order to help themselves".

Despite their various forms, all strands of *Blacks First* are met with the same kind of opposition from the discourse of *EW*. The main response from *EW*, and those who are not black, is that

putting blacks ahead of other races drives such others away, which in turn harms blacks' future prospects of success. Consider the following example.

> Is there a place and a future for coloureds, Asians and whites in the new South Africa? In my opinion these three population groups are beginning to feel alienated in their country of birth. [. . .] In the public sector there is simply no hope for promotion if a person belongs to the above-mentioned groups. Big corporations are threatened with punitive action if they do not promote black people into senior positions, regardless of merit. [. . .] I am glad that some form of democracy has come to our country. [. . .] However, I would like to warn the government that people from the above-mentioned three groups are being made to feel unwelcome in the new South Africa. They are leaving the country in droves. This will erode the tax base, chase away foreign investments and also rob this country of precious expertise. This will mean that the dream of black people to acquire wealth, power and peace in the new South Africa will remain just that: a dream. [ST/L/01/12/96]

While it may be read as a reiteration of earlier arguments (see ST/L/03/11/96a and ST/L/03/11/96b), the above example illustrates a more sophisticated defence against *Blacks First*. Here, those who are not black (i.e., "coloureds, Asians and whites") are contrasted against those who are black. Whites are positioned as holding "precious expertise", yet they have "no hope for promotion". Blacks, on the other hand, are said to be positioned to receive promotions "into senior positions, regardless of merit". Key to this argument is the message that whites should not be made to feel "unwelcome" or "alienated", but that policies of racial redress are doing just that. While other examples have positioned whites as essential for the normal running of things (ostensibly for the benefit of all South Africans), this example positions the "three race groups" as essential to making black people's "dream" a reality. Thus, according to the logic presented here, putting *Blacks First* will not serve to advance blacks' interests.

> I think affirmative action is a good thing, as long as it does not become part of a regime that takes away free choice in the open market. It must retain a balance, giving opportunity – but not at the expense of know-how and ability. [ST/L/06/03/94]

As a post-apartheid discourse, *EW* needs to accord with the ethos of the post-apartheid dispensation. However, here, it is evident that what appears as accordance can have distinctly anti-transformative aims. First, while Affirmative Action is presented as "a good thing", such praise is based on the continued existence of "free choice" within an "open market" that disregards the imperatives of race-based transformation. A scenario is thus set up where the need to ameliorate a context of *1994 Contradiction* may be bypassed. Second, as has been

shown, whites are positioned as "skilled experts", and this implies that whites are associated with competence. Thus, the extract's reference to "know-how and ability" can be understood as a reference to whites. In other words, the template of *EW* may grant blacks "opportunity", but not ahead of, or "at the expense of", whites. In this way, *EW* presents a subtle argument against the aims of *Blacks First*.

The above stance is wholly at odds with that of *BNB*, which sees whites as having a duty to help blacks reposition themselves. The following example reiterates that the template of *BNB* attempts to construct an acceptable form of whiteness which is aligned with black interests. Acceptable whites are defined as "patriotic whites" who have "identif[ied]" with the black "majority". Moreover, such whites are expected to "expose and isolate" unacceptable racist whites (as referred to in Chapter 5) whose motive is to perpetuate the apartheid past.

> Some whites are not prepared to embrace the new dispensation in our country. Others are not ashamed of even criticising the government for the policy of affirmative action. They regard it as reverse discrimination. In other words, they are approving the imbalances (in all respects) which were put in place by the system of apartheid. I therefore call on those patriotic whites to expose and isolate their counterparts who are still clinging to racist superiority. Those patriots will have to do something to identify themselves with the majority in building our new country. [CP/L/15/10/00]

While *EW* asserts that whites are being 'pushed out' of jobs due to policies of racial redress, *BNB* asserts that despite being the intended beneficiaries of policies of racial redress, blacks are being kept out of jobs currently dominated by whites.

> What has become of the government's promise of affirmative action in the predominantly white civil service? I always see advertisements in newspapers, but who gets appointed? Nobody knows! [ST/L/11/06/95]

> [The government's] promises – living wages, free education, better facilities – were just a vote-catching exercise. Today a white man with the same qualifications as I have still earns five times more than I do. [CP/L/13/11/94b]

Both of the above letters reflect black people's frustration with regard to a lack of tangible change. They recall the government's promise for change but suggest that change has not materialised. Invoking the argument of *Blacks First*, the first letter observes that although there are advertisements calling for the appointment of blacks in the civil service, the civil service remains "predominantly white". Similarly, invoking the argument of *1994 Contradiction*, the

second letter observes that despite having "the same qualifications", a white person "*still* earns five times more" than a black person.

The overall picture that emerges here shows that the discourses of *BNB* and *EW* are constantly caught up in a repetitive cycle of arguments which pull in different directions: efforts to reposition blacks are met with resistance from whites, while attempts to preserve whites' privileged position are in turn met with efforts aimed at repositioning blacks. The question that emerges from this is as follows: who or what is responsible for the fairly static (though nevertheless altered) positioning in which both blacks and whites seem to find themselves? I turn to this question in the following section.

SUCCESS AND FAILURE IN BLACK AND WHITE

> Let us accept that the tapestry of the new South Africa is being created by different threads; woven together to produced [*sic*] a beautiful garment. If one of the threads is black, that should be of no concern as long as the final product is beautiful. [CP/L/12/07/98b]

The transforming post-apartheid society can indeed be understood in terms of the creation of a new "tapestry" consisting of "different threads"; one that is being "woven together" by both blacks and whites. However, the question of who is responsible for the quality or beauty of the "final product" is not an easy one to answer. The answer must take into account a complex interplay between 1) assertions about the past actions of the white NP leadership and the effects of these actions on the post-apartheid present, and 2) assertions about the present actions of the black ANC leadership in light of the legacy of the apartheid past.

It is useful to begin by looking at what the New South Africa has offered to blacks and whites. That is, to ask how they are respectively positioned in the post-apartheid context. In this regard, the discourse of *BNB* presents a picture of racialised contrast.

Consider, on the one hand, the post-apartheid lived experience of blacks.

> There is nothing new in the country, especially if you are black and poor. [CP/L/17/09/00]

> Blacks are still homeless, they live in shacks, they are still poor, they are hungry and unemployed. They remain the only victims of all known poverty-related diseases. Standards of housing, health and education are still as poor for blacks as they have always been. It does not need to be said that black people are struggling for survival. This presents itself in all facets of our lives. [CP/L/19/07/98]

> Black people continue to bear the brunt of poverty and helplessness, and water pipes, drainage systems and roads in African residential areas have become monuments of shame. [CP/L/04/02/01a]

> Most of the unemployed South Africans are Africans. The poorest are African. People who live in squatter camps, which often burn down, are Africans. The most ill-equipped hospitals and clinics are those that serve Africans. The least educated and skilled are Africans. The worst roads are found where Africans live. The shortest life expectancy is among Africans. [CP/L/21/01/07]

On the other hand, consider the post-apartheid lived experience of whites as seen from the perspective of *BNB*.

> Life has even been better for whites in the new dispensation than it ever was during the apartheid era. [CP/L/24/10/04b]

> Many [whites] still enjoy the privileges of the past – they still have houses and jobs while many South Africans do not. [CP/E/16/02/97]

> While those who enforced apartheid are today sitting fat and happy, those who suffered under it are devastatingly poor and miserable. [CP/L/07/01/01]

> One hears of incidents where farmers who obtained land after their occupants were forcibly removed during the apartheid era are now being compensated for with millions of rands to give the land back to the rightful owners. Whites are being treated with kid gloves by our own brothers . . . and as a result the former oppressors are richer than before. [CP/L/15/07/01]

First, these extracts suggest that despite the new dispensation, the lives of most blacks have remained much the same as under apartheid. Indeed, "there is nothing new" in the new dispensation for those who "are black and poor". To be black is "still" associated with being "poor", "hungry" and "unemployed". Blacks' access remains limited to a low standard when it comes to healthcare, education and residential area. To be black thus means that one is "struggling for survival" and that one has to "continue to bear the brunt of poverty and helplessness". Second, by contrast, despite the legislative ending of white racial privilege, these extracts suggest that "life has even been better for whites in the new dispensation". Unlike many blacks who are "still" homeless and unemployed, "many" whites "still have houses and

jobs". Referred to as "those who enforced apartheid", whites are "sitting fat and happy", while blacks, referred to as those "who suffered under apartheid", are "devastatingly poor and miserable". Indeed, it appears that whites (i.e., "former oppressors") are better positioned now because they are "richer than before". They have benefitted during apartheid by taking land away from blacks, and they have benefitted again in the present through compensation for the return of land to "the rightful owners" (i.e., blacks).

This contrast or tension between black and white can be explored further in terms of attempts to balance the oppositional demands of *BNB* and *EW* as templates. The following editorial explicates these demands well.

> We want to see black people walking tall and being proud of having a black government. Sadly, this has not been the case in the last five years, because we spent too much time trying to appease whites who threatened to leave the country. [CP/E/27/06/99]

BNB pushes towards the creation of a new, confident type of blackness. It envisions blacks "walking tall and being proud" against the backdrop of a post-apartheid South Africa led by "a black government". Yet *EW* pushes towards the maintenance of white privilege. It seeks to limit change for whites despite the presence of a black government. Given the prominence of these oppositional templates, the following question arises: what is the democratic government doing to reposition blacks and whites? This question cannot be separated from yet another question; namely, whether black or white interests are being served, and by whom.

A failure to achieve post-apartheid change for blacks or whites can be attributed to different racialised factors. From one perspective, failure can be blamed on too little white involvement. Certainly, as the following extract notes, *BNB* envisions a place for whites within the new dispensation.

> We did not chase white people out of the country as soon as we took over – as was anticipated by several commentators. [. . .] We said that white South Africans had a role to play in the new South Africa – and we meant it. And still do. [CP/E/19/07/98]

As has already been shown, *BNB* positions whites in a supporting role; they are no longer in charge, but they are expected to share their skills with blacks and thus help to uplift and reposition blacks. However, at the same time, it has also been shown that *EW* positions whites

(and not blacks) as best suited for positions that are essential for the normal running of the country.

> No developing country can achieve economic growth without the sort of entrepreneurship which white people introduced during the much-maligned colonial era. [. . . .] By [*sic*] undermining white people, who through generations of business connections can initiate such wealth-producing industries, is to shoot yourself in the foot. Yet that is what affirmative action, black economic empowerment and employment equity, along with crime, are doing. Until black people start establishing job- and wealth-creating businesses on a similar scale, they should focus primarily on skills development in order to benefit from globally competitive enterprises established by those capable of doing so. Heaven knows, we'd all love to see black people establish large new industries and enterprises. But will it ever happen? [ST/L/24/08/03]

Here, the distinction between whites lending support, and reliance on whites, is eroded. In other words, *EW* recasts what *BNB* presents as a responsibility to share skills, into an opportunity to entrench whites' position as "skilled experts". Policies that aim to reposition blacks (i.e., "affirmative action, black economic empowerment and employment equity") are recast within *EW* as efforts at "undermining white people" and hence as dangerous policies. Here, whites are positioned as essential for the normal running of the economy: they are described as those with "generations of business connections", and as "those capable" of establishing "globally competitive enterprises". These descriptions consequently position whiteness as essential for, and synonymous with, economic success. Whites "introduced" and "established" industries and enterprises, and they should naturally continue to "initiate" these. Hence, in order to protect whites' positioning, it is concluded that to limit whites in this regard "is to shoot yourself in the foot". As an added measure, the template of *EW* casts doubt over blacks' ability to establish new industries and enterprises as successfully as whites (i.e., "but will it ever happen?"). Blacks are, therefore, relegated to a position which limits them to attaining skills within the enterprises established by whites. But, as has already been indicated, blacks are unlikely to be given authority within white-dominated domains. Hence, the suggested focus on "skills development" is more likely to help maintain whites' positioning than to alter blacks' positioning.

From another perspective, failure can be blamed on white involvement.

> [Former Commissioner of Police] George Fivaz, with all the good intentions in the world, could never really have overcome crime. He may have had police training, but the fact is, he has never lived in the townships and has little understanding of how blacks lived under apartheid and why they do things the way they do. [Jackie] Selebi on the other hand is a Soweto [South Western Townships] man, who fought the apartheid system with all his might right up to university, went through the political ranks and served as a civil servant. Yes, he is absolutely correct when he says he would serve the whole of South Africa and not only blacks. But we want him to treat our townships as a priority. It's about time that black people feel protected by their own kith and kin. South Africa is a black country and it must be seen as such. [CP/E/24/10/99]

The above example provides a clear answer to the question of why blacks are not "walking tall and being proud". Importantly, the editorial approaches the question from a now-familiar perspective which asserts that "South Africa is a black country". Whereas the previous example cited the problem of crime as one of the factors blocking success, this example maintains that whites have been unable to deal with crime effectively. A white police commissioner is seen as inappropriate within a black country; he cannot be expected to understand "how blacks lived" or "why they do things the way they do". Hence, he is ill-equipped to deal with crime. By contrast, as a "Soweto man", a black police commissioner is positioned to understand these things. The assertion that "townships" must be served "as a priority" provides a literal assertion of how blacks must come first. What emerges here is a bold and forceful reiteration of *Blacks First*; blacks can do things more effectively on their own, and indeed must take care of their own instead of relying on whites. They must be "protected by their own kith and kin" because this best serves black people's interests.

The oppositional stances of *BNB* and *EW* on the issue of the country's future success or failure are summarised in the following letters.

> My plea to all those contemplating the chicken run is: "Please get the hell out and leave us to rebuild the county you have ravaged, with the assistance of your European brothers, in our own African way". [ST/L/01/11/98]

> My message to you Minister Sigcau and all those who wish to see Africanisation is that it will be with the help of white grey-haired men that we will reverse the slide into the chaos of post-winds of change Africa. [ST/L/27/10/96]

The first letter reflects how the template of *BNB* holds that blacks can do it on their own. Whites, who have "ravaged" South Africa, are welcome to "get the hell out". They must let blacks "rebuild" what has been ravaged according to blacks' "own African way" – not according to any white-stipulated ways. The second letter, by contrast, reflects how the

template of *EW* holds that blacks cannot do it on their own. In the absence of "white grey-haired men", the "African way" noted in the first letter (i.e., "Africanisation") is presented as an inevitable "slide into chaos". Once again, whites' "help" is seen as essential for blacks' success as whites are ostensibly positioned to "reverse" the "slide into chaos". Hence, while *BNB* asserts that blacks can reposition themselves independently of whites, *EW* asserts that blacks cannot do so without the help of whites.

Given these competing perspectives on racialised success and failure, the following question remains: which discourse is ultimately going to shape racialised identities? In an effort to obtain a sharper analytical picture, I briefly consider a debate about the ANC government's ability to bring about post-apartheid change. As outlined below, the debate centres around two main clusters of text.

The first cluster of texts holds that, as part of the ANC, blacks are capable of achieving success and are thus capable of realising the goal of putting *Blacks First*.

> ANC ministers must realise that there are forces that would like to see the Mandela government fail so that they can claim "we told you so", blacks are incapable of running this country. [CP/E/08/03/98]
>
> There were the sceptics, who, for no other reason but the colour of our government, had no confidence in its capacity to manage the economy. [CP/E/13/02/00]
>
> [B]eing a largely black organisation, the ANC and its government have to succeed because many people here – black and white – expect it to fail simply because there are black people in charge. [CP/E/03/09/06]

These editorials can be read as a response from the perspective of *BNB*, to the assertion that whites are best suited to run the country. The aim here is to begin to undo the perception that blackness is synonymous with failure. The first step is to emphasise the ANC's blackness. Accordingly, the ANC is described as "a largely black organisation". The second step, by extension, is to qualify what it means to have the country run by "the Mandela government" or "the ANC and its government". Simply put, it means that "black people [are] in charge". The third step is to examine and conclude what it means to have a government led by black people. In this regard, it is apparent that the ANC's blackness (i.e., "the colour of our government") attracts the attention of "forces" and "sceptics" – who are defined as both "black and white" people. Such people have "no confidence" in the government because it is a *black* government.

They "would like to see the Mandela government fail" in order to 'confirm' (i.e., "we told you so") the inevitability of black failure. In response to the perception that blackness is synonymous with failure, it is asserted that "the ANC and its government have to succeed". In other words, if the assertions of "sceptics" are to be dismissed, then black success must be concretely demonstrated. Consider the following examples.

> After only three years in government, much improvement has been effected in the life of each South African black. Surely, it would be asking too much to expect this young government to redress all the wrongs committed by four decades of National Party rule. [CP/E/16/02/97]
>
> You have to be reminded that the ANC has only been in power for seven years, having taken over a country that had been misruled by whites for more than 100 years. The ANC is doing its best under the circumstances. [CP/L/28/01/01]
>
> Only cynics and spoilsports will deny that President Nelson Mandela's government has achieved more than anybody had bargained for – after only two-and-a-half years. We have not been called a miracle nation for nothing. Even our worst critics have privately and publicly acknowledged a great success in the healing of the wounds of the nation. [CP/E/08/12/96]
>
> We believe the ANC is taking South Africa in the right direction. Its most important achievement over the last five years was the restoration of the human dignity of millions of black South Africans who, for more than 300 years, had lived as second-class citizens in the country of their birth. [CP/E/09/05/99]
>
> It may sound mundane to most white people, but to the majority of black people, especially those in the rural areas, the bringing of clean, running water to their door steps was the greatest relief. [CP/E/04/01/98]

These texts contextualise the ANC government's efforts at bringing about a favourable post-apartheid future. Crucially, they point out that the black government has to contend with the legacy of the white NP government. This legacy of "wrongs" is described as white "misrule" where blacks had to live "as second-class citizens". In its defence of black rule, the template of *BNB* asserts that the progress of change must be assessed against an enormous legacy which extends back to an era of colonialism. Thus "three years" of government under the ANC are set against "four decades of National Party rule"; "seven years" against "more than 100 years"; and "five years" against "more than 300 years" of colonialism. The picture that emerges can, therefore, be described in terms of tension not only between black and white but also between the past and the emerging future. The message here is that the black government is winning because it is leading the country away from the past; it "is taking South Africa in the right direction". While it's successes "may sound mundane to most white people", it has brought

about "the greatest relief" to black people. Thus, it can be concluded that black people are satisfied with the progress that the ANC has made for them. These examples, therefore, reaffirm that a black government is best suited for putting *Blacks First* and overcoming a legacy of white "misrule". The following example goes even further.

> Let us also admit to the vicarious pleasure we feel when a black finance minister [Trevor Manuel] does well in his portfolio, especially in a country with a history of looking down on anything black. [CP/E/02/03/03]

On one level, this example is merely informative; it points out that "a black finance minister" has "do[ne] well". Certainly, such evidence is important from the perspective of *BNB* in that it can serve to dismiss "sceptics". Also, understood in terms of a previous example (see CP/E/27/06/99), the success of a black person within a black government allows black people to walk tall and be proud. Yet, on another level, it is apparent that black success in the present era is not simply contrasted against "a history of looking down on anything black". Within this debate, success serves as a crucial ingredient for the redefinition and reconstruction of black identity. Success alters the way blacks are positioned and makes the idea of "looking down on anything black" seem inconceivable. Success thus creates a temporal demarcation, which in turn enables the idea of "looking down" on blacks to be defined as something that *occurred* in the past – as history. Hence, this example reinforces the premise which underpins the template of *BNB*: a new black identity can only be created in a context that is free from the past. This is a context where blacks are no longer "looked down" upon or considered "inferior" to whites, and where whites are no longer considered "superhuman" and superior to blacks (see CP/E/18/09/05 in Chapter 5).

Nevertheless, the task of defending blackness from an association with failure can be understood as a continuous battle. Of course, neither blacks nor whites can possibly be expected always to achieve success. While the following letter acknowledges that blacks can "err", it asserts that since "this is Africa", blacks "must be in charge". Put differently, the letter echoes the earlier-stated notion that this is "a black country" and that having black people in charge is thus "inevitable" (see CP/E/31/03/96).

> Nobody suggests that Africans cannot err. All that is said is this is Africa and Africans are in charge, or must be in charge. [CP/L/06/07/03]

However, as the editorials below indicate, every instance of black failure is potentially damaging to the fragile association between blackness and success. This is because every instance can be gathered until "conservatives are armed with real examples" of black failure. Indeed, "any flaws will be used" to 'confirm' the view that "blacks are incapable of running this country" (see CP/E/08/03/98), thus bolstering the assertion that whites are best-suited for running things.

> The conservatives are armed with real examples of cases where commercial land was transferred from white farmers to blacks, resulting in total collapse of commercial production. [CP/E/31/07/05]

> Any flaws will be used by government critics as yet another example of how blacks cannot run a country. [CP/E/29/11/98]

Yet the template of *BNB* faces even greater opposition from the second cluster of texts, below. This cluster casts doubt on the ANC's ability to put *Blacks First*, and thus undermines the arguments put forward by *BNB* in the first cluster.

> The ANC and its allies rally around the fears of the whites every time there's a squeal from them. We know of assurances by Mandela that [white] farmers would be protected. [CP/L/11/09/94]

> Mandela and his ANC have compromised the dignity of all blacks in this country with his obsession with reconciliation. [. . . .] You [Mandela] have been seen to go to great lengths to appease the whites of this country. With the same fervour you have thrown tantrums whenever our black people put forward demands. [CP/L/21/04/96]

These letters maintain that, despite being a black organisation, the ANC is not putting *Blacks First*. They thus challenge the assumption that black leadership, and the prioritisation and pursuit of black interests, are automatically linked. Whereas Mandela is said "to go to great lengths to appease" 'squealing whites', he is said to "throw tantrums whenever . . . black people put forward demands". Thus, while white "fears" are met with "assurances" from the ANC regarding protection, black demands are disregarded. From this perspective, the ANC has "compromised the dignity of all blacks" by putting whites first. Understood in terms of an earlier example, the ANC's attempts to appease whites may be seen as the reason why blacks cannot walk tall and be proud of having a black government (see CP/E/27/06/99).

> There is a tendency among those who occupy high positions in South African society to want to compare themselves to and sometimes even emulate their National Party predecessors. South Africans will not allow their country to regress to the rot that permeated the years of Nat rule. [ST/E/01/07/01]
>
> Many of those former activists who went into government have simply fitted into the lazy, mechanistic and bureaucratic culture that prevailed in the past. Cronyism, a disease that successive Nat [i.e. Nationalist] governments were quite happy to tolerate, has continued, and, in some parts of the government, been given racial and political legitimacy. [ST/E/05/08/01]
>
> Rather than dismantle the crony capitalism that developed under apartheid, the ANC has allowed it to flourish. All that changed is that the beneficiaries of this cronyism are no longer just white. [ST/E/21/10/01]
>
> [The government] has signally failed to eradicate the rampant state gravy-trainism of the old regime: [it has] merely recycled it. [ST/E/10/11/96]

These editorials extend the attack on the black government. By equating the ANC government with the previous NP government – a government much-condemned from the perspective of *BNB* – they assert that the ANC is incapable of bringing about change. First, these editorials challenge the assertion that the ANC "is taking South Africa in the right direction". They maintain that instead of "dismantl[ing]" and "eradicat[ing]" the old ways of the NP, the ANC has "merely recycled" what has come before; it has simply replicated "the rot that permeated the years of Nat rule". Therefore, from this perspective, the ANC has not moved the country towards a favourable post-apartheid future. Second, these editorials suggest that ANC leaders are not interested in adopting the kind of post-apartheid black identity envisioned within *BNB*. Instead, ANC leaders are seeking to "compare themselves to" and "emulate" the white leaders of the apartheid government – a government which, for example, "did nothing to provide decent homes for blacks" (see CP/E/06/03/94 in Chapter 5). Current black leaders are, therefore, considered to be positioned like the white leaders of the past; they "have simply fitted into the lazy, mechanistic and bureaucratic culture" which has been carried over into the present. They have thus become the "beneficiaries" of both the "cronyism" and "gravy-trainism" which characterised the NP. The following letter further illustrates how the lines between the past and the present, and between black and white, can be blurred.

> People have not forgotten the ANC manifesto of 1994 when people were promised jobs, houses, education and health[care]. None of these have materialised in such a way as to have an impact on ordinary people's lives. As local government elections approach, the ANC top brass will leave their posh houses in the white suburbs and remember us in the poorly-serviced townships. Once more they will promise the poor African people heaven on earth. After securing our votes, they will retreat to the white suburbs. [CP/L/17/09/00]

The text offers a reiteration of two themes. First, it highlights that the ANC has not fulfilled its promises; it has failed to change "ordinary people's lives" and has thus not put *Blacks First*. Second, in light of the statement that the ANC is "a largely black organisation", the text's reference to the "ANC top brass" serves as a reminder that blacks are in charge of the ANC. The text uses these two themes to create a distinction between ANC blacks and other (ordinary) blacks. While "top brass" blacks live in "posh houses in white suburbs", "poor African people" live in "poorly-serviced townships". Hence, poor blacks are positioned in a way which does not allow them to escape conditions of poverty, but "top brass blacks" can "retreat to the white suburbs" and thus escape such conditions. It is, therefore, apparent that some blacks (i.e., those belonging to the "ANC top brass") are positioned in ways that are reflective of whiteness rather than blackness. While I shall return to this issue in greater depth in the next chapter, it is useful to note a further preliminary observation here. If those labelled as 'racist whites' "don't give a hoot about a black life" (see CP/L/17/04/05 in Chapter 5), those labelled as "top brass blacks" seem only to care for poor blacks insofar as they can secure their votes. Thus, it appears that a hierarchical relationship exists not only between blacks and whites but also between some blacks and other blacks.

How does *BNB* respond to these texts? The only remaining way to defend against the idea that the black-led ANC government has failed black people, and to dismiss the idea that black leaders are positioned like whites, is to assert that the ANC is not yet entirely in control of things. Whites, in other words, are still in control.

> Mandela must show that he is in charge of this country, or else we will always think that De Klerk and [former Minister of Defence, General] Magnus Malan are still the power behind the throne. [CP/L/25/02/96]

> [Deputy President F.W. de Klerk] is just there [in government] to use the remote control, power is in his hands. Blacks are just there to fool the world. [CP/L/15/05/94]

> Real power still rests in the hands of whites. Some agreeable blacks are placed strategically to camouflage the situation. [CP/L/31/08/97]

The picture presented here is one of a predominantly black government controlled by a few white individuals – specifically, De Klerk. Indeed, all three extracts associate whiteness with "power". Most strikingly, the image of De Klerk holding the government's "remote control" provides a literal description of how "power" is "still" in white "hands". The statement that "some agreeable blacks are placed strategically to camouflage the situation", echoes earlier examples which suggest that black inclusion occurs merely for the sake of "window-dressing" and "publicity purposes" (see CP/L/29/05/94 and CP/L/10/01/99). Thus, like the black executive whose authority is limited to watering the pot plant every morning (see ST/L/06/08/95), blacks within the current government "are just there to fool the world".

> The first five years in power have come and gone, and blacks would like to see even more visible changes in future. They must feel and see that blacks are now in charge of government and not only in office. [CP/E/04/04/99]
>
> It's about time the ANC government showed us and the world exactly who is in charge. [CP/E/12/11/00]

Both these editorials assert that blacks are eager to experience post-apartheid change; they want to "feel and see that blacks are now in charge of government and not only in office". They thus accord with the idea that the task for Mandela is not only to demonstrate that he is "in charge", but also that whites are not positioned as "the power behind the throne". This makes *BNB*'s only line of defence highly problematic. Certainly, the argument that blacks are not being put first because white leaders are still pursuing whites' interests provides a plausible explanation for the lack of change within the transitional context. However, it does not eliminate the question of when "visible changes in future" will be effected by a black government. Thus, the template of *BNB* is still tasked with demonstrating black success, and this brings it right back to the problem of effectively defending black success.

CONCLUSION

Seen against the backdrop of the previous chapter's findings, this chapter's findings reflect a mixture of similarities and dissimilarities. It has shown that, as templates, *BNB* and *EW* both contain references to blacks and whites, and has thus confirmed the previous chapter's conclusion that racialised identity is co-constructed at an individual template level. However, it has also shown that the idea that each template can 'manufacture' identities independently, does not hold. By considering the templates within a practical context, this chapter has demonstrated that both templates co-construct blackness and whiteness through constant reference to each other. Nevertheless, it has demonstrated this by relying on the previous chapter's assertion that *BNB* and *EW* form two oppositional templates for post-apartheid racialised identity construction. Indeed, the notion of opposition fuels both discourses as templates. By way of summary, consider the following example.

> When Mandela emerged from prison it was with inflated public expectations that he would be savour to a deeply divided society. White South Africans expected that Mandela would quickly put the country back to work after years of civil disobedience and hoped that their advantaged position in the society would not be too severely affected. Black South Africans wanted the material benefits of democracy to arrive – the sooner the better – and hoped whites would make some sign of contrition. Neither side quite understood the complexities of transforming the society. And neither, in all honesty, did Mandela and his government. When public administration tottered rather than improved, whites became angry. And when jobs, houses, schools and clinics failed to spring up miraculously, many blacks became disillusioned. [ST/E/28/12/97]

The text exposes a major source of tension within post-apartheid: the goal of eliminating "a deeply divided society" clashes with the lingering existence of the very elements which maintain a divided society. These elements centre on divisions between "black South Africans" and "white South Africans", and are, therefore, decidedly racialised. Thus, the text does not simply highlight the existence of racialised oppositions within the post-apartheid context; it highlights differences *between* blacks and whites within that context. For example, it is evident that when the post-apartheid era emerged, blacks "wanted the material benefits of democracy to arrive" but whites "expected . . . the country [to go] back to work". Hence, on the one hand, "blacks became disillusioned" when such benefits failed to arrive (i.e., when they did not "spring up miraculously"). On the other hand, "whites became angry" when, contrary to their expectations, things "tottered rather than improved" within the country's administration.

Looking closer at these oppositions, it is evident that the text is not simply a container for a cluster of elements which happen to be positioned in opposition. Rather, the text is an example which draws together two clashing templates; it contains oppositional elements that reflect the contents of, and which thus map directly onto, the discourses of *BNB* and *EW*. On the one hand, blacks' desire for the "material benefits of democracy to arrive", is a reflection of *BNB*'s assertion that black identity can only be reformulated within a new, post-apartheid context. On the other hand, whites' hope "that their advantaged position in the society would not be too severely affected", is a reflection of *EW*'s intention to preserve whites' positioning as seen under apartheid.

The following editorial plainly and succinctly lays out the source of tension between blacks and whites. Seen against the previous editorial, it provides an answer as to why "neither side quite understood the complexities of transforming the society".

> On his release from prison Mandela said South Africa's biggest challenge was to balance black aspirations with white fears. Twenty years later, the challenge is still to meet black aspirations. [CP/E/14/02/10]

As this chapter has attempted to illustrate, the templates of *BNB* and *EW* cannot be considered individually or in isolation. Instead, they must be considered relationally, in terms of how they co-construct black and white identities. Therefore, in practice, the task of "balanc[ing] black aspirations with white fears" is an exceedingly complex one to manage. The analysis has suggested that whites generally seek to preserve their apartheid-era positioning, while blacks generally seek to reposition themselves in the post-apartheid era. The analysis has similarly suggested that *EW* holds that whites are best suited to run things for their benefit, while *BNB* holds that blacks are best suited to run things for their benefit. Efforts intended to bring about black advancement are met with resistance from whites, most probably due to a fear that such advancement will ultimately lead to the displacement of whites from positions of authority. Whites, therefore, seek to maintain their privileged positioning (i.e., as those in "authority") by limiting black advancement. But whites' actions have the effect of triggering renewed efforts intended to drive black advancement. Whites, in turn, resist such efforts in novel ways and so the cycle continues.

If the two main sections of the analysis presented within this chapter have appeared somewhat repetitive in content, it should be clear that the analysis has been structured that way deliberately. To have presented extracts without illustrating a back-and-forth sequence would have been to strip away the constant tension that exists between *BNB* and *EW*. One discourse asserts its own position in response to its oppositional other, which prompts yet another response, over and over in a continuous cycle. Indeed, it is this cyclical relationship of attack and counter-attack which has been shown to underpin racialised identity construction – or more correctly, *co-construction*. This conclusion paints a rather gloomy picture; if neither discourse can ultimately win, then black and white racialised identities appear to be stuck in perpetual opposition to each other. Yet what remains to be examined is whether such opposition exists at the level of racialised subjectivities. In other words, are black and white subjectivities constructed relationally? How might this relationality be described? I turn to these questions in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 7

OPPOSITIONAL RACIALISED EXPERIENCES: ENTANGLEMENTS IN BLACK AND WHITE.

> *There is an "entanglement" of colours in South Africa . . . There is no black history in South Africa that doesn't involve whiteness. The history is an entanglement of colour lines.*
>
> Achille Mbembe
> (Interview by Forde, 2011, p. 231)

The preceding analytic chapters have demonstrated that the co-construction of black and white racialised identities may be observed on two different levels. Whereas Chapter 5 suggested that the oppositional templates of *BNB* and *EW* 'manufacture' racialised identities independently, Chapter 6 suggested that these templates 'manufacture' racialised identities interdependently via a constant to-and-fro. By focusing on questions around racialised subjectivities, this chapter attempts to show that neither template is wholly independent nor wholly interdependent. Instead, the chapter argues that racialised identity co-construction can be understood as a set of entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements between blacks and whites.

First, the analysis begins by considering what racialised subjectivities may emerge from each template. Here it is contended that what blacks and whites can experience is shaped by the manner in which blacks and whites are entangled. Whereas the template of *BNB* attempts to alter the existing entanglement between blacks and whites, the template of *EW* attempts to maintain the existing entanglement between blacks and whites. That is, the former promotes an entanglement which looks towards the unfolding future, and the latter promotes an entanglement which looks towards the past. In turn, it is shown that both of these entanglements give rise to oppositional racialised experiences. Second, the analysis turns to consider how oppositional racialised experiences are constructed against a backdrop of tension between the past and the future. Here it is shown that the templates shape what blacks and whites can experience by keeping the racialised other out; to be black is to have distinctly black experiences and to be white is to have distinctly white experiences. Thus, it is suggested that

Bold New Blacks and *Enduring Whites* are constructed through a dis-entanglement of blackness and whiteness. Third, the analysis turns to consider how oppositional racialised experiences are constructed against a backdrop where blackness and whiteness are dis-entangled. Here it is shown that the templates shape what blacks and whites can experience by continually referring to the racialised other; to be black is not to be white and to be white is not to be black. What it means to be a *Bold New Black* or an *Enduring White* thus arises through these templates' interdependence, or through a re-entanglement of blackness and whiteness. The chapter concludes by reflecting on the tensions which exist between these different levels of entanglement.

UN/DOING ENTANGLEMENTS

A Bold New Blackness

It is worthwhile to begin by recalling that the template of *BNB* offers a way to reshape and re-construct racialised identities. Because it constructs a firm demarcation between the past and the unfolding present, this template opens up the possibility for racialised experiences that are distinctly post-apartheid in nature. Here I argue that the template of *BNB* seeks to alter or undo the way in which existing black and white experiences are entangled. For example, in line with what has been asserted in Chapter 5, I contend that if the apartheid period was characterised by blacks experiencing oppression and whites experiencing privilege, then the period following the end of apartheid is envisioned in terms of the absence of both black oppression and white privilege. As will be shown, both templates are concerned with an entanglement which may be traced to the early encounters between blacks and whites in South Africa. From the perspective of *BNB*, these initial encounters gave rise to an entanglement characterised by black suffering.

> The root cause of our suffering is our own kindness. History tells us that white people came to South Africa to settle for a time to plant vegetables and fruits. Whites, however, on realising that blacks were so kind, annexed the land [. . .]. Whites, therefore, declared themselves rulers over the black people. That's where our suffering began. It becomes clear that our kindness has been misused and our hospitality turned against us. [CP/L/19/07/98]

This letter provides yet another example of opposing racialised constructions: whereas blacks are described as those who have shown "kindness" and "hospitality" towards whites, whites are described as those who have "misused" blacks' kindness and "turned against" their hospitality. At the same time, this letter also reflects an entanglement between blacks and

whites. The initial coupling of blacks acting as "kind" hosts to temporary white settlers who intend "to plant vegetables and fruits", gives way to the coupling of underhanded whites who "annexed the land" and became permanent "rulers over the black people". Moreover, the letter sheds light on the racialised experiences which emerge from this entanglement. As those being ruled over by whites, blacks experience defeat and resultant "suffering". By implication, as those ruling over blacks, whites experience triumph and the absence of suffering.

These racialised experiences are similarly reflected in texts which comment on the entanglement constructed under apartheid.

> For thousands of long-suffering farm workers and tenants in the Vryheid and Utrecht area, apartheid is alive and well. [CP/E/22/07/07]
>
> Whites are still living in the apartheid era. [CP/L/03/11/96]
>
> While those who enforced apartheid are today sitting fat and happy, those who suffered under it are devastatingly poor and miserable. [CP/L/07/01/01]

What these texts make apparent is that as long as "apartheid is alive and well", or as long as "whites are still living in the apartheid era", the entanglement between blacks and whites will remain unchanged, and so these particular racialised experiences will persist. Put in concrete terms, whites will continue to be "fat and happy", and "long-suffering" blacks will continue to be "devastatingly poor and miserable". Indeed, the above examples may be read as a reiteration of the contention that the construction of a bold new blackness requires the rooting out of anything reminiscent of apartheid. It follows, therefore, that *Bold New Blacks* must be repositioned in ways which block the replication of apartheid-era experiences. Two examples may be revisited in order to support this contention further.

> Whether these people [i.e., whites] like it or not we [i.e., blacks] will eventually have our country back, all of it. We are the future people of this country and many of us will influence a lot of things as policy-makers and leaders. [CP/L/06/05/01]
>
> [Whites'] regime has fallen and we, as Africans will, never allow them the opportunity to repeat such filthy politics again. We have toiled, we have mourned and we have triumphed. Never again will we allow such inhumanity to prevail against our people, never again will such heinous acts of terror against fellow South Africans be permitted. [CP/L/08/05/05]

If blacks were previously positioned as those who were defeated by whites, post-apartheid blacks are now positioned as those who have "triumphed" over whites. This repositioning allows blacks to have distinctly post-apartheid experiences. For instance, they can take back "all" of their (i.e., "our") country from those who "annexed the land" (see CP/L/19/07/98). Furthermore, as "leaders" with "influence", blacks have the ability to ensure that the terrible past is "never again" repeated. This repositioning implies that blacks can experience something other than suffering. The following letters construct contemporary blacks as eager, even impatient, to experience an end to their suffering through post-apartheid transformation.

> Black South Africans have displayed a remarkable capacity for forgiveness, grace and patience towards their former oppressors. However, that patience is not limitless. [ST/L/26/02/95]
>
> Africans have extended their hand of friendship long enough and the hand cannot stretch any further. We have been too forgiving. [ST/L/06/08/95]
>
> Reconciliation means that we must erase memories, symbols, paintings, names, statues or anything that depicts apartheid in the eye of the people. Reconciliation does not mean we should sacrifice and compromise everything. It does not mean we should swallow everything. [CP/L/23/10/94]
>
> The apologists' concept of reconciliation . . . demands we approach whites with moronic grins and shake their hands in the name of the new South Africa, when in fact they should be begging our forgiveness. [CP/L/10/11/96]

In line with previous examples, these letters present post-apartheid as an era of new possibilities for blacks. More specifically, they present the repositioning of whites from "rulers over the black people" to "former oppressors" as a change which opens up the possibility of redefining the entanglement between blacks and whites. Once again, it is asserted that the repositioning of blacks is predicated on a rejection of whatever is reminiscent of apartheid, hence the call to "erase memories, symbols, paintings, names, statues or anything that depicts apartheid in the eye of the people". Although the construction of blacks as "kind" is reflected here via the assertion that blacks "have displayed a remarkable capacity for forgiveness, grace and patience" towards whites, these texts are notably different from the example cited earlier in that they set a limit on blacks' kindness. In the new dispensation, blacks' "patience [towards whites] is not limitless" and the "hand of friendship" which has already been extended towards whites "cannot stretch any further". Given that whites are no longer positioned as their rulers or oppressors, blacks no longer have to "sacrifice and compromise everything" or "swallow everything" for the sake of whites. As has been illustrated in Chapter 5, blacks are no longer

constructed as "voiceless". This, in turn, allows blacks to experience a bold new blackness which does not back down in the face of whiteness; they can act from a position which refuses to "approach whites with moronic grins", and which refuses to "forget" and "forgive" the atrocities of the past. In line with this, *Bold New Blacks* ought to be able to speak out freely and demand the following: whites "should be begging our forgiveness".

An Enduring Whiteness

Further, it is worthwhile to recall that the template of *EW* offers a way to largely protect, and thus maintain, apartheid-era racialised identity constructions. Since it does not construct a firm demarcation between pre- and post-1994, this template maintains the possibility for apartheid-era racialised experiences to persist despite the end of apartheid. Here I argue that the template of *EW* seeks to keep the existing entanglement between blacks and whites intact. For example, drawing on Chapter 6, I contend that despite efforts at post-apartheid transformation, some whites continue to experience having "authority" over blacks because they are "still" positioned as their "bosses". As the following letter extracts show, *EW* presents the historical entanglement between blacks and whites as 'the natural order of things' and thus as unremarkable.

> Sure, the South African settlers barged in and took what they could get, but that was standard practice then. [. . .] What's to feel guilty about? [ST/L/12/01/97a]

> When discussing South African history over the past 350 years, people tend to forget two factors. First, the acquisition of territory by conquest is a time-honoured and legitimate activity. Second, over the past 97 years the financial resources for infrastructure came from tax, about 70 percent of which was paid by whites, who comprise about 10 percent of the population. Agriculture was developed beyond a subsistence level by the same people, as was industry in general. I believe there is only one basic principle in this life: you are entitled only to that which you have earned. [ST/L/12/01/97b]

By referring to whites as those who "barged in and took what they could get", the first letter seemingly reproduces *BNB*'s construction of colonial-era whites as those who "annexed the land" (see CP/L/19/07/98). However, within the discourse of *EW*, the act of taking and annexing is seen as "a time-honoured and legitimate activity" which falls within "standard practice". In other words, "what's to feel guilty about?". Since the acts which whites carried out historically are rendered unproblematic, it follows that *Enduring Whites* do not have to apologise about the past; they do not have to beg blacks for forgiveness (see CP/L/10/11/96). Moreover, the second letter shows that *EW* constructs *Enduring Whites* as those who are

entitled to experience privilege because they have earned it. This may be illustrated in conjunction with the following letters.

> The whites educated and gave money and employment to millions of blacks. [ST/L/12/01/97c]
>
> [The commentator] Oakley-Smith wrote that every time the whites went into hospital, or their children attended school, they benefitted. And why not? Whose tax money paid for those hospitals and schools? [ST/L/12/01/97d]

In line with the examples analysed in Chapter 6, the examples provided here assert that whites "developed" the country's agricultural and industrial sectors. They thus similarly position whites as those who drive progress. However, more importantly, they also position whites as those who have contributed to the bulk of "financial resources" for the country's "infrastructure". Despite making up "10 percent of the population" (i.e., being the minority), it is asserted that whites have contributed (i.e., "paid") disproportionately towards "tax" (i.e., "about 70 percent") "over the past 97 years". The idea that "you are entitled only to that which you have earned" serves on two fronts. First, it serves to naturalise whites' feelings of entitlement to a position of racial privilege. Since whites have "paid" tax, their entitlement to the benefits of schooling and healthcare is presented as well-deserved. Second, by implication, the black majority – who comprise about 90 per cent of the population but who have contributed only about 30 per cent – are positioned as those who are less deserving of benefits than whites. Therefore, seen from the perspective of this template, *Enduring Whites* ought to continue to experience racial privilege despite the end of apartheid.

DIS-ENTANGLEMENTS

The past and the present

The previous section has shed further light on the oppositional nature of the templates under consideration. It has shown that whereas *BNB* seeks to undo the existing entanglement between blacks and whites, *EW* seeks to preserve this entanglement. Moreover, it has shown that the notion of entanglement is presented in neatly-defined terms within each template; it may either be described in relation to the past *or* the unfolding future. To begin with, I assert that what blacks and whites can experience is predicated on whether they are located in an entanglement reflective of apartheid *or* post-apartheid. Consider the two texts below, which reflect typical examples found across the data corpus.

> It is back to business as usual in the white South African community. The fears of nationalisation, redistribution of assets, affirmative action, etc, are all forgotten and it is back to *baasskapdom* [white domination] and job reservation. And with Africans it is back to empty hand and bellies and the old habit of trying to keep their jobs and pretending to their bosses that they are forever happy. [ST/L/06/08/95]

> It is also clear that this legislation [i.e., Affirmative Action] is frustrating white South African males who feel that their skills are not appreciated in the country. This is unfortunate. They need to understand that black South Africans are still grappling with the immense, devastating effects of the apartheid legacy. [CP/L/25/03/07]

The first letter lays out the implications of maintaining an entanglement reflective of apartheid. If the context supports "business as usual", then white "fears" regarding transformation can be "forgotten". By going "back", whites can enjoy the same privileges as they did before. For blacks, however, going "back" implies not only going "back to empty hand and bellies" (i.e., "suffering") but also reverting to "the old habit" of "pretending to their [white] bosses that they are forever happy". Blacks, in other words, become "voiceless" (see Chapter 5). The second letter lays out the implications of undoing this very entanglement. If a context of transformation is allowed to flourish, then blacks can begin to deal with the "devastating effects of the apartheid legacy" (i.e., the broad experience of "suffering"). But while transformation may have the effect of releasing blacks from old habits, it may also have the effect of "frustrating" whites; no longer positioned as "bosses" over blacks, whites may feel "unappreciated".

Certainly, whether blacks and whites experience things such as fear, frustration or suffering, depends on the entanglement in which they are positioned. However, in addition to this, it is evident that, regardless of whether they are located in an entanglement reflective of the past or the present, blacks and whites have oppositional experiences. Two important questions arise in relation to the latter point. Firstly, given that blacks and whites can have oppositional experiences regardless of the entanglement in which they are located, how are oppositional racialised experiences constructed within each template? Secondly, given that oppositional racialised experiences can arise in relation to the past *or* the present, how do the templates overcome the clash or tension between the past and the present (see Chapter 6)? I begin to tackle these questions by looking at how the tension between the past and the present shapes post-apartheid racialised experiences. The following editorials serve to illustrate.

> Blacks are now the rulers; they are in government and they run the country. But at every turn, and wherever one goes, one is still greeted by old symbols of the previous rulers. That has to change, and soon. South Africa is a new country, under a new democratic government, and it has to reflect this new change all around it. [CP/E/23/07/00]

> White South Africans were told by apartheid rulers that they were superior and deserving of resources at the expense of black people, simply because they were white. Many of them internalised this and are finding the going tough today, when black people are in charge not only of the country but of a number of companies and parastatals. [ST/E/20/04/03]

First, consider the experience of blacks in post-apartheid. "Blacks are now the rulers" who "run the country" and "are in charge". Yet, despite their change in positioning, blacks constantly see reminders of a white-dominated past; they are "still greeted by the old symbols of the previous rulers". Blacks, therefore, experience a tension between "change" which has occurred, and "change" which must still occur in order to "reflect" a New South Africa "all around". Second, consider the experience of whites in post-apartheid. Now positioned as "the previous rulers", whites "are finding the going tough". They see that "black people are in charge not only of the country but of a number of companies and parastatals". Whites, therefore, experience a tension between what they "were told by apartheid rulers" that they were "deserving of", and the way in which they are positioned "today" relative to blacks. These editorials, therefore, highlight a problematic aspect for the templates under consideration: post-apartheid racialised experiences are an amalgam of both the past and the present. From this, I go on to address the following question: how do the templates manage the clash, or tension, between the past and the future?

Keeping the racialised other out

I argue that although the tension between the past and the present cannot be avoided, it remains possible for the templates to shape black and white experiences by shaping the entanglement between blacks and whites. This shaping occurs via a dis-entanglement of blackness and whiteness, or by keeping the racialised other out.

> Is it not true that as black people, we own 13 percent of the land but number about 40 million? It is not true that in tertiary education there are fewer black children enrolling? Is it not true that black people own less than 2 percent of the economy but are the majority? Is it not true that the cars we drive are bought from white dealers? Is it not true that the insurance companies that insure our cars, houses and lives are owned by whites? Is it not true that we take our kids to white schools to be taught by white teachers, but whites do not take their children to black schools? Is it not true that our children understand other cultures better than their own culture

> and speak and understand English better than their own language. [sic] It is absolutely wrong to borrow from other cultures. [. . . .] The vast majority of white people do not speak an African language. [CP/L/17/04/05b]

At first sight, the above letter seems to advocate for the following: blacks, as the majority, should be repositioned to fill the domains currently dominated by the white minority. Thus, it follows that blacks should own most of the country's land, comprise most of those enrolled at tertiary institutions, and control most of the economy. Blacks should similarly displace and replace most of the white car dealers and insurance company owners. Such a reading is congruent with what has been illustrated in Chapter 6. In other words, it is reasonable to conclude that putting *Blacks First* and ameliorating levels of *Post-1994 Contradiction* would help make blacks' and whites' lived experience more similar. However, the text also asserts a cultural distinction between blacks and whites. It argues that although the black "majority" have their "own culture" and "own language", most black parents send their children to "white schools to be taught by white teachers". As a consequence, black children come to "understand other cultures better than their own culture and speak and understand English better than their own language". The crucial aspect here is that the act of borrowing from other cultures is deemed "absolutely wrong". Further, the text makes it clear that whites do not borrow from African culture. Most members of the white minority "do not speak an African language" (i.e., they speak English), and thus white parents do not send their children to "black schools" (i.e., they send them to white schools). As the logic here goes, whites stick to their own language and so should blacks.

In light of this, the idea that the template of *BNB* opens up new possibilities for racialised experience requires some qualification. While the template positions *Bold New Blacks* in ways which enable them to have new experiences, it cannot construct *Bold New Blacks* without defining what constitutes black experience. This is because the dis-entanglement of blackness from whiteness requires that a distinction is drawn between black and white experiences. Yet, in order to construct distinctly 'black' experiences, it is necessary to keep anything reflective of whiteness out of blackness. This, in turn, limits the range of what *Bold New Blacks* can experience. The letters below serve to illustrate how *BNB* outlines a racially-separate direction for blackness.

> Language is not only a communication tool, but defines who you are, where you come from and where you are heading to. Today, children are no longer taught their own languages, they know nothing about their own idioms and proverbs. English is associated with intelligence. In South Africa, apartheid has indoctrinated us into believing that anything to do with black is evil. [. . . .] Parents have a duty to let children know where they come from so they know where they are going. [CP/L/05/06/05]

> A black nation without black languages is a lost and confused nation! [CP/L/02/09/01]

> When we deal with our domestic issues (Ezomndeni) [. . .] we should address such issues in our mother tongue in order to ensure we all comprehend where we come from and where we are heading. By doing so, we shall be dispelling confusion and misunderstanding. [CP/L/08/08/04]

Central to these letters is the idea that language forms the core of a person's identity: it "defines who you are, where you come from and where you are heading to". By dividing language into 'black' and 'white', the letters present language as a compass which respectively serves to guide blacks and whites. The message here is that a mismatch between language and "nation" results in "a lost and confused nation". For instance, when "domestic issues" pertaining to a "black nation" are discussed in English (i.e., a 'white' language), blacks experience "confusion and misunderstanding". Simply put, only "black languages" are deemed appropriate for guiding "a black nation" in the right direction. The prescriptive aspect of the template of *BNB* comes to the fore via the reference to black children who "are no longer taught their own languages". Constructed as children who are being 'misdirected', their parents have a "duty" to ensure that they are guided back on course; they must "know where they come from so they know where they are going". It becomes apparent then that the dis-entanglement of blackness from whiteness relies on successfully steering blacks towards distinctly 'black' experiences.

The template of *EW* similarly attempts to keep blackness out of experiences which are deemed to be reflective of whiteness or be typically 'white'. The following letters were prompted by transformative changes at the country's national, public English-language radio station, SAfm (formerly Radio South Africa). More specifically, they were prompted by the changes made by Govan Reddy – the head of radio at the South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC).

> English is no longer a second language to most SABC announcers. Sometimes I think it is a third language, or more likely no language at all. For example: sat-chew-rated, effluent farmers, vak-sin, at this point in time (meaning "now"), Debbin (in Natal), Jan-you-werri (before Febru-werri). [ST/L/19/03/95]

> Many old-guard broadcasters who spoke beautiful English [were] . . . replaced . . . with Afrikaans and African announcers, and now our children learn words like "sit-you-hay-shin" (situation) and "cow-pools" (couples), all thanks to Reddy and his gripe against white English speakers. [ST/L/21/06/98a]

> I am distressed to find that in the so-called interests of affirmative action, we have radio announcers on the new SAfm who, with all the goodwill in the world, are unable to speak English fluently and with the correct pronunciation and grammatical flow. [ST/L/02/04/95]

> Was it not the most blatant racial discrimination when he [Reddy] axed perfectly competent, highly professional radio presenters on SAfm who spoke English with an easy flow and replaced them with politically correct, affirmative-action tyros who proceeded to wreck the language and render it almost unintelligible? [ST/L/21/06/98b]

These letters affirm what has been asserted in the previous set of letters: blacks become "lost and confused" when they attempt to communicate in English; hence, English ought to remain a language for whites. By comparing black and white radio presenters' English-language competence, these letters construct sharply racialised differences. Those described as "old-guard broadcasters" or "highly professional radio presenters" are associated with the ability to speak "beautiful English" or "English with an easy flow". The fact that they were "replaced" or "axed" due to Affirmative Action suggests that the latter were in all likelihood white. Indeed, they were replaced with "African announcers" or "affirmative-action tyros", who "are unable to speak English fluently". In contrast to white presenters, these "politically correct" black presenters have proceeded "to wreck the language and render it almost unintelligible". As one letter-writer describes, English appears not to be a "second" or "third language" but "more likely no language at all" to black radio presenters. This steers blacks towards focusing on communicating in their own 'black' languages while leaving white radio presenters to communicate in 'their' own language – English. The idea that blacks "wreck" what is associated with whiteness is extended in the following letter.

> It is not outrageous to attribute decreased security to increased admission of black students [at the University of the Witwatersrand]. Which students rage through canteens and lecture halls kicking over dustbins, breaking windows and injuring law students? [. . . .] Many white students encourage gradual transformation that is peaceful, fair and not racism in reverse. [ST/L/04/12/94]

EW presents blacks' presence within formerly white-dominated domains as a disruption of how things are normally experienced by whites in 'their' spaces. In the above example, whites' sense of ownership over space is conveyed via the idea that "white students encourage" – rather than whole-heartedly support – "gradual transformation". Here a direct correlation is constructed between the "increased admission of black students" and "decreased security". By constructing black students as those who "rage" and engage in "kicking", "breaking" and "injuring", *EW* positions blacks as out of place within a domain which is considered 'white'. From this, it is evident that *EW* attempts to shape whites' experience by keeping anything reflective of blackness out. In other words, *Enduring Whites* are constructed through a dis-entanglement from blackness.

The idea that both templates construct the possibility for distinctly racialised experiences through a separation of blackness and whiteness is widely supported by the data. First, the idea is not dissimilar from the conclusion that *BNB* and *EW* construct racialised identities independently (see Chapter 5). Second, to make the point briefly, the idea goes hand in hand with so-called common-sense understandings of racialised difference. The following texts present this perspective in various guises.

> We acknowledge our differences as blacks and whites. [CP/L/01/05/11]
>
> The exclusion of African-based examples in mathematics, science and economics makes these subjects incomprehensible to black pupils. [ST/L/14/01/96]
>
> We need to be proud of who we are and not aspire to becoming something we are not and will never be. [CP/L/01/10/06]
>
> While black people as victims saw the TRC [Truth and Reconciliation Commission] as a platform to deal with their pain and suffering, certain sections of white society saw the TRC as a witch-hunt. [CP/E/23/03/03]

The first letter is representative of texts which simply assert that blacks and whites are inherently different. Such texts "acknowledge" differences between "blacks and whites" and thereby present racial differences as taken for granted or obvious 'facts'. While providing more qualification than the first letter, the second and third letters maintain that there exist profound differences between blacks and whites. If blacks require "African-based examples" in order to understand school subjects, then it is possible to assume, for example, that most teaching material relies on Eurocentric examples intended to enable white pupils' understanding.

Further, the message that "we need to be proud of who we are and not aspire to becoming something we are not and will never be", reflects the common perception that there exists a deep division between blacks and whites which is unbridgeable. The editorial serves as one example from a multitude of texts which subtly reinforce the idea of race as difference. Simply put, it illustrates that blacks and whites generally do not see things the same way; what most blacks see "as a platform to deal with their pain and suffering", is seen by some whites "as a witch-hunt". Together, these texts paint a picture of inherent racialised differences. Thus, in reading these texts, it is possible to conclude that blacks and whites simply have distinctly different thoughts, feelings and experiences. These templates' efforts at dis-entangling blackness and whiteness can, therefore, be seen in terms of a reassertion of a common-sense division between blacks and whites.

However, at the same time, the new dispensation may position blacks and whites in ways which appear to render racialised experiences insignificant. As the following examples illustrate, some texts point towards a kind of dis-entanglement which largely dissolves the distinction between blackness and whiteness.

> Miracles came from several quarters. [. . .] Black, white, coloured and Indian standing in long queues to cast their votes without any friction and at times sharing drinks. [CP/E/01/05/94]

> We are a miracle nation. Really we are. Just less than 20 years ago we were a divided nation – one black and oppressed, the other white and the beneficiary of political oppression and economic exploitation. [CP/E/19/04/09]

> The [1995] Rugby World Cup has come and gone – leaving the once racially polarised South Africa a more united country than ever before. It is an irony, indeed, that the very sport that drove a wider rift between black and white people in our motherland turned out to be the one that brought us much closer together. [. . .] We don't see Chester Williams as a sellout [*sic*] but as our own hero. We do not see Francois Pienaar as an oppressor but as the captain of the Amabokoboko. [CP/E/25/06/95]

The picture presented across these texts is one of racial sameness. The first editorial provides a take on the democratic elections of April 1994. While it presents the apparent unity between "black, white, coloured and Indian" as something difficult or even impossible to explain (i.e., as one of several "miracles" which occurred), it nevertheless describes racial unity in distinctly concrete terms: previously racially-separated groups of people are "mirac[ulously]" brought together "in long queues" where they stand "without any friction". They share not only the common purpose of "cast[ing] their votes" but also "shar[e] drinks". The second editorial looks

back at some fifteen years of democracy. Like the first editorial, it presents an apparently sustained and long-lasting racial unity as something which has been brought about by a "miracle". Here, a racially-united "miracle nation" has replaced a "divided nation"; one which consisted of "oppressed" blacks on the one hand, and white "beneficiar[ies]" of black "oppression" and "exploitation" on the other. The editorial thus maintains that since blacks and whites now belong to a united nation, they can no longer be meaningfully differentiated on the basis of race. The third editorial focuses on South African's victory at the 1995 Rugby World Cup final. In line with the second editorial, it presents the national rugby team's victory as a racially-unifying event: racial divisions within "the once racially-polarised South Africa" are reduced or virtually eliminated as the country is transformed into "a more united country than ever before". Here too it is possible to infer that a miracle is being alluded to; as a historically 'white' sport, which "drove a wider rift between black and white people", rugby has now inexplicably – but apparently undeniably – "brought" blacks and whites "much closer together". The ostensible insignificance of race is further illustrated as follows. The team's only black player, "Chester Williams", is not viewed as a "sellout" participating in a 'white' sport, but as a "hero". Similarly, the team's white captain, "Francois Pienaar", is not viewed as "an oppressor" of black people but simply as the team's "captain". Moreover, by referring to the team as the "Amabokoboko", rather than the 'Springboks', the editorial gives the impression that the country's black majority has wholeheartedly adopted a historically 'white' sport. Collectively, these texts assert that racialised differences have been rendered insignificant within the post-apartheid era. Put differently, in reading these texts, it is possible to conclude that blacks and whites can have very similar feelings, thoughts and experiences. From this, the following question arises: can the templates of *BNB* and *EW* dis-entangle blackness and whiteness without rendering racialised differences insignificant? More pertinently, how is the distinction between blackness and whiteness maintained? It is to this question which I turn to next.

RE-ENTANGLEMENTS

Drawing the racialised other back in

While it appears that black and white experiences can only be defined as distinct experiences if they are presented as entirely separate from each other, such dis-entanglement is undoubtedly problematic. To 'manufacture' blackness and whiteness independently risks losing the

relational points of reference needed to co-construct racialised identities. Now, at this point, I am able to address the question which I posed earlier: how are oppositional racialised experiences constructed within each template? In this regard, I argue that racialised experiences are constructed via a relational process of re-entanglement. Simply put, what it means to be black becomes defined through not being white, and what it means to be white becomes defined through not being black. However, as I will go on to show, the manner in which blacks and whites are re-entangled is not displayed evenly, or in parallel, across the templates.

First, bearing in mind that the broad direction for *Enduring Whites* is signalled in terms of maintaining the experience of white privilege despite the end of apartheid, consider the way in which *EW* presents what whites can experience *in relation to* blacks.

> As a white male, I no longer have a country because the government has by law deprived me of the essence of South African citizenship by prescribing racial discrimination against me. [ST/L/25/02/01]
>
> Although many Afrikaners were responsible for the implementation and maintenance of apartheid, it is . . . grossly unfair to punish today's younger (job-hunting) white Afrikaner generation for their forefathers' mistakes [. . .]. We are all either free in the new South Africa or we have just managed to change the colour of the faces of the oppressors. [ST/L/20/11/94]
>
> Tertiary education is a privilege, not a right. Privileges must be earned, and students need to prove themselves worthy of recognition. Bursaries are no longer based on academic merit, but race. [. . . .] Many white students encourage gradual transformation that is peaceful, fair and not racism in reverse. [ST/L/04/12/94]

Whereas the discourse of *BNB* has asserted that blacks suffered under the colonial and apartheid past, the discourse of *EW* asserts that whites are suffering in the unfolding post-apartheid present. Furthermore, if the lens of *BNB* provided a view of post-apartheid whites as "former oppressors", then the lens of *EW* provides a view where there has been a "change [in] the colour of the faces of the oppressors". This change is described as a reversal of the entanglement seen under apartheid: whites have become the oppressed and blacks have become the oppressors. Thus, while transformation (i.e., the end of white privilege) may be presented as something which ends black suffering, it can also simultaneously be presented as something which results in whites feeling "deprived" as they face "racial discrimination" and "racism in reverse". According to *EW*, the current generation of white youth, in particular, are positioned as victims of post-apartheid; they experience a "grossly unfair" form of "punish[ment]" for

"their forefathers' mistakes". Importantly, this positioning is constructed in response to a changing entanglement. The following letter may be revisited alongside the above texts.

> A top [African National Congress] member has declared that the needs of blacks would be addressed before those of whites, because blacks had been deprived. Where is their commitment to a non-racial South Africa? Needs should be addressed in order of urgency, not on the basis of race. Nor would a wealth tax, affirmative action, and other vengeful measures still to be devised against whites, be in keeping with the ideal of equal rights and a free society. [ST/L/09/01/94]

By putting "the needs of blacks . . . before those of whites", the new dispensation reconfigures the entanglement between blacks and whites and thus threatens to erode whites' privilege. At the same time, the new dispensation also allows for the possibility of defending white privilege. Paradoxically, in a context founded on the "ideal[s]" of "non-racial[ism]" and "equal rights", what is done "on the basis of race" can be construed as antithetical to the ethos of the new dispensation. In this vein, transformation efforts can be reduced to a set of "vengeful measures" which supposedly result in "racial discrimination" against whites (i.e., 'victims'). In this way, existing white privilege can be protected. Further, the question of privilege can be posed in a way which seemingly naturalises *Enduring Whites*' experience. It should be recalled that the idea that "privileges must be earned", echoes the earlier-stated idea that "you are entitled only to that which you have earned" (see ST/L/12/01/97b). In a context where "bursaries are no longer based on academic merit, but race", *EW* positions blacks as the beneficiaries of unearned racial privilege; they have failed to "prove themselves worthy of recognition". In contrast to blacks, whites are positioned as those who have "earned" their privilege through "recognition". In this way, the template of *EW* not only defends white privilege but also allows whites to feel that they are entitled to privilege.

Moreover, it is useful to point out that there is virtually no evidence in the data corpus to suggest that whites attempt to assimilate into blackness. Indeed, this absence is noticeable in that *EW* does not have to steer whites away from blackness. Articulated from the perspective of *BNB*, the following examples illustrate that what whites can experience is overwhelmingly defined in terms of what is not black. Thus, according to the template of *EW*, the experience of being white should entail 1) having a 'white' name, 2) going to a 'white' school, and 3) speaking English (i.e., not "SeTswana or IsiZulu").

> One never hears of white people with names like Mandla, Mapule or Nosipho, even though some of them have been on this continent for over 300 years. [ST/L/02/11/97]
>
> In my interaction with white people, I have come across only one lady with a genuine African name – Malehlwa (snow mother). [CP/L/12/08/07]
>
> Whites do not take their children to black schools [. . . .] The vast majority of white people do not speak an African language. [CP/L/17/04/05]
>
> I'd like to know whether our white Africans are going to learn at least one of our African languages. [CP/L/06/11/94]
>
> I have not seen or heard white people speaking in SeTswana or IsiZulu when dealing with issues of national interest. [CP/L/08/08/04]

Second, bearing in mind that the broad direction for *Bold New Blacks* is signalled in terms of ending the experience of black suffering through identity reconstruction, consider the way in which *BNB* presents what blacks can experience *in relation to* whites.

> The DP [Democratic Party] has its own agenda in parliament. They do not apologise for being there to look after the interests of white big business and a few rich whites. We do not believe that [DP Leader Tony] Leon cares that much for homeless and unemployed people. We do not think he understands the aspirations of black people who want to live the same as whites. [CP/E/26/01/97]
>
> After 11 years of democracy one would have thought the black middle class would have outgrown wanting to be 'white' at the expense of their identity [. . .]. It seems that our liberation was an opportunity to afford us all the opportunities to wallow in the white men's [*sic*] world. We rush into their neighbourhoods, attend their schools, patronise their restaurants and so on. In the meantime we leave our own neighbourhoods in neglect and squalor. Ultimately blacks have nothing to show for their newly-acquired status of being "liberated" except fancy cars and large houses. [CP/L/29/01/06]

Compared to the picture presented by *EW* with regard to whites, the picture presented by *BNB* with regard to blacks is more complicated. On the one hand, *BNB* aims to improve black people's positioning so that *Bold New Blacks* can "live the same as whites". Accordingly, it is critical of an "agenda" designed to "look after the interests of . . . whites" while leaving the interests of "homeless and unemployed people" (i.e., blacks) ignored. Thus, what blacks can experience is described and assessed in relation to what whites can experience. On the other hand, *BNB* aims to maintain a distinction between blacks and whites, and so, the "aspirations" of those wanting to "live the same as whites" threaten to dissolve this distinction. Those who have gone "to wallow in the white men's world" are seen as those who have sought "to be

'white' at the expense of their identity". Moreover, these blacks are associated with a 'white' agenda which leaves other blacks living in conditions of "neglect and squalor". At the same time, these blacks' experience is defined in terms of emptiness; apart from "fancy cars and large houses", they "have nothing to show" for their post-apartheid positioning. The desire to change black peoples' positioning can thus be understood in terms of having the "opportunity" to experience the *same* things as whites, while not becoming *like* whites.

> It's a shame for any black child with black parents and born in Africa to profess English as their mother tongue when we do not have white kids proclaiming any indigenous language as their mother tongue. [CP/L/12/08/07]

> I'd like to know whether our white Africans are going to learn at least one of our African languages. I'm enquiring because at our schools we [blacks] still have to study English and Afrikaans and we still have to pass them in order to get a matric [high school qualification]. We students have to concentrate on these two subjects and ignore our own language, and in most cases, we pass Afrikaans and English with very good marks but we then fail our own languages! [CP/L/06/11/94]

The first letter contains the same kind of argument used to motivate black and white disentanglement (see CP/L/17/04/05 about the wrongness of borrowing from other cultures). However, here the argument takes a comparative rather than a separatist dimension; given that whites do not regard any 'black' languages as their "mother tongue" it is a "shame" that some blacks regard a 'white' language as their "mother tongue". The second letter builds on from the first to clarify the source of the problem for blackness. Whereas the direction for whites (i.e., "white Africans") is defined in terms of English (i.e., the absence of "African languages"), the direction for blacks is muddled; it is defined in terms of "Afrikaans and English" as well as "our African languages".

In line with this, the template of *BNB* attempts to shape black experience by referring to what is associated with whiteness and then steering blacks away from whiteness (i.e., 'in the right direction'). Put differently, it suggests that what blacks can experience should be defined in terms of what is not white.

> We name our children with strange names like Natasha which has no historical and cultural richness whatsoever. We speak English to our kids. We are contributing to the extinction of African languages and culture. [CP/L/29/01/06]

> The hiring of African educators to teach in former model C schools cannot and should not be postponed any longer. [. . . .] Children in the former model C schools are still being purposefully deprived of the opportunity to be taught by their own. [CP/L/27/02/05]

According to the template of *BNB*, the experience of being black should entail 1) having a black name rather than a "strange" white name, 2) speaking "African languages" rather than "English", and 3) going to a 'black' school or at least being taught by black rather than white teachers (i.e., "their own"). However, efforts towards directing blacks away from whiteness constantly clash with efforts at reshaping blackness within the context of opportunities provided by the new dispensation. More specifically, as the following texts point out, material inequality along racialised lines tends to push blackness towards whiteness.

> Little attention has been paid to improving the condition of schools in black areas, hence the flood by those who can afford it to the previously whites-only schools. [CP/E/22/11/98]

> We witness . . . parents taking their children out of [black] township schools to white schools to give them a better education. [CP/L/04/05/03]

> The quality of learning and teaching in the former "Model-C" schools is still far superior to that in the black schools. Little wonder that matric results tend to reflect this pattern. And because of this, parents are forced to take their children to the better schools in the former white areas at huge expense, shunning free but poor-quality education in their locations. [CP/E/09/11/08]

Here it is evident that what is associated with whiteness can serve to improve black people's positioning; to shift blackness towards whiteness is to shift blackness away from the experience of suffering. For example, to go to a 'white' school opens up the possibility of experiencing a "better" or even "far superior" education than the "poor-quality education" at neglected black schools. Nevertheless, the template of *BNB* spells out the consequences for blacks who are not steered in the right direction.

> Our children from these [white, English-medium] private schools find it difficult to function in the township environment. They are handicapped. They cannot communicate effectively in the African languages. [CP/L/20/06/99]

What becomes apparent is that living in a "white men's world" also shapes what blacks can experience. From one perspective, it can be said that black children who attend 'white' "private schools", and who thus predominantly speak English, "find it difficult to function in the township environment" – an environment which is seen as the domain of blacks. This construction of blacks as "handicapped", reinforces the idea that African languages act like a

compass which guides blacks in the right direction (see CP/L/05/06/05). Indeed, the correctness of steering blacks away from whiteness – of constructing blackness in opposition to whiteness – is reinforced by the following letters.

> More often than not these poor African brothers and sisters make embarrassing grammatical mistakes while trying to impress audiences with their high flown English. [CP/L/04/02/01b]

> Black people do not owe anybody an apology for their fractured English – it is not their home language. [CP/L/22/08/99]

In terms of the first letter, it follows that fellow blacks who try to "impress" with their English are bound to end up "mak[ing] embarrassing grammatical mistakes". This implies that they ought to stick instead to "black languages". While the second letter attempts to defend blacks from ridicule by stating that "English . . . is not their home language", it too implies that blacks ought to avoid communicating in English as they can never attain the same level of proficiency as whites (for examples which articulate this position from the perspective of *EW*, see ST/L/19/03/95, ST/L/02/04/95, ST/L/21/06/98a and ST/L/21/06/98b). Again, this serves to promote a construction of blackness which is underpinned by its opposition to whiteness.

Nevertheless, from another perspective, it can be said that English opens up new opportunities for post-apartheid blacks – particularly for those living in a "white men's world" (see CP/L/29/01/06). The following letters may be read as replies to the lines of argument put forward in the preceding examples.

> Afrikaners are highly intelligent and they know exactly how they ran this country before, but today English has become a stumbling block to them. How can they be expected to attend workshops where the medium of instruction is English? [. . .] Most Africans are proud because they are fluent in Afrikaans and English and they can even speak other African languages. That is why they do not mind attending meetings and workshops in any town or city. [CP/L/19/08/01]

> I don't think [columnist] Charles Mogale . . . is being fair in ridiculing the woman he saw at the restaurant, even if she was speaking broken English to her kids, no matter how arrogant or stupid it looked to him. We are forever reading about journalists who want to dictate to other black people how to talk and what to talk about. [. . . .] We spend about 80 percent of our time at work speaking English, which means African languages belong to the townships. [. . .] No matter how dear our African languages are to us, how far can they take us these days? We can't even speak in these languages to some of our fellow blacks anymore. [. . . .] I encourage anyone who wants to speak English to continue, and do that with intensity to maintain that consistency. Learning and talking English is a sign of empowerment; people who can express themselves in

> English stand a better chance of being the kind of blacks we are looking for – confident. [CP/L/21/02/99]

On one level, the first letter reveals that the muddled direction for blackness in terms of language (see CP/L/06/12/94) can be advantageous for blacks in relation to white Afrikaners – for whom English can be "a stumbling block". Indeed, blacks who are fluent "in Afrikaans and English" as well as "other African languages" can feel "proud" of their ability to communicate in several languages. On another level, the second letter admonishes those who "ridicul[e]" blacks who speak "broken English" and are thus likely to "make embarrassing grammatical mistakes" (see CP/L/04/02/01b). Furthermore, it moves away from the idea that blackness is automatically associated with "fractured English" because "it is not their [i.e., blacks'] home language" (see CP/L/22/08/99). Although it states that "African languages belong to the townships", and thus agrees with the idea presented in CP/L/20/06/99, the letter goes on to question how useful African languages are in the post-apartheid workplace context (i.e., "how far can they take us these days?"). Far from being presented as something reflective of a 'handicap', English is presented as "a sign of empowerment". Accordingly, even a poor command of English is seen as something which offers blacks the possibility to empower themselves and become "confident". Here then, English is seen as something which can promote distinctly post-apartheid experiences for *Bold New Blacks*.

Muddling the direction for blackness further

Lastly, it is worthwhile to briefly comment on another avenue through which the direction for *Bold New Blackness* can be set. As various extracts presented across the previous analysis chapters have suggested, policies aimed at effecting racialised transformation are intended to reposition blacks. The following examples offer explicit reiterations of this point.

> The issue here is not about blacks taking away the wealth of whites, but equitable redistribution of our national income. [. . .] [White South Africans] must develop redistributive plans and measures premised on the objectives of rural development, black economic empowerment, job creation and, above all, the alleviation of poverty. [ST/L/28/06/98]

> Government has, in the interests of creating space for black people in business, come up with a strategy called Black Economic Empowerment (BEE). Simply put, it is an attempt to unlock the grip that white-controlled business interests have traditionally had on the economy. BEE is intended to create the economic muscle for blacks to match the political power they already wield. [CP/E/04/07/04]

> BEE is not about wrestling the country's wealth away from the white population. It is about redressing the disparities of the past and having the goodwill and willingness to let those previously excluded from participating in the mainstream economy make a leveraged entry. [CP/E/30/03/03]

Since it attempts to correct "the disparities of the past" through "equitable redistribution", BEE can be seen as something which aims to undo the historical entanglement between blacks and whites. Importantly, the impact of redistribution is not described primarily in terms of its effects on white experience; hence, it is "not" about "wrestling" or "taking away the wealth of whites". Instead, the "attempt to unlock" whites' "grip" over aspects of the economy is seen in terms of how it allows blacks to "make a leveraged entry" into a domain from which they were "previously excluded". The creation of "economic muscle for blacks" is, therefore, seen as part of a new, post-apartheid entanglement between blacks and whites. But, as one of the editorials presented above goes on to show, this altered entanglement can be met by a re-entanglement.

> Some companies . . . approach black people and ask them to be partners, so that they can be used as fronts to make the white company appear less white. There are many black people who are poor enough to go along with this. These people argue that they are, after all, empowered at the end of the transaction, even if they know nothing about how much money the other guy is making. Then there are those firms . . . which go further. They use the details of their black employees in tenders creating the impression that workers are directors. The employees know nothing of this and continue to receive their normal wages. [CP/E/04/07/04]

Here, the notion of re-entanglement takes on a remarkably complex form. In a context where whites' "grip" is seemingly "unlock[ed]", whites can form new entanglements, or partnerships, with blacks. Whether created with or without blacks' knowledge, these partnerships, in turn, allow the line between black and white to be blurred. Even though blacks do not wield power within these settings, the incorporation of blacks' "economic muscle" within white companies makes these companies "appear less white". What matters, therefore, is the "impression" that white companies are ostensibly black. Indeed, as the following editorial asserts, *Enduring Whites* can exploit *Bold New Blacks* in order to perpetuate their privileged positioning – albeit in new ways which appear in line with the imperatives of the new dispensation.

> It is scandalous that those who benefitted from apartheid are still benefitting from programmes intended to benefit victims of apartheid. In this regard, government must take tough measures to stop the fronting scandals throughout the country where blacks are used by whites to secure government tenders. [CP/E/19/09/04]

CONCLUSION

The above sections of this chapter have shown that oppositional racialised experiences are co-constructed on three different levels. On one level, within each template, what blacks and whites can experience is shaped by the manner in which blacks and whites are entangled. That is, blacks and whites may be positioned within an entanglement which is reflective of the apartheid past or the post-apartheid present. On another level, racialised experiences are shaped via a dis-entanglement of blackness and whiteness. That is, by keeping the racialised other out, the template of *BNB* shapes distinctly black experiences, and the template of *EW* shapes distinctly white experiences. On yet another level, what blacks and whites can experience is shaped in relation to the racialised other. That is, racialised experiences are shaped through interaction between the templates. Here then, the experiences that blacks can have emerge in contrast to white experiences, and the experiences that whites can have emerge in contrast to black experiences. Thus, to be black is not to be 'white' and to be white is not to be 'black'.

However, as the discussion linking this chapter's sections together has shown, there are tensions between the levels. Post-apartheid racialised experiences cannot simply be defined in terms of the past *or* the present. Instead, they are a mixture of both. Here, the tension may be eased by shaping black and white experiences through dis-entanglement. Nevertheless, since dis-entanglement risks rendering the racialised references required to co-construct racialised identities meaningless, this is problematic. As such, blackness and whiteness must be re-entangled. However, although re-entanglement is not troubling for whiteness, it is troubling for blackness. More specifically, the unevenness of re-entanglement between blacks and whites is problematic for the construction of a *Bold New Blackness*. Efforts towards directing blacks away from whiteness constantly clash with efforts at reshaping blackness within the context of opportunities provided by the new dispensation. Moreover, it remains possible for whiteness to exploit blackness through new re-entanglements. Furthermore, given that whiteness does not appear to assimilate into blackness, a recurrent problem that arises for *BNB* is how to craft a reconstructed black identity without assimilating into whiteness. I proceed to reflect on the overall implications of these tensions in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 8

TOWARDS A CONCLUSION: CO-CONSTRUCTING TROUBLE

> *Historically constructed and separated racial groups continue to be troubled in their own particular ways in relation to and in interaction with each other.*
>
> (Durrheim, Mtose & Brown, 2011, p. 24)

South Africa's first democratic elections in 1994 heralded the official end of apartheid. Set against a long and deeply racialised history, the dawn of the post-apartheid era signalled a host of new possibilities for change, including the possibility for reshaping racialised identities. Indeed, over the past 25 years, scholars have paid considerable attention to how South Africans are constructing post-apartheid racialised identities. The current study was inspired by the existing literature on whiteness and blackness in two related ways. First, on one level, the studies reviewed in Chapter 2 provided me with a basis for respectively looking at whiteness and blackness. Whereas few studies conducted prior to the early 1990s focused on whiteness, the post-apartheid era has seen a proliferation of studies which shed light on white identity. In line with the direction suggested by Sharp and Boonzaier (1995), the bulk of studies within the field of South African whiteness studies have variously considered "how white people make sense – or fail to make sense" (p. 64) of the new dispensation. These studies have, therefore, collectively urged us to explore, and thus to continue to interrogate, whiteness. Although the field of blackness studies is not as large or as clearly defined as that of whiteness, the post-apartheid era has seen an increasing array of material focusing on black identity. The question of how black identity is being constructed within the unfolding post-apartheid context forms a central theme within this array of material.

Second, on another level, my review of the literature in Chapter 2 led me to uncover a limitation within the existing literature. Scholars writing within the respective fields of South African whiteness and blackness studies have largely neglected to ask questions about the relationality *between* these identities. In other words, the existing literature sheds very little light on white and black racialised identity co-construction. The bulk of studies on whiteness have focused

solely on whiteness. Hence, blackness has only been considered relevant to analyses of whiteness insofar as blacks' post-apartheid positioning has served to trigger white resistance. Although the material comprising blackness studies often contains references to whiteness, the material does not spell out the manner in which black and white identity co-construction occurs.

This study has, therefore, sought to answer the following question: how are black and white racialised identities being co-constructed against the backdrop of a democratic, non-racial, post-apartheid South Africa? In tackling this question, this study has sifted through a data corpus of letters to the editor and editorials, drawn from two English-language newspapers, *City Press* and the *Sunday Times*, over the period 1994 to 2011. Following the steps, or tasks, proposed by Willig (2008), my analysis focused on the dynamics around the discourses labelled *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness*, these forming respective templates for black and white racialised identity construction. In chapter 5, I introduced the two templates and illustrated that they are underpinned by oppositional views regarding the apartheid past and the unfolding post-apartheid present. In showing that racialised identities are co-constructed within each template, I concluded that these oppositional templates 'manufacture' racialised identities independently. In chapter 6, I asked questions about the subject positions made available within each template, as well as the possibilities for action which such subject positions offer. In showing that racialised identities are co-constructed in an endless cycle of opposition between the templates, I concluded that racialised identities are 'manufactured' interdependently. In chapter 7, I explored black and white subjectivities. In so doing, I brought together the conflicting conclusions of the two previous chapters. Therein, I argued that the templates of *BNB* and *EW* are neither wholly independent nor wholly interdependent. More specifically, I concluded that the co-construction of black and white racialised identities is best understood in terms of a set of entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

(Post-)Apartheid (tem)plates

Having presented the three analytic chapters, I can now proceed to draw together a set of seemingly conflicting conclusions. It is useful to begin the discussion of results by reflecting on how the term *post-apartheid* can be utilised to shed light on the construction of racialised identities. On the one hand, it can be said that the element of *post* in post-apartheid highlights the 'shaking up' of existing constructions. In a context where the meanings attached to blackness and whiteness "are no longer pre-fixed" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 6), the templates of *BNB* and *EW* indicate not only the possibility of constructing alternate forms of blackness and whiteness but also the necessity of revisiting these racialised constructions. On the other hand, it can be said that the element of *apartheid* in post-apartheid highlights the continued significance of racialised identities in everyday life. The fact that the templates of *BNB* and *EW* can be discerned within public discourse indicates that racialised identities have not merely fallen away after apartheid. As Posel (2001b) has observed,

> it remains the norm for articles and letters in the press, reports on radio and television, and other modes of conversation and commentary to identify social actors in racialized terms, attesting to the lingering salience of these racial constructions within social consciousness. (p. 109)

The use of the hyphenated term *post-apartheid* has, therefore, served an important purpose throughout this study. It has not merely signified the existence of an 'official discourse' (Soudien, 2001) which can be classified along either pre- and post-1994 lines (Walker, M., 2005). Rather, it has stood to indicate that the contemporary setting is characterised by an uneasy co-existence between the past and the unfolding future. In this vein, it is useful to draw on Curt's (1994) notion of tectonics. While the discourses of *BNB* and *EW* have been presented as templates for the construction of post-apartheid racialised identity, they can further be imagined as tectonic plates which form part of the landscape (and by extension, the map) of racialised identity co-construction in post-apartheid South Africa. Indeed, given the tensions between the discourses of *BNB* and *EW*, it is appropriate to use the plate metaphor. While opting to use the (tem)plate metaphors, I am cognisant of the risk of reifying the discourses under consideration. For Potter, Wetherell, Gill and Edwards (1990), talking about discourses

as sets of statements (see Parker, 1992), and more particularly "endorsing something akin to the geology of plate tectonics" (p. 209), entails the risk of reification. As they elaborate:

> Great plates (discourses) on the earth's crust circulate and clash together; some plates grind violently together; others slip quietly over top of one another; volcanoes burst through while massive forces work unseen below. The limitation with this approach is that the discourses in this view become formed as coherent and carefully systematized (Parker, 1989, p. 5) wholes which take on the status of causal agents for analytic purposes. That is, the processes of interest are seen as those of (abstract) discourse working on another (abstract) discourse. (p. 209)

However, in response, Curt (1994) has argued that there is no reason why one cannot simultaneously ask questions about unseen forces or what has "shaped the map" (p. 66) and "how people negotiate their way around what the map is representing" (pp. 66-67). Indeed, the question underpinning this study requires one to ask questions relating to both of these aspects: how are black and white racialised identities being co-constructed (i.e., negotiated) across a terrain (i.e., map) shaped by the tensions of the democratic, non-racial, post-apartheid context?

Despite the plate tectonics caution noted above, the metaphor of mapping features strongly in Wetherell and Potter's (1992) slightly later work, *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Therein, they acknowledge that "the [mapping] metaphor . . . emphasizes that discourse does have substance, it is a material which can be explored and charted" (p. 2). Their work, therefore, suggests that it is possible to employ these kinds of metaphors without reifying the discourses under consideration:

> Racist practices may not fit together into a neat whole. Yet they have an organization, and that organization can be discovered and recorded. It is important to stress, however, that cultural maps and inventories keep changing. We do not want to suggest that the objects we discover will remain static or that the discovery is uncontested. Like the guide to a fast-growing city, new routes are often introduced and decrepit areas regularly bulldozed. (p. 2)

In this study, the idea that discourses have substance is not only emphasised via the perspective of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (namely its focus on objects) but also via the (tem)plate metaphor which is suggestive of a material object. While the plate metaphor reinforces the idea of substance, it also suggests that the objects contained within the discourses (templates) are

contested; tensions between the plates may build up, culminating in clashes. Moreover, the term post-apartheid serves to signify that the country's landscape is in a state of flux. As it reflects elements of both the past and the unfolding present, the map illustrating the (tem)plates is subject to on-going revision.

Though it appears in slightly different guises within each of the three analysis chapters, the tension between apartheid and post-apartheid forms a thread which runs throughout the analysis. Indeed, the overall effect of this tension on the construction of racialised identities has been summed up succinctly by Klandermans et al. (2001). Consider again their assertion as stated in Chapter 2: "whites had a more stable and clear position in the South African society than the blacks, coloureds and Asians. The end of apartheid destabilised the position of the latter three. They had to redefine their identity" (p. 101).

Certainly, the current study affirms that compared to blacks' positioning, whites' positioning has remained relatively stable and clear. As Chapter 5 illustrated, *Enduring Whites* are constructed within a template which is rooted in the past, and which centres on promoting continuity across the eras of apartheid and post-apartheid. Because a demarcation between the past and the unfolding future is not asserted within the template of *EW*, the necessity for identity redefinition is minimised. By contrast, *Bold New Blacks* are constructed within a template which arises from the possibilities that are envisioned for a distinctly post-apartheid era. That is, the template's emphasis on a firm demarcation between the past and the future goes hand in hand with a thorough redefinition of identity. Hence, it is possible to assert that whereas the way forward for whites is fairly certain and clear because it is guided by an established past, the way forward for blacks is uncertain because it must still be established along the lines of an unfolding, and thus unknown, future. Chapter 6 illustrated the same theme from a different perspective. The argument labelled *1994 Contradiction* highlighted that, despite the new dispensation, whites are "still" positioned in ways which are reflective of the apartheid past; they are positioned as those who are "in charge". More specifically, they are positioned as decision-makers who act as "bosses" over blacks. In other words, old certainties have tended to remain intact for whites. Moreover, the various strands of the argument labelled *Blacks First* highlighted that blacks are struggling to reposition themselves within the post-apartheid context. Though blacks may gain entry into (formerly) white-dominated domains, they are relegated to positions of "window-dressing" for "publicity purposes", and thus do not experience meaningful transformation. In other words, blacks' path towards the ostensibly

"inevitable" goal of becoming leaders of "a predominantly black country" remains elusive. Chapter 7 illustrated the same theme from yet another perspective. Whereas the direction in terms of what whites ought to experience is clear-cut, the direction in terms of what blacks ought to experience is fraught with tension and ambiguity. The template of *EW* sets the direction for whites in obvious, even predictable, terms. To be white is to have a 'white' name, to attend a 'white' school, to inhabit white-dominated domains and to speak English. While the template of *BNB* also sets the direction for blacks in clear terms, the post-apartheid context often pulls blacks towards whiteness.

If whiteness merely has to passively defend its existing position, and blackness has to actively fight in order to reposition itself, then it appears that it is easier to resist identity reconstruction than to reformulate identity in post-apartheid. Yet such a conclusion remains too simplistic. While the assertion provided by Klandermans et al. (2001) serves to open up the discussion of results, I argue that it does not fully illuminate the complex tensions that exist between (as well as around) blackness and whiteness. Therefore, I proceed to consider more carefully what the results suggest about the co-construction of *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness*.

Black and white co-construction

Just like our past, our future as South Africans – black and white – is intertwined.
[CP/E/19/04/09]

The above editorial extract usefully reminds us that the future of black and white South Africans is intertwined. Indeed, the existing literature has provided a few scattered assertions which hint at such intertwining. Stevens (2007), for example, has maintained that "blackness and whiteness are interrelated" (p. 425). The existing literature also contains a handful of comments which call for research aimed at shedding light on such intertwining. Whereas an article by Hunter et al. (2010) notes the possibility of carrying out "a relational analysis [which] focuses on the inevitable interdependence of blackness and whiteness" (p. 411), an article by Blaser (2008) concludes with a clear-cut directive for further research: "I suggest looking at 'white' identities in their relation to the Other" (p. 95). But what can be drawn from these kinds of statements? To state that blackness and whiteness are intertwined, interrelated, interdependent or simply related, is to signal the *existence* of black and white racialised identity co-construction. Certainly, this is a step in the right direction. However, these statements do not reveal anything about the *form* which such co-construction takes. Thus, we are left with the

following question: how might the co-construction of blackness and whiteness best be described?

Admittedly, the literature reviewed in Chapter 3 has provided some clues as to the form that black and white identity co-construction might take. Drawing on this literature, I have endeavoured to provide an explication of what authors such as Ansell (2001) and Thiele (1991) might mean when they respectively talk about the construction of blackness and whiteness as happening *together* or *in parallel*. More specifically, by focusing on the dynamics around the discourses labelled *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness*, I have endeavoured to reveal how *Bold New Blacks* and *Enduring Whites* are co-constructing their identities.

Put another way, my analysis has attempted to map the terrain of co-construction as constituted by the (tem)plates of *BNB* and *EW*. Here it is useful to briefly pause and reflect further on the (tem)plate metaphor. In as much as it may be said that the templates of *BNB* and *EW* offer essentialised constructions of blackness and whiteness, it may also be said that since tectonic plates are never entirely static, blackness and whiteness remain fluid constructions. If the (tem)plate metaphor allows one to map, and thus capture, racialised identity co-construction, it also suggests that multiple mappings may be required to capture the terrain in sufficient detail. The analysis chapters can, therefore, be understood as three maps which provide snapshots of the shifting dynamics or the changing topography of co-construction. What, then, do these chapters tell us about racialised identity co-construction? More specifically, how do the findings fit with descriptions of co-construction as found in the existing literature reviewed in Chapter 3?

First, to adopt the idea that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed *in parallel* (Thiele, 1991) is to suggest that while there is a relationship between *BNB* and *EW*, the two (tem)plates never intersect. In a sense, such an understanding is in line with the finding that the templates 'manufacture' blackness and whiteness independently (see Chapter 5). Here then, co-construction occurs at the same time (i.e., in parallel) within each template, and the plates drift without ever crossing paths (i.e., in parallel). To begin with, an explanation of why the plates drift *without* clashing might draw on the fact that the templates are characterised by dissimilar or oppositional stances. However, the idea that co-construction occurs *in parallel* can also imply that there exist more similarities than differences between the two (tem)plates. Since Chapter 6 found that the templates 'manufacture' blackness and whiteness interdependently

through an endless cycle of clashing or opposition, this notion of similarity cannot be supported. Moreover, the opposition between the templates is linked to the fact that each template focuses on a different time period. The apartheid past and the unfolding post-apartheid present clash precisely because they do not run in parallel to each other. Hence, it is problematic to talk about co-construction as something which occurs in parallel.

Second, then, it appears that it might be more appropriate to adopt the idea that blackness and whiteness are co-constructed *together* (Ansell, 2001). The three analysis chapters have consistently shown that references to blackness or whiteness are coupled with references to the racialised other. Simply put, black and white co-presence is fundamental to co-construction. However, to speak of co-construction merely in terms of togetherness or co-presence is to gloss over the manner in which co-construction occurs.

Third, alternatively, it is possible to think of the co-construction of blackness and whiteness as something which occurs in *opposition* (see Chapter 3). Insofar as *opposition* implies that blackness and whiteness are bound together relationally through co-presence, this idea incorporates that of co-construction as something which happens *together*. At the same time, the idea of *opposition* goes beyond the idea of togetherness; it opens up the possibility of revealing something about the relationality of that very togetherness. Thus, following Pfeifer (2009), it becomes possible to think of co-construction in terms of 'oppositional pairs of categories', 'binary oppositions' or a 'white-black dichotomy'. However, in this connection, Blaser (2008) has warned that looking solely at how identities oppose each other can be risky; one may end up not only reifying those identities but also ignoring how identities can influence each other. While heeding Blaser's warning, I argue that when utilised flexibly, the idea of opposition remains a useful one. For example, plates might be considered as oppositional not only when they clash together but also when they move away from each other. In this sense, the idea of *opposition* can accommodate an understanding of co-construction as something that also happens *in parallel*. Thus, further, it can accommodate the finding that co-construction involves a set of entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements (see Chapter 7).

Drawing yet again on the above editorial extract, it may be said that although black and white South Africans remain intertwined after the end of apartheid, they are now intertwined in ways which are different from the apartheid past. Certainly, the data are replete with pairings of black and white binary oppositions, which are reflective of the past. At the same time, however, the

data are also saturated with examples which point to a changing, and more complex, relationality between blackness and whiteness. In this sense, the data lend support to Durrheim, Mtose and Brown's (2011) observation that "the boundaries determining us from them have become blurred" (p. 23). Given these complexities, I turn to reflect on how *Bold New Blacks* and *Enduring Whites* influence each other within post-apartheid.

Firstly, although it is possible to state that, relative to blacks, whites have experienced more stability (Klandermans et al., 2001), this study has also revealed that white identity construction *has* undergone change. What do these findings imply? Insofar as many whites are "still" positioned as "bosses" over blacks in the contemporary context, it appears that white privilege has endured. However, in the absence of apartheid's legislative framework, these racialised positionings can also be viewed as part of a *1994 Contradiction* (see Chapter 6). In a context where blacks can "tell it like it is", white identity construction cannot simply proceed as before. While it may seem counterintuitive to assert that a template which attempts to perpetuate the past, offers new ways of constructing white identity, I argue that the template of *EW* evidences an "inventive dedication to maintaining business as usual" (Statman, 1999, p. 39) for whites.

In this vein, I pause to remark on the fact that the current study did not find evidence of a wide range of 'white' responses to post-apartheid transformation. As the works of Jansen (2009), Soudien (2010c), Steyn (2001b) and Theissen (1997) have collectively shown (see Chapter 2), white responses to the new dispensation can be classified along a continuum which stretches from acceptance to resistance. By contrast, this study's findings indicate that the major construction of whiteness being fashioned within public discourse is underpinned by the discourse of *EW*. Certainly, the discourse of *EW* accords with findings across a cluster of existing studies reviewed in Chapter 2. These have collectively demonstrated that some whites are constructing identities which are resistant towards the new dispensation (e.g. Ballard, 2004a; Statman, 1999; Steyn & Foster, 2008; Wale & Foster, 2007). Such accordance, however, does not account for why the data only revealed a narrow range of 'white' responses.

One possible explanation is that, like public discourse around race (see Chapter 4), public discourse around white racialised identity remains limited – particularly within the print media. Following Theissen (1997), it is possible to speculate that the majority of 'white' letter-writers are part of the country's older generation who exhibit a 'post-apartheid syndrome'. By extension, perhaps the younger generation of whites does not readily engage with the

newspapers under consideration. Hence the voice of the 'rainbow generation' (Theissen, 1997) may not be readily articulated within the material analysed in this study. Furthermore, the newspapers under consideration cater to a narrow readership. As noted in Chapter 4, *City Press* is "aimed at discerning, educated, economically active black readers" (Mysubs, 2011). It is thus reasonable to assume that both newspapers are aimed at educated, middle-class whites who occupy a position of privilege; these whites may, in turn, be more likely to resist efforts aimed at repositioning whites.

Another possible explanation is that the overall results are better understood in line with Theissen's (1997) results. That is, the results represent two broad oppositional lines of discourse: one discourse is supportive of the new dispensation, and one discourse is resistant towards the new dispensation. In this regard, it is important to bear in mind that this study has not attempted to link particular texts to the opinions of blacks or whites. Hence, the 'voices' of individual blacks and whites cannot be assigned to this or that discourse. Accordingly, the results do not foreclose the possibility that some whites are supportive of, and promote, the discourse of *BNB*. Likewise, some blacks may support and promote the discourse of *EW*. The results of this study should, therefore, not be taken to imply that all whites are constructing their identity along resistant lines.

Returning to the matter of white 'inventiveness', at first glance, 'inventiveness' can be seen as a general characteristic of whiteness. Yet, upon further consideration, 'inventiveness' cannot be separated from the context in which whiteness operates. To reiterate Steyn and Foster's (2008) assertion as cited in Chapter 2, "the central question for whiteness . . . [has become] how to maintain its advantages in a situation in which black people have legally and legitimately achieved political power" (p. 26). However, the majority of existing studies on post-apartheid whiteness have neglected to consider how whites are constructing their identity *in relation to* blacks. Instead, most scholars have merely focused on how whites are constructing their identity *in response to* efforts geared towards effecting post-apartheid transformation.

To be clear, I maintain that it is crucial to continue to take cognisance of, and interrogate, the context in which whiteness operates. As Steyn and Foster (2008) have correctly observed, "black empowerment, as well as the difficulties that certainly are part of the transforming political and social landscape, become *resources* for whiteness" (p. 46, original emphasis).

Indeed, my analysis has indicated that the post-apartheid context contains avenues which allow for the construction of an *Enduring Whiteness*. However, a consideration of context should be extended to encompass an analysis of the ways in which blackness shapes the construction of whiteness. To merely look at whiteness, or white resistance, is to suggest that whiteness can side-step blackness in its own construction. *Enduring Whiteness* is characterised by 'inventiveness' precisely because it is shaped by its co-construction with *Bold New Blackness*. It is thus essential to recognise that *Bold New Blackness* not only attempts to reposition blacks in relation to whites but also to prescribe guidelines for an acceptable post-apartheid whiteness.

Secondly, in line with Klandermans et al. (2001), the current study has shown that blacks have a less stable positioning relative to whites. Indeed, following Durrheim and Mtose (2006), it may be concluded that being white remains a relatively unproblematic identity while "being black in the new South Africa continues to be a troubling subject position" (p. 168). In considering blacks' positioning, it is worthwhile to note that, relative to the whiteness literature, the blackness literature is explicit in its assertion that blackness cannot side-step whiteness in its own construction. That is, the ways in which blackness remains relational to whiteness are central to debates about the direction for post-apartheid black identity construction.

In this connection, Mtose's (2008) study found that black identity is constructed "in binary opposition to whiteness", and that this opposition centres on "an inferior black subject positioning in relation to the superior white subject positioning" (p. 207). She, therefore, concluded that "what it means to be black today is no easier than it was prior to the new democratic order" (p. 209). Certainly, the current study has similarly found that blackness and whiteness are constructed in opposition to each other. By contrast, however, the current study has argued that the very state of flux around blacks' positioning is linked to possibilities for the reconstruction of blackness. Seen through the perspective of *BNB*, blacks' less stable positioning in the contemporary context offers a possibility to reconfigure the oppositional relationship between "inferior" blacks and "superhuman" whites. Moreover, although it is evident that *EW* holds that whites are superior to blacks, it is also evident that *BNB does not* hold that blacks are inferior to whites. The current study, therefore, highlights that although blackness and whiteness are constructed in binary opposition to each other, racialised positionings of inferiority or superiority are contested between the two discourses under consideration. Furthermore, the current study does not lend support to Mtose's (2008) conclusion that it is no easier to be black in post-apartheid than during apartheid. Although the

post-apartheid context involves an uneasy co-existence between the past and the unfolding future, this context *has* brought about significant shifts for both whiteness and blackness.

As has been noted above, contemporary whiteness is characterised by a degree of 'inventiveness' precisely because it is influenced by the construction of contemporary blackness. If the co-construction between blackness and whiteness remains more tricky from the perspective of *BNB* than the perspective of *EW*, then this can be attributed to internal tensions within *BNB* regarding the appropriate direction for blackness (see Chapter 7). It thus appears appropriate to state that contemporary blackness now faces different – though not necessarily easier – challenges than under apartheid, and that these challenges are tied to whiteness.

Co-constructing in and out of trouble?

> *Many asked how the jailed and the jailer, the hunted and the hunter, the oppressed and the oppressor could live together in harmony? Yet they did and still do.*
>
> [CP/E/19/09/04]

A final comment pertains to the experience of racialised identity co-construction in everyday, post-apartheid life. Taking Mbembe's (2008) assertion that there exists a relationship of 'mutual ressentiment' between blacks and whites – as well as Ramphalile's (2011) findings regarding the interrelatedness between the discourses of 'patriotic' blackness and 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness – one might infer that racialised identity co-construction is embedded in an experience of fierce clashing for both blacks and whites. Certainly, the current study has shown that the discourses of *BNB* and *EW* clash. At the same time, however, the results of the current study have left open the possibility to speculate that the co-construction of blackness and whiteness is a process which mostly goes unnoticed in everyday life. To put it in more precise terms, I maintain that the *processes* which underpin the given constructions of blackness and whiteness collectively smooth over the tensions of co-construction. As the above editorial extract asserts, while blacks and whites are positioned in opposition to each other, they have lived, and continue to live, "in harmony". How might this experience of harmony amidst tension be explained?

Firstly, I once again draw attention to the obvious point that black and white racialised identities have not simply fallen away with the demise of apartheid. As Jones and Dlamini

(2013) have put it, "most of the time when South Africans claim an identity, its corner-stone is race-shaped" (p. 3). In this regard, I argue that the durability of racialised identities can be attributed to their seemingly logical neatness. Racialised identities remain attractively yet deceptively packaged. If to be black is not to be white, and to be white is not to be black, then it follows that to be black is to have distinctly black experiences, and to be white is to have distinctly white experiences. This makes it appear as if blackness and whiteness are not co-constructed. Instead, racialised identities take on the guise of reflecting 'real' or inherent differences between blacks and whites, leading most South Africans to overlook the multitude of factors which have shaped the construction of racialised identities (see Alexander, 2007). To borrow Posel's (2001b) term, post-apartheid racialised identities remain grounded in what is perceived as 'common sense'.

Secondly, I argue that regardless of how 'messy' or convoluted the processes (i.e., entanglements, dis-entanglements and re-entanglements) underpinning the process of black and white identity co-construction might appear, these processes nevertheless serve to reinforce the logic of racialised difference. They thus contribute towards rather than disrupt the 'common sense' of race. The (tem)plates may clash forcefully and then pull away from each other, yet they ultimately work together in reinforcing the oppositional construction of racialised identities. Put another way, the oppositional discourses of *Bold New Blackness* and *Enduring Whiteness* go hand-in-hand to create a sense of order.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

By focusing on the co-construction of black and white racialised identities, this study has endeavoured to shed light on a neglected aspect within the South African race literature. More specifically, it has attempted to address some of the gaps in the respective sets of literature on South African blackness and whiteness. First, through this study, I have endeavoured to demonstrate that these otherwise separate sets of literature can fruitfully be drawn on together. Indeed, I assert that an approach which looks at blackness and whiteness simultaneously has the potential to yield rich insights relevant to both fields. Second, although the existing literature on post-apartheid whiteness is substantial, analyses of whiteness have neglected to incorporate an adequate consideration of blackness. By looking at how *Enduring Whiteness* is constructed in relation to *Bold New Blackness*, this study contributes towards deepening our

understanding of how post-apartheid white identity is being constructed. Third, by looking at *Bold New Blackness*, this study contributes towards a much-needed expansion of the sparse literature on post-apartheid black identity.

Although I have relied on material reflecting a sizable chunk of the post-apartheid era, and have drawn this material from two major newspapers, the picture which this study presents is not without its limitations. First, I looked at racialised identity co-construction during a period of rapid transition; a period characterised by uncertainties and resultant tensions between the past and the future. It is possible that an analysis of material drawn after 2011 would reveal templates that are characterised by a lesser degree of relational opposition or tension. Second, I relied on two long-established, national weekly newspapers. An analysis of material from newspapers established after the dawn of democracy might reveal different (perhaps more forward-looking) templates for co-constructing identity. Moreover, an analysis of daily newspapers might yield a more nuanced, if less generalisable, picture of racialised identity co-construction within different provinces. Third, I based the study on English-language newspapers. As such, I was not able to explore the distinction between English and Afrikaner whitenesses, nor the distinction between different blacknesses. Newspapers published in languages other than English (e.g., Afrikaans, IsiXhosa or IsiZulu) would possibly enable a more nuanced exploration of identity co-construction. Moreover, by necessity, I had to gloss over additional axes of difference, or what Chapter 2 has referred to as the fracturing of blackness and whiteness. Fourth, the picture which I have presented is limited in that it sheds light on the co-construction of blackness and whiteness within a public sphere. As noted in Chapter 4, it is likely that this sphere obscures or under-represents levels of racism. Fifth, I have not delved into how blackness and whiteness were (co-)constructed within the two newspapers under consideration before 1994. Furthermore, as Willig (2008) acknowledges, since they do not address "the historicity and evolution of discursive formations over time", the stages which she offers "do not constitute a full analysis in the Foucauldian sense" (p. 115).

PATHS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In examining how black and white racialised identities are being co-constructed, I have also endeavoured to prompt a dialogue between two disparate sets of literature. How might this dialogue between the blackness and whiteness literature be continued and expanded? In noting the current study's limitations, above, I have already begun to signal some potential paths for future research. Future studies, which draw together and utilise the separate fields of literature on racialised identity, have the potential to not only yield new insights regarding racialised identity co-construction but also to deepen existing insights about racialised identity construction. Of course, a focus on co-construction does not necessarily mean that one must adhere to the format of a black/white binary paradigm (see Perea, 1997). As demonstrated by the work of Bob et al. (2016), the dynamics around the relationality between black, coloured and Indian identities may fruitfully be investigated. Similarly, as the work of Steyn (2004a) has indicated, there is also scope for investigating the relationality between Afrikaans- and English-speaking whites.

Although this study's findings go some way towards answering questions about black and white racialised identity co-construction, the findings also raise a multitude of further questions. In one vein, one may ask questions about the discourses of *BNB* and *EW*. Are these discourses evident across other newspapers published during the same period? Moreover, can these discourses be discerned in other material reflecting everyday, public discourse? Analyses in this vein could yield interesting comparisons which would shed further light on these discourses. Though tricky, it might also be instructive to explore whether these discourses can be discerned within material which falls outside the realm of public discourse. In another vein, one may ask questions about the co-construction of blackness and whiteness prior to 1994. Indeed, as noted in Chapter 2, few studies have shed light on the history of white identity construction, and fewer still have focused on black identity construction. There is thus ample scope for examining the co-construction of black and white racialised identities during apartheid and earlier colonial periods.

Regarding the 'appropriate' direction for contemporary blackness, the tension within *BNB* also deserves further attention. Thus, another vein could explore co-construction by focusing specifically on questions around blackness. Indeed, Mangcu's (2008) concepts of 'racial

nativism' and 'syncretic adaptation' could be employed to generate a set of exciting research questions. To what extent, for instance, can blackness pull away from whiteness and ostensibly reclaim a 'pure' black identity? Do attempts at black assimilation into whiteness ease or intensify the tension between the templates of *BNB* and *EW*?

Lastly, as the country celebrates 25 years of democracy, and approaches the 30-year milestone, it is essential to continue to examine the kinds of (tem)plates available for racialised identity co-construction. I have asserted that much of the trickiness of doing research on racialised identities in South Africa (see reflections in Preface and Chapter 4) is linked to South Africans' reluctance to talk about race (see chapters 1 and 4). While South Africans may find it difficult to talk about race due to a lack of vocabulary (Distiller & Steyn, 2004b), it is also possible to speculate that the existing vocabulary circulating within South African society obstructs an open discussion about race. As Jones and Dlamini (2013) have put it, "our language for race is deeply rigid, and has settled into rehearsed grooves of accusation, polemic and defensiveness" (p. 3). The question that arises from this is whether or not South Africans' language around race is shifting.

Thus, while I have shown that the templates of *BNB* and *EW* form two major templates for racialised identity construction over the period 1994 to 2011, further work is needed to examine whether these templates have persisted beyond the period under consideration. Will *BNB* and *EW* continue to form major templates for constructing racialised identities within the post-apartheid dispensation or will newly-emerging templates overshadow these templates? How might such newly-emerged templates shape the co-construction of blackness and whiteness?

The questions presented above are but a few questions which warrant examination in future studies; these questions may, therefore, be read as cues intended to stimulate new avenues of research. I hope that the current study prompts other scholars to investigate the co-construction of black and white racialised identities in novel and creative ways.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Abdi, A. (1999). Identity formations and deformations in South Africa: A historical and contemporary overview. *Journal of Black Studies, 30*(2), 147-163. https://doi.org/10.1177/002193479903000201

Adhikari, M. (2002). *Hope, fear, shame frustration: Continuity and change in the expression of coloured identity in white supremacist South Africa, 1910-1994*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/7788

Adhikari, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Not white enough, not black enough: Racial identity in the South African coloured community*. Cape Town: Double Storey Books.

Ahmed, S. (2004). Declarations of whiteness: The non-performativity of anti-racism. *Borderlands E-Journal, 3*(2). Retrieved from http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol3no2_2004/ahmed_declarations.htm

Alberts, C. (2012). *Construction of threat: Afrikaansness as an identity in crisis in post-apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10413/9066

Alexander, N. (2007). Affirmative action and the perpetuation of racial identities in post-apartheid South Africa. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *63*, 92-108. https://doi.org/10.1353/trn.2007.0013

Anderson, P. (2003). Between the lines: A palimpsest, by way of introduction to Texts in Context. In P. Anderson (Comp.), *SLL101F: Texts in Context* (pp. 2-5). Cape Town: University of Cape Town.

Ansell, A. (2004). Two nations of discourse: Mapping racial ideologies in post-apartheid South Africa. *Politikon, 31*(1), 3-26. https://doi.org/10.1080/0258934040100169078 3

Apartheid Archive Project (2009). *Abstracts. Facing the Archive: the first Apartheid Archives Conference.* 18 – 20 June 2009, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Retrieved from http://www.apartheidarchive.org/site/media/abstracts/compendium_final_2.pdf

Apartheid Archive Project (2010). *Abstracts. Working with the archive: second Apartheid Archive Conference*. 01 – 03 September 2010, University of the Western Cape, Bellville. Retrieved from http://www.apartheidarchive.org/assets/conference2010/FINAL%2020%20Aug%20Abstract%20Booklet%20AAP%20Conf%202010.pdf

Apartheid Archive Project (2011). Abstracts. *Narratives, nostalgia, nationhoods: third Apartheid Archive Conference*. 27 – 29 July 2011, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. Retrieved from http://www.apartheidarchive.org/site/images/2011/FINAL_%20Abstract_Booklet_19JULY2011.pdf

Apartheid Archive Project (2014). Abstracts. *Space, race, location, dislocation: then and now. Fourth Apartheid Archive Conference.* 21 – 23 May 2014, University of Pretoria. Retrieved from http://www.apartheidarchive.org/site/images/2014/abstracts_2014.pdf

Appelgryn, A., & Bornman, E. (1996). Relative deprivation in contemporary South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(3), 381-397. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1996.9714016

Avusa (2012). *About us*. Retrieved from http://www.avusa.co.za/about-us/

Ballard, R. (2002). Desegregating minds: White identities and urban change in the new South Africa. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Wales, Swansea.

Ballard, R. (2004a). The ant and the grasshopper: Rationalising exclusion and inequality in the post-apartheid city. *Theoria: A Journal of Social and Political Theory*, *105*, 64-88. Persistent link http://www.jstor.org/stable/41802827

Ballard, R. (2004b). Middle class neighbourhoods or "African kraals"? The impact of informal settlements and vagrants on post-apartheid white identity. *Urban Forum, 15*(1), 48-73. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12132-004-0009-1

Ballard, R. (2004c). Assimilation, emigration, semigration and integration: 'White' peoples' strategies for finding a comfort zone in post-apartheid South Africa. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under construction: Race and identity in South Africa today* (pp. 51-66). Sandton: Heinemann.

Ballard, R. (2005). When in Rome: Claiming the right to define neighbourhood character in South Africa's suburbs. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *57*(1), 64-87. https://doi.org/10.1353/trn.2005.0024

Ballard, R. (2010). 'Slaughter in the suburbs': Livestock slaughter and race in post-apartheid cities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 33*(6), 1069-1087. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870903477320

Bamford, B. (1967). Race reclassification. *South African Law Journal, 84*(1), 37-42.

Benatar, D. (2008). Justice, diversity and racial preference: A critique of affirmative action. *The South African Law Journal, 125*(2), 274-306.
Persistent link https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC53823

Bennett, J., & Friedman, M. (1997). White women and racial autobiography. *Agenda, 32*, 49-55.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.1997.9675586

Berger, G. (2002). Seeing past race: Politics of the HRC's inquiry into racial representation. *Ecquid Novi, 23*(2), 254-277.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02560054.2002.9653250

Biakolo, E. (2002). Discourses on Africa. In P. Coetzee and A. Roux (Eds.), *Philosophy from Africa second edition: A text with readings* (pp. 9-19). Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa.

Bickford-Smith, V. (1995). *Ethnic pride and racial prejudice in Victorian Cape Town.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.

Biko, S. (2009). *Steve Biko: I write what I like*. A. Stubbs (Ed.). Johannesburg: Picador Africa. (Original work published 1978)

Blaser, T. (2008). Looking at the heart of whiteness in South Africa today. *Safundi, 9*(1), 81-96.
https://doi.org/10.1080/17533170701762990

Blum, L. (2002). Racialized groups and social constructions. In *"I'm not a racist but…": The moral quandary of race* (pp. 147-163). New York: Cornell University Press.

Blum, L. (2015). Races, racialised groups and racial identity: Perspectives from South Africa and the United States. In X. Mangcu (Ed.), *The colour of our future: Does race matter in post-apartheid South Africa?* (pp. 25-44). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Bob, U., Furusa, M., & Little, W. (2016). *Identity construction and (mis)perceptions on being black in South Africa: Unpacking socio-economic, spatial, and political dimensions in the south Durban basin*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Bonds, A., & Inwood, J. (2016). Beyond white privilege: Geographies of white supremacy and settler colonialism. *Progress in Human Geography, 40*(6), 715-733. https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132515613166

Boonzaier, E. (1988). 'Race' and the race paradigm. In E. Boonzaier, & J. Sharp (Eds.), *South African keywords: The uses and abuses of political concepts* (pp. 58-67). Cape Town: David Philip.

Boonzaier, E., & Sharp. J. (Eds.). (1988). *South African keywords: The uses and abuses of political concepts*. Cape Town: David Philip.

Bottomley, E.-J. (2012). *Poor white*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Bowker, G., & Star, S. (1999). The case of race classification and reclassification under apartheid. In *Sorting things out: Classification and its consequences* (pp. 195-225). Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Bowman, B., Duncan, N., & Sonn, C. (2010). Editorial: Towards a psychology of South Africa's histories – living with and through the apartheid archive. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40*(4), 365-369. https://doi.org/008124631004000401

Bryson, D. (2014). *It's a black white thing.* Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Bulhan, H. (1993). Imperialism in studies of the psyche: A critique of African psychological research. In L. Nicolas (Ed.), *Psychology and oppression: Critiques and proposals* (pp. 1-34). Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers.

Burman, E. (2003). *Discourse analysis means analysing discourse: Some comments on Antaki, Billig, Edwards and Potter 'Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique Of Six Analytic Shortcomings'*. Submission to Discourse Analysis Online. Retrieved from http://extra.shu.ac.uk/daol/articles/open/2003/003/burman2003003-paper.html

Burnett, S. (2018). *Giving back the land: Whiteness and belonging in contemporary South Africa.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/10539/27047

Carton, B., Laband, J., & Sithole, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Zulu identities: Being Zulu, past and present*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Chipkin, I. (2007). *Do South Africans exist? Nationalism, democracy and the identity of 'the people'*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press

Christopher, A. (2001). Urban segregation in post-apartheid South Africa. *Urban Studies, 38*(3), 449-466. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120080031

Christopher, A. (2005a). Further progress in the desegregation of South African towns and cities, 1996-2001. *Development Southern Africa, 22*(2), 267-276. https://doi.org/10.1080/03768350500163006

Christopher, A. (2005b). The slow pace of desegregation in South African cities, 1996-2001. *Urban Studies, 42*(12), 2305-2320. https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500332122

Cock, J. (1980). *Maids and madams. A study in the politics of exploitation*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Constitution (2012). *The constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996: As adopted on 8 May 1996 and amended on 11 October 1996 by the Constitutional Assembly*. Retrieved from http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/constitution/SAConstitution-web-eng.pdf

Conway, D. (2004).'Every coward's choice'? Political objection to military service in apartheid South Africa as sexual citizenship. *Citizenship Studies, 8*(1), 25-45. https://doi.org/10.1080/1362102042000178418

Cornell, J. (2015). *Black students' experiences of transformation at UCT: A Photovoice study*. Unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/13689

Cox, D. (2006). Letters are best-read section of newspaper. *Grassroots Editor, 47*(1), 11. Retrieved from http://www.grassrootseditor.org

Crapanzano, V. (1985). *Waiting. The whites of South Africa*. New York: Vintage Books.

Curt, B. (1994). *Textuality and tectonics: Troubling social and psychological science*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Davies, R. (2009). *Afrikaners in the new South Africa: Identity politics in a globalised economy*. New York: Tauris Academic Studies.

De Beer, M. (1997). *Inventing Afrikaner womanhood: Is the volksmoeder alive and well in post-apartheid South Africa? A review of the literature.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Cape Town, South Africa.

De la Rey, C. (1997). On political activism and discourse analysis in South Africa. In A. Levett, A. Kottler, E. Burman & I. Parker (Eds.), *Culture, power & difference: Discourse analysis in South Africa* (pp. 189-197). Cape Town: UCT Press.

De Wet, J., & Erasmus, Z. (2005). Towards rigour in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Research Journal, 5*(1), 27-40.

Desai, A. (Ed.). (2010). *The race to transform: Sport in post-apartheid South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Distiller, N., & Steyn, M. (Eds.). (2004a). *Under Construction: Race and identity in South Africa today.* Sandton: Heinemann.

Distiller, N., & Steyn, M. (2004b). Introduction: Under construction. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under Construction: Race and identity in South Africa today* (pp. 1-11). Sandton: Heinemann.

Dixon, J. & Durrheim, K. (2003). Contact and the ecology of racial division: Some varieties of informal segregation. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*(1), 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466603763276090

Dixon, J., & Reicher, S. (1997). Intergroup contact and desegregation in the new South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*(3), 361-381. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1997.tb01137.x

Dlamini, J. (2009). *Native nostalgia*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Dreyer, N. (2006). *A century of Sundays: 100 years of breaking news in the Sunday Times, 1906-2006*. Cape Town: Zebra Press.

Dolby, N. (2001). *Constructing race: Youth, identity and popular culture in South Africa*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Donaldson, R., Mehlomakhulu, T., Darkey, D., Dyssel, M., & Siyongwana, P. (2013). Relocation: To be or not to be a black diamond in a South African township? *Habitat International, 39*, 114-118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.habitatint.2012.10.018

Dubow, S. (1995). *Scientific racism in modern South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dubow, S. (2006). *A commonwealth of knowledge: Science, sensibility and white South Africa 1820 – 2000*. Cape Town: Double Storey Books.

Duncan, J. (2011). The print media and transformation. In J. Daniel, P. Naidoo, D. Pillay & R. Southall (Eds.), *New South African review 2: new paths, old compromises?* (pp. 345-368). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Duncan, N. (1996). Discourses on public violence and the reproduction of racism. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *26*(3), 172-182. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639602600307

Duncan, N. (2001). Dislodging the sub-texts: An analysis of a corpus of articles on racism produced by South African psychologists. In N. Duncan, A. van Niekerk, C. de la Rey, & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa* (pp. 125-152). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Duncan, N., Stevens, G., & Bowman, B. (2004). South African psychology and racism: Historical determinants and future prospects. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 360-388). Landsdowne: UCT Press.

Duncan, N., Van Niekerk, A., De la Rey, C., & Seedat, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa.* New York: Nova Science Publishers Inc.

Durrheim, K. (2005). Socio-spatial practice and racial representations in a changing South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*(3), 444-459. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630503500304

Durrheim K., & Dixon, J. (2005). Dislocating identity: Desegregation and the transformation of place. In *Racial Encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation* (pp. 179-207). East Sussex: Routledge.

Durrheim, K., & Dixon, J. (2010). Racial contact and change in South Africa. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(2), 273-288. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01645.x

Durrheim, K., & Mokeki, S. (1997). Race and relevance: A content analysis of the South African Journal of Psychology. *South African Journal of Psychology, 27*(4), 206-213. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639702700402

Durrheim, K., & Mtose, X. (2006). Being-black-in-the-new-South-Africa. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time* (pp. 153-170). Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Durrheim, K., Mtose, X., & Brown, L. (2011). *Race trouble: Race, identity and inequality in post-apartheid South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C., Foster, D., & Dixon, J. (2011). Historical trends in South African race attitudes. *South African Journal of Psychology, 41*(3), 263-278. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124631104100302

Durrheim, K., Quayle, M., Whitehead, K., & Kriel, A. (2005). Denying racism: Discursive strategies used by the South African media. *Critical Arts, 19*(1&2), 167-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/02560040585310111

Du Toit, B. (1974). *People of the Valley. Life in an isolated Afrikaner community in South Africa*. Cape Town: A. A. Balkema.

Du Toit, F., & Doxtader, E. (Eds.). (2010). *In the balance: South Africans debate reconciliation*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Dyer, R. (1988). White. *Screen, 29*(4), 44-64. https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/29.4.44

Dyer, R. (1997). The matter of whiteness. In *White* (pp. 1-40). London: Routledge.

Eaton, L. (2002). South African national identity: A research agenda for social psychologists. *South African Journal of Psychology, 32*(1), 45-53. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630203200106

Ebr.-Vally, R. (Ed.). (2001). *Kala pani: Caste and colour in South Africa*. Cape Town: Kwela Books and South African History Online.

Engles, T. (2006). *Towards a bibliography of critical whiteness studies*. Faculty Research & Creative Activity*, 51.* Retrieved from https://thekeep.eiu.edu/eng_fac/51

Epstein, D. (1998). Marked men: Whiteness and masculinity. *Agenda, 37*, 49-59. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.1998.9675691

Erasmus, Y., & Ellison, G. (2008). What can we learn about the meaning of race from the classification of population groups during apartheid? *South African Journal of Science, 104*(11-12), 450-452. Persistent link: https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC96744

Erasmus, Z. (Ed.). (2001). *Coloured by history, shaped by place. New perspectives on coloured identities in Cape Town*. Cape Town: Kwela Books and South African History Online.

Erasmus, Z. (2008). Race. In N. Shepherd & S. Robins (Eds.), *New South African keywords* (pp. 169-181). Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Erasmus, Z. (2017). *Race otherwise: Forging a new humanism for South Africa.* Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Erasmus, Z. & De Wet, J. (2003). *Not naming 'race': Some medical students' experiences and perceptions of 'race' and racism at the Health Sciences Faculty of the University of Cape Town*. Cape Town: Institute for Intercultural and Diversity Studies in Southern Africa.

Everatt, D. (2012). Non-racialism in South Africa: Status and prospects. *Politikon, 39*(1), 5-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2012.656910

Firmstone, J. (2003). *'Britain in the Euro?': British newspaper editorial coverage of the introduction of the Euro.* Centre for European Political Communications, European Political Communication. Working Paper Series Issue 5/03. Retrieved from http://www.leeds.ac.uk/ics/euro/paper5.pdf

Fisher, R. (2007). *Race*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Fishkin, S. (1995). Interrogating "whiteness", complicating "blackness": Remapping American culture. *American Quarterly, 47*(3), 428-466. https://doi.org/10.2307/2713296

Foley, A. (1992). A sense of place in contemporary white South African English poetry. *English in Africa, 19*(2), 35-54. Persistent link https://www.jstor.org/stable/40238696

Forde, F. (2011). It's complicated. In *An inconvenient youth: Julius Malema and the 'new' ANC* (pp. 225-246). Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Foster, D. (1993a). On racism: Virulent mythologies and fragile threads. In L. Nicholas (Ed.), *Psychology and oppression: critiques and proposals* (pp. 55-80). Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers.

Foster, D. (1993b). The mark of oppression? Racism and psychology reconsidered. In L. Nicholas (Ed.), *Psychology and oppression: critiques and proposals* (pp. 128-141). Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers.

Foster, D. (1994). Racism and children's intergroup orientations: Their development and the question of psychological effects on minority-group children. In A. Dawes & D. Donald (Eds.), *Childhood & adversity: Psychological perspectives from South African research* (pp. 220-239). Cape Town: David Philip.

Foster, D. (2000). Race, space and civil society. In J. Cochrane & B. Klein (Eds.), *Sameness and difference: Problems and potentials in South African civil society* (pp. 57-78). Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values and Philosophy.

Foster, D. (2005). Racialisation and the micro-ecology of contact. *South African Journal of Psychology, 35*(3), 494-504. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630503500307

Foster, D., & Finchilescu, G. (1986). Contact in a 'non-contact' society: The case of South Africa. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Social psychology and society: Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 119-136). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Foster, D., & Nel, E. (1991). Attitudes and related concepts. In D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social psychology in South Africa* (pp. 121-170). Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Fourie, W. (2008). Afrikaner identity in post-apartheid South Africa: The self in terms of the other. In A. Hadland, E. Louw, S. Sesanti, & H. Wasserman (Eds.), *Power, politics and identity in South African media* (pp. 239-289). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness.* London: Routledge.

Fredrickson, G. (1981). *White supremacy: A comparative study in American and South African history*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Friedman, S., & Erasmus, Z. (2008). Counting on 'race': What the surveys say (and do not say) about 'race' and redress. In A. Habib & K. Bentley (Eds.), *Racial redress and citizenship in South Africa* (pp. 33-74). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Fusco, C. (2003). Racial time, racial marks, racial metaphors. In C. Fusco and B. Wallis (Eds.), *Only skin deep: Changing visions of the American self* (pp. 13-50). New York: International Center of Photography / Harry N. Abrams.

Gallagher, C., & Twine, F. (2017). From wave to tsunami: The growth of third wave whiteness. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40*(9), 1598-1603. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1308535

Garner, S. (2006). The uses of whiteness: What sociologists working on Europe can draw from US research on whiteness. *Sociology, 40*(2), 257–275. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038506062032

Garner, S. (2007). Introduction: The political stakes of using whiteness. In *Whiteness: An introduction* (pp. 1-12). London: Routledge.

Garner, S. (2017). Surfing the third wave of whiteness studies: Reflections on Twine and Gallagher. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40*(9), 1582-1597. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1300301

Gartushka, I. (2009). *Discourses of whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa, as reflected in letters to the editor in the Cape Argus and Cape Times*. Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/8245

Giffard, A. (1976). South African attitudes toward news media. *Journalism Quarterly, 53*(4), 653-660. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769907605300407

Giliomee, H. (2009). *The Afrikaners: Biography of a peop*le. Cape Town: Tafelberg.

Gill, R. (2000). Discourse analysis. In M. Bauer & G. Gaskell (Eds.), *Qualitative researching with text, image and sound* (pp. 173-190). London: Sage Publications.

Gines, K. (2013). Introduction: Critical philosophy of race beyond the black/white binary. *Critical Philosophy of Race, 1*(1), 28-37. https://doi.org/10.5325/critphilrace.1.1.0028

Ginsburg, R. (2011). *At home with Apartheid. The hidden landscapes of domestic service in Johannesburg.* Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.

Gqola, P. (2001). Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa, 47*, 94-106. Retrieved from http://transformationjournal.org.za

Grossberg, A. (2002). Race relations. In Human Sciences Research Council (Ed.), *Public attitudes in contemporary South Africa: Insights from an HSRC survey* (pp. 63-72). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Hadland, A., Louw, E., Sesanti, S., Wasserman, H. (Eds.). (2008a). *Power, politics and identity in South African media: Selected seminar papers*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Hadland, A., Louw, E., Sesanti, S., Wasserman, H. (2008b). Introduction. In A. Hadland, E. Louw, S. Sesanti, & H. Wasserman (Eds.), *Power, politics and identity in South African media: Selected seminar papers* (pp. 1-13). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Hall, S. (1996). Introduction: Who needs 'identity'?. In S. Hall & P. Du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 1-17). London: SAGE Publications.

Hamilton, C., Huntley, L., Alexander, N., Guimarães, A., & James, W. (Eds.). (2001). *Beyond racism: Race and inequality in Brazil, South Africa, and the United States*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Harrison, D. (1986). *The white tribe of Africa: South Africa in perspective*. Johannesburg: Macmillan South Africa. (Original work published 1981)

Hartigan, J. (1997). Establishing the fact of whiteness. *American Anthropologist, 99*(3), 495-505. https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1997.99.3.495

Haupt, A. (2012). Author's note. In *Static: Race and representation in post-apartheid music media and film* (p. xv). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Heaven, P. (1977). A historical survey and assessment of research into race attitudes in South Africa: 1930-1975. *South African Journal of Sociology, 16*(2), 68-75. https://doi.org/10.1080/02580144.1977.10429257

Hellmann, E. (1979). Fifty years of the South African Institute of Race Relations. In E. Hellmann & H. Lever (Eds.), *Conflict and progress: Fifty years of race relations in South Africa* (pp. 1-27). Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Hellmann, E., & Lever, H. (Eds). (1979). *Conflict and progress: Fifty years of race relations in South Africa*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Helms, J. (2017). The challenge of making whiteness visible: Reactions to four whiteness articles. *The Counselling Psychologist, 45*(5), 717-726. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000017718943

Hendricks, L., Kramer, S., & Ratele, K. (2019). Research shouldn't be a dirty thought, but race is a problematic construct. *South African Journal of Psychology, 49*(3), 308-311. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0081246319852548

Hill, M. (1997). Introduction: Vipers in Shangri-la: Whiteness, writing, and other ordinary terrors. In M. Hill (Ed.), *Whiteness: A critical reader* (pp. 1-18). New York: New York University Press.

Holborn, L. (2010). *The long shadow of apartheid: Race in South Africa since 1994.* Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Holland-Muter, S. (1995). Opening Pandora's Box: Reflections on 'whiteness' in the South African women's movement. *Agenda, 25*, 55-62. https://doi.org/10.2307/4065849

Hook, D. (2011). Retrieving Biko: A Black Consciousness critique of whiteness. *African Studies, 9*(1), 19-32. https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2011.530442

Hook, D. & Long, C. (2011). The Apartheid Archive Project, heterogeneity, and the psychoanalysis of racism. *Psychoanalysis, Culture & Society, 16*(1), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1057/pcs.2010.45

Hook, D., & Vrdoljak, M. (2002). Gated communities, heterotopia and a "rights" of privilege: A 'heterotopology' of the South African security-park. *Geoforum, 33*(2), 195-219. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(01)00039-2

Horrell, G. (2009). White lies, white truth. *Scrutiny2, Issues in English Studies in Southern Africa, 14*(2), 59-71. https://doi.org/10.1080/18125440903461812

Horrell, M. (1978). *Laws affecting race relations in South Africa (to the end of 1976)*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Horrell, M. (1982). *Race relations as regulated by law in South Africa, 1948-1979*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Hughes, D. (2010). *Whiteness in Zimbabwe: Race, landscape, and the problem of belonging.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hugo, P. (1988). Towards darkness and death: Racial demonology in South Africa. *The Journal of Modern African Studies, 26*(4), 567-590. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022278X0001538X

Hugo, P., Boonzaier, E., Skalnik, P., Thornton, R., West, M., Gordon, R., & Whisson, M. (1990). Waiting: The whites of South Africa by Vincent Crapanzano: A review focus. In P. Hugo (Ed.), *Truth be in the field. Social science research in Southern Africa* (pp. 328-343). Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Hunter, S., Swan, E., & Grimes, D. (2010). Introduction: Reproducing and resisting whiteness in organizations, policies and places, *Social Politics*, *17*(4), 407-422. https://doi.org/10.1093/sp/jxq020

Hynds, E. (1992). Editorial page editors discuss use of letters. *Newspaper Research Journal, 13*(1-2), 124-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/073953299201300111

Hynds, E. (1994). Editors at most U.S. dailies see vital roles for editorial page. *Journalism Quarterly, 71*(3), 573-582. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769909407100309

Infinity Foundation (n.d.). *Bibliography of whiteness studies*. Provided by courtesy of Infinity Foundation, Princeton, New Jersey. Retrieved from http://www.infinityfoundation.com/mandala/BibliographyOfWhiteStudies/Biliography.pdf

IRR – South African Institute of Race Relations (2016). *Race relations in South Africa: Reasons for hope*. Report, March 2016. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

IRR – South African Institute of Race Relations (2017). *Race relations in South Africa – reasons for hope 2017: Sound but fraying at the edges*. Report, February 2017. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Jansen, J. (2009). *Knowledge in the blood: Confronting race and the apartheid past.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jansen, J. (2017). *Making love in a war zone: Interracial loving and learning after apartheid*. Johannesburg: Bookstorm.

Jawitz, J. (2012). Race and assessment practice in South Africa: Understanding black academic experience. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 15*(4), 545-559. https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2011.645568

Jenkins, E. (2007). *Falling into place: The story of modern South African place names*. Claremont: David Philip Publishers.

Jones, M., & Dlamini, J. (Eds.). (2013a). *Categories of persons: Rethinking ourselves and others*. Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Jones, M., & Dlamini, J. (2013b). Introduction. In M. Jones & J. Dlamini (Eds.), *Categories of persons: Rethinking ourselves and others* (pp. 1-16). Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Jones, T. (2008). Averting white male (ab)normality: Psychiatric representations and treatment of 'homosexuality' in 1960s South Africa. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 34*(2), 397-410. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070802038058

Jones, W. (2011). Introduction. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 30*(4), 405-407. https://doi.org/10.1080/02580136.2011.10751762

Kalane, L. (2018). *The chapter we wrote: The City Press story*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Kathrada, A. (2012). Preface: Non-racialism in South Africa today. *Politikon, 39*(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589346.2012.656957

Kendall, G. & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. London: Sage.

Kiguwa, P. (2014). *Telling stories of race: A study of racialised subjectivity in the post-apartheid academy*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/17169

Kilpatrick, S. (2010). *The racist's guide to the people of South Africa*. Kenilworth: Two Dogs.

Kincheloe, J. (1999). The struggle to define and reinvent whiteness: A pedagogical analysis. *College Literature, 26*(3), 162-194.
Persistent link: www.jstor.org/stable/25112481

Klandermans, B., Roefs, M., & Olivier, J. (2001). The formation of collective identity. In *The state of the people: Citizens, civil society and governance in South Africa, 1994-2000* (pp. 91-110). Pretoria: HSRC Press.

Korf, L., & Malan, J. (2002). Threat to ethnic identity: The experience of white Afrikaans-speaking participants in postapartheid South Africa. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 142*(2), 149-169.
https://doi.org/10.1080/00224540209603892

Kriger, R., & Zegeye, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Culture in the new South Africa: After apartheid – Volume two*. Cape Town: Kwela Books and South Africa History Online.

Lander, C., & Engler, H. (2014). *Stuff South African white people like*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Lambert, J. (2008). Their Finest Hour? English-speaking South Africans and World War II. *South African Historical Journal, 60*, 60-84.
https://doi.org/10.1080/02582470802287711

Lambert, J. (2009). An unknown people: Reconstructing British South African identity. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 37*(4), 599-617. https://doi.org/10.1080/03086530903327101

Lea, S. (1996). 'That ism on the end makes it nasty': Talking about race with young white South Africans. *South African Journal of Psychology, 26*(3), 183-190. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639602600308

Lefko-Everett, K., Govender, R., & Foster, D. (Eds.). (2017). *Rethinking reconciliation: Evidence from South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Le Grange, L. (2019). A comment on critiques of the article age- and education-related effects on cognitive functioning in colored South African women. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 33*(4), 9-19. https://doi.org/10.20853/33-4-3715

Leonardo, Z. (2009). The souls of white folk. In *Race, whiteness, and education* (pp. 167-186). London: Routledge.

López, A. (2005). Introduction: Whiteness after empire. In A. López (Ed.), *Postcolonial whiteness: A critical reader on race and empire* (pp. 1-30). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Louw, A. (2011). Reading, references and resources. In M. Peach (Ed.), *Being coloured. Coloured identity, history, and the future* (pp. 163-235). Cape Town: WB Peach Media and Communications.

Louw, J., & Foster, D. (1991). Historical perspective: psychology and group relations in South Africa. In D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social psychology in South Africa* (pp. 57-92). Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Louw, J., & Foster, D. (2004). Race and psychology in South Africa. In S. Winston (Ed.), *Defining difference: Race and racism in the history of psychology* (pp. 171-198). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

MacCrone, I. (1937). *Race attitudes in South Africa: Historical, experimental and psychological studies*. London: Oxford University Press.

MacDonald, M. (2006). *Why race matters in South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Macleod, C. (2002). Deconstructive discourse analysis: Extending the methodological conversation. *South African Journal of Psychology, 32*(1), 17-25. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630203200103

Mail & Guardian (2011). *The whiteness debate*. Retrieved from https://mg.co.za/specialreport/on-whiteness

Manganyi, N. (1973). *Being-black-in-the-world*. Johannesburg: SPRO-CAS/RAVAN.

Mangcu, X. (2008). *To the brink. The state of democracy in South Africa.* Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Mangcu, X. (Ed.). (2015). *The colour of our future: Does race matter in post-apartheid South Africa?* Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Mann, J. (1971). Attitudes towards ethnic groups. In H. Adam (Ed.), *South Africa: Sociological perspectives* (pp. 50-72). London: Oxford University Press.

Manning, J. (2004). Racism in three dimensions: South African architecture and the ideology of white superiority. *Social Identities, 10*(4), 527-537. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350463042000258944

Maré, G. (2014). *Declassified: Moving beyond the dead end of race in South Africa*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Marx, A. (1998). *Making race and nation: A comparison of South Africa, the United States, and Brazil*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, H., & Milton, V. (2011). Bastardised whiteness: 'Zef'-culture, Die Antwoord and the reconfiguration of contemporary Afrikaans identities. *Social Identities, 17*(6), 723-745. https://doi.org/10.1080/13504630.2011.606671

Mathabane, M. (1998). *Kaffir boy: The true story of a black youth's coming of age in apartheid South Africa*. New York: Simon & Schuster. (Original work published 1986)

Matlwa, K. (2007). *Coconut*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Matthews, S. (2011). Becoming African: Debating post-apartheid white South African identities. *African Identities, 9*(1), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1080/14725843.2011.530440

Mayer, P. (1971). *Townsmen or tribesmen: Conservatism and the process of urbanization in a South African city*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1961)

Maylam, P. (2001). Introduction. In *South Africa's racial past: The history and historiography of racism, segregation, and apartheid* (pp. 1-12). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Mbeki, T. (2004). *Statement of Deputy President Thabo Mbeki at the opening of the debate in the National Assembly, on "Reconciliation and Nation Building"*. 29 May 1998, National Assembly, Cape Town [Transcript]. Retrieved from https://www.dfa.gov.za/docs/speeches/1998/mbek0529.htm

Mbembe, A. (2008). Passages to freedom: The politics of racial reconciliation in South Africa. *Public Culture, 20*(1), 5-18. https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2007-012

McIntosh, P. (1988). *White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondence through work in women's studies* (Working Paper No. 189). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley Centers for Women.
Retrieved from
https://www.wcwonline.org/images/pdf/White_Privilege_and_Male_Privilege_Personal_Account-Peggy_McIntosh.pdf

McKaiser, E. (2012). *A Bantu in my bathroom!: Debating race, sexuality and other uncomfortable South African topics*. Johannesburg: Bookstorm and Pan Macmillan South Africa.

McKinney, C. (2007). 'If I speak English, does it make me less black anyway?' 'Race' and English in South African desegregated schools. *English Academy Review, 24*(2), 6-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/10131750701452253

MDDA – Media Development and Diversity Agency (2009). *Trends of ownership and control of media in South Africa*. A report prepared for the Media Development and Diversity Agency by Z-Coms, version 3.3, 15 June 2009.
Retrieved from
http://www.mdda.org.za/Trends%20of%20Ownership%20and%20Control%20of%20Media%20in%20South%20Africa%20-%20Ver%203.3%20%20Final%20-%2015%20June%202009.pdf

Media24 (2012). *About Media24*.
Retrieved from
http://www.media24.com/en/company-information/about-media24.html

Meyiwa, T., Nkondo, M., Chitiga-Mabugu, M., Sithole, M., & Nyamnjoh, F. (Eds.). (2014). *State of the nation. South Africa 1994–2014: A twenty-year review of freedom and democracy*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Mhlana, Z., Ndlovu, N., & Van Schalkwyk, S. (2007, December 7). *De Kock blocks book*.
Retrieved from
https://mg.co.za/article/2007-12-07-de-kock-blocks-book

Mkhize, N. (2005). Am I just a white-washed black woman? *Agenda, 19*(65), 116-122. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.2005.9674631

Morrell, R. (Ed.). (1992). *White but poor: Essays on the history of poor whites in Southern Africa 1880-1940*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

Morse, J., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K., & Spiers, J. (2002). Verification strategies for establishing reliability and validity in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 1*(2), 13-22. https://doi.org/10.1177/160940690200100202

Motsemme, N. (2002). Gendered experiences of blackness in post-apartheid. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture, 8*(4), 647-673. https://doi.org/10.1080/1350463022000068406

Mtose, X. (2008). *An emerging black identity in contemporary South Africa*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10413/970

Mtose, X. (2011). Black peoples' lived experiences of everyday racism in post-apartheid South Africa. *The Journal of International Social Research, 4*(17), 325-338. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com

Mtose, X., & Bayaga, A. (2011). The psychology of black identity. *The Journal of International Social Research, 4*(17), 504-515. Retrieved from http://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com

Muthien, Y. (1999). Democratic consolidation in South Africa, 1994-1999. In Y. Muthien (Ed.), *Democracy South Africa: Evaluating the 1999 election* (pp. 10-21). Pretoria: HSRC.

Myers, K., & Williamson, B. (2001). Race talk: The perpetuation of racism through private discourse. *Race & Society, 4*(1), 3-26. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-9524(02)00032-3

Mynhardt, J., & Du Toit, A. (1991). Contact and change. In D. Foster & J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.), *Social psychology in South Africa* (pp. 273-314). Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Nakayama, T., & Krizek, R. (1995). Whiteness: A strategic rhetoric. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 81*(3), 291-309. https://doi.org/10.1080/00335639509384117

My Subs (2010). *City Press*. Retrieved from http://www.mysubs.co.za/City-Press/2011-08-07

Naspers (2011). *Fact sheet November 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.naspers.co.za/cmsAdmin/uploads/Fact-sheet-Nov-2011.pdf

Nayak, A. (2007). Critical whiteness studies. *Sociology Compass, 1*(2), 737-755. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2007.00045.x

Ndebele, N. (2000). 'Iph' Indlela? Finding our way into the future' – the first Steve Biko memorial lecture. *Social Dynamics, 26*(1), 43-55. https://doi.org/10.1080/02533950008458685

Ndlovu, S. (2012). *Questioning constructions of black identity in post-apartheid South Africa: Cross-generational narratives*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/10413/9548

Ndlovu, Z. (2013). *A bad black's manifesto*. M. Wiener (Ed.). Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Nederveen Pieterse, J. (1992). Images of apartheid. In *White on black: Images of Africa and blacks in Western popular culture* (pp. 102-107). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nemavhandu, M. (2008). *The black diamonds. Are they acquiring riches or wealth?* Halfway House: Zambe Press.

Ngazimbi, X. (2006). *Negotiating identities in post-apartheid South Africa: Black African managers' experiences in an English-speaking university*. Unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/11427/11339

Nicholas, L. (1993). *Psychology and oppression: critiques and proposals.* Johannesburg: Skotaville Publishers.

Nieuwoudt, S., Dickie, K., Coetsee, C., Engelbrecht, L., & Terblanche, E. (2019). Retracted article: Age- and education-related effects on cognitive functioning in colored South African women. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition, 27*(3), 321-337.
https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2019.1598538

Norval, A. (1995). Decolonization, demonization and difference: The difficult constitution of a nation. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 21*(3), 31-51.
https://doi.org/10.1177/019145379502100302

Nuttall, S. (2001). Subjectivities of whiteness. *African Studies Review, 44*(2), 115-140.
https://doi.org/10.2307/525577

OMD – Omnicom Media Group (2011). *South Africa & SADC media facts 2011*.
Retrieved from
http://www.omd.co.za/samediafacts2011.pdf

Orkin, M., & Jowell, R. (2006). Ten years into democracy: How South Africans view their world and themselves. In U. Pillay, B. Roberts & S. Rule (Eds.), *South African social attitudes: Changing times, diverse voices* (pp. 279-295). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Packard, R. (1989). The "Healthy reserve" and the "Dressed native": Discourses on black health and the language of legitimation in South Africa. *American Ethnologist, 16*, 686-703. https://doi.org/10.1525/ae.1989.16.4.02a00050

Park, Y. (2008). *A matter of honour: Being Chinese in South Africa*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Park, Y. (2011). Black, yellow, (honorary) white or just plain South African? Chinese South Africans, identity and affirmative action. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *77*, 107-121. https://doi.org/10.1353/trn.2011.0043

Parker, I. (1992). Discovering discourses, tackling texts. In *Discourse dynamics: Critical analysis for social and individual psychology* (pp. 3-22). London: Routledge.

Parker, I. (2013). Discourse analysis: Dimensions of critique in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 10*(3), 223-239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2012.741509

Pauw, B. (1969). *The second generation: A study of the family among urbanized Bantu in East London*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1963)

Peach, M. (Ed.). (2011). *Being coloured: Coloured identity, history, and the future*. Cape Town: WB Peach Media and Communications.

Peberdy, S. (2009). *Selecting immigrants: National identity and South Africa's immigration policies 1910-2008*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Perea. J. (1997). The black/white binary paradigm of race: The "normal science" of American racial thought. *California Law Review, 85*, 1213-1258. https://doi.org/10.2307/3481059

Perez, A., Ahmed, N., & London, L. (2012). Racial discrimination: Experiences of black medical school alumni at the University of Cape Town, 1945 - 1994. *South African Medical Journal, 102*(6), 574-577. https://doi.org/10.7196/SAMJ.5721

Pfeifer, T. (2009). Deconstructing Cartesian dualisms of Western racialized systems: A study in the colors black and white. *Journal of Black Studies, 39*(4), 528-547. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934706298192

Pilossof, R. (2012). *The unbearable whiteness of being: Farmers' voices from Zimbabwe.* Cape Town: UCT Press.

Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies, 4*(4), 539-542. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445602004004090 1

Potter, J. (2008). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 200-221). London: SAGE.

Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R., & Edwards, D. (1990). Discourse: Noun, verb or social practice? Philoso*phical Psychology, 3*(2-3), 205-217. https://doi.org/10.1080/09515089008572999

Popke, J., & Ballard, R. (2004). Dislocating modernity: Identity, space and representations of street trade in Durban, South Africa. *Geoforum, 35*(1), 99-110. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(03)00002-2

Posel, D. (1983). Rethinking the 'race-class debate' in South African historiography. *Social Dynamics, 9*(1), 50-66. https://doi.org/10.1080/02533958308458333

Posel, D. (2001a). What's in a name? Race categorizations under apartheid and their afterlife. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *47*, 50-74. Retrieved from http://transformationjournal.org.za

Posel, D. (2001b). Race as common sense: Racial classification in twentieth-century South Africa. *African Studies Review, 44*(2), 87-113. https://doi.org/10.2307/525576

Posel, D., Hyslop, J., & Nieftagodien, N. (2001). Editorial: Debating 'race' in South African scholarship. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, *47*, i-xvii. Retrieved from http://transformationjournal.org.za

Ramphalile, M. (2011). *'Patriotic blackness' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness: Charting the emergence and character of an articulation of black/white racial subjectivity peculiar to post-apartheid South Africa*. Unpublished Masters of Arts research report, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/11339

Ratele, K. (1998a). The end of the black man. *Agenda, 37*, 60-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/10130950.1998.9675692

Ratele, K. (1998b). Relating to whiteness: Writing about the black man. *Psychology Bulletin, 8*(2), 35-40.

Ratele, K. (2003). We black men. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*, 237-249. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(02)00094-9

Ratele, K. (2004). About black psychology. In D. Hook (Ed.), *Critical psychology* (pp. 389-414). Landsdowne: UCT Press.

Ratele, K. (2007). Make indigenes unconscious of whiteness: A response to Green, Sonn, and Matsebula. *South African Journal of Psychology*, *37*(3), 431-436. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630703700304

Ratele, K. (2009). Sexuality as constitutive of whiteness in South Africa. *NORA, 17*(3), 158-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740903123784

Ratele, K. (2013). Does he speak Xhosa? In M. Jones & J. Dlamini (Eds.), *Categories of persons: Rethinking ourselves and others* (pp. 119-134). Johannesburg: Picador Africa.

Ratele, K., & Laubscher, L. (2010). Making white lives: Neglected meanings of whiteness from apartheid South Africa. *Psychology in Society, 40*, 83-99. Retrieved from https://www.pins.org.za/pins/pins40/pins40_ratele_laubscher.pdf

Reader, D. (1961). *The black man's portion: History, demography and living conditions in the native locations of East London Cape Province*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, J. (2001). "Now is the time to put an end to all this": Argumentative discourse theory and "letters to the editor". *Discourse & Society, 12*(2), 143-168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926501012002002

Richardson, J., & Franklin, B. (2003). 'Dear Editor': Race, readers' letters and the local press. *The Political Quarterly, 74*(2), 184-192. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.00528

Robus, D., & Macleod, C. (2006). 'White excellence and black failure': The reproduction of racialised higher education in everyday talk. *South African Journal of Psychology, 36(*3), 463-480. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630603600303

Roefs, M. (2006). Identity and race relations. In U. Pillay, B. Roberts & S. Rule (Eds.), *South African attitudes: Changing times, diverse voices* (pp. 77-97). Cape Town HSRC Press.

Roos, N. (2009). The Springbok and the skunk: War veterans and the politics of whiteness in South Africa during the 1940s and 1950s. *Journal of Southern African Studies, 35*(3), 643-661. https://doi.org/10.1080/03057070903101870

Rose, G. (2012). Discourse analysis I: Text, intertextuality and context. In *Visual methodologies: An introduction to researching with visual materials* (pp. 189-226). London: SAGE Publications.

SAARF – South African Advertising Research Foundation (2011). *All Media and Product Survey: Jan 10 – Dec 10*. *Average issue readership of newspapers - profile.* Retrieved from http://www.saarf.co.za/AMPS/technicalreports/AMPS%20Jan-Dec%202010new/Data%20files/Amps/Tot-d01.pdf

Salusbury, T., & Foster, D. (2004). Rewriting WESSA identity. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under Construction: Race and identity in South Africa today* (pp. 93-109). Sandton: Heinemann.

Schmidt, J., & West, M. (2010). Whiteness studies in South African literature: A bibliography. *English in Africa, 37*(1), 103-114. Persistent link https://www.jstor.org/stable/27807133

Schooley, R., Lee, D., & Spanierman, L. (2019). Measuring whiteness: A systematic review of instruments and call to action. *The Counseling Psychologist, 47*(4), 530-565. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000019883261

Schönfeldt-Aultman, S. (2009). A new trek, but the same old rhetoric: a review essay of Johann van Rooyen's the new great trek: the story of South Africa's white exodus. *African Identities, 7*(1), 113-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/14725840802583389

Seedat, M. (2001a). Invisibility in South African psychology (1948 – 1988): A trend analysis. In N. Duncan, A. Van Niekerk, C. De la Rey and M. Seedat (Eds.), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa* (pp. 83-102). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Seedat, M. (2001b). A comparative characterisation of South African psychology (1948 – 1988): Discerning ideological and academic strands. In N. Duncan, A. Van Niekerk, C. De la Rey and M. Seedat (Eds.), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa* (pp. 103-126). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Seekings, J. (2008). The continuing salience of race: Discrimination and diversity in South Africa. *Journal of contemporary African Studies, 26*(1), 1-25. https://doi.org/10.1080/02589000701782612

Seekings, J., & Nattrass, N. (2005). *Class, race, and inequality in South Africa*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Seibold, C. (2002). The place of theory and the development of a theoretical framework in a qualitative study. *Qualitative Research Journal, 2*(3), 3–15.

Sennett, J., Finchilescu, G., Gibson, K., & Strauss, R. (2003). Adjustment of black students at a historically white South African university. *Educational Psychology, 23*(1), 107-116. https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410303219

Sennett, J. & Foster, D. (1996). Social identity: Comparing white English-speaking South African students in 1975 and 1994. *South African Journal of Psychology, 26*(4), 203-211. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639602600401

Serote, A. (2011). *Blackness in a predominantly white academe: A case of the University of Cape Town's Faculty of Health Sciences*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/11427/11701

Sharp, J., & Boonzaier, E. (1995). 'Sieners in die suburbs;?: exploring new directions for South African anthropology. *South African Journal of Ethnology, 18*(2), 64-70.
Retrieved from
https://journals.co.za/content/journal/saje

Shepherd, N., & Robins, S. (2008a). Introduction: New South African keywords. In N. Shepherd & S. Robins (Eds.), *New South African keywords* (pp. 1-12). Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Shepherd, N., & Robins, S. (Eds.) (2008b). *New South African keywords*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Sibanda, S. (2012). *Through the eyes of the other: An analysis of the representations of blackness in South African youth novels by white writers from 1976 to 2006*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/12769

Sidiropoulos, E., Mashabela, H., Mackay, S., Gordon-Brown, C., Frielinghaus, J., Musiker, C., Swanepoel, H., Gallocher, R., & Forgey, H. (1995). *South Africa survey 1994/95*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations.

Soudien, C. (2001). Certainty and ambiguity in youth identities in South Africa: Discourses in transition. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 22*(3), 311-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596300120094352

Soudien, C. (2010a). Initiating debate. Affirmative action and admissions in higher education. *South African Journal of Higher Education, 24(2)*, 221-223. Persistent link: https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC37610

Soudien, C. (2010b). Who takes responsibility for the 'Reitz four'? Puzzling our way through higher education transformation in South Africa. *South African Journal of Science, 106*(9/10), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajs.v106i9/10.429

Soudien, C. (2010c). The reconstitution of privilege: Integration in former white school in South Africa. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(2), 352-366. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01649.x

Soudien, C. (2012). *Realising the dream: Unlearning the logic of race in the South African school*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Speer, S. (2002). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: a sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies, 4*(4), 511-525. https://doi.org/10.1177/14614456020040040601

Statman, J. (1999). The shape of the shadow. *ReVision, 22*(1), 35-41.

Steenveld, L. (2008). Media and race. In P. Fourie (Ed.), *Media studies volume 2: Policy, management and media representation* (pp. 277-303). Cape Town: Juta & Co.

Stevens, G. (2003). Academic representations of 'race' and racism in psychology: Knowledge production, historical context and dialectics in transitional South Africa. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27*(2), 189-207. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(02)00092-5

Stevens, G. (2007). Tactical reversal or re-centring whiteness? A response to Green, Sonn, and Matsebula, *South African Journal of Psychology*, *37*(3), 425-430. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630703700303

Stevens, G., Bell, D., Sonn, C., Canham, H., & Clennon, O. (2017). Transnational perspectives on Black subjectivity. *South African Journal of Psychology, 47*(4), 459-469. https://doi.org/doi.org/10.1177/0081246317737

Stevens, G., Duncan, N., & Hook, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Race, memory and the apartheid archive. Towards a psychosocial praxis*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Stevens, G., Franchi, V., & Swart, T. (2006a). Changing contexts of race and racism: Problematics, polemics and perspectives. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp. 3-27). Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Stevens, G., Franchi, V., & Swart, T. (Eds.). (2006b). *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa*. Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Stevens, G., & Laubscher, L. (2010). Editorial: Facing the apartheid archive. *PINS, 40*, 1-7. Retrieved from https://www.pins.org.za/issue.php?num=40

Stevens, G., & Lockhat, R. (1997). 'Coca-Cola kids' - Reflections on black adolescent identity development in post-apartheid South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology, 27*(4), 250-255. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124639702700408

Steyn, M. (1999). White identity in context: A personal narrative. In T. Nakayama & J. Martin (Eds.), *Whiteness: the communication of social identity* (pp. 264-278). London: SAGE Publications.

Steyn, M. (2000). New shades of 'whiteness': White identity in a multicultural, democratic South Africa. *Communitas, 1*(5), 1-18. Retrieved from http://journals.ufs.ac.za/index.php/com

Steyn, M. (2001a). Whiteness in the rainbow: Experiencing the loss of privilege in the New South Africa. In C. Hamilton, L. Huntley, N. Alexander, A. Guimarães & W. James (Eds.), *Beyond racism: Race and inequality in Brazil, South African, and the United States* (pp. 85-103). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Steyn, M. (2001b). *Whiteness just isn't what it used to be: White identity in a changing South Africa*. New York: SUNY.

Steyn, M. (2003). *White Talk: White South Africans and the strategic management of diasporic whiteness*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/11427/8605

Steyn, M. (2004a). Rehabilitating a whiteness disgraced: Afrikaner White Talk in post-apartheid South Africa. *Communication Quarterly, 52*(2), 143-169. https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370409370187

Steyn, M. (2004b). Rehybridising the creole: New South African Afrikaners. In N. Distiller & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under Construction: Race and identity in South Africa today* (pp. 70-85). Sandton: Heinemann.

Steyn, M. (2005). "White talk": White South Africans and the management of diasporic whiteness. In A. Lopez (Ed.), *Postcolonial whiteness: A critical reader on race and empire* (pp. 119-135). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Steyn, M. (2007). As the postcolonial moment deepens: A response to Green, Sonn, and Matsebula. *South African Journal of Psychology, 37*(3), 420-424. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124630703700302

Steyn, M., & Conway, D. (2010). Introduction: Intersecting whiteness, interdisciplinary debates. *Ethnicities, 10(3)*, 283-291. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796810372309

Steyn, M., & Foster, D. (2008). Repertoires for talking white: Resistant whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 31*(1), 25-51. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701538851

Steyn, M., & Van Zyl, M. (Eds.). (2009). *The prize and the price: Shaping sexualities in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Stone, L., & Erasmus, Y. (2012). Race thinking and the law in post-1994 South Africa. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa, 79*, 119-143. https://doi.org/10.1353/trn.2012.0019

Sullivan, L., & Stevens, G. (2010). Through her eyes: Relational references in black women's narratives of apartheid racism. *South African Journal of Psychology, 40*(4), 414-431. https://doi.org/10.1177/008124631004000405

Suzman, A. (1960). Race classification and definition in the legislation of the Union of South Africa 1910-1960. *Acta Juridica, 1960*, 339-367.

Teppo. A. (2004). *The making of a good white. A historical ethnography of the rehabilitation of poor whites in a suburb of Cape Town*. PhD thesis, University of Helsinki. Research Series in Anthropology. Helsinki: University of Helsinki Press. Retrieved from https://ethesis.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/val/sosio/vk/teppo/

Teppo, A. (2009). A decent place? Space and morality in a former 'poor white' suburb. In M. Steyn & M. Van Zyl (Eds.), *The prize and the price: Shaping sexualities in South Africa* (pp. 220-233). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Terre Blanche, M., & Seedat, M. (2001). Martian landscapes: The social construction of race and gender at South Africa's National Institute for Personnel Research 1946 – 1984. In N. Duncan, A. Van Niekerk, C. De la Rey & M. Seedat (Eds.), *Race, racism, knowledge production and psychology in South Africa* (pp. 61-82). New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Theissen, G. (1997). *Between acknowledgement and ignorance: How white South Africans have dealt with the apartheid past.* A research report based on a CSVR public opinion survey conducted in March 1996. B. Hamber, C. Garson, L. Segal & M. Terre Blanche (Eds.). Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.

Thiele, S. (1991). Taking a sociological approach to Europeanness (whiteness) and Aboriginality (blackness). *The Australian Journal of Anthropology, 2*(2), 179-201. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1835-9310.1991.tb00136.x

Thomaselli, K. (2000). Faulting faultlines: Racism in the South African media. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies, 21*(2), 157-174. https://doi.org/10.1080/02560054.2000.9665861

Tobias, P. (1972). *The meaning of race*. Johannesburg: South African Institute of Race Relations. (Original work published 1961)

Twine, F., & Gallagher, C. (2008). The future of whiteness: A map of the 'third wave'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *31*(1), 4-24. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870701538836

UCT Unilever Institute of Strategic Marketing (2006). *Black diamond 2: Connecting with black diamonds* [CD ROM]. Cape Town: Unilever Institute.

UCT Unilever Institute of Strategic Marketing (2007). *Black diamonds 2007: On the move* [CD ROM]. Cape Town: Unilever Institute.

Vahed, G., & Desai, A. (2010). Identity and belonging in post-apartheid South Africa: The case of Indian South Africans. *Journal of Social Sciences, 25*(1-2-3), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1080/09718923.2010.11892861

Vale, P., & Prinsloo, E. (Eds.). (2014). *The New South Africa at twenty: Critical perspectives*. Scottsville: University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Van den Berghe, P. (1964). *Caneville: The social structure of a South African town*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

Van der Merwe, H., Ashley, M., Charton, N., & Huber, B. (1974). *White South African elites. A study of incumbents of top positions in the Republic of South Africa*. Cape Town: Juta and Company.

Van der Ross, R. (2015). *In our own skins: A political history of the coloured people*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball Publishers.

Van der Westhuizen, C. (2007). *White power & the rise and fall of the National Party*. Cape Town: Zebra Press.

Van der Westhuizen, C. (2013). *Identities at the intersection of race, gender, sexuality and class in a liberalising, democratising South Africa the reconstitution of "the Afrikaner woman"*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Cape Town, South Africa. Retrieved from http://hdl.handle.net/11427/12302

Van Dijk, T. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Van Rooyen, J. (2000). *The New Great Trek: The story of South Africa's white exodus*. Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Van Zyl, M., & Steyn, M. (Eds.) (2005). *Performing queer. Shaping sexualities 1994-2004 – Volume one*. Roggebaai: Kwela Books.

Van Zyl, M., De Gruchy, J., Lapinsky, S., Lewin, S., & Reid, G. (1999). *The aVersion project. Human rights abuses of gays and lesbians in the SADF by health workers during the apartheid era.* A report on behalf of the Coalition for Lesbian and Gay Equality, Gay and Lesbian Archives, Health and Human Rights Project Centre for Epidemiological Research in Southern Africa, and the South African Medical Research Council. Cape Town: Simply Said and Done.

Verwey, C., & Quayle, M. (2012). Whiteness, racism, and Afrikaner identity in post-apartheid South Africa. *African Affairs, 111*(445), 551-575. https://doi.org/10.1093/afraf/ads056

Vestergaard, M. (2001). Who's got the map? The negotiation of Afrikaner identities in post-apartheid South Africa. *Daedalus, 130*(1), 19-44. Persistent link https://www.jstor.org/stable/20027678

Vice, S. (2011). How do I live in this strange place? *Journal of Social Philosophy, 41*(3), 323-342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9833.2010.01496.x

Vingoe, L. (2007). *A portfolio of work on stigma, personality disorder and counselling psychology*. Unpublished DPsych dissertation, City University, London. Retrieved from http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/8594/

Visser, G. (2003). Unvoiced and invisible: On the transparency of white South Africans in post-apartheid geographical discourse. *Acta Academia, supplement 3*, 220-244. Persistent link https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC15125

Vourc'h, F. (2006). Preface. In G. Stevens, V. Franchi & T. Swart (Eds.), *A race against time: Psychology and challenges to deracialisation in South Africa* (pp. xiii-xvii). Pretoria: Unisa Press.

Wa Azania, M. (2014). *Memoirs of a born free. Reflections on the rainbow nation*. Auckland Park: Jacana Media.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2002). Understanding the conditions for public discourse: Four rules for selecting letters to the editor. *Journalism Studies, 3*(1), 69-81. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700120107347

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2004). A 'legitimate beef' or 'raw meat'? Civility, multiculturalism, and letters to the editor. *The Communication Review, 7*, 89-105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714420490280161

Waitt, G. (2010). Doing Foucauldian discourse analysis – revealing social realities. In I. Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods in human geography* (pp. 217-240). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wale, K. (2013). *Confronting exclusion: Time for radical reconciliation.* SA reconciliation barometer survey: 2013 report. Institute for Justice and Reconciliation. Retrieved from http://reconciliationbarometer.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/IJR-Barometer-Report-2013-22Nov1635.pdf

Wale, K. (2014). *Reflecting on reconciliation: Lessons from the past, prospects for the future*. SA reconciliation barometer survey: 2014 report. Institute for Justice and Reconciliation. Retrieved from http://reconciliationbarometer.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/IJR-SA-Reconciliation-Barometer-Report-2014.pdf

Wale, K., & Foster, D. (2007). Investing in discourses of poverty and development: How white wealthy South Africans mobilise meaning to maintain privilege. *South African Review of Sociology*, *38*(1), 45-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/21528586.2007.10419166

Walker, L. (2005).The colour white: Racial and gendered closure in the South African medical profession. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 28*(2), 348-375. https://doi.org/01419870420000315889

Walker, M. (2005). Race is nowhere and race is everywhere: Narratives from black and white South African university students in post-apartheid South Africa. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 26*(1), 41-54. https://doi.org/10.1080/0142569042000292707

Wander, P., Martin, J., & Nakayama, T. (1999). Whiteness and beyond: Sociohistorical foundations of whiteness and contemporary challenges. In T. Nakayama & J. Martin (Eds.), *Whiteness: The communication of social identity* (pp. 13-25). London: SAGE Publications.

Wasserman, H., & Jacobs, S. (Eds.). (2003). *Shifting selves. Post-apartheid essays on mass media, culture and identity*. Cape Town: Kwela Books.

West, M. (2009). *White women writing. Identity and representation in (post-) apartheid literatures of South Africa.* Claremont: David Philip Publishers.

West, M. (2010). Responding to whiteness in contemporary South African life and literature: An interview with Njabulo S. Ndebele. *English in Africa, 37*(1), 115-124. Persistent link https://www.jstor.org/stable/27807134

West, M., & Schmidt, J. (2010). Whiteness studies in South Africa: A South African perspective, *English in Africa, 37*(1), 9-13. Persistent link https://www.jstor.org/stable/27807127

Western, J. (1996). *Outcast Cape Town*. California: University of California Press.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. New York: Colombia University Press.

WHITEWASH 1 (2013). *Workshop programme and abstracts*. Negotiating whiteness in 21st century South Africa. 19 – 20 March 2013, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg. Retrieved from https://www.viad.co.za/s/Whitewash-1-programme-and-abstracts.pdf

Wilbraham, L. (1994). *Confession, surveillance and subjectivity: A discourse analytic approach to advice columns*. Unpublished Masters dissertation, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
Retrieved from
http://hdl.handle.net/11427/7858

Willig, C. (2001). Foucauldian discourse analysis. In *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and Method* (pp. 106-124). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: Adventures in theory and method*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill/Open University Press.

Wilson, M. & Mafeje, A. (1963). *Langa. A study of social groups in an African township*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.

Zegeye, A. (Ed.) (2001). *Social identities in the new South Africa: After apartheid – Volume one*. Cape Town: Kwela Books and South African History Online.

LIST OF TEXTS

***City Press* – editorials.**

CP/E/02/01/94
Now is the time to take control of the golden ox!, p. 14.

CP/E/06/03/94
Pie-in-the-sky?, p. 14.

CP/E/24/04/94a
The dawn of a new beginning is here at last, p. 24.

CP/E/24/04/94b
Oh, happy happy day!, p. 1.

CP/E/01/05/94
Historic week of miracles and muddles, p. 16.

CP/E/15/05/94
The next five years will make or break SA, p. 14.

CP/E/05/06/94
Don't pander to minority whims, p. 16.

CP/E/25/06/95
Rainbow nation plays the game, p. 14.

CP/E/03/09/95
Racism must not be allowed to go unpunished now, p. 16.

CP/E/10/09/95
A chance to get a share of the cake, p. 16.

CP/E/04/02/96
Bubble, bubble, taal and trouble, p. 18.

CP/E/25/02/96
Clamp down on Potty racists now!, p. 16.

CP/E/31/03/96
Some puzzles left after the reshuffle, p. 16.

CP/E/05/05/96
The final seal on our freedom, p. 14.

CP/E/08/12/96
Celebrate SA's miracle change on December 16, p. 8.

CP/E/26/01/97
PAC welcome – but why Leon?, p. 14.

CP/E/02/02/97
The ones who ordered deaths, p. 14.

CP/E/16/02/97
SA loves Mandela, but not the govt, p. 14.

CP/E/04/01/98
Cheers! to our bright future, p. 14.

CP/E/08/03/98
MPs really must attend to their obligations, p. 16.

CP/E/22/03/98
The first time should be the last time, p. 16.

CP/E/19/07/98
Opposition shouts 'fire!' too often, p. 8.

CP/E/22/11/98
Arms spending now is inappropriate, p. 12.

CP/E/29/11/98
Registration must proceed smoothly, p. 10.

CP/E/03/01/99
Elections the focus for SA in 1999, p. 6.

CP/E/04/04/99
Landslide victory needed, p. 6.

CP/E/09/05/99
We believe the ANC is on the right track, p. 6.

CP/E/06/06/99
The people have indeed spoken, p. 6.

CP/E/27/06/99
Mbeki promises to do us proud, p. 6.

CP/E/24/10/99
About time for Selebi, p. 6.

CP/E/13/02/00
Not soccer nor rain can ruin SA's party, p. 6.

CP/E/23/07/00
SA has changed, so must names, p. 8.

CP/E/12/11/00
If they can't change, we'll force them to!, p. 8.

CP/E/02/03/03
Good budget, now let's build on gains, p. 18.

CP/E/23/03/03
TRC report serves a warning, p. 18.

CP/E/30/03/03
Putting BEE on the agenda, p. 18.

CP/E/04/07/04
Name and shame fake BEE operators, p. 18.

CP/E/19/09/04
We voted for a free and fair democracy, p. 18.

CP/E/31/07/05
Government must act to change land policy, p. 22.

CP/E/18/09/05
Painting the colours of the past onto the new SA, p. 22.

CP/E/03/09/06
ANC playing into the hands of the prophets of doom, p. 22.

CP/E/22/07/07
Apartheid injustice still prevails in some areas, p. 22.

CP/E/29/07/07
No excuse for anarchy in service delivery protests, p. 22.

CP/E/09/11/08
'Black education' continues to fail, p. 26.

CP/E/19/04/09
The future is in your hands, p. 1.

CP/E/14/02/10
Long trudge to nowhere, p. 22.

CP/E/07/08/11
Transformation has long way to go, p. 26.

***City Press* – letters.**

CP/L/13/02/94
M. De Haas, Durban.
Let's police the police!, p. 14.

CP/L/03/04/94
D. Sagela, Durban.
On the NP's bandwagon, p. 14.

CP/L/15/05/94
G. Modupi, Mabopane.
Election has brought blacks no liberation, p. 14.

CP/L/29/05/94
[illegible]
Examine police command roles, p. 14.

CP/L/07/08/94
Concerned Resident, Kabokweni.
Hope fading in the Eastern Transvaal, p. 16.

CP/L/11/09/94
Condemn, Harrismith.
Farm misery must end now, p. 16.

CP/L/23/10/94

N. D. Machaka, Atteridgeville.
Those apartheid statues MUST go!, p. 14.

CP/L/06/11/94

M. Khumalo, Sibasa.
Don't let go of our languages!, p. 14.

CP/L/13/11/94a

N. Rathibane, Pretoria.
No marching to Pretoria, p. 14.

CP/L/13/11/94b

M. Theos, Vivo.
Elections will shock gravy train riders, p. 14.

CP/L/04/12/94

J. Van Niekerk, Cape Town.
Power lies in making money, p. 20.

CP/L/15/01/95a

G. Khoza, Harrismith.
Mink-and-manure ANC are ignoring the poor, p. 14.

CP/L/15/01/95b

I. Maluleke, Elim Hospital.
The ANC has let us down, p. 14.

CP/L/12/03/95

L. Mogorosi, Bloemfontein.
No logic in reader's argument, p. 14.

CP/L/25/02/96

D. S. Swartbooi, East London.
Stop bashing PAC, p. 16.

CP/L/17/03/96.

B. Mahabir, [omitted].
Democracy needs a giant leap, p. 16.

CP/L/21/04/96

Z. Marimuthu, Lenasia.
ANC has made liberation a farce, p. 16.

CP/L/27/10/96
K. Gqititole, Scottsville.
Viva the Africanbond!, p. 14.

CP/L/03/11/96
Staff Member, Thaba Nchu.
Racism alive in SANDF, p. 7.

CP/L/10/11/96
M. Legwale, Dobsonville.
Charlie barks up wrong tree, p. 16.

CP/L/08/12/96
E. Lekopa, Orkney.
We need to unite against oppression, p. 8.

CP/L/04/05/97
W. Maseko, Dennilton.
Leon, De Klerk: ship out!, p. 14.

CP/L/20/07/97
Z. Kweza, University of Zululand.
Our courts are too Afrikaans, p. 14.

CP/L/31/08/97
R. T. Mbele, Den.
'Syfrets was sparked by racism', p. 14.

CP/L/12/07/98a
Z. J. Mgwebi, Vanderbijlpark.
Our economic wealth should be distributed equally, p. 6.

CP/L/12/07/98b
P. Modiselle, Mafikeng.
Critics will soon see that Tito is more than capable, p. 6.

CP/L/19/07/98
N. Samora, Pretoria.
Too much kindness is the reason for our downfall, p. 8.

CP/L/22/11/98
M. Ramgobin, Verulam.
Tony Leon is no champion of the poor, p. 12.

CP/L/10/01/99

Worried Teacher, KwaThema.
Yes, whites run the Gauteng education department, p. 10.

CP/L/21/02/99

R. Sanamela, [omitted].
Don't mock their English, help them improve, p. 10.

CP/L/20/06/99

S. Muofhe, Johannesburg.
Revival of our culture lies in Mbeki, p. 6.

CP/L/22/08/99

P. A. Rakometsi, Welkom.
Don't blame teachers for their poor English, p. 6.

CP/L/17/09/00

M. Mbili, Nonteclair.
ANC fools us some of the time, p. 8.

CP/L/15/10/00

M. Mthimkhulu, Durban.
Some whites are still racist, p. 8.

CP/L/07/01/01

J. C. De Ruco, Pretoria.
Little has changed for poor blacks in new SA, p. 8.

CP/L/14/01/01

M. Mbili, Merebank.
Why do SA's poor never learn?, p. 4.

CP/L/28/01/01

E. Phofa, Katlehong.
The PAC is a dying party, p. 8.

CP/L/04/02/01a

E. Mahlobo, Marshalltown.
PAC bashing does not fool anyone, p. 8.

CP/L/04/02/01b

T. Moloi, Harrismith.
New struggle is to preserve languages, p. 8.

CP/L/06/05/01

T. Monyai, Potchefstroom.
White media get a kick from insults, p. 6.

CP/L/15/07/01

M. Phadu, Thembisa.
Without land, Azanians will remain forever poor, p. 6.

CP/L/19/08/01

T. Milangeni, Witsieshoek.
Use of mother tongue scorned, p. 6.

CP/L/02/09/01

M. M. Wa Ga Mabokwane, Ga-Maroga, Driekop.
Shed enslavement by foreign tongues, p. 6.

CP/L/16/12/01

J. Madondo, Pietermaritzburg.
Shame on you, Mbeki!, p. 23.

CP/L/03/03/02

M. Masia, University of Venda for Science and Technology.
Editorial insults Venda university, p. 23.

CP/L/23/06/02

S. Nyembe, Pretoria.
All's not well under rainbow, p. 20.

CP/L/04/05/03

R. Molala, Emndeni South, Soweto.
ANC government is not worth a vote next time, p. 20.

CP/L/06/07/03

M. W. Nape, Mamone GaSekwati.
Makgoba is spot on: we need African university, p. 20.

CP/L/21/09/03

Concerned traffic officer, Free State.
There is something amiss in the Free State traffic dept, p. 20.

CP/L/08/08/04

Z. B. Zulu, Pretoria.
Mother tongue preferable for domestic issues, p. 25.

CP/L/22/08/04

O. Mandla, UK.
SA's Olympic team 'whites only', p. 23.

CP/L/24/10/04a

T. Mange, [omitted].
SABC boss should apologise to the nation, p. 20.

CP/L/24/10/04b

S. Xaba, Pretoria.
Many whites still cherish apartheid, p. 20.

CP/L/27/02/05

T. P. Tsotetsi, Badplaas.
An educational anomaly, p. 20.

CP/L/17/04/05a

T. Mange, Johannesburg.
Racism is alive and well in SA, p. 20.

CP/L/17/04/05b

V. Wauchope, Braamfontein.
Borrowing from cultures a sin, p. 20.

CP/L/08/05/05

T. Xhali, Yeoville.
Time for whites to wake up to the new order, p. 20.

CP/L/05/06/05

M. Lucky, Waterval Location, Elim.
Kids need their languages, p. 20.

CP/L/29/01/06

K. Buthelezi, Bellville, Cape Town.
Time for blacks to take pride in Africanness, p. 24.

CP/L/01/10/06

S. Ngwetsheni, Mogale City.
Let's be proud of our heritage and traditions, p. 24.

CP/L/21/01/07

M. Pheko, [omitted].
White farmer's death a wake-up call, p. 9.

CP/L/25/03/07

D. Ka-Ndyalvan, [omitted].
Our wealth is still in the hands of white males, p. 24.

CP/L/12/08/07

P. Mnisi, Johannesburg.
We need pride in our languages, p. 24.

CP/L/16/12/07

M. Phaahla, Ekurhuleni.
New leader must revisit policies, p. 28.

CP/L/01/11/09

K. G. Nkadimeng, Sekhukhune.
White is still right in SA, p. 24.

CP/L/01/05/11

H. Krüger, email.
Swart gevaar is still very much alive, p. 24.

***Sunday Times* – editorials.**

ST/E/24/04/94

Laying the foundation for our future, p. 40.

ST/E/01/05/94

Need for stability outweighs all else, p. 24.

ST/E/08/05/94

A celebration of unity and democracy, p. 24.

ST/E/19/02/95

Working to heal the nation's wounds, p. 20.

ST/E/26/02/95

Forging a future on lessons of the past, p. 24.

ST/E/10/11/96

Time to rejoin moral crusade, p. 30.

ST/E/28/12/97

All we need is common sense and understanding, p. 20.

ST/E/14/05/00
Teaching new values to the generation to come, p. 18.

ST/E/01/07/01
South Africans expect better, p. 16.

ST/E/05/08/01
Doing okay, but can do better, p. 18.

ST/E/21/10/01
Platitudes instead of creativity, p. 20.

ST/E/20/04/03
It's time for all of us to play our part, p. 16.

ST/E/30/01/05
Critics are not enemies, p. 18.

ST/E/21/11/10
Shutting our eyes to violence, p. 4.

***Sunday Times* – letters.**

ST/L/02/01/94
K. Roberts, Kokstad.
Pillay plan set to ruin the economy, p. 12.

ST/L/09/01/94
R. Rell, Johannesburg.
Power-sharing is the only way to address the needs of everyone, p. 15.

ST/L/23/01/94
B. Turok, Johannesburg.
Supportive press will aid ANC's new role, p. 19.

ST/L/06/03/94
R. Hands, Durban.
Creating equal opportunity, p. 24.

ST/L/17/04/94
G. Nkutha, Orlando.
Stop using ANC as a scapegoat, p. 31.

ST/L/07/08/94

F. Schoeman, [omitted].
Continuity needed in public service, p. 18.

ST/L/20/11/94

Johnny, Melkbosstrand.
Not to blame for sins of our fathers, p. 13.

ST/L/04/12/94

A Concerned Witsie, Johannesburg.
'Non-political' students at Wits should also be heard, p. 23.

ST/L/22/01/95

J. O. Hendry, Johannesburg.
'Late Mary' Metcalfe doesn't deserve praise, p. 15.

ST/L/26/02/95

P. Volmink, Wynberg.
Patience for racists won't be limitless, p. 21.

ST/L/19/03/95

M. Martin, Rondebosch.
SAfm trashes English, p. 17.

ST/L/02/04/95

J. Tshabalala, Olifantsfontein.
I've lost a good companion – to radio SAfm, p. 23.

ST/L/11/06/95

H. Nkosi, Nelspruit.
Racism still rules in the workplace, p. 14.

ST/L/16/07/95

L. Vincent, Durban.
Springbok is a noble emblem, p. 17.

ST/L/06/08/95

L. A. Tondi, Johannesburg.
Africans have been friendly for too long, p. 18.

ST/L/14/01/96

F. Nekhwevha, University of Fort Hare.
Education system needs total revamp, p. 17.

ST/L/27/10/96

A white grey-haired man, Ramsgate.
White, greying males stand up to take on Stella Sigcau, p. 30.

ST/L/03/11/96a

D. L. Du Bois, Durban.
Standing up to be counted among those angered by Sigcau's outburst, p. 22.

ST/L/03/11/96b

Per ardua ad astra, Germiston.
Standing up to be counted among those angered by Sigcau's outburst, p. 22.

ST/L/17/11/96

A Denel Employee, Pretoria.
Denel's white men opposed to change, p. 29.

ST/L/01/12/96

P. A. Nel, Worcester.
Minorities begin to feel alienated in new South Africa, p. 23.

ST/L/12/01/97a

N. H. Avery, Cape Town.
Silent support for apartheid was just as evil, p. 17.

ST/L/12/01/97b

M. Zeiss, Germiston.
Silent support for apartheid was just as evil, p. 17.

ST/L/12/01/97c

G. N. Muchau, Krugersdorp.
Silent support for apartheid was just as evil, p. 17.

ST/L/12/01/97d

J. E. Graham, Durban.
Silent support for apartheid was just as evil, p. 17.

ST/L/02/11/97

L. Maisela, Johannesburg.
Why black 'Mikes' give Africans a bad name, p. 30.

ST/L/28/12/97

K. R. McDonald, Durban.
So much for Mandela's reconciliatory stature, p. 19.

ST/L/21/06/98a

B. Moodley, Johannesburg.
SABC's Reddy judged by his own standards, p. 26.

ST/L/21/06/98b

A. Glaser, Cape Town.
SABC's Reddy judged by his own standards, p. 26.

ST/L/28/06/98

M. H. Maserumule, Bloemfontein.
Mulholland's defence of rich whites is a poor effort, p. 21.

ST/L/19/07/98

L. Mzukwa, Cape Town.
Equity Bill's critic ignores our history, p. 21.

ST/L/01/11/98

T. Gibaha, Ennerdale.
A pox on the chickens who run, p. 33.

ST/L/25/02/01

Countryless, Johannesburg.
We've lost faith in country that discriminates against us, p. 23.

ST/L/26/08/01

M. Novukuza, Cape Town.
SA the next Zimbabwe unless whites share, p. 26.

ST/L/24/08/03

K. Bentley, Port Elizabeth.
Don't write off the whites, p. 17.

APPENDIX 1

Year	Editorials		Letters	
	City Press	*Sunday Times*	*City Press*	*Sunday Times*
1994	88	28	82	255
1995	84	62	107	306
1996	57	79	79	269
1997	75	91	101	315
1998	57	81	77	177
1999	73	76	101	25
2000	61	89	83	58
2001	83	79	97	118
2002	86	88	97	76
2003	79	95	109	94
2004	69	81	97	50
2005	70	80	144	87
2006	70	76	146	93
2007	88	88	151	136
2008	93	76	207	108
2009	95	81	218	90
2010	64	83	78	44
2011	76	83	48	33
Totals	**1368**	**1416**	**2022**	**2334**

Table of data counts by type for *City Press* and the *Sunday Times*, 1994 – 2011.

APPENDIX 2

See overleaf.

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

Department of Psychology

University of Cape Town Rondebosch 7701 South Africa
Telephone (021) 650 3417
Fax No. (021) 650 4104

11 May 2018

Itai Gartushka
Department of Psychology
University of Cape Town
Rondebosch 7701

Dear Itai

You were given ethical clearance by an Ethics Review Committee of the Faculty of Humanities for your study, Texts in black and white racial identities in post-apartheid South Africa on 16 November 2011.

I wish you all the best for your write up and submission of your thesis.

Yours sincerely

Lauren Wild (PhD)
Associate Professor
Chair: Ethics Review Committee

University of Cape Town
ΨPSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT
Upper Campus
Rondebosch