

Racial identity and racism in the gay and lesbian community in post-apartheid South Africa

Emily Craven

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Humanities, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Political Studies.

May 2011

Declaration

I Emily Craven, declare that this research report is my own work. It is being submitted in partial fulfilment for a degree of Master of Arts in Political Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. I further declare that neither this report, nor any part of it, has been submitted for any degree or examination at any other university.

Acknowledgements

I want first to say a huge thank you to my mother and father, Norma and Patrick Craven who were willing to take in and support their thirty something daughter when she decided to go back to school, without their endless support both financial and emotional this adventure would not have been possible. Also, to my dearest friend Simonne Horwitz who always believes in me. To my supervisor Antje Schuhmann who first discussed the idea of this work with me under a tent on a dusty field in Kwa Thema some years ago and who has seen it through to the end, thank you so much for everything. In addition I have to thank all the staff in the Wits Political Studies Department, a special thanks to Shireen Hassim for so much help not least for staying up all night to proof read my work, also to those people apart from Antje and Shireen who taught the coursework elements of my MA, Stephen Louw, Estienne Rodary and Malathi De Alwis and finally to Gillian Renshaw who is a superhero. I need to thank the staff at Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action who hold the Gay and Lesbian Archive, in particular Gabriel Khan and Anthony Manion for all their help and for providing such an amazing and important resource.

The year spent working on this would have been considerably less fun and sane without my supervision support group of Kate Joseph, Dasantha Pillay, Molemo Ramphalile, Nina Partzch, Sherona Gani, Lyle Prim and Nicola Cloete, thank you particularly to Nicola for also helping so much with proofreading. Also to those people who have helped me through the last few months, Donna Powell, Komnas Poriassis, Carrie Shelver, Natasha Vally, Dipika Nath, Phoebe Harward, Phumi Mtetwa, Viv and Mike Findley, Oriel Willemse, Tracy Marcus, the Macks, Kate Chisholm, Kim Vance, Dawn Cavanaugh, Mpumi Mathabela, the bridge ladies and everyone involved in the 1 in 9 campaign, thank you!

Finally to all my friends and colleagues in the LGBTI and gender sectors, to every woman in South Africa with a raised fist and a cry for justice, to Zoliswa, Fezeka, Phindile, Eudy, Thandiswa Noxolo, Sizakele, Salome, Girly, Lisa and so many more, this work as with all that I do is dedicated to you.

Abstract

The first Johannesburg Pride march took place in 1990 and an event has taken place in the city every year since. The history of Johannesburg Pride runs alongside the history of the transition to democracy in South Africa. The event has from its very beginnings been the site of multiple contestations sometimes bitterly fought out. These conflicts have erupted around issues such as the route of the parade, its political content and its commercialisation among others. These conflicts it could be argued speak to the generally much fractured nature of gay and lesbian community in South Africa. As a result of apartheid policies of identify control, the ongoing legacies of the apartheid system and the various ways in which all people have been renegotiating their identities within the post-apartheid moment have left a community characterised by massive race, class and gender inequalities. Pride is one of the few times and spaces in which the various members of this community converge and this speaks to why it has become such an important space of contestation. Contestation not just around Pride, but in fact around what it means to be gay in post-apartheid South Africa and what it means to claim a community defined by this identity. Also importantly, what are the networks of power that exist that determine who is able to define and control both gay and lesbian identity and community?

Contents

1. Introduction
 - 1.1 Introduction to topic
 - 1.2 Structure
 - 1.3 Methodology
 - 1.4 A note on terminology
2. Theoretical overview
 - 2.1 Queer theory
 - 2.2 Constructions and contestations of community
 - 2.3 Pride
 - 2.4 Race and sexual orientation
 - 2.5 Identity in post-apartheid South Africa
3. The history of gay and lesbian community in South Africa
 - 3.1 The early years and the law reform movement
 - 3.2 National movement from GASA to GLOW
 - 3.3 That National Coalition years
 - 3.4 New era, new challenge
4. Johannesburg Pride
 - 4.1 Historical overview
 - 4.2 City streets to suburban sidewalks
 - 4.3 It's all about the money
 - 4.4 To blend or offend
 - 4.5 Protest or celebration
5. Conclusion and Recommendations for future research

Introduction

Introduction to topic

In October 2010 some 15 000 people took part in the annual Joburg Pride Parade (Joburg Pride Web site, 4 October 2010). This event, though branded in a variety of ways, has taken place each year since 1990 when, what was then termed the Lesbian and Gay Pride March first wound its way through the streets of Johannesburg. The history of the Johannesburg Pride event runs parallel to the history of the transition to democracy in South Africa beginning, as it did, in the same year in which Nelson Mandela was released from prison. Its earliest incarnations took place during a time that homosexuality remained illegal in South Africa through a variety of pieces of legislation stemming from the apartheid regime and earlier.

The march took place each year through the long processes of Constitution writing and legislative reform. Its unbroken chain of existence through so many years and so much upheaval within society is incredibly impressive. Its continuity however belies the fact that it has, as an event, been in crisis for many of those years and there have been a number of occasions on which the holding of the event was uncertain till the last moment. It has almost since its inception been a space of contestation over multiple issues including its route, themes, level of commercialisation and political content. These points of conflict all exist within the framework of a conception of gay and lesbian community that is itself wracked with division along lines of race, class and gender. These divisions have profoundly influenced the ways in which this community developed historically and continue to influence to this day the distribution of power and privilege within this community and indeed the very critical question of who has the ability to create and define this community.

The history of gay and lesbian organising in South Africa from the 1960s onwards is in every way underpinned by the apartheid system, both its specific provisions related to homosexuality but also its broader policies of racial segregation and purity. Sodomy has been a criminal offence since the first settlers arrived in the Cape (Gevisser, 1995) but in addition to this the apartheid regime (through a process that will be considered in some detail later) further criminalised homosexual activity through amendments to the Immorality Act a piece of legislation known most commonly for its prohibition of inter-racial sexual activity. The provisions were very much integrated within the apartheid political and moral project of racial superiority. For this reason the ways in which the apartheid regime engaged with gay and lesbian people of different race groups were different. While not suggesting that the government was tolerant of homosexuality in non-white groups, indeed statistics would suggest the vast majority of sodomy convictions during these years affected black men, there was clearly a particularity to the ways in which the state engaged with white gay and lesbian people. In addition to the differentiation in the forms of state oppressions faced by gay and lesbian people of differing race groups, the policies of the apartheid regime also created a situation which made collective gay and lesbian activism unlikely. This both in terms of the physical restrictions it placed on interactions across racial lines but also because of the ideological divisions it created within which many people situated in spaces of racial power and privilege were unlikely to perceive more opportunity than threat from black gay and lesbian people.

Over a number of years the organised gay lesbian sector has developed the discourse and indeed the practice of non-racialism and clearly the formal barriers to racial integration within the gay and lesbian community have been dismantled. Despite this and in line with many aspects of South African society a great deal of segregation remains, this is particularly true in social spaces. There are very few times and spaces in the year in which the multiple groupings within the gay and lesbian community engage in common activities. Pride parades are important because they have the promise of providing one such space. While some parades, particularly those staged in townships, are overwhelmingly attended by one racial group, those

staged in major urban centres such as Johannesburg and Cape Town are possibly the most mixed spaces in terms of race, class and gender. It is for this reason that they inevitably become spaces of conflict around the needs and interests of gay and lesbian people and indeed around the very definitions of what it means to be gay and lesbian in South Africa.

This work situates Pride historically and currently within the context of the post-apartheid moment as well as the legacy of the apartheid regime in relation to both gay and lesbian community and South African society more generally. It tries to avoid suggesting a South African exceptionalism which ignores that fact that Pride parades across the world have been sites of conflict¹ or that academic literature questioning the notion of gay and lesbian community is prevalent in many countries. It does however recognise that Apartheid history and the post-apartheid project of nation-building have profoundly influenced the creation, recreation and daily practice of identities in this country.

The history of gay and lesbian communities in South Africa has been told through such seminal works as Gevisser's (1995) "A different fight for freedom" a section within the book "Defiant Desire" edited by Gevisser and Edwin Cameron. The history of Johannesburg Pride has also been told in some detail in De Waal and Manion's excellent 2006 work "Pride: protest and celebration." This latter book provides many of the texts including personal reflections that are analysed in this work. It hopes to give texture to many of the conflicts that have plagued pride from its earliest years. It hopes to make a contribution to both the queer theory project of problematising narrow concepts of gay and lesbian community and in addition to make a contribution to the project of understanding identity and specifically race in the post-apartheid period.

¹ See for example the controversy around the participation of Queers Against Israeli Apartheid in Toronto Pride in 2010 and the refusal of Judith Butler to accept an award at Berlin Pride in the same year.

Structure

This introduction serves to define the scope of the work undertaken in this research report, to provide information on methodology and also to clarify some of the terminology used throughout the rest of the work. Chapter two outlines the theoretical ideas that underpin this work, including the influence of queer theory, the critical consideration of the idea of gay and lesbian community and the intersection of identities particularly those related to race in both South Africa and internationally. Chapter three situates the history of the gay and lesbian community in South Africa, it shows the ways in which the history of gay and lesbian community developed from the 1960s and the very clear racialised and gendered ways in which this occurred, as a result both of the deep physical and ideological segregation created by the apartheid system and the differing ways in which oppression of all forms was perpetrated against different groups. Chapter four considers a brief history of Johannesburg Pride and then goes on to consider a number of the areas of contestation that have come to the fore throughout the history of Pride, in doing so it attempts to recognise the multiple layers of contestation.

Methodology

This work is based on the study of texts related to Pride from 1990 to the present day as well as those related to the gay and lesbian community more generally. These include memoirs of people who worked on and attended Pride events, official brochures, posters and advertising around events, news coverage in both the gay and lesbian press and in mainstream media and the minutes and correspondence of the organisers of Pride. For much of this information I am indebted to Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action the keepers of the only gay and lesbian archive in South Africa. While drawing on this archival material I am aware of the fact that there are a

number of issues related to the process of archiving including those related to what is archived and the process through which this takes place. Particularly in the case of South Africa, questions around which histories tend to make it into archives and which do not cannot be ignored. There is not scope within this work to fully explore these issues however it is important to be cognisant of them.

In addition to the archived material memoir style recollections of prominent individuals who have interacted in one way or another with Pride are used extensively. In doing so I draw on the work of Nuttall (2001) on the "Subjectivities of whiteness", in this work Nuttall analyses representations of whiteness within the autobiographical work of white South Africans. The short memoir pieces used in this work clearly do not represent an exhaustive set of opinions on the Pride event, nor are they necessarily comparable to one another given that each is written given the various foci and priorities of the writers. What they do allow for however is the unpacking of layers of meaning that can be found in such memoir style writing and also gives more scope for interpreting the ways in which issues of race, class and gender feed these memoirs both overtly and implicitly. In doing this of course it needs to be acknowledged that in the process of writing about themselves and their experiences they will inevitably tend to represent themselves in a positive light. For this reason it is important to maintain a level of critique. The other materials used in the work, for example the correspondence, minutes, news stories etc reflect only a certain range of perspectives. The idea is not to argue that for example the correspondence quoted represents the only or even the dominant view but rather that it provides a certain discourse that can be interrogated to understand its meanings and impacts. There are no direct interviews in this work, there are two main reasons for this, the first is my own positionality and my relationships with many of the people related to Pride, this is expanded on below. The second reason is that there was a particular interest in the reading and interpreting of texts and the particular perspective this provides.

I draw to a great extent on a Cultural Studies Methodologies in this work. The concept of Cultural Studies is a complex and contested one. I draw on Stuart Hall's (1997: 6) definition of Cultural Studies as, "a cluster (or formation) of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about, forms of knowledge and conduct associated with, a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society". This work is trans-disciplinary in nature, it draws on theoretical ideas and works across the fields of Politics, Sociology, and Geography among others, it is reflexive and self-conscious. It recognizes texts of many forms and does not dissociate those texts from the subjects they analyse. It recognises the complexity of the multiple systems of power both current and historical within which the subject of the work is situated. This approach assists me to recognise that the relationship between the gay and lesbian community in South Africa and the annual Pride event is complex. Each historically and to this day serves to create and recreate the other in ways determined through the circulations of power within the social movement and in its relationship to broader society. In turn, the texts that exist around the event both construct and are constructed by these same relations of power.

This work is not principally grounded within Social Movement Theory. This is both due to its specific focus on identity and the fact that the identification of gay and lesbian organising in South Africa as a social movement is deeply contestable. It cannot however deny the importance of this work and does draw on work on social movements both locally and international work (for example, Giugni, 1999; McAdam et al 1996; Tilly, 1978) and specifically that work such as Scott (1985) which attempts to integrate Social Movement Theory with identity based movements (also see Della Porta and Diani, 1999; Tarrow, 1994).

Johannesburg Pride is used as the case study for this work for a number of reasons. There are other parades across the country and each has its own interesting history and contestations. There is not space within this work to consider all the events to the level they might deserve although several are touched upon at various points. Johannesburg Pride makes a good case

because it was the first parade and has therefore the longest history and its history runs parallel to the history of the post-apartheid era, it is also by far the biggest Pride event in the country with very diverse attendees, this makes it an excellent space to consider each of the forms of contestation considered here.

Reflection

All academic work requires a level of self reflection and positioning. In relation to this work, it is important to recognise my positionality as a white, lesbian woman in South Africa. I have also worked in the organised LGBTI sector over a number of years. The debates around Johannesburg Pride are ones in which I often took part as an active participant, at times from a position of some influence. The work takes full cognisance of this and acknowledges that my own reading of situations and memories of both my own and other people's roles in debates in which I participated constitute in some ways just another text as ingrained within the networks of power and requiring of interrogation as any others.

As the work unfolded the limitations of the stated title became very clear. While race is probably the single most recognised and studied societal fault line in post-apartheid South Africa, it is clear that contestation around Johannesburg Pride is far more complex. Issues around race, gender, class, gender identity, sexual orientation and the multiple intersections between these identities are all key to understanding the contestations around Pride. The work therefore necessarily diverges from the title and this is acknowledged. The complexity that was revealed throughout the research could also not be fully captured given the word restrictions of this work and as a result certain aspects could only be flagged and not fully explored.

A note on terminology

In recent years the acronym LGBTI which stands for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender and Intersex has become the title of choice for most organisations in the sector and is increasingly used in the media, at times the “I” is left off, occasionally an “A” for asexual is added. The acronym is not used without a level of contestation; the question of representation and claims to representation is critical. Bisexual visibility is occasionally raised as an issue but more commonly the question of Transgender and Intersex representation is a point of conflict specifically related to the extent to which groups using the “T” and the “I” actually represent people identified as such.

Recently there have been some discussions around the use of a more broadly inclusive term such as queer, a move that would not only ease the problem of the ever enlarging and unwieldy acronym but also politically allow space for a different way of understanding identity that questions the need to assign essentialist identities and allow for a multiplicity of ways of being to be represented (Seidman, 1996:13). While the term queer is occasionally used colloquially in South Africa it is not embraced formally or used in a political sense. For this reason, though this work is firmly located within queer theory (expanded on in the following chapter) the term is not used to identify the subjects of this work.

While Johannesburg Pride has in the last few years used the LGBTI acronym in various contexts it has for most of its history defined itself as either a ‘Gay and Lesbian’ or ‘Lesbian and Gay’ event. The decision around whether to foreground the word gay or lesbian is not unconsidered. A number of groups, including at some points Johannesburg Pride, have chosen to use the term Lesbian and Gay in order to give “affirmative priority to ‘lesbian’” as De Waal and Manion (2006: 9) put it, in the light of the marginalisation of women within the community as well as in society more generally.

Throughout the research report, I use the phrase “gay and lesbian” to identify subject populations but fully recognise the limitations related to these indicators. Its use is in large part because this term, or its reverse, is used in the texts about Johannesburg Pride and also because it is the construction of the notion of a gay and lesbian community in South Africa that is the interest of this work. I specifically do not use the term LGBTI (except when making specific reference to organisations or events that use this acronym) as there is not space within this paper to begin to scratch the surface of issues related to the interaction of Transgender or Intersex people with Pride and indeed with their interaction with gay and lesbian people. The term LGBTI is often used too carelessly and this work is cognisant of this.

The Johannesburg Pride event has throughout its history been referred to as the Lesbian and Gay Pride March, the Gay and Lesbian Pride March, the Gay and Lesbian Pride Parade, the Lesbian and Gay Pride Parade, the Gay and Lesbian Parade and Festival and Joburg Pride. This work at times, and in order to be able to refer to issues that cut across the years, uses the phrases Johannesburg Pride or simply Pride to define its subject.

Theoretical Overview

Queer Theory

Seidman (1996) situates the foundations of queer theory within America in the 1980s. Ironically it was as attempts were made to strengthen the gay and lesbian movement in the face of the AIDS epidemic that the foundational assumptions of gay and lesbian community came under great challenge; “social differences within the gay and lesbian communities erupted into public conflict around the issues of race and sex” (Seidman, 1996: 10). Both feminist lesbians and non-white gay and lesbian people began to question the notion of community and argued that where a form of gay and lesbian community could be defined, it almost always represented the experiences of white gay men.

One way in which gay and lesbian activists responded to this crisis was to reaffirm even more strongly the biological foundations of a gay and lesbian community, following the assumption that as Irvine (1996: 226) puts it; “essentialism is a precondition for legitimacy”. Within the academic community however some did the opposite. Heavily influenced by poststructuralist theory, questioning stable identities and recognising the fluidity and multiplicity of peoples identities, they began to dispute the natural theory of homosexuality an indeed of sex in favour of one based on social constructionism, and they began to promote a “radical politics of difference” (Seidman, 1996: 11). As Steyn and Van Zyl (2009: 7) put it “critical queer scholarship has unearthed a variety of cultural permutations of sexual and (trans) gender subjectivities and identities that perform as dissident sexualities beyond the boundaries of normativity”.

Queer theory and indeed the word queer has come to have multiple meanings, at times being used as no more than a less cumbersome way of referring to the same constituency covered by the LGBTI acronym in all its forms. It is however about something much more than that. It

recognises that there is a vast multiplicity of ways of being that may include identifying as gay or lesbian or simply practicing a form of sexual expression that falls outside of heteronormative expectations, and that the attempt to homogenise this multiplicity of experiences into a united community is not only dangerous but at times counterproductive to the struggles that unity is an attempt to undertake. As Seidman (1996: 11) puts it

“Identities are always multiple or at best composites with literally an infinite number of ways in which identity components (e.g., sexual orientation, race, class, nationality, gender, age, able-ness) can intersect or combine. Any specific identity construction, moreover, is arbitrary, unstable and exclusionary.”

This work is clearly situated within queer theory. As was indicated in the introduction the term queer is rarely used. This is because to do so would be an inaccurate identification of the subject group, given that historically and indeed to this day the term queer has never been one generally used in the discourses around the community in South Africa nor is a term that very many people would use in self identification. The work is however still within the ambit of queer theory in so much as it recognises that much of the contestation around Johannesburg Pride is profoundly linked to questions of identity politics and specifically the creations and uses of the idea of a gay and lesbian community against the backdrop of severe race, class and gender inequalities.

Construction and contestations of community

It has been pointed out that conceptions of gay identity and ‘community’ went through a substantial change in the 1970s (Epstein, 1998). There was of course a notion of homosexuality and the existence of a deviant subculture of mostly homosexual men much earlier. Foucault (1976 and considered in Namaste, 1996) traces the construction of the category of homosexual to a more general interest in and increase in discourses around sexuality during the Victorian era. In 1956 Leznoff and Westley, in a paper entitled “The Homosexual Community” (reprinted 1998 in an edited collection) noted:

“the homosexual group provides on the only social context in which homosexuality is normal, deviant practices moral, and homosexual responses rewarded, the homosexual develops a deep emotional involvement with his (sic) group.” (Leznoff and Westley, 1998: 5).

It was only in the 1970s in developed countries that the notion of a positive community began to emerge (Epstein, 1998). This idea of a community was very different from (though in most cases inclusive of) the very limited vision of Leznoff and Westley of community as social and support networks. This new approach to community was a political act; as the struggle for gay and lesbian rights increased in visibility and ferocity there was an attempt to tap into struggles for minority rights by firmly identifying gay and lesbian people as what Stephen Murray (1998: 207) refers to as a “quasi-ethnic community”. Murray uses the example of the area in Toronto, Canada around Church and Wellesley streets to argue that it is possible to see examples of gay and lesbian community that mirror those of other minority groups in the city through the existence of certain indicators such as territorial location, shared values and norms and collective group action and solidarity (Murray, 1998). Levine (1998) considers many of the same issues in his work on Gay Ghetto’s across America. While both works do attempt to define community as something more than mere geographical locality they do still tend to revolve around a physical locality. The work relied on what Davis (1995: 286) calls “inflexible notions of identity” which used the same forms of methodology as were used to study other ethnic communities. This is clearly a very limiting understanding of community and does not really speak to the way in which the term is used in everyday language which is to mean any gay or lesbian person, usage that is both broad and limiting. It is broad in the sense that it covers all gay and lesbian people regardless of whether they themselves make any form of self identification with this community but it is also limiting in that it requires an essentialist labelling process in which membership of the community is based on all people being identifiable as either homosexual or heterosexual. The more modern usage of the acronym LGBTI and all its variants expand the number of people included within the community but maintain the same principles of inclusion and exclusion.

The idea that the mere sharing of a sexual orientation is enough to create community is a controversial and very problematic one. If a community is thought of as a group who have some level of shared experience, at times shared oppression and a set of collective needs and interests then it is very hard to identify such community. South Africa provides an interesting case in this regard. The level of socio-economic inequality is among the highest in the world; it remains even fifteen years after the formal end of Apartheid a country characterised by racial segregation and gender inequality. In this context we would have to question to what extent a black lesbian woman living in a township or rural area and a white gay man living in urban suburbia could possibly be considered to share any form of community. Indeed even a black lesbian woman living in an urban setting and a black lesbian woman living in a rural area may experience their identity in vastly different ways. Even when a certain number of shared oppressions and struggles can be discerned the impacts of the oppression and priorities for change may be entirely different. The use of term community given these issues becomes not just factually questionable but also extremely dangerous because in a context of severe power imbalances within those people defined as being part of the community, some people inevitably have greater power to define the needs and interests of the community, which then become the stated needs and interests of the whole, including potentially large numbers of people whose real needs and interests may be entirely different.

For all the contestation around the concept of a gay and lesbian community however its rhetoric, as Woodhead puts it, can clearly be located:

“published in the gay press, broadcast by other gay media, espoused in the language of reclamation politics and histories, promoted in the rhetoric of Pride, called upon in gay male-targeted HIV health promotion literature, and, of course talked about by many lesbian and gay men themselves” (Woodhead, 1995: 237).

To refuse to use the term therefore is unsatisfactory in that it creates a fissure between the theoretical recognition of its limitations and the reality of its use, day and in day out. The solution to this problem can be found in a reconsideration of the concept of community. Benedict Anderson in his work *Imagined Communities* speaking specifically of nations introduces the idea of the imagined community, imagined in the sense that “the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (Anderson, 1983: 15). He does not limit this notion to nations but considers all communities larger than those characterised by constant physical closeness and contact to be imagined. Following Anderson’s thinking on this issue allows us to critically analyse the idea of a gay and lesbian community without ultimately having to deny its existence. As Anderson goes on to say “Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined” (Anderson, 1983: 15).

This opens up two very critical questions that this paper hopes to tackle in relation to gay and lesbian community in South Africa, the first being how can the same community be imagined differently and the second being what is the price of this imagining of community. The first question inevitably speaks to questions of power in that the ability to define gay and lesbian community is linked to resources, those people within the community who have the greatest access to the media, both gay and mainstream, and the most powerful political platforms are those whose imaging will come to define the community. The second relates to what is lost when we try to fit a multiplicity of experiences into something definable as a community. It can serve to homogenise, suppress internal differences and create exclusionary boundaries (Woodhead, 1995: 237). A final important question around community is whether it is necessary. A strong argument could be made (and often is) that in the face of an overwhelmingly heterosexual and heteronormative society and any number of forms of discrimination only a strong community with a united face can possibly hope to protect and promote the needs of gay and lesbian people. This is however not universally accepted. As Butler (1991: 15) puts it: “Is ‘unity’ necessary for effective political action? Is the premature

insistence on the goal of unity precisely the cause of an ever more bitter fragmentations among the ranks?”

Perhaps the biggest questions within the gay and lesbian community (indeed around many identity communities) are around how to reconcile the need for unity with the appreciation of difference and specifically in relation to groups who face high levels of discrimination. How do you mobilise your community to struggle? In other words “social movements seem strong when they pivot around a unitary (racial, gender or sexual) identity but this heightened solidarity is purchased at the cost of increased internal repression” (Seidman, 1996: 22). The key problem around the need to suppress internal conflict in the interests of ‘strategic’ objectives is that it serves to entrench structures of power and privilege.

Pride

There is a distinct lack of academic study around Pride events, an extensive literature search turns up only a small number of works theorising Pride, more common are studies which use Pride events as a case studies of broader questions. An exception to this is Namaste’s (1992) work on Montreal Pride, considered further by Bell and Valentine (1995). Bell and Valentine are geographers and situate their thinking around Pride within the scope of work on sexuality and space it is perhaps not surprising given the spatial element that much of the work that does exist about Pride parades is situated within the discipline of geography. Clearly any analysis of Pride does need to take into account this body of work as the use of space, the claiming of space and the reconstitution of space is fundamental to all Pride events whether this is intentional on the part of their organisers or not. Early geographic work on gay and lesbian space was (as we have already seen) fixated on the identification and study of gay residential, commercial and/or social communities. This work was however very limiting and as Plummer (quoted in Bell and Valentine, 1995, Pg 8) puts it, geographical work has shifted toward “a concern with identity politics” in which they go on to say it “mirrors the general cultural and

postmodern theoretical turn within human geography as a whole". Pride events provide a fascinating subject for this form of geographic inquiry, involving as they do the simultaneous contestation of literal and theoretical space.

The issues that Namaste raised in relation to Montreal Pride as ones that as we shall see are very pertinent to Johannesburg Pride as well. They relate to the conflict that engulfed the event in 1991 and 1992. The 1991 event saw a rejection of the official parade which travelled only through the city's gay village and an unofficial march through the streets of the city (Bell and Valentine, 1995: 14). The official parade with its routing through safe, gay populated areas hoped to affirm these spaces but in doing so it also did not encroach on the city's heteronormativity. What marches through contested spaces, particularly those in city centres do is, as Bell and Valentine (1995) put it:

"by coming out into straight space, inevitably queered the streets; indeed queered the whole city. Important in this process in that the presence of queer bodies in particularly locations forces people to realise (by the juxtaposition 'queer' and 'street' or 'queer' and 'city') that the space around them, the landscape of Montreal (or wherever), the city streets, the males and motels, have been produces as (ambiently) heterosexual, heterosexist and heteronormative" (Bell and Valentine, 1995: 18)

The following year conflict erupted around an official set of regulations set out by the organisers which read:

"there was to be no cross-dressing, no exposure of breasts or buttocks, no displays deemed too vulgar or erotic, and no flags. As if the outlawing of extravagant fashion weren't enough, it was suggested that the preferred attire of the parade participants be blue jeans and a white T-shirt" (Namaste, 1992: 8).

The response was a drive to dress and act as 'outrageously' as possible on the part of opponents of the regulations who began asking searching questions around Pride like, "Who was it for? Who felt the pride, and what were they proud of?" (Bell and Valentine, 1995: 14). These are questions that perennially hang around pride events in many areas. Reddy (2001) makes the important point that disquiet around flamboyance at Pride events is not the sole prerogative of the socially conservative, even people who would consider themselves politically radical can feel that the over sexualisation of the parade may position it as a site of erotic voyeurism that distracts from its political message.

Theme and content are also common areas of conflict around Pride, Gamson (1995) writes about the immense conflict that broke out in San Francisco around the decision in 1993 to give the Pride parade that year the theme "The year of the Queer" (Gamson, 1995: 395). The conflicting opinions around the theme which Gamson suggests often divided along age lines related to among other things a debate between assimilationists who feared using politically provocative terms like queer and separatists who wanted to not only assert a non heteronormative sexuality but also contest the identity constructions that that underpinned the heterosexual/homosexual binary.

Another interesting theory which links Pride specifically to questions around community is McClintock's (1997) work on Commodity Spectacle or fetish spectacle as she also terms it. McClintock's work is around the creation of nationalisms. She follows Anderson's thinking around the imagined nature of community but suggests that the main way nationalism is created is through the "capacity to organize a sense of popular, collective unity through the management of mass, national, commodity spectacle" (McClintock, 1997: 102). In her 1997 work McClintock speaks about the creation of Afrikaner identity in South Africa and the use of fetish spectacle in this process, specifically she relates the story of the Tweede Trek in 1938 and its profound impact in the creation of a strong Afrikaner nationalism and community despite the lack of any real substantive foundations for such community. While clearly there is danger

in simply transplanting a theory based around one form of community on to another there is a clear resonance within McClintock's work with the creations of identity based communities other than national communities. Within this Pride events can be seen as relevant spaces of commodity spectacle.

Race and Sexual orientation

Among the many identity conflicts that exist within the gay and lesbian community the most commonly written about involve gender and race. In debates about the intersection of gender and sexual identities, there is attention to the ways in which lesbian women experience not only particular forms of discrimination and violation, but are also often face discrimination of gay men. The intersection of race and sexual orientation is one that gay and lesbian people of colour have to balance constantly, particularly in contexts in which there is a need to engage in struggles against both racial and sexual discrimination. Although there is an endless multiplicity of identities that an individual may carry and inhabit, it is most often the intersection of race, gender and sexual orientation that has been the subject of written work. As Hayfield (1995) puts it in relation to black lesbian women in Great Britain "in any examination of the discrimination that Black lesbians experience in Britain, we must examine the racism that exists against all Black people, the sexism against all women and the homophobia against all lesbians and gay men".

While there is clearly a powerful argument and indeed general acceptance that people have multiple identities and that they cannot but be at all times some combination of each of these, it is not at all uncommon for people to be called upon at various times to choose to give preeminence to one identity over another. This often occurs in relation to race and sexual orientation. Gregory Conerly suggests that the question which embodies the conflict for many African Americans is "Are you black first or are you queer?" (Conerly, 2001: Pg 7). The decision to give preeminence to one identity over another may be a matter of personal choice but can

also be forced upon people who in many cases are choosing not only a preeminent identity but also a preeminent struggle. This choice in many instances involves not only choosing to identify primarily within one identity group but also to suppress or turn a blind eye to discrimination based on another. This is often defended on the basis of a strategic necessity, a need for a united face. To give this united face it is expected that racism in gay and lesbian communities should be hidden or be tolerated and similarly that homophobia within black communities should not be openly challenged.

A number of academics, activists and writers have strongly contested the idea that they should be forced to choose between their many identities, pointing out not only the impossibility of doing so but also that their oppression is often a consequence of the intersections of multiple identities. Audre Lorde perhaps summed this up best when she says:

“As a black, lesbian, feminist comfortable with the many different ingredients of my identity, and a woman committed to racial and sexual freedom from oppression, I find I am constantly being encouraged to pluck out one aspect of myself and present this as the meaningful whole, eclipsing or denying the other parts of self” (Lorde, 1995: 289).

Simon Nkoli the former head of GLOW and one of the leading figures behind the first Johannesburg Pride march also spoke to this issue within specifically the context of the apartheid regime when he said:

“I am black and I am gay. I cannot separate the two parts of me into secondary or primary struggles. In South Africa I am oppressed because I am a black man, and I am oppressed because I am gay. So when I fight for my freedom I must fight against both oppressions.” (Simon Nkoli quoted in Ditsie's account of Pride in De Waal and Manion, 1996: 19).

Identity in Post-Apartheid South Africa

The Apartheid state was structured around the ordering and controlling of identities, particularly racial identities, in fact race became the pivot around which society was ordered “the apartheid state posited racial identities as paramount, defined and classified all people on the basis of them and arranged society accordingly.” (MacDonald, 2006:92). Ingrained in its racial project however was the need to control other forms of identity and behaviour as Gunkel states while the main thrust of the apartheid regime was to regulate racial identity it simultaneously “introduced laws that regulated the apparatus of race through sexuality by linking sexuality directly to race” she further states that “sexuality, within the apartheid project, was the biopolitical interface between the individual body and the population body.” (Gunkel, 2010: 29). Class identity was also ordered around the requirements of the regime as “the racial state gave economic expression to the disparities between the political experiences of belonging and not belonging (MacDonald, 2006: 4). The strict defining and process of ordering multiple identities was a fundamental project of the apartheid system. A project whose impacts are still being felt profoundly in post-apartheid South Africa.

MacDonald (2006) makes the very important point however that the apartheid state did not merely attempt to order pre-existing identities it also served to create them. He explains his core thesis as follows, that:

“South Africa’s races originated in political experiences as well as cultural similarities, they the white supremacist state made communities of ‘whites’ and ‘blacks’ by conferring citizenship on one and denying it to the other” (MacDonald, 2006” 3).

In addition to this the idea of ‘races’ within the apartheid state as MacDonald (2006: 2) puts it is “conceived relationally as mutually constituting and constituted”. My research also defines race primarily as a construction or set of constructions which assign meaning and power to certain groups of people. Summed up by Walker (2005:41) definition of race as “a complicated multiplicity of identifications producing, reproducing and transforming identities under

changing social and historical circumstances”. The notion of the construction of specific forms of whiteness and blackness by the apartheid system and by extension the construction of all the intersecting identities required to sustain the racial project is extremely important in understanding why identity is such a fundamental site of contestation in South Africa today.

The post-apartheid era has forced all South Africans into a process of renegotiating their identities. As Steyn (2001) puts it:

“South Africans, willingly or unwillingly, successfully or unsuccessfully, are engaged in one of the most profound collective psychological adjustments happening in the contemporary world....they are selecting, editing and borrowing from the cultural resources available to them to reinterpret old selves in the light of new knowledge and possibilities while yet retaining a sense of personal congruence.

In the immediate post-apartheid era there was an attempt to create discourses and national projects that promoted unity and emphasize the value in diversity rather than its negative possibilities. This is perhaps epitomized by the concept of the Rainbow Nation. The idea of the rainbow nation is one that was most prominent in the immediate post-apartheid era but continues to be pulled out when politically necessary. Fuelled by a need to engender a notion of collective South Africaness in the face of the deep and ongoing legacy of apartheid it was considered a way to pull people together in a way that recognised diversity and suggested that there was room for all people to coexist. As Cock (2003) puts it:

“The ‘rainbow’ emerged (and remains) a strong collectivist and inclusive symbol defining unity among the diverse peoples of South Africa and a source of national pride”

The notion was however also very problematic in large part because it served to become a blanket under which any number of ongoing inequalities, discriminations and abuses could be hidden, it does not deny difference but does downplay the importance of difference. More specifically as Gqola (2001: 99) states it involves “the inherent contradiction contained in a

label which superficially emphasises difference but prevents its discussion is enabled". The deafening silence around issues of identity (racial but also gender, class and sexual among others) whether motivated by a real buy in to the ideal of the rainbow nation or a deep seated fear of the possible consequences of not doing so means that for at least the first decade or so of democracy real discussion around identity politics was suppressed or at least pushed out of the public sphere. This has changed somewhat in the last few years as a little more space has opened for such discussion and in part this has opened the space for positive discussion around real ongoing inequalities and discriminations. It has however also opened the way for more questionable discourses a prominent one of these is around the perceived new oppression of white people at the hands of the black majority. An idea that Steyn in her analysis of narratives of whiteness in the new South Africa considers under the title of "This shouldn't happen to a white" (2001). This set of ideas around the persecution of white people politically and economically in South Africa today has become extremely powerful within white communities even though at least in the case of the latter it flies in face of all research which would seem to suggest as MacDonald states that "wealth is still distributed extremely unequally and economic inequality is still expressed racially" (MacDonald, 2006: 4) and indeed of common sense. Still, notions of white persecution have become very important in the ways in which white people understand their place in the new South Africa while clearly the very real ongoing inequalities faced by the majority of the population profoundly influence their identity formations.

The process of renegotiating identities has been particularly interesting for gay and lesbian people and particularly white gay and lesbian people for whom the transition has been a deeply contradictory process. This is not to suggest that it has not been so for black gay and lesbian people given that the transition to democracy has opened the space for the foregrounding of sexual identities which may well have previously been subsumed within the broader anti-Apartheid struggle but the situation for white gay and lesbian people is more contradictory. The apartheid system assigned great power and privilege to whiteness but also perpetuated a deep persecution of gay and lesbian people. The transition has forced white gay and lesbian people to engage simultaneously with the gain of great sexual freedom and the loss (at least formally)

of enormous racial power and privilege. Not all people of course will have experienced this transition in the same way. The priority given to differing identities and the different ways in which people experience both their whiteness and their gayness would all have an impact. The fact that it is considerably easier to hide one's homosexuality than one's whiteness of course also impacts the ways in which people would have interacted with both the apartheid and post-apartheid moments. As Gunkel (2010) states the various pieces of legislation used to criminalise homosexuality placed white gay and lesbian people on the margins of apartheid society but a margin that has its own complexities linked to, among other things, the ability to pass for straight which allowed access to racial privilege something denied to black gay and lesbian people. The ways in which both white and black gay and lesbian people have reinterpreted their identities within the post-apartheid era alongside the constructions of these identities which are a legacy of the apartheid system are fundamentally important to any analysis of how community is created, understood and contested in South Africa today.

Gay and Lesbian community and organising in South Africa

The early years and the Law Reform Movement

Homosexuality was criminalised both before and during the Apartheid regime through a number of pieces of legislation. Until the 1960s the primary legal mechanism used to criminalise homosexuality was the common law crime of sodomy² which continued to operate until it was declared unconstitutional in 1997 (Berger, 2008: 17) and formally struck off the books in 1998 by the ruling of the Constitutional Court in *National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality and another v Minister of Justice and others* (Reddy, 2011). In addition to this the 1927 Immorality act and its amendments³, while not expressly referring to homosexuality, had provisions related to 'unlawful carnal intercourse' that were considered to include public homosexual acts (Hoad, 2005: 16). The laws targeted only men and were based on the criminalisation of certain behaviours rather than identity. It was in the mid to late 1960s that the state began to explore legislative options that would serve to dramatically change the way in which the law engaged with gay and lesbian people, not only through a shift to the criminalisation of gay identity as opposed to gay sex but also through bringing lesbian women into the gaze of the law for the first time.

The Forest Town raid of 1966 was a turning point in the way in which the state engaged with homosexuality as a criminal offence and the ways in which gay and lesbian people mobilised in opposition to the state. Until the date of the raid there was a general disinterest on the part of the state in clamping down on homosexuality and with much homosexual socialising occurring in private there was a limit to what the system could do. Even in the months leading up to the

² The South African common law crime of sodomy was inherited from the Roman Dutch law brought to the country by the Dutch East India Company. While initially covering a number of sexual acts it was eventually refined to refer only to anal sex between men.

³ The act was first passed as the Immorality Act No. 5 of 1927, it was amended in 1950, 1957, 1967 and 1969. The act was rescinded in 1985 (Ratele, 2009: 295).

police raid there was no obvious increase in anti-gay activity or warning signs that there had been a change of policy from the police services of the regime more generally (Gevisser, 1995: 30).

On 20 January 1966 however everything about the systems of interaction between gay and lesbian people and the law changed. A private party in the affluent suburb of Forest Town, attended by a large number of largely well-heeled white gay men, was raided by the police (Gunkel, 2010: 52). The raid itself had limited consequences. It was not illegal for gay men to hold private parties and no alcohol was being sold. Nine men were arrested for “masquerading as a woman” while one was charged with indecent assault of a minor (Hoad, 2005: 16). The existing provisions in the Immorality Act could only be applied to public activities and therefore could not be applied to what was clearly a private party. The fall out following the raid was however immense. The press coverage of the raid expressed shock and disgust at the goings on and particularly at the identity of the participants. Indeed a great deal of the response appeared to be motivated by shock that such activity could have been taking place in such a respectable area and by implication involving such seemingly respectable men (Gevisser, 1995:30). The state responded almost instantly through the tabling of a piece of legislation which would greatly extend the criminalization of homosexuality in South Africa.

The Anti-Homosexuality Bill tabled in 1967 sought to criminalise homosexual identity (where previously only the act of sodomy was a criminal act). It also brought lesbian women into the ambit of legislation for the first time by providing for a standardised punishment of three years imprisonment for both men and women found guilty of homosexuality (Gevisser, 1995: 31). The bill was deferred until the following year, at which time it was reintroduced this time as an amendment to the Immorality Act. (Gevisser, 1995: 31). This fact is extremely significant. The Immorality act was the piece of legislation through which the Apartheid state legislated against inter-racial relationships and other forms of sexual ‘immorality’, as it included the policing of sexuality along the lines of race and sexual identity in one act. While homosexual acts had

previously been implicitly accepted as part of its provisions on unlawful carnal acts this would be the first time homosexuality was explicitly named within this Act.

The Act was a key part of the broader Apartheid project of racial purity and Christian morality. The decision to encompass the anti-homosexuality provisions into this particular piece of legislation speaks to the fact that the oppression of homosexuals was an integral part of that project. Retief (1995) in his paper 'Keeping Sodom out of the laager' expands on this point, showing how within the context of a regime representing a minority population fighting against an ever more powerful resistance movement, the need to grow and protect the purity of the white South African population became an urgent priority. South Africa was, as he put it "a country under siege and can only survive if it maintains its sexual purity and moral solidarity" (Retief, 1995: 109). Elder (1995), considering the targeting of white gay men specifically by the Act, makes the point that this issue is skewed somewhat by the fact that the history of the gay and lesbian community in South Africa is written largely by and from the perspective of white gay men. Nonetheless, like Retief he recognised that there was a specificity in the ways in which white male homosexuality (and to an extent white female homosexuality) threatened the Apartheid state and was therefore within the gaze of this new legislation in a way that homosexuality in non-white community may not have been. This is not to say that homosexual activity among non-white people was accepted by the state. As Elder points out, between July 1966 and June 1967, the period immediately after the raid 147 of the 162 sodomy cases heard in South African courts involved black men (Elder, 1995: 62). When differentiating homosexual activity from homosexual identity however it is clear that it was the homosexuality of white people, particularly men, was a threat to the 'moral basis of the populace' (Elder, 1995: 62). This differentiation had a great impact on how gay and lesbian community and activism developed, as Elder puts it;

"The differential consequences of homosexual activity, depending on racial classification and class position amongst other things, has made itself felt in present imposed essential notions that inform current sexuality studies in South Africa". (Elder, 1995: 58)

There was an immediate response to the proposed bill from gay and lesbian people who were rocked by the provisions contained within it, including the threat of prison sentences for those found guilty of homosexuality and the threat of the removal of the distinction between public and private space. The movement which sprang up following the Forest Town raid became known as the Law Reform Movement (Gevisser, 1995: 32) and was the first organized gay and lesbian political initiative in South Africa. Its primary goal was to raise funds in order to retain a firm of attorneys to fight the proposed legislation. The Law Reform Movement was almost entirely constituted by white, gay, middle class men (Gevisser, 1995: 32). While there is ample evidence that gay and lesbian social organising was taking place within various race and class groups (see Zackie Achmat's *Apostles of Civilised Vice*, for some such stories) it was specifically white gay men who were both the initial targets of police activity and the resistance to this activity. Ultimately the vast majority of the provisions mooted as amendments to the Immorality Act were dropped and only three were adopted. The first was an increase in the age of consent for homosexual activity, the second was the very contentious 'three men at a party' clause which stated that any homosexual activity taking place in a place at which more than two men were present constituted a crime, and thirdly a ban was placed on dildos.⁴

The outcome was viewed as a great victory for the Law Reform Movement and indeed given the harshness of the bill as it was first mooted the ultimately passed provisions could be viewed as far less punitive. Those provisions were however profoundly important for a number of reasons. One is that for the first time the government had been seen to act against identity rather than behaviour. Another is that for the first time anti-homosexuality provisions were explicitly brought into the legal frameworks of the broader Apartheid system. In doing so it made explicit within the apartheid project of identity control the links between race and sexuality and the need to police both simultaneously. It also served to further blur the distinction between the public and the private around sexuality. All of these facts would come

⁴ The banning of dildos by the Immorality Act is probably the least considered of the three amendments eventually adopted, often considered as little more than amusing evidence of the bizarre nature of the Apartheid state, Gunkel (2010, 57) however offers a very interesting analysis of why this provision was one of those retained.

to have a profound impact on the ways in which the gay rights struggle was able to situate itself within the anti-Apartheid struggle in years to come.

The immediate aftermath of the passing of the bill however saw the rapid collapse of the Law Reform Movement, created with the goal of achieving a single objective. Apparently satisfied with the, albeit still problematic outcome, the organization melted away as its members returned to their largely hidden existences. It was not until the 1980s that organized political activity would again be seen around issues of gay and lesbian rights.

From the earliest attempts at organisation within gay and lesbian communities there has been a tension between the social function of such organization and its political voice. (Gevisser, 1995) this tension was never more apparent than in the 1980s. It was during this time that gay organizations began to spring up that challenged the state. Inevitably, in the process of defining this new activism, divisions within gay communities began to become clear and the disconnection between the needs and expectations of various groups came to the fore.

National movements from GASA to GLOW

The Gay Association of South Africa was formed in April 1982 (Gevisser, 1995: 48). It followed a number of attempts to start small scale groups in various parts of the country. Most of these groups were based around providing social support for gay and lesbian people and specifically white gay and lesbian people and indeed this was GASA's initial intention. From its earliest stage GASA struggled to negotiate the issue of its political positioning within the Apartheid system, a negotiation it never entirely resolved and that would turn out to be much of the reason for its ultimate demise. GASA had an explicit policy of being apolitical. For them this meant as Gevisser (1995: 51) puts it "firstly remaining non-aligned in broader South African politics, and secondly, following a moderate, non-confrontational and accomodationist

strategy.” Or as their mission statement read they were the “non-militant, non-political answer to gay needs” (Croucher, 2002: 318). Despite this claim to be apolitical there were clearly aspects of GASA’s stated aims that were deeply political and could potentially have put them on a collision course with the Nationalist government if they had chosen to push them. GASA however, consistently failed over a period of time to step up on issues that would require a critique of the state. For example, in 1982 a situation arose in which a number of white lesbian women were fired from their jobs with the South African Railway Police. GASA initially refused to do anything and even when heavily pressured did nothing beyond writing a letter of complaint. The organisation’s reasoning behind their failure to act was essentially that they were too small to change the situation and their work would be compromised by getting into conflict with the government (Gevisser, 1995: 51). This failure would set the tone of what was to come; it was the failure of GASA to speak out against the racist policies of the apartheid state (even when they pertained to black gay and lesbian people) that sealed their fate.

GASA did not bar black gay and lesbian people from joining the organization and indeed a number did. Prominent among them was Simon Nkoli who not only joined but also created a support group within GASA for members who were not white. From the earliest stages it was clear that the organization was unwilling to speak out in defence of black members. When a function was organized at a venue that turned out to be a whites-only venue, white members continued with the event even though a number of non-white members in attendance were forced to remain outside. The issue came to a head however when in 1985 Nkoli was charged with treason along with a number of United Democratic Front activists and tried in the Delmas Treason Trial. GASA repeatedly refused to support Nkoli, a refusal that not only alienated black members of the organization but also had far broader ramifications. Among the most profound of these was GASA’s expulsion from the International Gay and Lesbian Association (ILGA) in 1987 due to their ongoing unwillingness to openly condemn the Apartheid regime (Cock, 2003). Once again the reasons given by the GASA for this failure were all related to a fear of being seen to rock the boat, a feeling that they were too small and vulnerable to challenge the state and their commitment to their apolitical ideal. Underlying these arguments however was the

very real issue of racism and conservatism within the white gay and lesbian community. As Gevisser (1995: 45) put it, given “the level of political oppression in South Africa: any talk of ‘rights’ was regarded with suspicion not only by the authorities but also by the conservative white gay community itself, which eschewed any identification with the broader liberation struggle.” White gay men in particular had a great deal to lose through the attainment of the goals of the anti-apartheid struggle. While the state did discriminate greatly against them on the basis of their sexual orientation a level of discretion could buy access to all the power and privilege that went with being white and male in Apartheid South Africa, power and privilege that would be endangered with the end of the regime. GASA’s supposed policy of remaining apolitical was in fact a very clear political project of accommodation in which there was a decision to negotiate space within the apartheid regime and not oppose it.

This was never seen more clearly than during the 1987 white parliamentary elections. GASA ignored a call from the anti-apartheid movement to boycott the elections and instead encouraged gay voters to vote for candidates with pro-gay policies regardless of their party affiliation. In Hillbrow, an area of Johannesburg with a large gay population, a National Party candidate with pro-gay policies won the seat from the incumbent PFP candidate. The result was lauded as an example of the power of the gay community. The implication was clear: to GASA the fact that the National Party candidate supported gay rights mattered more than the fact that he represented a party engaged in perpetrating one of the worst systems of violent racial discrimination the world had ever seen. Far from being apolitical GASA had in fact shown clearly that they would actively support racial repression if it was in the interests of white gay people (Gevisser, 1995: 61)

It was the inability and/or unwillingness of GASA to connect their struggle with the broader struggle for human rights in South Africa, along with a great deal of internal conflict, that led to the eventual collapse of GASA. Even before this however new organizations had begun to appear within South Africa for whom the connection was obvious and desirable and it was

these organisations which took the political space that GASA was unwilling to take. The Gay and Lesbian Organisation of the Witwatersrand was formed in 1988 by Simon Nkoli upon his release from prison and in response to the abject unwillingness of GASA to support him in any way during his trial and imprisonment. The GLOW membership was mostly black and was drawn particularly from gay and lesbian communities in Soweto and KwaThema (Gunkel, 2010: 66), as well as a number of progressive white activists who were equally disenchanted with GASA. GLOW was an overtly political organisation that situated itself squarely within the broader anti-apartheid struggle and recognised the indivisibility of human rights. At around the same time as GLOW was working on the Witwatersrand like-minded organisations were being set up in other parts of the country, specifically in the Cape Province where the Lesbian and Gay Organisation (LAGO) and then the Organisation of Lesbian and Gay Activists OLGA were set up by a small group of lesbian and gay activists who though mostly white middle class intellectuals had strong struggle credentials and were increasingly disillusioned with GASA (Croucher, 2002: 319). OLGA joined the United Democratic Front and began caucusing within that organisation around the role of gay and lesbian rights within the new power dispensation that was clearly now inevitable (Sunday's Women Newsletter, October 1990). GLOW was undertaking similar work in the Witwatersrand and perhaps their most important single action and the one of most importance to this work is that in 1990 they organised the first gay and lesbian pride march in South Africa through the streets of Johannesburg.

The National Coalition years

The National Coalition for Gay and Lesbian Equality (NCGLE) was formed in 1994 (Reddy, 2001: 178). It was a coalition of gay and lesbian organisations created for one specific purpose, that being campaigning for the inclusion of sexual orientation in the new Constitution for the Republic of South Africa which was in the process of being drafted. The actual size of the coalition is a deeply contentious issue; at one time there was a claim that over 70 organisations were members of the coalition though the real number of actual functioning members was far

lower. The NCGLE was successful in its attempts and sexual orientation was included in the extensive list of grounds in the equality clause in the bill of rights in the Constitution.

Following this victory the coalition turned its attention to using the equality clause to overturn a series of pieces of legislation that discriminated against gay and lesbian people. Using what it referred to as its 'shopping list' (Berger, 2008: 18) they set about an ambitious litigation strategy through which they were able to change the law on any number of issues from adoption, to access to medical insurance and concluding with gay marriage. This litigation strategy was very successful and case after case was won, the crowning moment being the passing of the Civil Union Bill in 2006 that legalised marriage rights for gay and lesbian couples. During this time the Coalition had formalised itself into a non-governmental organisation called the Lesbian and Gay Equality Project. A new structure the Joint Working Group was set up in 2003 to replace in some part the role that the coalition had played in bringing together the diverse groups working within the organised gay and lesbian (or LGBTI as it became commonly known) sector (Kraak, 2008: 279).

The struggle around the constitution and the subsequent litigation process provided a common goal for those people working on gay and lesbian issues and created for a number of years an impression of unity within which all of the gay and lesbian community appeared to be pulling together for a common cause. Of course this impression was not necessarily a reflection of the reality, Cock makes the point that:

“the unity of the gay rights movement should not be overemphasized...the movement was fragmented, splintered politically and divided along race, gender, class and ideological lines” (Cock, 2003: 36).

The NCGLE nonetheless was extremely successful in achieving its stated objectives, not only securing the protection of sexual orientation in the final Constitution but also winning a series of stunning victories through the legal system. It was able to do this in part by setting very specific goals and trying to achieve them in the least controversial manner, there was a

deliberate decision not to use the language of gay rights but instead to focus on equality and the uniformity of all discriminations in a way that spoke to the broader process of removing legislated inequality more broadly (Cock, 2003; 40). The very specific nature of the demands being made was a large part of the ability to maintain cohesion within the coalition, not unlike the Law Reform Movement in 1968 the single issue focus of the NCGLE facilitated broad participation.

Despite this clear focus and its influence on the cohesion the unity within the community still required a certain level of engineering. Beverly Ditsie (a well known activist during the NCGLE years) makes the point in her discussion with Gunkel (2010: 71) that the common cause was not simply the result of an obvious strategy to achieve an obvious goal that was commonly understood, it was in fact engineered by the NCGLE who actively played down differences and structured its operations in such a way as to give the least possibility for internal conflict. One example of this pointed out by Ditsie was that in areas where organisations were known to differ from the coalition policy the NCGLE would simply start a new organisation even if it only had a few members and then give that organisation membership of the coalition (Gunkel, 2010). This not only significantly bumped up the number of member organisations that the coalition could claim but also ensured that all its members were pulling toward a common political vision while marginalising any groups with differing views. Oswin (2007) expands on this idea suggesting that while the National Coalition appeared to be a coalition of independent organisations in practice control fed from the coalition to its members and not the other way round. A quotation from an anonymous founder member of the coalition in Oswin's paper states "the community was made through the National Coalition...or the idea of a community was made by this idea of an umbrella body" in other words "the NCGLE performatively constitutes the very community on the behalf of which it claims to be acting" (Oswin, 2007: 49).

This insight is key to understanding the state of gay and lesbian activism from the mid-1990s until perhaps the mid 2000s. The coalition provided the appearance of a strong, united

community fighting for its collective interests when in fact there was a relatively small number of people undertaking what was a fairly conservative project of legislative reform within which the mobilisation of a mass movement was deliberately not undertaken. The limited scope of the work undertaken did not allow for any real interrogation of fissures within the community and the lack of real mass participation allowed little space for debate on these fissures to take place. As Oswin (2007:) puts it:

“when the NCGLE came into being, it opted to pursue a politics of strategic essentialism that ignored the ways in which class, race and gender issues are inevitably intertwined with sexuality. Thus, it deepened community schisms along these lines and made its self-imposed task of building a strong, cohesive gay and lesbian movement in the post-apartheid era that much more difficult”

During these years there were limited spaces in which these contestations around race, class and gender within the broader community could play themselves out. Pride was one of these spaces and as will be shown it remained an important space of contestation throughout these years.

New era, new challenges

In the years since the passing of the Civil Unions Act the organised gay and lesbian sector has had to rethink and reposition itself to face a new set of issues and concerns. Many of these relate to the very divergent ways in which gay and lesbian people have been able to access and gain full benefit from the legal rights won during the 1990s and early 2000s. Specifically the issue of rising levels of hate crime⁵ have caused a fundamental shift in the sector and its work. While no one is immune to violence based on their sexual orientation a very definite trend has

⁵ Whether levels of hate crime are rising or not is a controversial topic, there is an argument that this is merely assumption given that there is a lack of any information on levels of homophobic violence in non-white communities who were rarely if ever the focus of work within the sector prior to the early 2000s.

emerged around the targeting of black lesbian women for assault, rape and murder. In 2000 a group of lesbian women were gang-raped after leaving the Johannesburg Pride after-party (Dirsuweit, 2006: 325). Since then there have been numerous reports of rapes from all over the country in which the sexual orientation of the victim was known or strongly suspected to be the motive for the attack. There have also been a number of very brutal murders such as that of Zoliswa Nkonyana in 2006, Eudy Simelane in 2008 and Noxolo Nogwaza in 2011 to name but a few.

This new challenge has not only caused a shift in focus within the organised sector but indeed a fundamental shift in the makeup of the sector with organisations like the Forum for the Empowerment of Women and numerous township based CBOs (Community Based Organisations) being set up to deal specifically with these issues. This has inevitably led to a shifting of and contestation over power between the white gay men who traditionally constituted the leadership of LGBTI organisations and the black lesbian women often with a strong background in feminist politics and the liberation struggle who entered the sector. This has also engendered something of a disconnection between the sector and the spaces of social activity, pink consumption and gay and lesbian media which are in most cases still controlled by white gay men.

Another issue influencing the community greatly relates to the relationship between gay and lesbian communities and the political system. In the early days of Johannesburg Pride and earlier, when GLOW was prominent, there was a very definite connection between the struggle for gay and lesbian rights and the ANC. While not without some internal discussion the ANC honoured this connection by giving prominence to gay and lesbian issues and were largely responsible for the ultimate inclusion of the sexual orientation clause in the interim and then final Constitutions. While there has always been deep suspicion toward the ANC from many segments of the gay and lesbian population, Gevisser (1991) points out that from the earliest days of Johannesburg Pride many people were troubled by the connection to the ANC.

However, even the most anti-ANC of gay people probably had some sense that their best hope for equality and protection lay with that party. This remained true to an extent right up until 2005 when the Civil Unions Bill was passed through Parliament in large part due to the ANC forcing its MPs to vote yes (BBC report, November 2006). For many white gay people the Democratic Alliance, with its overtly pro-gay agenda, has become the party to support. For many black gay and lesbian people with strong historical links to the ANC either personal or familial, and who still perceive the ANC as the party that represents their interests, the DA however offers very little. This has created a division not absolutely based on race but which very often fissures along race lines around attitudes to the ANC and indeed to the state.

While the sector retains a level of cohesion this is tested as organisations look to their own constituencies and realise that the needs and expectations are not the same. Kraak (2008: 280) in his reflections on the Civil Union Act states “I believe that in South Africa today we have a genuinely non-racial gay and lesbian movement, which has struck roots in townships and rural areas. It is a movement in which there is increasingly a commitment to poor and black LGBTI people”. This statement is interesting on a number of levels, not least the fact that the comment about increasing commitment to poor and black LGBTI people implies that the default position of the sector from which it is moving remains a commitment to rich and white LGBTI people. Also interesting is that later on the same page Kraak comments that “the community remains divided and the fault-lines of race, class and gender persist. In the world of the commercialised club scene, patronised by a mainly white and male clientele, there is little notion of solidarity or common experience with those seeking to find safe spaces in township or rural areas”. What this speaks to either a highly romanticised view of collectivity within the organised sector or a profound disconnect between the sector and the community it seeks to represent.

Johannesburg Pride

Historical Overview

The first Gay and Lesbian Pride march held in South Africa (and indeed in Africa) took place on October 13, 1990. This was a time of great political turmoil in South Africa, Nelson Mandela was released from prison in that year and the transition to democracy had begun, but the first democratic elections and the Constitution with its protections for gay and lesbian people were still many years away. There may be multiple reasons related to the political context in the country generally which explain why 1990 was the year selected for the first march. Lurink (1998) quotes Simon Nkoli and suggesting that the release of Nelson Mandela and the unbanning of the ANC had encouraged a belief that the time was right. Another important reason for the march taking place when it did was that in 1988 the ANC in exile had produced a set of draft Constitutional guidelines, this document did not include any reference to gay and lesbian rights. Organisation such as OLGA and GLOW were well aware that they probably had a fairly small window of opportunity to get gay and lesbian rights on to the agenda for the political transformation that now appeared inevitable and undertook a number of strategies to achieve this aim. One of the key strategies employed particularly by GLOW was related to creating visibility and within this the 1990 gay and lesbian pride march was a vitally important event (Gunkel, 2010).

The march was organized by GLOW and was overtly political in nature. Gevisser (1995) describes the parade as the flagship for the new form of gay and lesbian activism that disavowed the previous focus on single issue activism and reflected the new movement to situate gay and lesbian issues within the broader struggle for rights in South Africa. The theme of the march that year was “Unity in the Community” (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 13), an interesting choice since in the midst of great political upheaval, the message of that first Pride was aimed clearly at its own fractured constituency. The organisers also called on heterosexual

South Africans to join in; the Manifesto for the first march included “A call to all South Africans who are committed to a non-racist, non-sexist, non-discriminatory democratic future: Join us in the first lesbian and gay pride march”. (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 15). The march attracted a diverse crowd, some of whom famously chose to march with paper bags covering their faces due to fear of the legal and social consequences of being seen at the march. An OLGA activist who travelled to Johannesburg for the march describes the crowd in attendance as follows:

“There was a fascinating cross-section of lesbian and gay people there, a really motley assortment including very heavily butch-femme lesbian couples a few flamboyant ‘queens’ whom the press of course chose to function heavily, lots of very conventional looking people and the bar types through to the left wing types.” (OLGA News, Feb 1991).

The march succeeding in pushing the dual messages of the demand for the rights of gay and lesbian people and the need for an end to the Apartheid regime. Placards and slogans at the rally carried such messages as ‘Dykes for Democracy’, ‘Lesbians and Gays Against Apartheid’, and “We’re here, we’re queer, we’re everywhere”, “hey hey hey, ho ho ho, homophobia’s got to go” (Sundays Woman Newsletter, November 1990).

Though relatively small compared to the large parades of later years, the success of the 1990 march encouraged activists to push ahead with efforts to make the march an annual event. The 1991 Pride March went ahead on 12 October 1991. Over 500 marchers took part and despite the fact that homosexuality remained as criminalised as it had been the year before, paper bags were largely done away with. The theme that year was “March for Equality” a shift from the previous year’s call for internal unity to an outward demand. This was matched in 1992 when the theme of Pride was “Marching for our rights”. The linked themes of rights and equality speak to the process ongoing in South Africa at the time of negotiating the principles that would underpin the new South Africa and particularly its new Constitution. Through these years Pride continued to be organised by a small number of dedicated activists mainly affiliated to GLOW, such as Simon Nkoli, Donne Rundle and Beverly Ditsie, Roy Shepherd among others.

1993 was an interesting year in part because it marked the first pride march in Cape Town, organized by a group of activists who had travelled to Johannesburg the year before to take part in the march it was the first march to be inspired by the Johannesburg event and while the Cape Town Pride took place only intermittently in those early years it has since also become a regular annual event.

The Johannesburg event that year was also special in that it took place literally days after the political negotiations for a new dispensation in South Africa had approved a section of the interim Constitution related to the protection of fundamental human rights. This section included fourteen grounds on which discrimination would be expressly prohibited, including sexual orientation (Edwin's Speech). This ground breaking achievement, unprecedented anywhere in the world, lent an immense sense of celebration to the march that year. Underneath this euphoria however tensions were simmering. The attendance that year was poor and there were questions within the gay and lesbian community about the leadership of the event. The following year would see great upheaval within the organizing of the pride with both a change in leadership and in focus.

In 1994 Paul Stobbs a gay man dismayed with the poor turnout of the previous year's march took over the chairmanship of the Johannesburg Pride. His perspective was radically divergent to that of the previous organisers and his political positioning was also entirely different. Stobbs was involved in Pride for a number of years in a variety of capacities including chairing the event from 1994 to 1995. These years saw a vast growth in the scale of the event and with this the growth of commercial interest. In 1998 there was another major shift in the running of Pride. Sharon Cooper became the co-chair of pride with Ian McMahon in 1998 and Carrie Shelver in 1999. (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 109). There was a gender transformation on the committee in these years that saw a large number of lesbian women joining the organising committee. This created a level of tension. As Cooper quoted in De Waal and Manion (2006: 108) put it "Pride was a private boys' club when we came on board in 1998. Some of the guys

were upset that they were no longer able to make unilateral decisions, and responded by not offering their resources or connections". Gary Bath who was on the organising committee of Pride for a number of years is quoted in De Waal and Manion (2006: 163) on this issue. He says that there appeared to be such a clash between the men and women on the committee that a vote was held at which the name of the event was changed from the "Gay and Lesbian Pride Parade" to the "Lesbian and Gay Pride Parade." This statement is curious in that it is clear from looking at all the branding materials from the early years of pride that the name of the event for its first few years was the "Lesbian and Gay Pride March." The precedence of Gay over Lesbian came about only during the Stobbs era and at the same time that the word Parade was substituted for march. The decision to officially name the parade as the Lesbian and Gay Pride Parade which actually took place earlier than Bath suggests (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 9) therefore constituted only a return to the original name of the event with parade substituted for march after only a couple of years of the use of the name Gay and Lesbian.

The board in 1998 and 1999, infused with a strong feminist discourse, tried to bring a political consciousness back to the annual Pride event, particularly in relation to what they saw as an absence of lesbian women and engagement with the needs of lesbian women in the parade. But issues related to race continued to simmer. While the parades continued to be relatively successful in terms of organisation and attendance there were clear problems, the organising committee was riven with internal conflicts and the parade was beginning to regularly run at a financial loss. In 1999 the parade made a loss of R60 000 (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 109). Although this amount is not huge for an event of its size, it is indicative of the ways in which pride had changed so radically that within 10 years it had gone from being organised on a shoestring budget to being able to operate at a loss of R60 000. The following few years would be particularly bleak for the event with ongoing financial losses and deep division and conflict over organisational issues.

In 2001 following crisis talks involving a number of gay and lesbian organisations and individuals to stop an alternative Pride event being organised by activists deeply angry at what they considered the growing racial exclusivity of the event, a committee chaired by Daniel Somerville and Donna Smith and supported by the Lesbian and Gay Equality Project did manage to put together a pride event. It was fairly successful and managed to avoid the massive debts of earlier years but by the end of that year Pride was in crisis. Successive organisers had been worn down by the strain of organising the parade and negotiating the multiple conflicts it involved, there was a massive debt crisis created by years of running the event at a financial loss and there was huge disagreement on a way forward. At this time Gary Bath stepped in once again, this time through his company Pride Communications CC (Joburgnews.co.za, 2003). His plan was to take over the running of the annual pride event as a private company and run it as a commercial venture. This was a deeply controversial idea and many activists were appalled at the idea of the event being run by a private company and particularly at the idea that the name of Pride could be trademarked and used then exclusively by this company. Nonetheless Bath stepped into a vacuum and there was a lack of a concerted capacity to challenge him or offer a sustainable alternative on the part of the organised sector.

The first Pride Parade organised by Bath was in 2002 and in this year the long debated decision was finally taken to move the event away from the inner city and to Zoo Lake in Rosebank. It remained there until 2005. The Bath years saw big commercial events being staged but with continued heavy financial losses. Writing in De Waal and Manion's (2006) book Bath attributed this to the very large debt inherited by Pride which made it hard to raise money because the reputation of the event for financial accountability was nonexistent. The fact is though that Pride continued to lose money all through his tenure. The most embarrassing incident being when R210 000 raised at the 2004 event for Nkosi's Haven, a charity working with children infected with HIV was never paid despite a large cheque being handed over (Mambaonline article, 11 May 2006).

In 2004 there was a decision for the first time to charge an entrance fee to attend the Pride festivities, this was deeply controversial as many people believed that Pride was a community event and should be open to all members of the community. It was not until 2005 that a decision was made by Bath to take the route of Pride back through the streets of the city to conclude at the Heartlands, a relatively short-lived geographic concentration of gay clubs in Braamfontein. The event was marred however by the serious injury of a participant who was hit by a bottle thrown from a building on the route. The woman's life was saved due to the quick action of other marchers and paramedics but the incident cast a shadow over the day. It soon became used as further proof that it was not safe to march through this part of the city and further justification for the eventual permanent move to Zoo Lake. This was an irony given that the injured woman was participating with the Forum for the Empowerment of Women (FEW), an organisation that has consistently supported a city march and objected to the de-politicisation of the event. It was FEW who in 2004 had initiated the Soweto Pride event. The Soweto march has never been billed overtly as an alternative to Johannesburg Pride. Indeed its placement a week before was intended to bracket the activities that traditionally took place in the week leading up to Johannesburg Pride. It is however an overtly political march which attempts to speak to the violation of rights and violence that continued to affect LGBTI people and specifically black lesbian women.

2006 represented possibly the darkest moment in the history of Pride. No one seemed willing to step forward and organise the event and it was unclear for a great deal of the year whether there would be a pride event or not. The Lesbian and Gay Equality Project which had for many years provided a certain level of consistent support to the various organisers of Pride collapsed that year following stunning accusations of financial mismanagement against its then director, leaving a massive void in the organised gay and lesbian sector and in the running of pride. The previous year's chairperson Paul Tilly was unwilling to carry on in that capacity and while both Gary Bath (despite his deeply controversial status) and Bruce Walker (a prominent club owner) expressed some interest in organising the event there appeared to be no unifying force that could facilitate the project (Mambaonline article, 11 May 2006). Ultimately Bath did take on the

event which took place in September 2006 but the late planning, lack of any communication and general unhappiness that had marred its organisation ensured that the event would be highly problematic. Perhaps the most significant legacy of the 2006 event was the decision to move the parade back to Zoo Lake where it has remained to this day. During 2006 negotiations began between prominent gay individuals, LGBTI organisations and the LGBTI media around what would become a new structure set up to take over the organisation of Johannesburg Pride

In 2007, following years of conflict and a series of pride events which, while well attended, were financially disastrous, a group of concerned individuals came together to create a new structure to run pride, this group are defined on the Johannesburg Pride web site as “organisers, all with considerable skills and experiences in relevant fields and not linked to troubled events” (Joburg Pride Web site). A Section 21 not for profit company was created under the name of the Joburg gay pride festival company (Wells, 2007). The structure was very much based on the model of Cape Town Pride which had formed itself some years earlier into a Section 21 company with a board drawn from prominent members of the gay and lesbian community in Cape Town. Indeed the first Chairperson of the new Johannesburg board, Tracey Sandilands, had previously worked on Cape Town Pride (Mambaonline news article, 2006). The event this new structure created became branded and known simply as “Joburg Pride.”The removal of the words gay and lesbian from the name may have allowed the new structure to dodge the controversial question of which to place before the other but it has also led to accusations that both the board and its sponsorship partners deliberately understate the gay and lesbian aspect of the event to make it more attractive and less threatening to heterosexuals. This accusation is questionable given that the identity of the event is very overt despite the absence of the words from the name but it is nonetheless another chapter in the story of the naming of Pride that had been unfolding ever since 1990. Since 2007 a number of very successful, large and financially sound Pride events have been held in what has almost certainly been the most stable period in the tumultuous history of Pride. Despite this however, controversy continues to abound both in relation to the structure that runs Pride (specifically its racial composition) and the long standing points of conflict around the route, political content

and commercialisation of Pride. These conflicts have played out through a number of specific incidents, among these being the Bring it to Soweto campaign in 2007 and the controversy around the organisation of an official after party in 2010. I will address these below.

Johannesburg Pride has changed immensely through its two decade long history. The massive, commercially marketed and slickly run events of the last few years seem a million miles away from the iconic images of the few hundred people, many covering their faces with paper bags, who took part in the first march in 1990. What is clear however, is that through its tumultuous history, through changes in leadership and in focus one of the few consistencies around pride is to be found in the conflicts that have surrounded the event. Some of these will be fleshed out in the coming sections.

City streets to suburban sidewalks

Until 2002 the annual Pride parade always took place in and around the inner city of Johannesburg. Although neither the route of the march nor the start and end points were the same in all years there were certain areas that the parade regularly traversed: the CBD, Braamfontein, Newtown, Hillbrow and Yeoville. All are central to the city and many have important significance to the history of gay and lesbian organising in the city. Almost from the start however there were questions asked around other possible locations, particularly the idea of moving the march out of the city and into the suburbs. However it was not until the mid 1990s that these questions were asked openly. The 1996 pride parade drew a large crowd and was considered a great success by the organisers but it was also a year in which a number of the simmering conflicts related to pride came to the forefront, and perhaps the most important of these was around the route with previous questions around a possible change in location spilling into open conflict. While Soweto, Sandton and Pretoria have all been suggested at

various times as possible locations for Pride, it is Zoo Lake in the suburb of Rosebank that has consistently been the preferred location of those who want to move away from the inner city.

Rosebank is located in the Northern suburbs of Johannesburg, the area is known to be trendy and very gay friendly and Zoo Lake itself is a large park located close to the Johannesburg Zoo from which it takes its name. The park has a long association with the gay community in Johannesburg, being for many years a popular cruising zone (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 8) it also was one of the few spaces in Johannesburg that was non-racial during the apartheid years, a specific requirement set by its donor. The suburb of Rosebank however was in the mid 1990s almost exclusively white and indeed remains largely so to this day. It is also not serviced by public transport networks in the same way as the city centre is and this makes it less accessible to people who lack their own transport. While there are commercial and retail areas within the suburb a great deal of its space is dominated by large homes often surrounded by high walls.

While the decision was ultimately made to keep the parade in the city centre in 1996 this was not universally agreed and there were threats of to boycott the event by those who wanted it to move (as indeed there were threats to boycott if it did move as well). Correspondence to the pride board at this time showed the depth of unhappiness. Many activists were disturbed both by the possibility of the move and by the fact that discussions seemed to be taking place within the structures of the pride board and with no community consultation. GLOW activists communicated to Pride their deep concerns around the proposal to move the parade away from the city and to a predominantly (indeed in 1996 almost exclusively) white suburb. Other people were upset at the ultimate decision to stay in town as the following correspondence from a person who had previously volunteered to help with the event displays:

“I would like to express my dismay at the decision taken to stage the parade in the CBD and to emphasise how strongly I feel about this, I am withdrawing my attendance and support for this year’s Pride celebrations” (LP Botes, Private correspondence).

Within the board itself there were opposing views on the subject. Richard Holden the secretary of Pride wrote the following in a letter to Paul Stobbs:

“My reservations with regard to the Johannesburg CBD routes relate specifically to the safety and security for individuals in view of the nature of crime which takes place on the streets, if adequate security in the form of considerably improved police and traffic police presence, can be improved, I am convinced that the Johannesburg CBD is the best option” (Holden, Private correspondence, 12 June 1996).

He goes on to state that while Zoo Lake certainly had a number of advantages particularly in terms of the post parade events there were also a number of drawbacks. He mentions specifically the accessibility of the location for non-white participants. He also mentions that the decentralisation of the parade would inevitably lead to people in other areas starting their own parades and subsequently to a dispersion of the messaging of the event. He also makes an interesting political argument when he says:

“a perception could be created that the parade has been moved to predominantly white ‘turf’ now that the gender discrimination clause has been included in the Constitution, it could appear as if the black gay community has been utilised in a somewhat cynical manner for the attainment of a political objective, only to be ‘dumped’ thereafter” (Holden, Personal correspondence, 12 June 1996)

In both his prediction of the possible political ramification of the suggested move and the possibility of the creation of alternative events Holden proved to be very insightful given the subsequent events which would unfold when a decade later the parade did make its permanent move to Zoo Lake. During the 1996 parade a survey was conducted to gauge the opinion of attendees on a number of subjects, one of which was the preferred route for future marches. There are many methodological questions that could be asked about this survey not least the

fact that it involved a very small number of people (141) given the overall attendance of over 15 000 that year (De Waal and Manion, 2006). The fact that the interviewers spoke to 123 men and only 18 women is also problematic. Despite these concerns, the results remain interesting. Of those questioned 62 voted to move the parade to Rosebank while 74 wanted the parade to stay in the CBD with small numbers supporting a shift to Soweto or Pretoria⁶. It is clear that while the majority vote still supported the status quo there were a large number of people supporting a move to the suburbs. The survey offers no information on the race of those people surveyed but it is easy to comprehend why the debate around the route so often appeared linked to race. A move to Rosebank would clearly be perceived as an attempt to encourage attendance from white people while making accessibility to the event for non-white people difficult other than through outreach transport programmes.

The debate around the route of pride and its ultimate destination continued to be an annual feature of the organising of the event. In 1998 three possible routes were considered. One of these was a Zoo Lake based event, while the other two remained largely within the traditional area. After much debate a decision was taken to hold the event at Pieter Roos Park in Braamfontein and take the parade through the inner city and the suburbs of Berea and Yeoville. While the debate around the location of pride remained alive, this was the last time that a change of location was seriously considered until 2002. In that year Gary Bath who had taken over the running of pride first moved the event to Rosebank, and the march started and ended at Zoo Lake. Arguments in favour of the move were largely twofold: first, that Zoo Lake can handle the ever increasing numbers attending pride and has the infrastructure to hold large after-march events and second that the inner city had become an unpleasant space in which there was a strong perception of grime and crime. The fact that the inner city and the suburbs of Yeoville, Hillbrow and Berea through which the parade moved had become increasingly and eventually almost exclusively black as white residents had moved out and into the suburbs was not openly discussed. The short-lived decision to move the parade back into the city in 2005

⁶ The full results were Pretoria – 17, Rosebank – 62, CBD – 74, Soweto – 10. This means 163 total votes cast while the survey incites that only 141 people were surveyed clearly another methodological question mark.

was perhaps in part motivated by the increased involvement of the Lesbian and Gay Equality Project in the event but was also certainly about supporting the Heartlands development. A number of gay and lesbian clubs had opened at an intersection in Braamfontein with the intention of providing a safe gay area in the city. The Heartlands hosted the event that year and was where the official after party took place. The following year however the event moved back to Zoo Lake where it remains to this day.

The new organisation that took over the running of Pride in 2007 made the decision to keep the event at Zoo Lake despite demands from the organised LGBTI sector for a return to the city which they believed to constitute contested space and to have far greater symbolic meaning than the leafy gay friendly suburbs. The board has however indicated that the event will remain in Rosebank for the foreseeable future. The movement to Zoo Lake represents far more than a mere shift in location. It was a political statement that speaks to the very meaning of Pride. The arguments around the push for a change of venue have always gone hand in hand with the debates around whether Pride is supposed to be a political march or a celebratory parade, the choice to walk in areas that are generally gay friendly and non-threatening contrasts with the notion of Pride as an attempt to claim contested space. As the late Peter Busse put it:

“Today it seems that people on the sidewalks don’t count. It’s a march for the marcher’s sake, rather than for any possible impact on the people who happen to see it. In those early days it always went by choice through densely populated urban areas, to that as many people as possible would see it. More recently the Pride March has strolled around the oak-lined avenues of Rosebank, and it doesn’t have the same impact” (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 39).

Debates around the route of Pride have also constantly been racialised, as Richard Holden had predicted they would be some 10 years before the parade made its final move to Zoo Lake. Gerald Kraak in his 2006 reflections upon the state of the gay and lesbian community considers

the ongoing inequality and lack of social engagement between white and black LGBTI people says the following;

“The differing aspirations of these two communities is replicated every year in the debate over the nature of the Pride parade, what its message should be and where it should take place. The re-routing of Pride from the Johannesburg city centre to the wealthy northern suburbs of Johannesburg demonstrates this continued divide and the predominance of the interests of a privileged minority, at least in determining this part of the annual gay and lesbian agenda” (Kraak, 2006: 281).

It’s all about the money

The early pride events were organised with little money and with no expectation or for that matter capacity to make money. It did not however take long for the potential for pride to make money to be realised by people within the sector. At times such as the Bath years this clearly involved individual financial gain (or rather the possibility thereof given that the event consistently ran at a loss). At other times it has revolved around the notion that Pride must be self sustaining. While not controversial in theory, this concept becomes so when the scale of the event escalates, requiring an exponential escalation in the level of commercialisation required merely to sustain the event. Class exclusion seems an inevitable result. In 1995 a decision was taken for the first time to organise an official after party. The event, a rave held at the Electric Warehouse in Newtown, was marketed aggressively as an integral part of the day’s festivities. Pride after-parties have consistently been a point of bitter contention specifically between the organisers of pride and the club owners in the Province. The days around Pride and the night itself constitute one of the most lucrative times for gay clubs who traditionally all organise an after-party. The organisation of an official after-party inevitably eats into this profitability. Pride organisers realised very early the money making potential of an official after party and began to question why the club owners made money from an event that they did not

financially contribute to when this money could contribute to the cost of pride itself. This conflict continues to the present day.

In 2010 the Pride board made the decision to host an official after party for the first time in many years. The reason for this was to try and generate some income to offset the costs associated with the event. The after party was heavily advertised and headlined by Sonique, a well known British artist. Almost immediately conflict erupted with the owners of a number of gay clubs in Gauteng for whom an official after party would almost certainly cause a loss of income. Almost immediately rumours began to spread that members of the Pride board stood to benefit from the after party, rumours that the board denied in a press release stating that “No board member stands to financially benefit from the hosting of the official after-party - all profit generated will go towards Joburg Pride” (Mambaonline article, 13 August 2010).

The decision that the organisers of pride should get involved directly with the organisation of an income generating event changed profoundly the nature of Pride and the mandate of its organisers. This led Gavin Hayward, the editor of Exit magazine, to question in 1996 whether it was appropriate that pride should ask for the free advertising and editorial space given to it in the past when it clearly had shifted toward being an income generating event (Hayward, Personal letter). In the early to mid 1990s Pride was funded largely by donations from donors and individuals. Donor funding remains important and in recent years has been used to specifically fund the outreach programmes associated with Pride for example the transport provided from Townships. However as the event grew in size and scale and the infrastructure required to support it increased, organisers looked at new ways to generate revenue. One of these was sponsorship, the other was to make money out of participants. One way to doing this was through an official after party, another was the sale of food and drink at the end venue of the parade. In 2004 a very controversial decision was made to charge an entrance fee to get into the part of Zoo Lake in which the post march festivities would take place. The decision

greatly angered many people who considered it exclusionary. Thuli Madi, the director of Behind the Mask, recalls it as follows:

“The section of Zoo Lake where the festivities took place was fenced off and the public was required to pay a R40 entrance fee. It didn’t apply to the march itself but the entrance fee meant that many black people struggling with poverty and unemployment could not take part in the broader festivities, having already spent their money on transport from the townships. It made me furious. I wasn’t prepared to go inside while others were excluded.” (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 153)

So controversial was the decision to charge an entry fee that it has never been revisited and subsequent organisers have had to find more subtle ways in which to raise money. In 2010 the Pride board made the decision to prohibit people from bringing food or drink into the pride venue. They argued that the bar and the revenue from food outlets was fundamental to their ability to make the event cover its costs. The problem is however that both the food and drink for sale is prohibitively expensive for many participants. While not overtly exclusionary in the way in which an entry fee would be the effect is similar for people who cannot afford to eat or drink once there.

To blend or offend

As early as 1994, in response to an invitation from the organisers to take part in the parade the Gay Christian Community responded negatively. They stated:

“The previous marches and stances taken at the ‘park celebrations’, failed to convey any dignity upon gay people, rather we believe that the public was compelled to see all gay people as disreputable and obscene, and so their anti-gay opinions were reinforced. We

know that there are millions of gay people leading decorous lifestyles, and who are affronted by the portrayal of gay persons as utterly depraved” (Maxwell, 1994).

As was shown in the earlier discussion around Montreal pride the question of what behaviour, dress, forms of demonstration are considered appropriate is not unique; it is one that surfaces repeatedly in relation to pride events. Paul Stobbs says that he received a number of requests from various organisations over the years to ban drag queens from taking part in the parade, requests he refused to entertain. While the ‘fabulous’ nature of gay and lesbian people is often a feature of parades, and drag queens are prominent features there remains a level of contestation around the idea that gays and lesbians should blend and not offend in the projection of their community to the outside world.

In 1996 artist Steven Cohen marched in the parade carrying a large banner which read “Give us your children what we can’t fuck we eat”. The banner elicited strong responses from both people watching the event and those taking part. The organisers were inundated with complaints from other participants who were appalled at the idea. Cohen of course fully anticipated such a response. His banner, while clearly intended to mock stereotypes and the prejudices of the general society, was also intended to send a message to his fellow marchers. Responding in the Exit Newspaper to the outcry caused by his banner Cohen says:

“Some gays are so surprised to be out there that they have to saccharine their image- they buy into the demands that heterosexual society makes of us freaks – they try to be better than straights, beyond reproach” (De Waal and Manion, 2006:28)

He goes on to say that so many gay people appear to have “become what we despise: judgemental moralists and finger-pointing accusers”. Cohen’s statement is a clear disavowal of the idea that the key to acceptability from the broader society is to pander to their prejudices

and try to allay their fears by asserting the 'normalness' of gay and lesbian people. This idea relates back to Gamson's (1996) work on San Francisco's 1993 Pride event and the furore around the theme of "The year of the Queer". Gamson points to the fact that there is a clear tension between those people who want to assert difference and those who want to assert sameness, this latter group including in Gamson's thinking civil rights strategists for whom "at least the appearance of normality is central to the gaining of political 'room'" he goes on to say that "rights are gained, according to this logic, by demonstrating similarity (to heterosexual people, to other minority groups) in a non-threatening manner" (Gamson, 1996: 402). Cohen's actions in 1996 clearly represented a form of subversion to the idea that the key to the protection of gay and lesbian people lay in being as unthreatening to straight people as possible.

Drag queens have often been the targets of reactionary attacks from gay and lesbian people. In 2004 the Gay and Lesbian Alliance, an alleged gay political party, announced that they would attempt to have drag queens taking part in the Pride March that year arrested. While the ramblings of the GLA (generally accepted to in fact be one person) could not be considered representative of the general feeling of gay and lesbian people, they nonetheless express an opinion that is not particularly rare, a sense that the gender bending nature of drag queens (and at times of particularly effeminate men) is a bad reflection on the community generally most of whom are 'perfectly normal'. This internal conflict around gender nonconforming individuals has also manifested in more recent years in relation to the place of Transgender people in Pride events given that the LGBTI acronym is now so generally used. There is almost every year an outcry from gay and lesbian people that the media tend to feature pictures of people in drag or in some ways outrageously dressed. Gevisser writing in 1992 addressed this issue when he asks "would South Africa gay pride attract more participants if both drag queens and radical politics were outlawed. And if so, at what price? (Glowletter, October 1992).

In 2009 the question of the “gayness” of the Pride event came to the fore. That year the media partner for the event was once again 94.7 Highveld Stereo, a number of adverts were flighted on the station all of which used the name Joburg Pride but not the words Gay or Lesbian. A furore erupted in the gay media and across various social networking sites following an email questioning this omission, which accused Pride of "selling out the gay community for corporate sponsorship" (Mambaonline article, 25 September 2009).

Protest or celebration

One of the questions that has surrounded Pride from the very start is a fundamental one around what it is that the march is meant to be. Is it a political protest or is it a day of celebration? Most people concede that it is part both, but in what proportion and why? Gevisser points out in a 1992 article that in the previous two marches:

“many people were made profoundly uncomfortable by the political militancy of the march, and the way it aligned itself with the larger South African liberation struggle. ‘Why can’t gay Pride live up to its name and be pride’, one man complained, ‘who needs the political sloganeering? Let’s just be Proud’” (Gevisser, 1992).

There is no doubt that the first march was intended to be a serious political protest. The clear need to add or perhaps to strengthen the voice of gay and lesbian people within the debates around the nature of a new society which were gaining momentum at the time required it to be so. The organizers certainly chose to address much of the messaging of the march to the newly unbanned ANC and in turn received messages of support from its structures. A letter from the PWV regional office of the ANC was delivered and read to the crowd which said among other things:

“we believe that the struggle for gay rights is a fundamental part of the struggle for human rights and dignity of all oppressed peoples. As such it is a wing of the liberation

struggle in South Africa and we commend the organizers of this occasion for putting the issue of gay rights firmly on the agenda for a new South Africa.” (ANC PWV Press Statement, 1990)

A message of support was also received from Albie Sachs who was at that time a member of the ANC National Executive Committee. He said “many of us in the ANC would like to see a new Constitution in South Africa that guarantees members of the lesbian and gay community full protection against any form of discrimination, harassment or abuse” (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 14) This focus on the Constitution and what provisions it may ultimately make towards the rights of gay and lesbian people would come to be a major focus of each of the first few marches as the Constitution writing process unfolded over a period of years.

While the theme of the first Pride event as stated earlier was fairly inward looking in the following years the themes were clearly more of an outward projection. In 1991 it was ‘March for Equality,’ and in 1992 ‘Marching for our Rights.’ The imagery employed in 1992 was more overtly radical than in previous years. The official poster showed a black fist smashing through a triangle (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 57). This was still a time of negotiation within the country as a whole, its future direction was by no means clear and it was vital for gay and lesbian activists that their message remained strong and constant so that it would not be lost within the bigger political upheavals of transition. When Paul Stobbs took over as the chair of the Pride organising committee in 1994 he brought a vastly different political position to the table. He made clear his belief that Pride was too political and that this was at least in part the cause of its declining numbers.

One of the most profound changes brought in by Stobbs was the change of the name of the event from a ‘march’ to a ‘parade’ (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 85). This change was controversial at the time, angering a number of GLOW activists, and the branding of the event as a parade rather than a march remains controversial to this day. The reason for the shift was

clearly that Stobbs believed the event to be too political or perhaps rather that it was perceived as too political and that a shift in terminology could make it more accessible. He states:

“The march at the time was too political and this was preventing people from coming. White gay boys want to have fun, they want to drink. This is what GLOW didn’t understand” (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 85)

The fact that Stobbs states that people were not coming and then relates this directly to what would attract white gay men implies clearly that ‘people’ in this instance means white gay men and that the indicator of the success or failure of pride is the attendance of this specific demographic. Gevisser writing shortly after the 1992 states that his research undertaken in social spaces frequented by white gay men indicated that many did not want to take part in the annual parade, the reasons given for this were that they found it “too political, too closely aligned to the ANC and put plainly, too black”. This as Gevisser points out is curious given that at least 75% of those people who took part in the 1992 march were white (Gevisser, 1992). The second very troubling aspect of Stobbs’ comment about the need to change Pride to appeal to white gay men is that it asserted that if people (however that was meant or is understood) could not engage with the political nature of the event then it was the event rather than the people that needed to change, a problematic idea given the very real battles that clearly still needed to be fought in the mid-1990s.

Depoliticisation within South African social movements in the mid to late 1990s is a well recognised phenomenon; Ballard et al (2006) in their introduction to *Voices of Protest* discuss this in some detail. The reasons for this relate to the honeymoon period in which civil society and government appeared to be working together rather than in opposition to one another, to the leadership of many of the movements being subsumed into the structures of government and to the professionalization of many social movements into NGOs. While the depoliticisation of Pride cannot be removed from this context it clearly does not entirely fit the pattern either.

It is important to problematise the concept of depoliticisation and question whether in fact this

actually means repoliticisation. More concretely in this specific context, did making Pride less political merely mean the removal of ANC politics from the event? Stobbs himself says that the biggest problem he had with Pride in its early years was that it was run by communists (De Waal and Manion, 2006: 85). Whether or not the organisers of the original events did identify as communists is questionable and not clearly indicated anywhere. However they did engage with the politics of the ANC, a politics that clearly was deeply threatening too many white gay and lesbian people. In 1995 the then leader of the Democratic Party Tony Leon was invited to speak at Pride. He was unable to do so as he was travelling at the time. In response to his declining the invitation Stobbs wrote to Leon saying among other things:

“as a fervent Democratic Party supporter and in view of the forthcoming elections I would suggest that you send a letter of support to the gay and lesbian community to be read out on the day.” (Personal Correspondence, 27 July 1995)

This seems to stand in stark contrast to the assertion that Pride needed to be made less political. The question seems then to be not whether Pride is political or not but rather in what ways it is political and whose politics can claim the platform it offers. As Gevisser pointed out as early as 1992, Pride is always political, its existence is so, even if tries not to be. (Glowletter, October 1992). Through the Stobbs years however the parades continued to have themes which spoke to the needs of the community within the context of the ongoing transition to democracy and the unfolding process of law reform being undertaken by the NCGLE. The theme in 2005 was “Gay by nature, proud by choice” (Pride marketing materials, 2005). A theme which very much spoke to the strategy of the coalition as discussed earlier which was to use the notion of the naturalness of homosexuality to justify its demands for equality. The shift from protest to celebration though is highlighted in the following quote from the 1996 Pride information pack, in answer to the question of why we need a Pride parade:

“The nation celebrated when rugby and soccer teams won their campaigns and victory tours celebrating their wins were held through the streets of Johannesburg. When the Pope came to SA in 1995 thousand of Catholics flocked to celebrate their religion. The Pride parade is the same thing. Gays and Lesbians flocking to celebrate their Gayness of [sic] lesbianess”. (Pride information pack, 1996).

The comparison of gay and lesbian people to a religion is fascinating and certainly worthy of a study in and of itself, for our purposes however there are a number of parts of this statement that are interesting. One of these is the very clear indication that Pride is a space of celebration and not of protest, the comparison to sports victory parades shows this. The second is the implication that there is an essential gayness or lesbianess that people would flock to celebrate.

The 1998/1999 committees did attempt to bring Pride back to its roots as a political protest but always with the need to maintain a balance with the celebratory aspects that people had become used to and even in 1998 there was affirmation of the fact that it was a Parade and not a March and should always be described as such. The 2001 event made a real attempt to bring the parade back to its political roots. That year's event was the product of negotiations between the existing organisers of Pride and supporters of a rival event termed African Pride. This movement within which Donna Smith was the most prominent voice argued that Johannesburg Pride did not cater for black gays and lesbians (Report to Pride AGM, 2001). Eventually an organising committee was put together under the leadership of Smith to organise the 2001 event. African Pride was the first suggested alternative Pride event born out of dissatisfaction with the increasingly commercial and depoliticised nature of Johannesburg Pride. Although the idea of an alternative Pride event was shelved in 2001 following the negotiations it was only three years later that Soweto Pride was held for the first time to be followed some years later by Ekhurelheni Pride in the township of Kwa Thema to the east of Johannesburg. The return of overt politics to Johannesburg Pride was short lived with the takeover by Gary Bath taking place the following year.

In 2007 after the new dispensation took over the running of Pride there were attempts to engage with the organisations in the gay and lesbian sector and a series of themes have been selected that are political in nature, the board has however steadfastly attempted to keep itself separate from politics, choosing instead to view itself as a platform through which political organisations can operate. This has not however spared them the same conflicts around the

role of Pride as a space of protest, the increase in concern around hate crimes over the last few years has increased this. In July 2007 two lesbian women Sizakele Sigasa and Salome Masooa were murdered in Meadowlands Soweto, there was an immediate outcry from the community and a great level of mobilisation. At Soweto Pride of that year (held one week before Johannesburg Pride) the murders were still incredibly raw, at that event Carrie Shelver offering a message of solidarity from People Opposing Woman Abuse publically questioned why Johannesburg Pride was not taking place in Soweto that year. This question reflecting the view that following the murders in July it was Soweto that represented the front line of the struggle for the rights of gay and lesbian people. Following her statement Shelver was accosted by a number of members of the Johannesburg Pride board demanding to know why she had asked the question in such a public forum and accusing her of creating disunity within the community. In response to this a number of activists decided to stage a protest the following week during the Johannesburg Pride Parade, wearing t-shirts, badges, and carrying banners branded "Bring it to Soweto" (Shelver, Pers. Com). The protest within the parade was stunted somewhat by the fact that the parade was largely washed out that year by torrential rain and as such the numbers attending were far smaller than in all the years since. Nonetheless it shows clearly how in the face of the 'new' tide of violence affecting the LGBTI community, particularly black lesbian women, people looked to Pride to be a site of protest.

The question of contestation within the gay and lesbian community is one that is controversial, it is often suggested that in fighting over almost any issue serves to weaken our capacity to fight against the many external threats. Johannesburg Pride has used this argument to silence dissent on more than one occasion, in 2009 in relation to the dispute over the lack of the word 'gay' on adverts for the Pride event the co-chairs of that year's event made the following statement "If we give up on and boycott our own community events and spaces and are a house divided, it makes it all the more easier for Jacob Zuma and Ray McCauley to shut down and close those events and spaces" (Mambaonline article, 25 September 2009). In 2007 in relation to the incident at Soweto Pride the argument was similar, that it was detrimental to air internal issues on public platforms. This speaks to the questions raised earlier related to the

construction of community and the purchasing of strengthened community at the price of what Seidman (1996:22) calls “increased internal repression”.

A strong argument could be made that given the high levels of homophobia that exist within South African society and the increasingly violent manifestation of that homophobia there is a need for a unified face and voice to gay and lesbian community. The silencing of dissidence in the service of ensuring strength in unity is however equally problematic. To do so serves only to silence those peoples with the least access to the means of the production of community, it entrenches power inequalities by blocking any means to their contestation. It appears that much of the contestation around Pride that is immediately related to its route, commercialization, political nature etc also speaks to broader conflict within the community around what different groups want, need and expect from an event like Pride. In his analysis of the ongoing conflict around Pride, particularly its route Gerald Kraak says that “it dispels the notion that people are united by the common experience of their homosexuality; class, race and gender remain greater imperatives” (Kraak, 2006: 281). Bev Ditsie quoted in Gunkel (2010: 74) speaks to the issue of differing needs, specifically linked to race, when she says: “So then they may want to celebrate and have a Mardi Gras but actually we are still marching. For us it’s still about visibility, for us it’s still about your basic human rights on the ground which we’re not getting you know.”

Conclusions and recommendations for further research

Johannesburg Pride is without question the most overt, public and powerful special expression of gay and lesbian identity in the city and perhaps in the country given its scale is so much greater than any other pride event. Its history runs chronologically side by side with the history of democracy in South Africa. It is an event located squarely within the space of the post-apartheid moment and yet also affected profoundly by the history of gay and lesbian activism and creations of community under the apartheid regime. From its origins in the relatively small number of people marching through the city streets in 1990 to the thousands parading through the suburbs in 2011 it is an event marked by a certain level of consistency and a great deal of change. Its consistencies include the fact that it has always been surrounded by great controversy, organising it has rarely been an entirely pleasant activity and yet despite this it has taken place every years since 1990. Its contestations are multiple and multilayered. This work has attempted to tease out a number of these contestations. Many can be traced back through the history of Pride each surfacing at certain times, being dormant at others, each interesting at times with one another and each a speaking to broader issues within the community.

It must be acknowledged that contestations around creations of gay and lesbian community are not unique to South Africa (indeed contestations around specific identity based community are not unique to gay and lesbian people). Indeed the question of how community and struggles are constructed around specific identities and the advantages and costs of such constructions is one of the most important ongoing debates within current and particularly post-structuralist academia. What does make South Africa particularly interesting however is the placing of this debate within the context of the apartheid regime and the post-apartheid era. The brutal segregation that characterised the apartheid system both physical and ideological and its associated regulation of sexuality and of gender, the legacy of segregation again both literal and ideological and the vast socio-economic inequalities left by the apartheid regime create the setting on which attempts are and indeed have for decades been made to create and sustain a

notion of gay and lesbian community. The success or failure of this project is not only interesting as a study of how gay and lesbian community is created within this context but also how a set of people are negotiating and renegotiating their identities and forms of community in the post-apartheid moment.

The contestations within Pride identified in this work are all interesting in and of themselves particularly when traced over a period of time, each however also speaks to a set of core problems related to identity and specifically how gay and lesbian identity is constructed. The initial theory of this work related to exploring race and racism within the gay and lesbian community and using Johannesburg Pride as a case study of how this racism plays itself out. Indeed it is clear that race is a major factor underlying much of the conflict within the gay and lesbian community, it could hardly not be given South Africa's history of systemic legislated racial oppression and the fact that so many other forms of repression such of those around class, gender and sexuality were so intrinsically tied up with the apartheid racial project. What is apparent however is that there a deep level of complexity to the contestations that exist within the gay and lesbian community and which reveal themselves so compellingly in a space like Johannesburg Pride.

There is clearly space for a great deal more work stemming from many of the questions raised by this work. For one thing there is a clear need for a greater theorizing around pride events. While pride parades are often used as case studies in explorations into gay and lesbian community they are in many ways a unique phenomena, located within a particular space at a particular time they are both a powerful outward projection of gay identity and a site of internal struggle. In other words they simultaneously represent the greatest expression of an essential homosexual identity and bring to the fore the deeply problematic and contested nature of that identity. There is also space for a comparative project that seeks to research how pride events around the world are similar and differ in the nature of their activities and of their

conflicts and in this way to be able to evaluate what the impact of South Africa's history and legacy of apartheid has had on the development of pride and of gay and lesbian community.

Bibliography

Anderson, B (1983), Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism, Verso, London.

Ballard, R et al (2006), Voices of Protest: Social movements in post-apartheid South Africa, University of Kwa Zulu Natal Press, Scottsville.

Barker, C (2008), Cultural Studies: Theories and Practice third edition, Sage, London.

Bell, D and Valentine, G (1995), Introduction: Orientations, in Bell and Valentine (eds), Mapping Desire, Routledge, London, pp. 1-27.

Berger, J (2008), Getting to the Constitutional Court on time: A litigation history of same-sex marriage, in Judge et al (eds.), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp.17-28.

Branmann, S (1996), Postmodernism and Queer Identities, in Seidman (ed), Queer Theory/Sociology, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge Massachusetts, pp. 1-30

Butler, J (1991), Imitation and gender insubordination, in Fuss, D (ed), Inside/Out: Gay theories, lesbian theories, Routledge, New York.

Cameron, E (1995): "Unapprehended felons": Gays and lesbians and the law in South Africa, in Gevisser, M and Cameron, E, Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa, Routledge, New York. pp 89-98

Charles, H (1993), "Queer Nigger": Theorizing 'White' Activism, in Bristow, J and Wilson, A, Activating Theory: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual Politics, Lawrence and Wishart, London

Chipkin, I (2002), The Sublime Object of Blackness, *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*, Vol. 42 No.167

Chubbuck, S (2004), Whiteness Enacted, Whiteness Disrupted: The Complexity of Personal Congruence, *American Educations Research Journal*, Vol.41 No.2, pp 301-333.

Cock, J (2003), Engendering gay and lesbian rights: the equality clause in the South African Constitution, *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol. 26, No. 1, pp 35-45.

Conerly, G (2001), Are you black first or are you queer?, in Constantine-Simms, D (ed) The Greatest Taboo: Homosexuality in black communities, Alyson Publications.

Croucher, S (2002), South Africa's Democratisation and the Politics of Gay Liberation, *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 315-330.

Davis, T (1995), The Diversity of Queer Politics and the Redefining of Sexual Identity and Community in Urban Spaces, in Bell and Valentine eds, Mapping Desire, Routledge, London, pp. 284-303.

Della Porta, D and Diani, M (1999), Social movements an introduction, Blackwell publishers, Malden

De Vos, P (2008), Difference and belonging: The Constitutional Court and the adoption of the Civil Union Act, in Judge et al (eds), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp.29-41.

De Waal, A and Manion, A (2006), Pride: Protest and Celebration, Fanele, Johannesburg.

Dirsuweit, T (2006), The problem of identities: The lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex social movement in South Africa, in Ballare et al (eds) *Voices of protest: Social movements in post-apartheid South Africa*, University of Kwa Zulu Natal Press, Scottsville.

Elder, G (1995), Of Moffies, Kaffirs and Perverts: Male homosexuality and the discourse of moral order in the Apartheid state, in Bell and Valentine (eds), Mapping Desire, Routledge, London, pp. 56-65.

Epstein, S (1998), Gay Politics, Ethnic Identity: The Limits of Social Constructionism, in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London.

Foucault, M (1976), The Will to Knowledge: The History of Sexuality 1, Penguin Books, London.

Foucault, M (1984), The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality 2, Penguin Books, London

Gamson, J (1996), Must Identity Movements Self-Destruct?: A Queer Dilemma, in Seidman (ed.), Queer Theory/Sociology, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge Massachusetts, pp. 395-420.

Gevisser, M (1995): A Different Fight For Freedom: A history of South African lesbian and gay organisation from the 1950s to the 1990s, in Gevisser, M and Cameron, E, Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa, Routledge, New York. pp 14-85.

Giugni, M (1999), How social movements matter: Past research, present problems, future developments, in Giugni et al (eds), How social movements matter, University of Minesotta Press, Minneapolis.

Gqola, P (2001), Defining people: Analysing power, language and representation in metaphors of the New South Africa, *Transformation*, Vol. 57.

Gunkel, H (2010), The Cultural Politics of Female Sexuality in South Africa, Routledge, New York.

Hall, s (1997), The work of representation, in Hall, S (ed), Representation, CA Sage, London.

Hayfield, A (1995), Several Faces of Discrimination, in Mason-John, V (ed), Talking Black: Lesbians of African and Asian Descent Speak Out, Cassell, London.

Hensman, S (1995), A Retrospective: Black Together Under One Banner, in Mason-John, V (ed), Talking Black: Lesbians of African and Asian Descent Speak Out, Cassell, London.

Irvine, J (1996), A place in the Rainbow: Theorizing Lesbian and Gay Culture, in Seidman (ed), Queer Theory/Sociology, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge Massachusetts, pp. 213-240.

Kitzinger, C (1987), The Social Construction of Lesbianism, SAGE Publications, London.

Kollapen, J and Cohen, J (2008): The achievement of equality and tolerance – how far have we travelled?, in Judge et al (eds.), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp. 164-170.

Kraak, G (2008), Are our lives ok? Reflections on 13 years of gay liberation in South Africa, in Judge et al (eds.), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp. 278-283.

Leap, W (2002), "Strangers on a Train" Sexual Citizenship and the Politics of Public Transportation in Apartheid Cape Town, in Cruz-Malave, A and Manalansan, M, Queer Globalizations: Citizenship and the Afterlife of Colonialism, New York University Press, New York.

Levine, M (1998), "Gay Ghetto", in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London.

Leznoff, M and Westly, W (1998), The Homosexual Community, in in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London.

Lorde, A (1995), Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women redefining difference, in Guy-Sheftall (ed), Words of Fire: An anthology of African-American feminist thought, The New Press, New York, pg. 283-292.

Luirink, B (1998), Moffies: Gay life in Southern Africa, Ink inc, Cape Town.

MacDonald, M (2006), Why race matters in South Africa, University of Kwa Zulu Natal Press, Scottsville.

Mason-John, V and Okorowa, A (1995), A Minefield in the Garden: Black Lesbian Sexuality, in Mason-John, V (ed), Talking Black: Lesbians of African and Asian Descent Speak Out, Cassell, London.

McAdam et al, (1996), Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings, Cambridge Univeristy Press, New York.

McClintock, A (1995), Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Context, Routledge, New York

Mullen, H (1994), Optic White: Blackness and the Production of Whiteness, *Diacritics*, Vol.2 No. 1/3, Critical Crossings. Pp 71-84.

Murray, S (1998), The Institutional Elaboration of Quasi-ethnic Community, in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London

Namaste, K (1996), The Politics of Inside/Out: Queer Theory, Poststructuralism, and a Sociological Approach to Sexuality, in in Seidman (ed), Queer Theory/Sociology, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge Massachusetts, pp. 194-212.

Nuttall, Sarah (2001): Subjectiveness of Whiteness, *African Studies Review*, Vol 44, No 2, pp 115-140.

Oswin, N (2007), Producing Homonormativity in neoliberal South Africa: Recognition, Redistribution and the Equality Project, *Signs*, 32, 3.

Ratele, K (2009), Apartheid, anti-apartheid and post-apartheid sexualities, in Steyn and Van Zyl (eds), The Prize and the Price: Shaping sexualities in South Africa, HSRC Press, Cape Town.

Reddy, V (2001), Institutionalizing sexuality: Theorizing queer in Post-Apartheid South Africa, in Constantine-Simms, D (ed) The Greatest Taboo: Homosexuality in black communities, Alyson Publications

Reddy, V (2011), Decriminalisation of homosexuality in postapartheid South Africa: A brief legal case history review from sodomy to marriage, *Agenda*, Vol, 20, No. 67, 146 — 157

Reid, G (2008), “This thing” and “that idea”: Traditionalist responses to homosexuality and same-sex marriage, in Judge et al (eds), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp.73-86

Retief, G (1995), Keeping Sodom our of the laager: State repression of homosexuality in apartheid South Africa, in Gevisser, M and Cameron, E, Defiant Desire: Gay and Lesbian Lives in South Africa, Routledge, New York. pp 99-111

Scott, J (1985), Weapons of the weak: Everyday forms of peasant resistance, Yale University Press, New Haven.

Sen, A (2006), Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny, Allen Lane, London

Seidman, S (1996), Introduction, in Seidman (ed), Queer Theory/Sociology, Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge Massachusetts, pp. 1-30.

Steyn, M (2001), "Whiteness Just Isn't What it Used to be": White Identity in a Changing South Africa, State University of New York Press, Albany

Steyn, M and Van Zyl, M (2009), The Prize and the Price: Introduction, in Steyn and Van Zyl (eds), The Prize and the Price: Shaping sexualities in South Africa, HSRC Press, Cape Town.

Stoler, Ann (2002), Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power, University of California Press, California

Tarrow, S (1994), Power in movement: Social movements, collective action and politics, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Taylor, V, and Whittier, N (1998), Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London

Thompson, Becky (2002), Multiracial Feminism: Recasting the Chronology of Second Wave Feminism, *Feminist Studies*, Vol 28, No 2, pp 337-360

Tilly, C (1978), From mobilization to revolution, Addison-Wesley, Massachusetts

Trengrove-Jones, T (2008): Marriage and murder, in Judge et al (eds), To have and to hold: The Making of Same-Sex Marriage in South Africa, Fanele, Auckland Park. pp.182-192

Troiden, R (1998), "A Model of Homosexual Identity Formation", in Nardi, P and Schneider, B. Social Perspectives in Lesbian and Gay Studies: A Reader, Routledge, London

Van der Westhuizen, Christi (2007), White Power and the Rise and Fall of the National Party, Zebra Press, Cape Town

Vestergaard, M (2001). Who's Got the Map? The Negotiation of Afrikaner Identities in Post-Apartheid South Africa, *Daedalus*, Vol. 130 No. 1

Walker, M (2005), Race is nowhere and race is everywhere: Narrative from black and white South African university students in post-apartheid South Africa, *British Journal of Sociology in Education*, Vol.26, No. 1.

Woodhead, D (1995), "Surveillant Gays": HIV, Space and the Constitution of Identities, in Bell and Valentine eds, Mapping Desire, Routledge, London, pp. 231-244.

Web References

<http://www.joburgpride.org/sitenews/joburg-pride-celebrates-21st-birthday-style> (Information on 2010 Pride event, 4 October 2010)

http://www.joburgnews.co.za/2003/sept/sep16_parade.stm (Report on Pride 2003, 16 September 2003)

www.joburgpride.org/sitenews/joburg-pride-2010-real-facts (De Barros, L (2010), Joburg Pride 2010: The real facts)

www.few.org.za/index/php (Mathabela, M, FEW history of Soweto Pride)

www.mambaonline.com/article.asp?artd=325 (Joburg Pride Chaos 11 May 2006)

www.mambaonline.com/article.asp?artd=497 (Joburg Pride: What is at stake)

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/6147010.stm> (S Africa approves same sex unions, 14 November 2006)

Archival Documentation

AM 2910, Paul Stobbs (Pride Papers) Collection, 1994-1999, Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action

- B.2 Policy and planning documents 1996 – Pride Information Pack
- B.2 Policy and planning documents 1996 – Survey results 1996
- G.1 Promotional material 1994-1998 – theme for 1995 event
- E.3 Correspondence in 1994-1995 – Fax to Tony Leon from Paul Stobbs, 27 July 1995
- E.3 Correspondence in 1994-1995 – Letter from Gay Christian Community, 17 July 1994
- E.5 Correspondence in 1996 – Letter from Gavin Hayward
- E.5 Correspondence in 1996 – Letter from LP Botes
- E.5 Correspondence in 1996 – Letter from Richard Holden, 12 June 1996

AM 3185, Daniel Somerville Collection, 2001, Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action

- A.1 Lesbian and Gay Equality Project: Memorandum Agreement and report

AM 2799, Donne Rundle Collection, 1990, Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action

- 1 Scrapbook on 1st Pride Parade – Message of support from ANC PWV region

AM 2805, Lee Randall Collection, 1983 -1993, Gay and Lesbian Memory in Action

- B.1.3.1 Glowletter, February 1992 – Background to first Pride march
- B.1.3.1 Glowletter, October 1992 – Article by Gevisser, Pride and prejudice
- B.1.1.1 Sunday's Woman Newsletter November 1990 – Report on Pride 1990
- B.1.2.1 OLGAs News Feb 1991 – Report on Pride 1990

Personal Communication

Carrie Shelver, former co-chair of Johannesburg Pride, May 2011.

