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Abstract:

This dissertation is a critical examination of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. While racism presents an intractable problem for all racial groups in South Africa, this dissertation will show that Indian South Africans are especially framed by a specific racist discourse related to broad perceptions of economic exploitation within the context of redistributive and resource-allocation conflicts, political corruption, insularity and general lack of a socio-cultural ‘fit’ with the rest of South African society. This is not unique to present day South Africa and is (albeit in evolving ways) a long standing phenomenon. Key concerns addressed by the dissertation are: the lack of critical attention to the matter of anti-Indian racism, the historical origins of anti-Indian racism, the characteristics and dynamics of anti-Indian racism and its persistence in post-apartheid South Africa despite an avowed commitment of South Africa’s new post-apartheid dispensation to a non-racial society.

This dissertation argues that a particular set of structural circumstances largely due to the confluence of the ‘racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001) with social forces of culture and identity have located Indian South Africans in a space of ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980) and that anti-Indian racism is promoted and continually reproduced by the status of Indian South Africans as ‘in-betweeners’. The idea of ‘in-betweenity’ used in this dissertation is an adaptation of Bulhan’s concept of ‘cultural in-betweenity’ in
order to describe the different aspects (political, economic and socio-cultural) of the intermediary role played by Indian South Africans in South Africa’s socio-political order. The space of ‘in-betweenity’ occupied by Indian South Africans is seen to be one which is characterised by uncertainty, ambiguity and a perpetual testing of Indian South Africans in terms of their loyalty to South Africa as well as their authenticity in relation to indigenous South Africans.

Within the constraints of the methodological challenges posed by investigating sensitive research terrain, certain data sources were deployed in order to help critically understand and analyse anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. The data sources help to support the overall argument advanced by this dissertation, i.e. that a set of structural circumstances engineered by the ‘racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001) in combination with forces such as identity and culture, have trapped Indian South Africans into a state of ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980) which has contributed to the continued development of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. Furthermore the dissertation argues that a general environment of hostility and threat has forced Indian South Africans to imbibe negative perceptions and stereotypes in ways which reinforce a ‘vicious cycle’ of racism and continues to imprison Indian South Africans into the space of ‘in-betweenity’.

A phenomenological approach was used in the dissertation to guide the methodology and ensure a commitment to qualitatively understanding the subjective nature of anti-Indian racism.
This dissertation contributes to the state of academic knowledge on anti-Indian racism by illuminating the historical origins of anti-Indian racism, the dynamics of contemporary anti-Indian racism and the reasons for its continued persistence in post-apartheid South Africa. In particular, the findings in this dissertation about the extent to which negative perceptions and stereotyping shapes and continues to sustain anti-Indian racism is an original contribution to academic knowledge about racism.
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CHAPTER ONE: THE POSITIONING OF INDIAN SOUTH AFRICANS IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This dissertation is a critical examination of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. While racism is generally well recognised in South Africa, specific variants of racism such as anti-Indian racism have scarcely received sufficient critical scholarly attention. Anti-Indian racism has historically been obfuscated in different ways. It has tended toward being typically downplayed as anti-Indian prejudice or anti-Indian sentiment or else euphemistically referred to as the ‘Indian question’ or the ‘Indian problem’ by political stakeholders. Consequently anti-Indian racism has never been decisively identified and acknowledged and there is a need for discursive frameworks and modes of thinking to explain the phenomenon of anti-Indian racism. As such the matter of anti-Indian racism requires sustained academic attention and critical scrutiny.

The question of why anti-Indian racism continues to haunt a post-apartheid dispensation organised around the fundamental repudiation of racism, is of specific interest. It might be assumed in line with modernisation principles, that, as the Indian South African population has grown and become more integrated into mainstream social and political institutions that anti-Indian sentiments would possibly lessen. Instead the post-apartheid context has paradoxically seen a deepening of anti-Indian racism on South Africa’s socio-political landscape. Popular sentiment and discourse often sees Indian South Africans singled out for blame particularly in terms of causing suffering and harm to black Africans. Indian South Africans are accordingly
expected to make amends to black Africans for the injustices suffered under apartheid. This popular attitude is captured in the words of former Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) parliamentarian, Prof H. Sibisi-Ngubane (Vapi, 2000):

Having been firmly placed above Africans by apartheid policies, Indians are now in a situation somewhat perilous for them insofar as they can enjoy their privileges acquired under apartheid, including occupying various positions of authority. They will gain acceptance (among Africans) only if they show that they acknowledge that their former privileges, acquired by virtue of their racial identity, give them an obligation in respect of African people who suffered so greatly.

Popular sentiment and discourse as shown during the course of this dissertation indicates that Indian South Africans are subject to different forms of racial stereotyping. Derogatory stereotypes and racial caricatures about Indian South Africans, such as that of the politically corrupt businessman or the mercenary shopkeeper, circulate freely in South African society. While everyday racist discourse may refrain from derogatory racial terms seen as off-limits to other racial groups such as ‘kaffir’, it is often said that the racial slur ‘coolie’

1 ‘Coolie’ and ‘kaffir’ are derogatory terms used as racial slurs toward Indian South Africans and black Africans respectively. Historically the word coolie was used to refer to low-wage manual labourers of generally Asian descent (Bahadur, 2013). ‘Kaffir’ is generally understood to be derived from the Arabic word ‘kafir’ meaning infidel or non-believer. It acquired derogatory overtones in the context of South African history, particularly during South Africa’s apartheid era (Webb, 2002). Both terms constitute hate speech under Section 10 (1) of the Equality Act and when used, constitute crimen injuria: “the unlawful, intentional and serious violation of the dignity of another” (Promotion of Equality and Prevention of Unfair Discrimination Act, 2000).
South African society. Micro-scale conflicts between Indian South Africans and other racial groups are frequent occurrences\(^2\). There have been several notable instances, often played out in the media and on social media platforms such as Facebook, in which Indian South Africans have been publicly called upon to ‘return to India’.

Evidence of the latter is cited at different points in this dissertation. The public calls for Indian South Africans to ‘return to India’ have recently been renewed by a growing anti-Indian lobby in KwaZulu-Natal demanding that Indian South Africans relinquish their Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) status in order that black Africans be allowed to prosper economically (Sosibo, 2014).

Along with other vulnerable minority groupings such as migrants and ‘foreigners’\(^3\), Indian South Africans tend to serve as scapegoats for the socio-economic ills of South African society. For example, this dissertation shows the prevalence of perceptions that Indian South Africans are responsible for the economic marginalisation of black Africans. There is also a widespread belief that Indian business interests are responsible for high-level political corruption in South Africa, as indicated by public anxiety about the extent of the influence of the wealthy and politically connected Gupta family in the national affairs of South Africa (Forrest, 2016).

---

2 According to Dubin (2013:49), “in a small community in KwaZulu-Natal in 2005, two primary school teachers who were Indian South African, were warned ‘either leave the school or leave in flames’. Some people accused the teachers of using ‘bad English and spicy Indian food was being served at the school, very different from what the students customarily ate at home.”

3 ‘Foreigners’ in South Africa tend to be defined as poor black Africans from the continent of Africa who are seen to be competing with local poor and marginalised communities for resources. Migrants and ‘foreigners’ are largely perceived as a threat to national development as well as to the security and stability of the country. The opposition to ‘foreigners’ and the climate of xenophobia and violence toward ‘foreigners’ can be seen to be founded on a similar basis to that underlying anti-Indian racism, i.e. a politics of citizenship founded on the principle of indigeneity and a corresponding sense of entitlement to national resources. See Hassim, Kupe and Worby (2008) for a full account of South Africa’s culture of xenophobia toward poor black migrants and ‘foreigners’.
Some Indian South Africans are the bearers of racism themselves and as such, can be said to further reinforce anti-Indian attitudes. Accordingly, Indian South Africans tend to be viewed unfavourably by many fellow South Africans. It is through the small but important window of perceptions afforded this dissertation by the data sources used herein, that some sense of the powerful ‘reality’ held by such stereotypes was gained. The stereotypes accorded Indian South Africans fall into one of two main kinds of stereotypes generated toward minority groups (Pettigrew, 1980). This form of stereotyping is typical when minority groups have achieved economic mobility and resources and can be seen to be visibly successful. Accordingly, as the data sources used in this dissertation appear to indicate, Indian South Africans tend to be seen in terms of a stock set of negative images relating to perceptions of Indian South Africans being viewed as (a) outsiders; (b) extraneous to the two main racial groups of black and white; (c) mercenary and exploitative, particularly toward black Africans; (d) politically and economically corrupt, and, (d) parasitical upon resources which ought rightly to belong to indigenous black Africans. According to Healey and O’Brien (2015:73): “In this situation, credulity would be stretched to label the group ‘inferior’ so their relative success is viewed in negative terms. They are seen as too smart, too materialistic, too crafty, too sly, too ambitious.”

This dissertation sets out to critically analyse and understand anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. The dissertation is acutely sensitive to the complexities of causation and accordingly, eschews grand causal narratives. This work is also

---

4 According to Pettigrew (1980), a different type of stereotyping takes place when dominant groups need to assert control over a particular group of people and as such, must justify power relations in society. This form of stereotyping involves a process of extreme inferiorisation with traits such as laziness and lack of intelligence attributed to the minority group in question.
aware of making generalisations about anti-Indian racism. Rather than investigating the reality of anti-Indian racism, the dissertation is focused instead on understanding the subjective nature of anti-Indian racism and the power of perception in shaping and defining anti-Indian racism.

A central concern of the dissertation is how Indian South Africans have been constructed as an ‘in-between’ group (Bulhan, 1980) tending to be seen as strangers and outsiders in South African society and the effects of such constructions on the development and perpetuation of anti-Indian racism in South Africa. The dissertation is motivated by three core enquiries: (1) the origins and historical specificity of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa; (2) the dynamics of contemporary anti-Indian racism with key reference to the constructions of Indian South Africans as ‘in-betweeners’ and; (3) the persistence of anti-Indian racism in a post-apartheid dispensation organised around a commitment to a non-racial society.

The dissertation argues firstly that the problem of anti-Indian racism is historically inherited. Anti-Indian racism thrives in the ‘colour-blind’ context of post-apartheid South Africa, bears a strong relationship to economic uncertainty and as shown by the data sources in this dissertation, can take both overt and covert forms. Anti-Indian racism is reinforced by racist behaviours displayed by some Indian South Africans. The extent to which Indian South Africans are implicated in anti-Indian racism refers to a sociological concept developed in the United States to describe a particular ideology centred on race-avoidance and the idea that race no longer matters, allowing society to ignore the structural and institutional basis of racism and helping reinforce systems of privilege. Key works on colour blind racism include that of Wildman (1996), Carr (1997) and Bonilla-Silva (2006).
racism as agents of racism, and in fact invite anti-Indian racism, is explored through some key issues: (a) the influence of early colonialist racist discourse which portrayed black Africans as non-religious, idle, immoral and uncivilised in relation to spiritually-based ancient notions of Indian civilisation; (b) apartheid paradigms of cultural exclusivity in which the socialised fear of ‘the other’ was developed in order to maintain racial divisions and, (c) notions of superiority in relation to the indigenous black majority on account of innate colour and caste⁶ consciousness.

The dissertation highlights the structural and institutional character of racism with key reference to the role of the ‘racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001) in order to fully understand the comprehensive presence of anti-Indian racism in South Africa. It is argued that the ‘racial state’ has created an ‘in-between’ role for Indian South Africans in the structure of South African society. Accordingly a key conceptual device utilised in this dissertation is that of ‘in-betweenness’ (Bulhan, 1980) as a means of framing the context in which Indians have been historically located as a result of a deliberate strategy of construction by the ‘racial state’. While Bulhan’s concept of ‘in-betweenness’ is a cultural theory, it is used herein to primarily describe the structural location of Indian South Africans in South Africa. ‘In-betweenness’ is described herein as a space of ambiguity and uncertainty between the black indigenous majority and a powerful white minority in which Indian South Africans are subjected to a perpetual testing of

---

⁶ Caste can be seen as a form of hereditary social and economic organisation in traditional Hindu society, with pre-modern origins, in which different groups are ranked hierarchically on the basis of social status and degrees of purity or pollution. Caste is seen as hereditary. There are key concepts, birth (jati) and class (varna). Varna, literally meaning colour, constituted a framework for classifying people into upper and lower classes based on skin colour. See Fuller (1997) for an understanding of the nature and significance of the caste system in India. Caste can be seen as an influence in notions colour consciousness among Indian South Africans and the privileging of lighter skinned people over those who are darker skinned.
loyalty to the South African ‘nation’ as well as pressures for acculturation and assimilation into the broader South African society. The collision of state engineering with an array of non-material factors emanating from ‘below’, such as culture, ethnicity and identity, provides the structural framework for the continuation and persistence of anti-Indian racism in South Africa. It is within the space of ‘in-betweenity’ and in the context of a particular set of historical and political circumstances, that the conditions for anti-Indian racism have been created and accordingly continue to thrive and give life to racism against Indian South Africans. The framing device of ‘in-betweenity’ captures this complex array of dynamics in relation to the central role of the South African ‘racial state’.

As with all racisms, anti-Indian racism is often driven by the degree of economic and political stability in society. As an ‘in-between’ group, Indian South Africans are particularly vulnerable to being blamed for many of society’s ills and to general scapegoating. The background to South Africa’s complex climate of anti-Indian racism is that of the country’s volatile mix of high unemployment, poverty, low educational quality, lack of skills and ever-deepening economic inequalities. During the past two decades of democracy South Africa has confronted increasing economic insecurity, particularly in relation to global debt crises, resulting in job losses and large scale unemployment. It has become increasingly clear that despite the success of South Africa’s societal transformation, the patterns of institutionalised

---

7 The concept of ‘the nation’ is one which is highly contested. It is recognised herein that the nation is not necessarily natural or inherent, but rather a deliberate construction by dominant elites in society for particular political, social or cultural ends. The ground-breaking study of nationhood by Anderson (1983) in the book *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism* provides a cogent analysis of the modern nation. It acknowledges the role of political and socio-cultural imagining in the creation of the concept of nationhood, which can be manipulated for positive purposes as well as for less well-meaning purposes. Other scholars such as Ernest Gellner (1983) see the creation of nationhood in a less positive light and emphasise the nation as an inherently artificial concept.
poverty and inequality inherited from colonialism and apartheid remain almost intractably locked in place and economic justice continues to elude the majority of poor black South Africans (Seekings and Nattrass, 2015).

A growing tradition of violent ‘service delivery’ protests serve as testimony to the growing gap between South Africa’s few ‘haves’ and millions of ‘have-nots’. Xenophobic attacks against black Africans and ethnic mobilisations on the part of different social groupings bear further evidence of high levels of discontent and frustration, particularly in poorer communities where lack of access to basic social and welfare services are most acutely felt (Von Holdt et al, 2011). Indeed many of the xenophobic attacks carried out by South Africans have been directed at South Asian immigrants, such as Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, who are typically identified as ‘Indian’ by locals. Having been subsumed under the apartheid category of ‘Indian’, Pakistani immigrants who have settled in Limpopo and Free State provinces have frequently been harassed and attacked by black Africans (Dubin, 2012).

Anti-Indian racism has thrived in such a context of economic instability, given the historic label of privilege attached to the Indian South African racial group and the dire need for redress together with the perception that Indian South Africans are economically successful and received preferential treatment by the apartheid system in relation to black Africans. Indian South Africans are now increasingly confronting complex forms of racism that are linked to wider issues, such as matters of equity and affirmative action or access to education. Such complex issues are more difficult to address, precisely because the specific role racism plays is less apparent and can be more easily sidestepped or denied. The view that Indians have taken advantage
of affirmative action and black economic empowerment (BEE) to the detriment of black Africans continues to be vigorously promoted by some high-profile political actors, including Mr Julius Malema, the leader of the African National Congress Youth League (ANCYL) and other key stakeholders in government and civil society⁸.

Anti-Indian racism has often been expressed in the realm of culture, ascribing a striking sense of ‘difference’ and an exoticism to Indian South Africans. The sense of difference ascribed to Indian South Africans has been a key resource for the political machinations of colonial and apartheid governments in appearing to confirm the cultural incompatibility of South Africa’s different racial groups and thus justifying racial separation on all aspects of social, political and economic life. As such, Indian South Africans tend to be seen as having a very distinctive culture which sets them apart from other racial groups and constructs a marked sense of difference. A key tenet in the literature of race and racism is that racism constructs difference, whether real or imagined, as natural in order to serve political ends, usually but not exclusively by reference to biological or phenotypical characteristics. This is a process which Miles (1989) has termed ‘signification’, i.e. the construction of imagined social and cultural differences in order to characterise and distinguish between different groups of people. Racism’s construction of difference or ‘signification’ predominantly serves to transform the group of people in question into

---

⁸ Mr Julius Malema has often publicly spoken out against the need to exclude Indian South Africans from affirmative action and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) programmes in light of the historic levels of privilege ascribed to Indian South Africans under apartheid in relation to that of black Africans. He has publicly accused Indian South Africans of unfairly dominating the economy to the detriment of the economic empowerment of black Africans. In 2015 Malema questioned the appropriateness of appointing an Indian judge according to the economic and judicial dominance of Indian South Africans in KwaZulu-Natal, during interviews with the Judicial Services Commission (JSC) for the position of deputy judge president of the KwaZulu-Natal division of the high court (Tolsi, 2015). In 2013 Malema accused the Minister of Finance, Mr Pravin Gordhan and “his group of Indians” (SAPA, 2013) of persecution on account of personal tax debt problems.
the ‘Other’ (Miles, 1993: 14). According to Miles (1993: 48) the social construction of
difference is presented as a supposed deviance of the dominant cultural norm. Such
difference varies according to time and place. Although the notion of ‘the other’ is
highly fluid and context-dependent, Miles has identified one common characteristic in
that the markers denoting the visibility of the ‘Other’ have continued to be
phenotypical (such as hair texture and skin or eye colour). One key phenotypical
marker of difference for Indian South Africans is the varying hues of skin colour
(brown) which register as very different from black and white populations and
particularly as denoted on apartheid’s racialised scale of colour prejudice.

Other secondary markers of difference for Indian South Africans include language,
religion, distinctive style of cultural dress, food habits etc. Some typical examples of
distinguishing cultural differences of Indian South Africans are that of clothing and
general attire, including the Islamic ‘burqa’ or ‘hijab’ worn by those of the Islamic faith
or the braided red string bracelet, ‘kalava’, worn by Hindus to symbolise allegiance to
the Hindu faith. Indian South Africans are also set apart by the colourful and
distinctive architecture of Indian places of worship such as mosques and temples.

Cultural racism against Indian South Africans is often posited in terms of the perceived
danger that cultural differences pose to the South African ‘nation’. Of relevance here is the
foundational myths, ‘invented traditions’ (Hobsbawm, 1990) and ‘imagined communities’
(Andersen, 1983) which are constructed by dominant elites for political purposes and which
delineate boundaries of belonging for those who are included and excluded from
representations of the ‘nation’. As with all nationalist ideologies, the unitary nationalist
discourse of South Africa’s ‘rainbow nation’ easily lends itself to descriptors of ‘outsiders’
and ‘others’ and consequently, cultural racism toward those deemed to be outside the boundaries of the non-racial culturally homogenous citizenship exhorted by the ‘rainbow nation’. Cultural racism can be defined as “the dislike of the other not because of who they are but in perceptions of what they do and what they think” (Fleras, 2014: 49). Cultural racism practices a rhetoric of exclusion and draws on perceived or imagined incompatible cultural differences that preclude belonging or acceptance.

An important aspect of anti-Indian racism is its part derivation from racist attitudes held by Indian South Africans. Studies of internalised oppression show that where racism is deeply entrenched, some victims of racism internalise the racism of broader society, deny they are oppressed, at some level accept their condition or oppress those who are lower than they are in the social scale (Schaefer, 2010; Aronson, 1999). One of the ways in which Indian South Africans have responded to the circumstances of their oppression is by projecting racism outward to others. The external projection of racism by Indian South Africans takes different forms, such as that of discrimination toward those who are darker-skinned, desires for geographical separateness and general racially based assumptions about different racial groups. The veracity of this sentiment can be seen to be supported by the data sources used in this dissertation. It is especially evident in the statement by Mngxitama (2013) that: “Indians, because of where the white system put them in the racial hierarchy, generally do strange and hurtful things to sustain their distance from the ‘kaffir’ ” (Mngxitama, 2013).

The role played by Indian South Africans themselves as agents of racism is highly complex and merits a separate study of its own. It is understood herein to be one of
several variables in an explanatory framework of anti-Indian racism and as an important strand in the analysis and understanding of anti-Indian racism. The extent to which Indian South Africans are culpable in instigating anti-Indian racism against them is informed by a number of factors, including cultural separateness, historically enforced patterns of spatial and physical segregation etc. which will be further unpacked in this dissertation.

It is worth dwelling at this point on some specific reasons as to why anti-Indian racism has scarcely been attended or dealt any serious analytic attention. Anti-Indian racism has been easy to obscure and overlook, on account of South Africa’s demographics and its history of colonialism and apartheid in which the black majority and white minority have featured predominantly. Racism in South Africa is popularly understood in terms of a stark black-white binary. As such, the term ‘minority’ has often been understood to refer primarily to the white minority in South Africa. A case in point is that of former President Nelson Mandela’s emphasis on ‘minorities’ as referring to the white minority in South Africa when casting his vote in South Africa’s first democratic election in 1994. Mandela spoke to the challenges facing the new non-racial government and pointed out: “But we are also concerned about the minorities in the country—especially the white minority. We are concerned about giving confidence and security to those who are worried that by these changes, they are now going to be in a disadvantaged position” (Mandela, 1994). The voices and perspectives of minorities such as Indian South Africans and Coloureds have been largely subsumed under
the dominance of the black-white paradigm. A young Coloured journalist (Petersen, 2015) has noted:

*South Africa’s diversity would make you think that there’s room for more than only two voices, but that’s not the case. The coloured voice is heard and acknowledged so little that as a coloured person, any attempt to make your voice heard is seemingly futile. Politically when issues of race, culture, or class come up it is seen from one of two perspectives: the underprivileged black perspective or the over-privileged white perspective.*

Over the last two decades in post-apartheid South Africa, racism has been seen to be effectively legislated out of existence with the advent of the post-apartheid order. The complexities of group-specific kinds of racism have been generalised and indeed neutralised, under the race-blind discourse implied by the advent of the post-1994 so-called ‘rainbow nation’. Despite the primacy of the state as one of the key actors in establishing the cultural norms and values, and institutional structures which should negate racism, little substantive direction has been provided in the matter of addressing racism. Many state commitments made to addressing the matter of racism have been in the realm of the symbolic and legislative only. The constitution (1996) was rewritten in order to implement a fundamentally new value system conforming to international standards against racism. The South African Human Rights Commission was set up with a mandate to protect fundamental

---

9 A robust pool of literature has developed on the positioning of Coloureds in post-apartheid South Africa and the construction of a Coloured identity. Some leading voices include that of Erasmus (2002) and Adhikari (2005).
human rights. Initiatives such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) and the Speak Out Against Poverty Hearings in the early 1990s were implemented in order to avail the South African public of the opportunity to both discuss and advocate remedial action on matters of race, racism and the country’s history of racialised suffering. South Africa ratified important treaties such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1998. South Africa hosted the World Conference on Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance (WCAR) in 2001 (WCAR Report, 2001).

Although key pieces of legislation refer to the need to combat racism, for example ‘redressing the inequities caused by apartheid’ and ‘affirmative action in terms of race and gender in particular’ (Employment Equity Act, Department of Labour 1998), racism is not explicitly addressed in key policy documents including that of South Africa’s National Development Plan (NDP). Matters of racism tend rather to be couched in ‘softer’ and less strident terms such as social cohesion, reconciliation and nation-building and there is a policy vacuum in the matter of racial awareness and sensitivity. While many of the policy changes initiated by the post-apartheid state may be seen as laudable, they have been mostly top down and elite-led as well as cosmetic. Such high level and often legalistic approaches to addressing racism in South Africa is largely distanced from real life qualitative experiences of racism on the ground.

Stevens, Duncan and Sonn (2010:9) note that:
Since 2004 South Africa has witnessed a series of fairly harrowing manifestations of racism; some of which revivify in those who had lived through the dark days of the apartheid era, memories that they would not want to relive. While certainly not as pervasive as during the apartheid era, disconcerting incidents (such as the following) which have been reported with disquieting regularity in the media in recent years, cannot but serve as ineluctable reminders and post facto evidence and re-inscriptions of the apartheid order.

During apartheid there was a large-scale acceptance of violence and racism, as well as an accompanying societal desensitisation\(^\text{10}\). In the post-apartheid era little has been done to address the resulting psychological damage of apartheid. South Africans often display public outrage at specific heinous incidences of racism such as the ‘Reitz Four’ (Soudien, 2010) or the case of the farm labourer Mr Nelson Shisane who was thrown into a lion den in a labour dispute (Arenstein, 2004).

However it is also true that the public reception to such cases can be variable. As part of the publicity generated by such cases, online, news and print media showed supportive attitudes toward the perpetrators in question. Such vocal public statements about racism tend to be short-lived and occupy the public imagination for the duration of the media coverage. For the most part, racism is now predominantly viewed as a pathology in post-apartheid South Africa and the structural as well as

\(^{10}\) Many high-profile cases of racism in post-apartheid South Africa have captured national attention and earned widespread public condemnation. One of the most heinous incidences was that of the ‘Reitz Four’, i.e. four students at the University of the Free State (UFS) who forced five UFS cleaning staff to eat urine-soaked food as part of an initiation-type ceremony at the Reitz university residence. As a result of a court case, the four students were subsequently fined R20,000 each. Another highly publicised case was that of the murder of Mr Nelson Shisane, a labourer on a farm in Limpopo Province who was severely assaulted, tied up and thrown into a lion enclosure at the Mokwalo White Lion breeding project. The perpetrators received fines.
the everyday interpersonal manifestations of racism are scarcely acknowledged. It tends to be viewed as a matter of interpersonal prejudice of a few pathological individuals and as such, not something to which the state should necessarily respond.

Accordingly South Africans continue to battle in the arena of racism without direction or assistance by the state. While ordinary South Africans may exercise the option to report matters of racial discrimination to the Human Rights Commission (SAHRC) or the Equality Court, they have largely been left to ‘sink or swim’ in the absence of corrective approaches to racism which would allow South Africans to grapple with the challenges of a politically and not socially de-racialised society. Poor and marginalised South Africans may be less empowered to approach official institutional spaces such as the SAHRC and the Equality Court than those with affluence who are equipped with resources. In addition, public and institutional interest in racism appears to have weakened and there is now less of a sense of urgency or public outrage about racism. Thus racism continues to fester at grassroots level.

Given the relative silence of post-apartheid South Africa on matters of racism as described above, there is space for some reflection on the matter of how racism can continue to exist in societies that fundamentally claim to be non-racist. Such a question is posed at a time when discourses of ‘colour-blindness’ and ‘post-raciality’ (Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Carr, 1997; Omi and Winant, 1994) have gained traction in the international academy. According to the literature on ‘colour-blindness’ and ‘post-raciality’ it has now become socially unacceptable in contemporary society to show blatant signs of racial prejudice, leading to the development of a general cultural
norm against the overt expression of racism. Societies which are said to be ‘colour-blind’ are characterised by a general culture of public repudiation of racism and stigmatisation of all overtly racist expressions. In order to support the theory of colour-blindness, Brown (1985) proposes the concept of ‘racist non-racism’ in which certain groups who exercise economic and political dominance in society such as whites, are unable to recognise any form of racism in their actions toward and interactions with those who are not white11.

A key part of this body of international literature on ‘colour-blindness’ as a normative ideology focuses on what has been labelled ‘new’ forms of racism (Pettigrew and Meertens, 1995; Omi and Winant, 1994; Bonilla-Silver, 2006). This form of racism is distinguished by its more ‘invisible’ and covert character, to a substantial degree, from old’ racism. Old racism is characterised by old-fashioned and more flagrant forms of racism which are based on overt acts of prejudice and bigotry. ‘Old’ racism is typically classified as blatant and direct forms of racism, often undergirded by a legislative basis (Virtanen and Huddy, 1998). New racism is seen as “serving today as the ideological armour for a covert and institutionalised system” of racism and that it “aids in the maintenance of white privilege without fanfare, without naming those whom it subjects and those who it rewards” (Bonilla-Silva, 2006, 3; Coates, 2011). Omi and Winant describe ‘new’ racism as “(that) the legacy of the past-of conquest, racial dictatorship and exclusion—may no longer weigh like a nightmare on the brain

11 A useful example of Brown’s concept of ‘racist non-racism’ can be drawn from the work of journalist Ms Donna Bryson, author of the book ‘It’s a Black White Thing’ (2014). In particular Bryson notes that "I have interviewed white South Africans who did not realise they were revealing racist thinking when they told me, a black American, that ‘our blacks’ are different from ‘you Americans’. They thought that was a compliment".
of the living, but it still lingers like a hangover or a sleepless night that has left us badly out of sorts” (1994:57).

Post-apartheid South Africa presents an interesting case study of concepts of ‘old’ and ‘new’ racism. South Africa’s former apartheid system can be seen as an example of old racism. With the advent of the post-apartheid era, however, it can be claimed that the flagrant legislative racism of the apartheid past is now being reformulated along less direct lines which are difficult to decisively name and challenge. Racism in itself is a complex phenomenon which changes its form in different historical circumstances and situational contexts. It manifests in variable ways, is often classed and gendered, and interwoven with ethnic, religious or national identities. It is a particularly difficult concept to grasp because in the absence of ‘old’ racism where racism has been morally repudiated, it can be easily more denied. Victims of racism are thus challenged to ‘prove’ the existence of racism or racist intentions as racial innocence is presumed on the part of people, institutions, policies and ideas. ‘New’ racism is more complex and contradictory as the influence of non-racialism and colour blindness can compel racism into ‘going underground’ or reforming into something ostensibly more subtle, indirect and hence seemingly invisible (McConahay, 1986). It is therefore essential for the purposes of this dissertation for some clarity on how the matter of anti-Indian racism is understood.

This dissertation is particularly sensitive to the need to avoid over-generalisations about the attitudes, experiences and social position of members of particular racial groups. It is understood that the overlapping nature of identities (for example race
may well be superceded by variables such as that of sex/gender) may blur the meanings assigned to the membership of particular groups. The dynamic nature of identities and identity-formation processes is acknowledged in the effect it exerts on peoples sense of who they are at any given time. Therefore the data sources used to supplement this study were chosen with particular care. The two data sources used in the dissertation are as such: (a) a set of 18 national focus groups conducted by the Gauteng City-Region Observatory (GCRO) and the Ahmed Kathrada Foundation (AKF) with a wide range of South African respondents from urban, suburban and rural environments and (b) thirty two in-depth semi-structured interviews with a selected cross section of respondents, 30 of whom were Indian South African. The GCRO/AKF focus groups were selected to be utilised in this dissertation because they revealed high levels of anti-Indian hostility and prejudice. More so than any other racial group, hostilities were expressed toward Indian South Africans across all the different variables of class, gender/sex, geographical location etc. The semi-structured interviews were conducted in order to further probe experiences of anti-Indian racism among Indian South African respondents on account of the limited sample of Indian South Africans in the AKF/GCRO focus groups. The interviews showed the extent of the threat felt by Indian South Africans. In sum, both data sources indicate a volatile combination of anti-Indian racisms, related to different matters of belonging and entitlement as part of the contestation of the place of Indian South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa.

Primacy is given here to the experiences of anti-Indian racism as articulated by interviewees and respondents. In this sense, it is felt that those who suffer racism should be in a privileged position to say when racism is being experienced and when
actions, behaviour or language is perceived as racist or not. Therefore this dissertation is sensitive to experiences and definitions of anti-Indian racism utilised herein as rightly reflecting the experience of those who are its recipients.

In utilising the aforementioned data sources, it is acknowledged that a full scale research enquiry into all aspects of anti-Indian racism was not possible within the scope of this thesis. Moreover the sensitive research terrain of this dissertation mitigated against an ‘investigative-type’ approach to this work. Chapter Four of the dissertation acknowledges some of the methodological complexities of undertaking research into racism as well as the specific challenges of recruiting respondents and conducting interviews with them experienced in the course of pursuing this dissertation. Therefore the dissertation sought to focus on the subjective nature of anti-Indian racism. The data sources utilised in this dissertation have been employed to illustrate the power of perceptions and attitudes on the development and perpetuation of anti-Indian racism and not to demonstrate the existence of anti-Indian racism. These data sources can be considered a small but important window into a particular component of the Indian South African experience of racism. These data sources cannot be considered objective or in any way statistically representative. The value of the data sources used in the dissertation is its fundamental subjectivity and the insightful perspective it provides on attitudes and perceptions towards Indian South Africans, the effects on Indian South Africans and the consequent development of anti-Indian racism. Rather than providing factual evidence of anti-Indian racism, these data sources instead help to contribute a sense of the subjectivity of anti-Indian racism and more specifically, how negative perceptions about Indian South Africans, often long-held and historically inherited,
have encouraged the reproduction of anti-Indian racism and conditioned Indian South Africans to respond to their environment in ways which encourage anti-Indian racism. The data sources help to support the overall argument advanced by this dissertation, i.e. that a set of structural circumstances engineered by the ‘racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001) in combination with forces such as identity and culture, have trapped Indian South Africans into a state of ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980) which has contributed to the continued development of anti-Indian racism.

CONCEPTS OF RACISM

Given that racism is a complex concept weighted with multiple interpretations, its utility as a clear descriptor of behaviours, interactions and practices defining anti-Indian racism must be defined at the outset of this work. A starting point for a definition of anti-Indian racism is that of concepts of race and racism.

Definitions of racism are located in the root, ‘race’, with attendant notions of biological determinism. Van den Berghe calls race “a human group that defines itself and/or is defined by other groups as different from other groups by virtue of innate and immutable physical characteristics. These physical characteristics are in turn believed to be intrinsically related to moral, intellectual, and other non-physical attributes or abilities” (Van den Berghe, 1978:9). From this perspective perceived physical differences is the focus of race. Race has tended to be associated generally with biology and the correlation of genetic markers and phenotypical traits with certain groupings of humans. Qualities such as morality and intelligence are thought to be determined by biology or genes, with the result that perceived racial differences become perceived as fixed and immutable. It is within this context that racial
stereotypes proliferate and serves as the justification of prejudice and discrimination (Gilman, 1985). For example, Indian South Africans are often seen as naturally inclined to business or commerce, hence the stereotypes of being mercenary or corrupt in business. Black Africans are stereotyped as violent and warlike types. Those holding Islamic beliefs are often stereotyped as ‘bombers’ and ‘terrorists’. White South Africans tend to be seen as generally opposed to and fearful of black rule in post-apartheid South Africa, and inclined toward emigration as a response to such fears. Coloureds are popularly stereotyped as tending to be involved in a culture of drugs and gangs.

There is continuing work by some scientists and researchers to essentialise notions of race, seek biological explanations for differences amongst the human population and in doing so, propagate claims that certain racial groups are naturally superior to others. A recent book by respected journalist Nicholas Wade has helped revive ideas of racial science (Wade, 2014). However despite the recent proliferation of racial science emanating from certain quarters of the scientific community, there is also a robust counter-movement debunking myths of scientific racism. The general consensus in the academic community is that race is: (a) politically and socially constructed, and, (b) dynamic and historically flexible. However race has always been regarded as a seemingly ‘real’ division of humanity. Despite its socially constructed nature, history has shown that race holds a powerful purchase on the
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12 In 2007 world renowned scientist and former Nobel laureate Dr James Watson, responsible for discovering the double helix structure of DNA together with Professor Francis Crick, received widespread censure for public statements that black people were not of equal intelligence to white people. See Rutherford (2014) ‘He may have unravelled DNA, but James Watson deserves to be shunned’ at http://www.theguardian.com.

13 In 2015 the widely acclaimed book ‘Black Brain, White Brain: Is Intelligence Skin Deep?’ by Gavin Evans challenged prevailing notions of racial science and denounced it as pseudo-science.
everyday lived socio-political reality of people. The extent to which the realities of race must be acknowledged in order to adequately address the matter of racism, remains a matter of debate and contestation.

Interpretations of race have since evolved to include a more expansive focus on race as a proxy for matters of belonging and exclusion. According to Goldberg and Solomos (2002:3), race is seen as:

- A medium by which difference is represented and otherness produced, so that contingent attributes such as skin colour are transformed into supposedly essentialist bases for identities, group belonging and exclusion, social privileges and burdens, political rights and disenfranchisement” and “remains at the level of everyday representation, a potent social and political category around which individuals and groups organise their identity and construct a politics.

Influential race theorists Omi and Winant explain race as “...an unstable and ‘decentered’ complex of social meanings constantly being transformed by political struggle,” and as “a concept which signifies and symbolizes social conflicts and interests by referring to different types of human bodies” (1994:55). Omi and Winant see race primarily as a social construct and such social constructs signal political and economic consequences for matters such as access to rights and resources. Race is linked to race directly to political struggles between different groups of people, and to social conflicts which stem from competing group interests. To say that race is defined in large part by political struggle is to recognise how definitions of
race and racial categories and hence the form and expression of racism have shifted over time, as the political terrain has changed. As such, racial formation theory shows how the meaning and implications of race are always historically situated, and are ever evolving with the passage of time. The point here is that racism as an experience, and even the ways in which it might be explained, as a result of the different forms racism might take, is never the same in two different contexts or in different time-periods. Sivanandan (1983:2) argues that racism is never static: “Racism does not stay still; it changes shape, size, contours, purpose, function- with changes in the economy, the social structure, the system and, above all, the challenges, the resistances to that system”.

The more value-neutral term ‘ethnicity’ has often been used as a proxy for race, indicating the close relationship between matters of race, racism and ethnicity. The distinction is often made between race and ethnicity, providing the basis for a robust theoretical debate about the relationship of both concepts to each other and which constitutes the superordinate one. This is in keeping with Hall’s playful contention that “race and ethnicity play hide and seek with each other”. Ethnicity refers to groups of people who have common cultural traits such as similar language, religion, food habits, other social behaviours as well as a common ancestry and shared group history, which distinguishes them from other people. Gordon argues that the term ethnic group is sufficiently large enough to include race: “The larger phenomenon then is not race but ethnicity which as a sociological concept, includes race” (Gordon, 1988:131). Omi and Winant argue against the inclusive view of ethnicity, and call for a critical examination of the modes of group construction in specific cases. Ethnicity differs fundamentally from race in that ethnicity can be ‘chosen’ in a
way that race, as an involuntary choice, cannot. Race is politically and socially imposed and denotes hierarchy whereas ethnicity is much more fluid and optional.

The earliest concepts of racism focused centrally on attitudes, prejudices and ideology. Racism tended to be seen primarily as a matter of attitude and cognition, i.e. related to “matters of thinking, mental categorisation, attitude and discourse” (Delgado and Stefancic, 2001:17). Benedict (1945) was one of the first scholars to use the term in the book *Race and Racism*. According to Benedict (1945:87) racism is defined as “the dogma that one ethnic group is condemned by nature to congenital inferiority and another group is destined to congenital superiority.” Racism is seen as an ideology and a set of ideas and beliefs in the inferiority of a designated group and that those beliefs have the potential to induce discrimination or racial treatment of particular groups in society (Benedict, 1945; Blumer, 1958; Van den Berghe, 1978; Wilson, 1973; Schaefer, 1990). Blumer (1958) identified four components of racism: perceptions of superiority of the dominant groups in society over the subordinate groups; a sense of inherent difference between the dominant and subordinate groups; a sense of advantage held by the dominant group over subordinate group and fear of the subordinate group by the dominant group (Blumer 1958:4). Integral to Blumer’s work is the notion of group power in the context of relationships of dominance and subordination.
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14 The most significant difference between race and ethnicity is the differential relationship to power. The close relationship of race and ethnicity is particularly evident in South Africa given the historical context in which ethnicity and race was contrived and manipulated by both colonial and apartheid governments in order to achieve political ends and sustain their rule. The concept of ethnicity was most fully appropriated by apartheid in 1948 as a means of emphasising cultural difference as the logic underpinning segregation and ‘apartheid’. Ethnicity was utilised as a synonym for multiple plural interests such as ‘the people’ (volk), culture, population group, nation. In terms of this racialised logic Indian South Africans were deemed a separate group on account of shared cultural or ethnic attributes such as food, language, religion, kinship and family structure, etc.
Sociological concepts of racism have now advanced beyond notions of racism as simply a doctrine or belief system. In *Portraits of White Racism*, Wellman (1993) notes the evolution in the sociology of racism away from interpersonal prejudice and belief systems toward macro-scale analyses of institutional, historical, and structural dynamics which entrench the social advantages of dominant groups in society. Power is seen as a central characteristic of racism. According to Goldberg (1993:111) “Racisms are largely if not altogether exclusively expressions of dominance” (Goldberg, 1993: 111). According to Miles (1993:101): “It is also a discourse of marginalisation which is integral to a process of domination: and those who articulate racism always necessarily situate themselves within relations of domination”. The role of power in the operation of institutions is illuminated by Arendt (1970), who contends that power (like racism) is not the property of individuals but of groups. According to Arendt (1970), power is held in place within institutions by the consent of individuals who maintain it. Similarly, indirect institutional racism operates through consent. Furthermore, Arendt maintains that power is not necessarily obvious to those who have it. Well-meaning people who perform everyday racism may not perceive their actions as racist, even though their actions contribute to the perpetuation of institutional racism.

Marxist scholars who regard class and class struggle as the central explanatory variable of social life view racism as a legitimating ideology to divide the working class and secure the economic interests of the wealthier classes of society (Cox, 1948; Perlo, 1975; Szymanski, 1981). Neo-Marxists (Miles, 1980; Solomos, 1986; Wolpe, 1986) share similar views about class dynamics as the real engine of racism and present the idea that racism is a product of class struggle.
Omi and Winant (1994) emphasise the primary role of ‘racial formations’ and ‘racial projects’ as a means of explaining racism. Racial formation is defined as the “socio-historical process by which racial categories are created, inhabited, transformed and destroyed” (1994:55). This theory provides a framework for understanding the operation of racially stratified societies. It locates race at the centre of politics and culture and “will always be at the centre” (1994:5). In this view, race is a key organising principle of social and political relationships and shapes all spheres of social life at both the macro and micro level. Omi and Winant emphasise the central role of the state in reorganising the structures and institutions of society in order to frame and organise inequality. They also give primacy to the racial projects of dominant elites such as conservatives and reactionary political parties in shaping the racial character of societies. Racial formation theory accords a central role to doctrinal ideological processes in defining racism.

Systemic racism theory (Feagin, 2006) and racial formation theory (Omi and Winant, 1994) both emphasise the systemic nature of racism and the structured nature of white privilege and advantage. Systemic racism reaches further than ‘racial projects’ by locating racism through exploitative and discriminatory practices perpetrated by whites; the unjustly gained resources and power for whites institutionalized in the still-dominant racial hierarchy; the maintenance of major material and other resource inequalities by white-controlled and well-institutionalised social reproduction mechanisms; and (d) the many racial prejudices, stereotypes, images, narratives,
emotions, interpretations and narratives of the dominant ‘white racial frame’
designed to rationalise and implement persisting racial oppression (Feagin, 2006).

A large body of scholarship (Alvarez et al, 1989; Carmichael and Hamilton, 1968; Chesler, 1974) advances the idea that racism is primarily structural and centrally transmitted through institutional means. Carmichael and Hamilton (1968:122) define racism as “the predication of decisions and policies on considerations of race for the purposes of subordinating a racial group and maintaining control over that group.” As such, racism is viewed as an institutional matter in which white privilege is reproduced systemically through institutions controlled by the interests of dominant groups. There is a close relationship between institutional racism and structural racism, both terms are often used interchangeably with each other. Institutional racism refers to the norms and practices within institutions, organisations and governments; structural racism refers rather to the interactions between and among institutions which produce racist and racialised outcomes for certain racial groups (Adams, Bell and Griffin, 1997). Structural racism is the macro-level systems, social forces, institutions, ideologies, processes that interact with one another to generate and reinforce inequities between racial and ethnic groups (Powell, 2008). This form of racism is seen to be diffused through all aspects of society, including history, culture, politics, economics and the entire social fabric. Structural racism is the most profound and pervasive form of racism. All other forms of racism such as institutional, interpersonal, internalised, etc. emerge from the presence of structural racism.
Institutional racism focuses on the insidious phenomenon of institutional and macro-level behaviours which function to preserve and perpetuate unearned privileges of dominant groups. It is deemed insidious because racial privilege is structured into institutions in 'hidden' ways which systematically produce advantages for some dominant groups in society and persistently disadvantages others. Institutional racism is transmitted by elites in sectors such as politics, government policy, media, educational institutions, and other institutions which purvey racist ideologies, often in hidden and subliminal terms (Van Dijk, 1993).

Omi and Winant have written about hidden and pernicious forms racism circulating in society: “Conscious or unconscious, acknowledged or denied, the racial organisation of everyday life is omnipresent: where we live, the work we do, what we eat and what we wear, the language we speak and the idioms we use, the television programs we watch; in short nearly every aspect of our everyday life is shaped in crucial ways by race” (Omi and Winant, 2008: 1568). Gidden’s (1981) theory of structuration and Arendt’s (1970) work on power both illuminate the link between hidden racism and the social structure in which institutional racism is embedded. The seminal work of Stuart Hall (1980) illuminates how hidden or unconscious racism operates outside of people's awareness. As such, the practices of racism become and remain invisible and are passively tolerated by all in society. Therefore institutional racism is often the most difficult to recognise and counter, particularly when it is perpetrated by institutions and governments who do not view themselves as racist.
Essed (1991) provides a crucial counterpoint to the matter of institutional racism by inserting the role of individual agency into the practice of institutional racism. Essed argues that over-emphasis on the structural aspect of institutional racism downplays the role of individuals in the production of racism, for “structures of racism do not exist external to agents-they are made by agents” (1991:39). Essed advanced the term “everyday racism” to capture everyday practices and interactions that maintain the social oppression of racial groups. Essed argues that everyday racism ensures the continuity of the relationship between the personal and the group experience of racism. Accounts of “everyday racism” provide individuals with the ability to explain their own experiences in terms of group experiences, by interpreting them in terms of the historical and contemporary group experience of racism. Essed’s work breaks new academic ground in its explication of the experiential basis of racism particularly in terms of how racism is recognised and experienced particularly in covert manifestations of racism.

In summary, the need to define anti-Indian racism for the purpose of its usage in this dissertation looms large at this point. Given the multiplicity of theoretical and conceptual understandings of racism within different ideological frameworks advanced here, racism can be described as an umbrella term encompassing both micro and macro level elements of racism, which include attitudes, beliefs and prejudices which reinforce and maintain oppression of different racial groups. Racism manifests at an individual (micro) level if it is perpetrated by a person holding racist beliefs about the inherent inferiority or superiority of different racial groups, or at the institutional (macro) level, when policies or resources are shaped and channelled to advantage or disadvantage particular racial groups. Key attributes of
racism are understood herein to be its assumptions of inferiority or superiority of different racial groups based on perceived differences; its relationship to power and structural processes that inferiorise and dehumanise particular racial groups; its dichotomy of ‘outsiders versus insiders’ and its mediation through the matter of ‘difference’ and the creation of ‘the Other’ in order to serve political ends. Therefore definitions of anti-Indian racism used here encompass a wide range of understandings of racism: its manifestations in individual behaviours, institutional practices, cultural values and political priorities; and its expression at varying levels from the interpersonal and ideological to the institutional and structural.

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

This dissertation hopes to break some of the silence on anti-Indian racism in South Africa, which generally remains a highly sensitive, controversial and even ‘taboo’ subject for South African society. There is a propensity toward avoidance: “The colour line is a curtain of silence” (Shipler, 1998: 473). Through its focus on anti-Indian racism this dissertation will explore some of the reasons why anti-Indian racism has generally been neglected as a problematic and left largely unexamined. When undertaking this work, it became apparent that there is a dearth of literature on anti-Indian racism and the role of racial minority groups more generally. The issue of anti-Indian racism remains a blind-spot for South African history and politics. While matters of race and racism in South Africa are well researched and theorised, a critical re-interpretation of the role of racial minority groups such as Indian South Africans is largely absent from a contemporary retelling and revision of South African history and politics. This study looks to address this critical gap.
In undertaking a literature search, it was found that there are very few stand-alone texts on Indian South Africans and those that exist tend to gravitate toward two main areas of analysis: (a) historical works on the experience of immigration and indentured labour and (b) analyses of the role of Indians in post-apartheid South Africa. There are few, if any, works on prejudice and racism toward Indian South Africans.

to the field of early Indian South African history is that of Duncan du Bois' work *Labourer or Settler? Colonial Natal's Indian Dilemma 1860-1897* released in 2011. Du Bois' work is centrally focused on the political environment in colonial Natal and the effect of colonial politics on the development and settlement of the Indian indentured labourers in Natal. This work provides a political nuance to the study of the Indian South African historical experience which has not been explored to the same extent in other works on Indian South African history.

The second key area of focus in the literature on Indian South Africans is that of the matter of the political positioning of Indian South Africans in a post-apartheid era. This thematic focus has emerged only fairly recently, post-1994. Given the vulnerabilities experienced by minority groups in the post-apartheid dispensation, the strengthened focus on Indian South African identity and positioning may be seen in the context of a search for greater understanding of the post-apartheid positioning of Indian South Africans and the processes of social construction and meaning of an Indian South African identity (Vahed and Desai, 2010; Ramsamy, 2007; Lemon, 2008; Dhupelia-Mesthrie, 2000; Ebrahim-Vally, 2001; Desai, 1996; Freund, 1995). This recent growth in literature may also be partly due to the processes of critical reflection prompted by the 150 year anniversary of the arrival of Indian indentured labour in 1860 and hence, the increased levels of interest in a “search for ‘roots’” (Vahed and Desai, 2010, p.4). Increased academic attention could possibly be attributed to increased levels of uncertainty and anxiety about the position of Indian South Africans in a post-apartheid South Africa.
In digesting this small though robust body of literature, it is apparent that more critical and empirically-grounded research is needed in order to understand the position of Indian South Africans and/or the specific dynamics of anti-Indian racism. Some key works by international scholars (Soske, 2009 and 2010; Jayawardane, 2012; Burton, 2016) provide important direction for a shift in the current pool of scholarship toward a focus on anti-Indian racism. However a dedicated focus on the matter of anti-Indian racism in the general pool of literature would be helpful and particularly so from South African scholars.

Accordingly this study now hopes to add to the growth of a substantial body of literature on the presence of an Indian South African minority and the nature and extent of their integration into South African society. This must include a broader discourse of what may be termed ‘minority politics’ (Blalock, 1967; Deleuze and Parnet, 1977; JanMohamed and Lloyd, 1990). In addition this study contends that there is space for a discourse of minority politics within the South African social science academy in much the same way that it has developed in other international contexts. Some examples of key studies of minority politics include that of the everyday racism experienced by black women in the Netherlands and the United States (Essed, 1991), the experiences of black men in the United States (Feagin and Sikes, 1994) and studies of Asian Americans in the United States (Lee, 2015; Mistry, 2009). A discourse of minority politics is said to involve a “complex scholarship of revisionist histories, the collation of personal and oral narratives, testimonies of informants and the subjective experiences of the researcher, exhaustive archival research and reading through public cultures and artefacts” (Mistry, 2009: 2). According to Madhu (2012:1) minority discourse is seen as fundamentally political as it:
challenges the spread and territory of power relations that constitute internal and external assemblages. Internal assemblages are habituated mind-sets, routine-habitus-praxis, and flow of practices; external assemblages are the situations and relations that constitute the internal assemblage. Both internal and external assemblages are emergent realities resonating to the power relations condition them.

It may be imagined that a similar process of helping further develop a minority discourse may be possible in South Africa in tandem with the many ongoing projects, often activist-based, which are engaged in creating revisionist histories through theatre and literature and helping develop new representations of Indian South Africans. Should such a discourse of minorities be developed in South Africa, it will require rigorous theoretical exploration which acknowledges the political and sociological reality of the experiences and lives of Indian South Africans in South Africa. This study would hope to help provide a very basic starting point toward such a process.

In sum, there are two key reasons to pursue this dissertation. One is the need to increase the pool of critical scholarship on the experiences of Indian South Africans in terms of a dedicated focus on racism. The second reason is to help develop a consolidated discourse of minority politics. This will help provide a starting point as well as a metaphorical ‘safe space’ for a discussion of matters of anti-Indian racism. This provides a powerful rationale for determined pursuit of this study.
QUALIFYING REMARKS

Given that the student is of Indian South African descent and can claim an Indian South African identity amongst a multiplicity of other identities, this dissertation may well invoke claims of subjectivity and possible emotional involvement. With key reference to the phenomenological approach employed in this dissertation, the work seeks to distance itself from the traditional approach of positivist social science research methods which emphasise the principle of pure objectivity and hence detachment as central tenets of the research process. Chapter Four of this dissertation outlines the principles of phenomenology and the overall value of the phenomenological approach to a study on a complex subject matter such as race and racism. Phenomenology raises the awareness of the researcher and increases insight. Therefore, in line with Draper’s (2002) emphasis on the importance of “understanding and owning our subjectivity”, this dissertation accordingly embraces subjectivity.

Research is viewed here as a two-way process in which the student brings the benefit of situational influence and experience to the subject matter at hand. Accordingly, subjectivity or positionality is seen here as an unavoidable core characteristic of research, which, nonetheless is able to produce possibly richer and more significant data than that which consciously endeavours to eliminate all subjective influences. This notion is supported by a body of sociological work which argues, for example, that “it is more logical to accept our subjectivity, our emotions and our socially grounded positions than to assume that some can rise above them” (Ramazanoglu, 1992: 211), opposes the view that, “a scientifically acceptable
research method is objective or value-free, that it harbours no particular point of view” and ultimately accepts that, “all methods and forms of representation are partial” (Eisner, 1986:15). It is understood that a rejection of pure objectivity does not in any way preclude research from critical rigour and accuracy.

The dissertation is acutely aware of the risks of subjectivity, such as “projection on behalf of the researcher, limitations due to the researcher’s own blind spots and a sometimes unclear demarcation between what belongs to subjectivity and what belongs to delusions” (Drapeau, 2002). It is considered particularly important to be aware of pre-judgement and projections cast upon the research. The phenomenological approach of ‘bracketing’ (Denzin, 1989), i.e. the setting aside or ‘bracketing out’ of customary ‘natural’ assumptions about the research phenomena at hand, is intended toward this purpose and that the researcher keep an open mind at all times. Therefore this dissertation proceeds from the starting point that the close relationship of the author to the subject matter at hand is ultimately of benefit to this dissertation.

A further qualification must be made with regard to use of racial terminology. There is some bitter irony in the fact that to research matters of race and racism is also to use the same categories and language used inherited from the same racialist discourse that was used to justify racial and political oppression. However it is understood that use of such racial categories does and should not in any way lend credibility or legitimacy to apartheid naming categories as well as the multiple caricatures and stereotypes which have accompanied these descriptors. In writing
and researching matters of race and racism, social scientists must remain attentive to the unintended dangers of promoting, with language, the very racialisation that the academy is attempting to address and critique. For reasons of simple utility, reference is made throughout this dissertation to apartheid-derived racial categories such as black African, Coloured and white. To open up an exploration of alternative descriptions is beyond the scope of this dissertation.

This dissertation acknowledges at the very outset that usage of the term ‘Indian South African’ or even ‘Indian’ is conceptually problematic. ‘Indian’ is an apartheid-derived classification term. ‘India’ also does not represent one over-arching dominant culture which can be described as ‘Indian’. The Indian South African population is a highly diverse grouping differentiated along the lines of class, religion, language, caste, etc. ‘Indian’ serves as an umbrella term for multiple diverse identities. There appears to be little or no consensus on the matter of how those designated as ‘Indian’ should be referred. During colonial rule Indians were first referred to as ‘Persons of Indian Origin’ (PIOs) subsumed under the population category ‘Asians’, a category which also included parts of the small Chinese population. At different points during apartheid those of Indian origin were variably called ‘Asian’ or ‘Non-White’. Accordingly the matter of conceptual terms and ‘naming’ remains controversial and sensitive. During apartheid some activists chose not to capitalise the first letter of the term ‘Indian’ as a protest against apartheid-imposed racial categories and ethnocentric values and as a defiant affirmation of

---

15 The land of descent was presumed self-evidently to be India, but the ‘Indian’ population is descended from as far afield as Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Malaysia and the old colonial empires of Fiji and Mauritius. See Bhana and Brain (1990) for a historical overview of the movements of Indian migrants to South Africa.
non-racial values. In line with political currents of the time, some Indians self-identified as ‘black’ or simply ‘South African’. There is room to conceptualise more appropriate designations for Indian South Africans, in the same way that South African society may search on behalf of other racial groupings as a corrective to apartheid category-making processes. In the post-apartheid era hyphenated terms such as ‘African-Indian’ have proved deeply controversial, implying a prioritisation of the African identity before the Indian identity and calling into question the strength of the Indian South African affiliation to India and South Africa. There are several terms in current usage, such as Indian South Africans, South African Indians, ‘South Africans of Indian descent’, and even fashionably ‘Indo-Safricans’. There are several terms in current usage, such as Indian South Africans, South African Indians, ‘South Africans of Indian descent’, and even ‘Indo-Safricans’. Amidst the multiplicity of terms, the term ‘Indian South Africa’ is used here as a (relatively) neutral naming category.

It may be asked why this dissertation singles out anti-Indian racism in the context of systemic racism in South Africa. Singling out anti-Indian racism does not weaken general anti-racist critiques by diverting attention to another group, nor does it attempt to differentially weigh the socio-political importance or immorality of one type of racism over another. This dissertation is grounded in the belief that the matter of systemic racism is generally served by being more attentive to particular forms of racism. Nor does this dissertation suggest that the anti-Indian racism in South Africa

---

16 The term ‘African-Indian’ gained notoriety within the context of its original usage by former President Thabo Mbeki in an attempt to court the Indian electorate in the 1999 general elections through newspaper advertisements. It is said that Mbeki was made to change the order of appellations in order to appease vocalised discontent among Indian South African politicians about the implied strength of attachment to an African identity by having ‘African’ supercede the ‘Indian’ identity (Ebrahim-Vally, 2001:4).
is in any way qualitatively different from racism toward minority groups in other parts of the world. There are important commonalities in the experience of other minority groups in different parts of the world. Indeed the experiences of Indians in Africa bear important similarities to that of Indians in South Africa. However it is not the place of this dissertation to discuss racism toward those of Indian descent in a global context. The focus of this dissertation is specifically on anti-Indian racism in South Africa.

CHAPTER OUTLINE

This dissertation is organised in the following order: Chapter One is the introduction to the dissertation. It lays out the core argument of the work as well as the rationale for undertaking the work. For the purposes of this dissertation an understanding of anti-Indian racism has to be elucidated. Concepts of race, racism and ethnicity are explored in order to help better define the concept of anti-Indian racism.

Chapter Two presents a theoretical framework which supports the core argument of this study. This framework draws centrally on Bulhan’s theory of ‘in-betweenness’ (Bulhan, 1980) as well as a body of literature on the assimilation and adaptation processes of immigrant communities. It argues that the ‘in-between’ space is configured by the interaction between the role of the ‘racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001) and other key factors such as culture and identity. Of particular interest is the concept of Indian South African identity and how a fine line has been maintained between a dual commitment to South Africa and a psychological attachment to the so-called ‘homeland’ of India. This chapter argues that, having been historically
located in a space of ‘in-betweenness’, Indian South Africans may be locked into what can be seen as a permanent ‘in-between’ status.

Chapter Three constructs an explanatory framework for anti-Indian racism through a historical narrative of the Indian experience in South Africa. This chapter provides context and background for the structural location of ‘in-betweenness’ as a key component of the Indian South African experience. It highlights critical junctures and key events in South African history which historically produced and continue to produce, anti-Indian racism. This chapter helps to analyse the similarities between historical and contemporary forms of the Indian South African experience in order to show the relationship between historically situated anti-Indian racism in South Africa and their contemporary location in a post-apartheid context. The chapter is seen as particularly important in terms of its description of the shape and contours of anti-Indian racism and the depiction of continuities between the past and the present.

Chapter Four presents the methodological approach utilised by the dissertation. Specifically, this chapter explains the methodological choices adopted for this work. A phenomenological approach was selected for the purposes of this work. Given that the focus of the work was on understanding the subjective nature of anti-Indian racism, phenomenology was deemed an appropriate methodology to guide the work. With a central emphasis on “description, interpretation, and critical self-reflection” phenomenology focuses “in-depth on the meaning of a particular aspect of experience, assuming that through dialogue and reflection the quintessential meaning of the experience will be reviewed” (Rossman and Rallis, 1998: 52). This approach helps to make a case for an in-depth qualitative approach to the subject
matter at hand. Given the sensitivity of research on race and racism, and the methodological complexities of soliciting insights from respondents, reference is made here to a body of international work dealing with sensitive research in the interest of working toward a methodologically rigorous design for this work.

Chapter Five presents the data findings of the study according to a set of themes. The aforementioned themes are: (a) the continued social reality and significance of race in the post-apartheid context; (b) the widespread and multi-faceted nature of anti-Indian racism; (c) exploitation of black Africans by Indian South Africans; (d) resentment and envy as key factors in anti-Indian racism and (e) the Indian South African experience of fear, insecurity and vulnerability. These themes have been extracted out of the raw data of focus groups and individual interviews as part of the protocols for a phenomenological data analysis (Creswell, 1998). The data was examined and organised into key statements which were then transformed into particular clusters of meaning reflecting aspects of respondents’ understandings about Indian South Africans and about anti-Indian racism.

Chapter Six provides a critical reflection on anti-Indian racism from the perspective of having reached the end of the dissertation and with the benefit of the cumulative findings of the combination of the theoretical framework and qualitative research. Part of the analysis of anti-Indian racism involves an explication of how Indian South African identities have been shaped by the space of ‘in-betweenity’ in which Indian South Africans have found themselves. The analysis also explores the relationship between past and present forms of anti-Indian racism as well as that of ‘old’ forms of
anti-Indian racism (biological; officially legislated; flagrant) and ‘new’ forms of anti-Indian racism (subtle, covert, unconscious and unacknowledged) in post-apartheid South Africa. In sum this chapter will provide an explanatory framework for the forms that anti-Indian takes and has taken through successive periods in history, as well as the reasons why anti-Indian racism exists and continues to exist.
CHAPTER TWO: ‘IN-BETWEENITY’: A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING ANTI-INDIAN RACISM IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

The theoretical framework outlined here is informed by a large and multi-faceted body of sociological theory, including Bulhan’s theory of ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980) and Blalock’s theory of ‘middleman minorities’ (Blalock, 1967) for the purpose of constructing a broad explanatory framework in order to understand anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. The conceptual framing device used here is that of ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980). This chapter addresses the relationship between anti-Indian racism and the vexed condition of ‘in-betweenity’ through the nature of the historical process by which Indian South Africans established their place in South Africa, the adaptive responses to ‘in-between’ positioning, the impact on identity formation of Indian South Africans and the consequent prevalence and persistence of anti-Indian racism in such contexts.

The ‘in-between’ space is not unique to Indian South Africans. There is a robust body of scholarship which critically analyses the ‘in-between’ experiences of many minority groups all over the world including the Jews in Europe, Chinese minorities in various South East Asian countries, the Ibos in Nigeria, Indians in East Africa etc. (Anand and Kaul, 2011; Portes and Manning, 2008; Pfeffer and Parra, 2009; Ghai and Ghai, 1970; Keshodkar, 2004)\(^{17}\). Despite the empirical and analytical richness of scholarship on ‘in-between’ groups, much of it lacks a dedicated focus to the matter

\(^{17}\) From a historical perspective the ‘in-between’ positioning of Indian South Africans can be seen to bear similarities to that of the Anglo-Indian group (Indians of mixed Indian and European heritage) during the period of British colonial rule in India: “uncomfortably sandwiched between the disapproval of the rulers and the distrust of the ruled” (Bose, 1979:9).
of racism and specifically, how racism is configured into the in-between space occupied by the minority group in question. However, works such as that by Glassman (2004), Brennan (2012) and Aiyar (2015) highlighting anti-Indian animosities in other parts of Africa have opened up important spaces of academic reflection on the matter of anti-Indian racism in Africa.

A large part of the literature on different ‘in-between’ minority groups focuses instead on the diverse assimilation paths experienced as part of their incorporation into host societies and the racialised obstacles encountered therein. Classic assimilation theory, centrally influenced by the popular ‘melting pot’ paradigm of the United States, views immigrant groups as following a sequential path from initial economic hardship and discrimination to upward socio-economic mobility and eventual full assimilation into what is assumed to be a unified ‘white’ middle class North American culture (Park and Burgess, 1921; Bierstedt, 1957). It is argued that classic assimilation theory is biased against those seen as ‘not white’ in that it requires new immigrants shed their cultural distinctiveness and conform instead to a homogenous ‘white’ culture. Another body of theory known as ‘segmented assimilation’ focuses on the resistance of immigrant groups to the ‘melting pot’ paradigm and the preservation of ethnic identities as a key adaptive response to unfamiliar and often hostile environments (Gans, 1992; Portes and Zhou, 1993). Segmented assimilation theory argues that assimilation of immigrant groups is most often blocked by general discrimination and institutional barriers to employment and other opportunities, with some members of immigrant groups managing to achieve mobility while others remain mired in structural and institutional obstacles which are racialised in nature.
Theories of assimilation are insightful and useful, however they do not help adequately explain the experiences of Indian South Africans with anti-Indian racism. They have been formulated in the context of bipolar black-white models of racial and ethnic relations, often based on empirical observations in the United States, and apply less cogently to Indian South Africans whose historical experiences differ considerably from those of immigrant groups in the United States. The appeal of this body of scholarship to this dissertation, however, is the corresponding view of resilient immigrant groups formed into ‘communities’ as the result of an early disadvantageous economic position and the absence of a smooth path of assimilation. Characteristics of such immigrant groups which are similar to those of Indian South Africans include tenacity and resilience, particularly in the context of a hostile external environment. The unit of the ‘group’ functions as a source of political power as well as a general social support system (Suttles, 1968; Parenti, 1967). The strengthening and consolidation of ethnic identities in response to threatening situations such as the onslaught of legislative discrimination is similar to the situation of Indian South Africans (Hechter, 1977; Despres, 1975; Nagel and Olzak, 1982).

As it is premised here that the conditions under which Indian South Africans first entered South Africa largely determined their fate in the country. It has in many ways shaped the nature of relations and social acceptance with other racial groups. Toward this end the dissertation has actively tried to incorporate literature on other ‘in-between’ minority groups in order to better understand the historically-based processes of assimilation and subsequent processes of incorporation by which Indian South Africans in their roles as new immigrants negotiated and adapted to the new socio-political environment.
In decisively naming racism as well as addressing the relationship between racism and the ‘in-between’ experience of Indian South Africans, this work could be seen to provide an important nuance to the global field of minority and race scholarship.

THE CONCEPTUAL BASIS OF ‘IN-BETWEENITY’

The notion of ‘in-betweenity’ is conceptualised here as a space where Indian South Africans are wedged between dominant groups in society and those who are subordinated. The position and status of Indian South Africans under colonialism and apartheid have shaped the broad contours of this space of ‘in-betweenity’. Under colonialism and apartheid Indian South Africans were historically constructed as an intermediary layer between the ruling white minority and the oppressed black majority within the context of a racialised hierarchy of power and oppression. Veracini has characterised this arrangement as that of a “triangular relationship” between whites, blacks and Indians (Veracini, 2010: 18). Colonialism thrust Indian South Africans between black Africans and whites into a racialised political economy within the context of a repressive legislative environment. They were also distinctively ‘othered’ through “a process of differentiation and demarcation, by which the line is drawn between ‘us’ and ‘them’-between the more and less powerful-and through which social distance is established and maintained” (Gingrich, 2004: 101). In the most institutionalised form of ‘in-betweenity’, apartheid provided a hierarchically ordered division of the population into specified race groups: white Afrikaners at the apex followed by other whites; Coloureds next; then Indians and black Africans at the very bottom. Resources and privileges were differentially distributed according to apartheid hierarchies of race. The preferential treatment
meted out to Indian South Africans, located directly above black Africans in the apartheid pecking order, earned mistrust and resentment from black Africans who continued to be oppressed at the bottom of the hierarchy. This ‘in-between’ space was constructed specifically to support the material interests and prejudices of colonialism and apartheid, and has survived the vicissitudes of history into the post-apartheid context.

The ‘in-between’ positioning of Indian South Africans is captured to a certain extent by the concept of ‘middlemen minorities’ (Blalock, 1967). The term ‘middleman minority’ refers to a minority group who occupy an intermediate (middle) position between producers and consumers in the political economy in fields such as business and trade and commerce. The Jews in feudal and early modern Europe represent the classic instance of a middleman minority. Other examples include Indian merchants in East Africa, and Chinese entrepreneurs in Southeast Asia and throughout the Pacific Basin (Blalock, 1967; Hamilton, 1978; Bonacich, 1973; Kitano, 1974). Middleman theory tends to be utilised as one of the key theoretical explanations for the economic success of minority groups. While Indian South Africans are not strictly typical ‘middlemen’ and are much more occupationally diverse than the theory suggests, there are a number of ways in which Indian South Africans can be usefully compared to ‘middlemen’.

The typical characteristic of a middleman minority is that of a culturally distinct group of immigrants who are inserted in specific economic niches, generally of trade, commerce and local entrepreneurship, as intermediaries between dominant and subordinate groups in society (Bonacich, 1973; Light, 1984). Middlemen are seen to
fill a ‘gap’ between dominant and subordinate groups in society by doing work which
is generally disparaged by dominant groups: “Where there is a significant gap
between elites and masses, middlemen plug this gap by acting as the go-betweens.
Because elites feel they may lose status by dealing with the masses middlemen
minorities do it for them. These middlemen minorities are not concerned with status
considerations and they are free to trade with anyone. Thus they negotiate the
economic relationship between elites and masses” (Butler, 1991: 5).

A key characteristic of middlemen minorities is their use of the experience of
discriminatory legislation from host societies as a catalyst for successful self-
employment and entrepreneurship. The discrimination experienced by Indian South
Africans under colonialism and apartheid activated and promoted group solidarity as
a collective ‘self-defence’ mechanism through which many local businesses were
established with the help of informal credit networks and support systems. Indian
South Africans have tended toward conducting their businesses in particular
geographically-defined residential and business spaces, some of which international
literature has popularly defined as ‘ethnic enclaves’ (Portes and Manning, 2008)\(^\text{18}\),
and which has provided the social capital and economic grounding for rapid
economic mobility.

The experience of oppression and legislative discrimination can also enforce relative
geographical isolation upon middlemen minorities. The effect of segregationist
legislation was such that it facilitated the creation of geographical spaces of ‘Indian-

\(^{18}\) An ‘ethnic enclave’ is popularly defined as a geographic area in which migrants are concentrated
for work or residential purposes, or a combination of both. Racial discrimination is usually the catalyst
for concentrating migrants into such spaces.
ness’ which divided the different racial groups and isolated Indians in a particular way. As new immigrants Indian South Africans settled in ‘ethnic enclaves’ because it offered a number of specific group benefits. The social bonding which took place in such prescribed areas of Indian residence facilitated a powerful sense of group belonging amongst Indians. Indian residential spaces became the medium through which the culture which helped define Indian identity became transmitted. Reinforced by a hostile public discourse about the ‘Asian menace’ under colonialism and ‘dirty coolies’ under apartheid, residential separateness helped transform Indians into a self-conscious social group. Indian South Africans effectively became a separate community with its own interests and stake in the struggle against colonialism and later apartheid. Even when the apartheid system was dismantled in 1994, freeing many middle class Indians to move to more affluent formerly whites only neighbourhoods, the majority of working class Indian South Africans chose to stay in the townships and neighbourhoods to which apartheid originally assigned them. The motivation to stay rooted in apartheid-assigned neighbourhoods and townships is also influenced by preferences to remain within a familiar environment with high levels of social capital, cultural links and proximity to local consumer goods such as retail shops, businesses and restaurants which are found only in Indian neighbourhoods. However in such contexts residential isolation becomes often associated with social exclusion and stereotypes of clannishness, aloofness and superiority. Characteristics of aloofness and separateness became gradually ascribed to Indian South Africans, reinforcing social distance and the general perception that Indian South Africans are unwilling to integrate.
According to Vahed and Desai (2010:6), “people are also creating *laagers* and withdrawing into them” in the post-apartheid period. It is true that Indian South Africans have self-segregated to a large extent in a post-apartheid context, however the dynamics of residential segregation for Indian South Africans are also influenced by factors related to structural racism such as racial discrimination on the housing market. Indian South Africans are often prevented from moving out of traditional Indian areas by organised efforts on the part of the property market and financial institutions to exclude black and Indian households from white neighbourhoods (Frescura, 2001). This suggests that Indian South Africans may be seen as unable, rather than unwilling, to move out of particular ‘Indian’ neighbourhoods and townships.

Middleman minority theory typically assumes that middlemen enter as ‘sojourners’ (Bonacich, 1973) i.e. those who intend to return to their country or place of origin and maintain ties toward the homeland through remittances and frequent visits. As such they are only temporarily located in the host country and have no incentive to develop attachments to the host country. Middlemen or ‘sojourners’ then work toward amassing capital as quickly as possible in order to return to the country of origin. It is for this reason that middlemen are seen to be concentrated in businesses in which assets can be rapidly liquidated. Indian South Africans deviate from the ‘sojourner’ aspect of middlemen theory due to the sense of attachment espoused to South Africa and the tenacity within which they resisted historical efforts against repatriation and continued to stake a claim to live in South Africa. However it is the essential perception of middlemen as sojourners which arouses hostilities from
others: “Because middlemen are seen to be transient, the label of disloyalty to the host country is placed upon them” (Butler, 1991:5).

Middlemen are often despised on account of their economic success. As noted by Sowell (1994:6): “It is not just what these minorities have achieved but how they have achieved it that provokes suspicion and resentment from others”. Middlemen tend to work very hard, earning resentment and envy from less industrious elements in society. Key attributes of middlemen are generally that of independence, thrift and family values. Their success is invariably due to a primary combination of hard work and frugality, often using ‘ethnic resources’ such as the use of family members as labour sources and the derivation of support from group solidarities which facilitate their economic and social survival.

Middlemen minorities are often scapegoated. According to Blalock (1967:79), “In times of prosperity and reduced class conflict the middleman finds himself relatively secure under the protection of the elite group. In times of stress, however, he becomes a natural scapegoat”. As an intermediary between dominant and subordinate groups, middlemen perform distinct political and economic functions of serving as scapegoats in times of crisis for dominant groups in society. As direct targets for hostilities from subordinate groups, middlemen are typically used as a buffer to deflect hostilities away from dominant elites. The scapegoat or frustration-aggression theory is useful in understanding hostilities toward Indian South Africans who have often been used for instrumental purposes by colonial and apartheid governments to shield whites from the anger of oppressed black Africans.

Historically governments have failed to protect the rights of middlemen minorities
during periods of unrest, often taking a passive position (Blalock, 1967:84). The passive position of government is exemplified by the failure of the South African state to protect Indian South Africans during the conflicts in KwaZulu-Natal in 1949 and 1985 respectively. The deflection of hostilities onto Indian South Africans “is facilitated by the fact that they are more accessible. These people, unlike those of superior status, live in close proximity to their clientele” (Desai, 2014:49).

**How is ‘in-betweenity’ created?**

A defining characteristic of ‘in-betweenity’ is its location in the institution of the state. One of the key assumptions of this work is that the state is an important, if not principal, factor in the historical, political, socio-economic and ideological processes defining the prevalence and persistence of anti-Indian racism. Given the latter, there is no need here to reproduce the history of colonialism and apartheid in racialising South African society and creating the space of ‘in-betweenity’ for Indian South Africans. What is rather more important is to direct attention to the state in its role as a repository of the racist ideology which enables and legitimises the ongoing racialised structuring of people’s lives.

In referring to the state, it is understood here in the Weberian sense of a complex machinery of institutions, such as the administrative bureaucracies, police, judiciary, the military etc. which oversee a territorially-defined political community. States have variable formations. States have variable formations. It is important to guard against the reification of the state and to view it as a complex, often heterogenous entity prone to internal contradiction and incoherence. A racialised perspective of the role
of the state has only recently emerged in the academy. Traditional theoretical conceptualisations of the state have rarely interacted with those of race and racism, is often seen as Eurocentric and is therefore prone to ‘ghetto-isation’ in the academy (Mills, 1997). A recent burgeoning field of race scholarship has formulated a different theoretical conception of the state from which spring such concepts as ‘racial formation theory’ (Omi and Winant, 1994) and the racial state’ (Goldberg, 2001).

According to Omi and Winant (1994) racial projects politically and legally reorganise the state. The role of the state is central in shaping racism and the realities of racism for the population under its control. The state (political arrangements and government structure broadly conceived) is seen as the “pre-eminent though by no means only site of racial contestation” (Omi and Winant 1994, p. viii). As Omi and Winant (ibid) argue, racial categories engendered by the state play an “enduring role” in relation to social ordering of life and are central “in organizing social inequalities of various sorts, in shaping the very geography of American life, in framing political initiatives and state action” (Omi and Winant, 1994: p vii). Though developed for application to the context of the United States in the time period of the 1960s to the 1990s, racial formation theory has pertinence for the South African situation in how it captures the constitutive role of racism in the fundamental make-up of the state.

In a more universal rendering of the racialised conception of the state, Goldberg contends that all states are essentially ‘racial states’ but cautions that the term be applied in specific contexts and not through generalisations (Goldberg, 2001). It is argued that even while assuming specific expressions in different socio-cultural
contexts, any particular racial state is an inextricable part of a global order of racial states all of which mask long-entrenched systems of white privilege and advantage. Goldberg further argues that those states which proclaim themselves to have officially repudiated race and racism, in their various configurations, i.e. non-racialism in South Africa, ‘colour-blindness’ in the United States or ethnic pluralism in Europe, can be seen as cosmetic modifications of the racial state and actually represent “state rationality toward race in modern states” (Goldberg, 2002: 203).

Many criticisms of traditional social contract theory have been offered of late: “The racist rationale-i.e. the belief that only people with white skins had the right to self-determination and the duty to rule the rest of humanity-was often cited by otherwise ‘enlightened’ social and political thinkers of the Western world” (Magubane, 1996:357). In a provocative reformulation of classic Western social contract theory, Mills (1997) argues that the social contract establishing the basic structure of modern states is essentially an unacknowledged ‘racial contract’ supporting a system of European global domination and white supremacy for the material interests and political advantages of white people. To support Mills’ claim of an unacknowledged racial contract, a history of race and racism over the past 500 years is cited, beginning with the African slave trade, the mass genocides and dispossession of indigenous peoples in the Africa, the Americas and Australia, to enforced labour justifying the wealth acquisition of the global North. The ‘racial contract’ is described as a system which divides people into categories of ‘white’ and ‘non-white’, which Mills terms a ‘domination/exclusivist’ contract. Mills argues that the racial contract is essentially un-named and as such is imposed upon those seen as non-white through ideological conditioning and violence.
In summary, for the purposes of this dissertation, the ‘racial state’ is seen here to have shaped and influenced racism and hence anti-Indian racism and ‘in-betweenity’ for Indian South Africans in several important ways. Firstly the racial state is essentially enabled to enforce racialisation through the various state apparatus at its disposal such as the law, policy-making, the constitution, border controls, bureaucracy, population censuses etc. For example, the law is central in promoting racial categorisation and identification and shaping racial and national identities through legislating on citizenship rights and immigration controls. According to Goldberg (2002) racial states are essentially surveillance states which police the populations under its control and construct ‘docile bodies’. Similarly, in analysing anti-Semitism through the Jewish Holocaust, Bauman (1994) posits that racism is enabled by the advancement of modern science, modern technology and modern forms of state-power. According to Bauman modernity made racism possible and through the needs of the state and capital, created the conditions under which racism thrives. In South Africa the apartheid state used state apparatuses in order to construct a highly institutionalised racial order. All the instrumentalities of state power such as the military and police, the judiciary, legal systems, religious and educational institutions, were deployed for the purposes of enforcement of apartheid laws, suppression of political protest, prevention of unrest etc.

Secondly, the state is able to use violence in furtherance of ideological ends and has the monopoly of the legitimate use of violence (within a certain territorially-defined space) in order to do so. The place of violence in the architecture of state power is
well understood in social science. It is toward this end that Foucault viewed racism as “the fundamental mechanism of power that exercises itself in modern states” and accordingly dedicated part of his 1976 lecture series at the College de France to that of bio-power\textsuperscript{19}. Bio-power is defined as the state’s power over life, that which aims to “foster life or disallow it to the point of death” (Foucault, 2003: 251-254). According to Foucault, the duty to defend society against itself means that the state cannot function without racism”, which Foucault terms “as the break between what must live and what must die” (ibid). According to this analysis, racism establishes “a relationship between my life and the death of the other that is not a military or warlike relationship, but a biological-type relationship: the more inferior species dies out…the more I-as species rather than individual-can live, the stronger I will be” (ibid). For Foucault the state cannot legitimate its right to kill without racism.

Foucault’s argument presents an interesting opposition to middleman theories which see minorities as blamed for society’s problems, used to deflect anxieties and frustrations and essentially scapegoated by society. Foucault’s theory of racism is an expression of an ongoing conflict nurtured by bio-political technologies of purification, making racism internal to the bio-political state. In South Africa the state has used racialising technologies such as border controls, legal systems, population censuses and various ‘invented’ cultural traditions and imaginings, by doing all it can to maintain homogeneity and ‘managing’ diversity. However it is not only ‘racial’ in its formation and use of practices such as the law, but also ‘racist’ in terms of using bio-power and government technologies to control its population, and in particular but not exclusively, minority groups such as Indian South Africans.

\textsuperscript{19} In fact it is the idea of bio-power (power over life), rather than racism itself, that Foucault links to the state.
South Africa’s apartheid system provides a particularly cogent example of the legitimisation of the use of violence through the construction of a massive security apparatus armed with legal powers, in conjunction with the police and the military, to crush all state opposition. The state was also able to employ the practice of what the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) has called ‘contra-mobilisation’ in the form of deployment of surrogate forces such as Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) supporters and various politicised gangs.

Finally the state is the bearer of invented histories and traditions, ceremonies and cultural imaginings through which racism is transmitted and reproduced (Andersen, 1983; Hobsbawm, 1992). One of the most important mechanisms of the state role in racism is to structure and perpetuate the idea of unity through the construction and presentation of the ‘imagined community (Andersen, 1983) within dominant popular political and ideological discourses of the nation-state. The nation and its corollary problematic, nationalism, presents the “imagined community as an assumed commonality with others, since not all members can interact in person to form a real community. Groups of people are socially constructed to constitute a mythical unity, “because 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” (Andersen, 1983:6). It also normalises the legitimisation of the control and domination of dominant groups in society over others. Such enforced homogeneity obscures the diversity of the actual ‘nation’ and imposes the interests of dominant groups in society over others.
The construction of the ‘imagined community’ includes a determination of who belongs to the community, demarcating boundaries of those who belong and those do not belong. A formal dichotomy of ‘us’ and ‘other’ is established (Miles, 1993:152). In this vein the state assumes the role of gatekeeper and the inclusion and exclusion of who is allowed into the national space. The state is responsible for the regulation of socio-economic privilege through the distribution of wealth and opportunities in society. In this collective consumption role the state has the right to exclude and include certain groups of people from various resources, goods and services of the state.

In its capacity to invent and manufacture, the state has played a key role in helping define identities for Indian South Africans. Definitions of ‘Indian-ness’ have varied in accordance with different historical contexts and settings. Under colonialism Indians were conceptualised as ‘foreign elements’ ‘unassimilable’ and ‘the Asiatic menace’. Moreover they were presented as a threat to hygiene and sanitation standards (‘dirty coolies’). The definition of ‘Indian’ along such lines was less about satisfying racial prejudices and more about securing the political and economic interests of the white property owning class (and ultimately all who capitalised on the colonial economy) in order to neutralise the threat of Indians as economic competition.

Under apartheid Indians were categorised rather as ‘Asiatics’ and inserted into an intermediary position between the oppressed black majority and the white minority in order to serve as a ‘buffer’ for whites against blacks. As such changing definitions of ‘Indian-ness’ have persisted into the post-apartheid era with Indians now drawn into the homogenised notion of South Africa’s non-racial ‘rainbow nation’. This lends
credence to racial state theory which posits that states, each in its own particular way, are defined by their power to exclude and/or include racialised ‘others’. According to Goldberg, homogeneity is ultimately “heterogeneity in denial”. This explains, in part, the ongoing process of vilifying the ‘Other’, in this case Indian South Africans. In turn, Indian South Africans have practiced a similarly contradictory politics, expressing solidarity with the black African majority or withdrawing into defensive forms of isolationism or nationalism depending on the degree of alienation or belonging they experienced in any given political climate of the time.

The state need not always be seen as an instrument of racial oppression. The state plays a paradoxical role in maintaining racially oppressive arrangements in that, depending on how it is formed and controlled, it has both the capacity to oppress and exploit as well as to protect the rights of the oppressed. On the one hand it is a repository of structural racism and protects and legitimates racist interests. On the other hand the state has also been shown to play a transformative role in mobilising resources in the interests of oppressed people and helping to protect the interests of oppressed people. This paradox can be seen through the evolution of the state over time in South Africa. Under apartheid and colonialism the state was an authoritarian hierarchical structure which reinforced racialised power structures and maintained the subordination of all those defined as ‘non-white’. In the post-apartheid context the state is qualitatively different in its orientation. However although the state has since evolved from a violent coercive and fundamentally racist state, racism remains configured into the make-up of the state and structural continuities with the past remain intact. Important in developing this line of thought is Omi and Winant’s contention that racism as an experience, and even the ways in which it might be
explained is never the same contextually or in different time-periods as a result of the different forms racism may assume (Omi and Winant, 1986). According to Omi and Winant the close relationship of racism with other key variables such as class produces new social configurations in which racism constantly changes in character and orientation.

It would be amiss to see anti-Indian racism essentially as something externally foisted upon people by the state. While the role of the state is a key, if not pre-eminent factor in the reproduction of anti-Indian racism and defining the ‘in-between’ space of Indian South Africans, the role of the state also has to be seen in relation to the multiplicity of external influences to which it is constantly subject (Skocpol, 1985). Of key importance here is the interactions and interdependencies between the role of the state and the range of non-material factors such as culture and group psychology which impact upon the space of ‘in-beweenity’. Such factors have often acted to reinforce and reinterpret particular aspects of the economic and political environment provided by the state.

Anti-Indian racism tends often to be seen in purely cultural terms. It is understood here that reified notions of culture frame conflict and racism, even if cultural differences are not a direct cause, as Huntington’s ‘clash of civilisations’ argument would have one believe. In 1993 at the end of the Cold War Huntington famously defined the “fundamental causes of conflict” in the contemporary world, not as economic or ideological in nature, but as “cultural”. For Huntington each civilisation has a primordial cultural identity, such that “the major differences in political and economic development among civilisations is clearly rooted in their different
cultures”. He warns “culture and cultural identities are…shaping the patterns of cohesion, disintegration and conflict in the post-Cold War World” (Huntington, 1993: 22; 1996: 20). For Huntington ‘culture’ refers to the supposed enduring values of “highly integrated civilisations” - also confusingly called ‘cultures’.

The view of culture as espoused by Huntington is empirically untenable. Huntington’s understanding of culture as a specific group’s inherent values or traits is typical of the primordialist view of culture, i.e. that culture represents a natural and essentialist category and that it is an innate and reflexive part of the human constitution. Primordialism obscures the historical dynamics and power relations which give rise to political phenomena such as ethnic conflicts and movements for democratisation. More importantly, in ignoring historical processes and specific relations of political power, it downplays the heterogeneity of group dynamics and exaggerates the constancy and permanence of group beliefs and value systems. As a result, essentialist explanations of political phenomena such as racism tends to naturalise ‘groupness’ rather than exploring the conditions under which such experiences of ‘groupness’ come to be seen as natural.

Primordialism predominates in popular discourses about culture in South Africa. Static seemingly immutable notions of culture are common currency amongst the different racial and ethnic groups in South Africa. Indian South Africans tend to be unproblematically associated with an already-given homogenous community bearing a fixed set of beliefs and values, irrespective of variables of internal stratification such as class, religion, language etc. This is not to deny the existence of an ‘Indian’ culture as such but rather to recognise that the core of cultural attributes which can
be ascribed to Indian South Africans is malleable and situational and always grounded in time, place and perspective. This is in line with the constructivist view of culture which emphasises culture as a fluid entity constantly being created, contested and recreated. It is understood that culture is constantly evolving in response to changes in the environment. Because culture is a learned phenomenon, “individuals and groups can and do change their ethnic or cultural identities and interests through such processes as migration, conversion, and assimilation or through exposure to modifying influences” (Smedley, 1993:241).

The conceptualisation of ‘culture’ is central to an understanding of ‘in-betweenity’ as reified notions of culture are implicit in the ideas that have been constructed about the differences of Indian South Africans in relation to the rest of South Africa. The concept of a unified ‘Indian culture’ in relation to that of broader South Africa is posited as a key reason for the isolation and separateness of Indian South Africans from broader South Africa. It is within this context that ‘cultural brokers’ have emerged to supposedly represent the interests of the ‘community’ and manipulate the ‘culture’ of Indian South Africans to their own ends.

The ways in which Indian culture has typically been constructed is particularly problematic in terms of how South Africans have themselves participated in its construction. Indian South Africans have typically responded to the political vagaries of their environment with the attitudes and behavioural patterns of an established ‘group’, i.e. a self-defined community of people with common interests and goals.

---

20 A typical example of a ‘cultural broker’ is that of the National People’s Party (NPP) established by Mr Amichand Rajbansi in 1981. The NPP won 18 out of 40 seats in the tricameral elections for the Indian-only House of Delegates (HoD) in 1984. The NPP later became the Minority Front (MF).
who are characterised by high levels of member identification and solidarity. Under threat Indian South Africans have typically practiced adaptive strategies of retreat and avoidance. Indian South Africans have tended to withdraw into an alternative world characterised by in-group practices such as endogamy, establishment of separate schools, reinforcement of cultural practices and customs etc. when under threat, minimal involvement in politics is often preferred. These forms of self-constructed social and spatial separation can be seen in the residential spaces or sub-communities in which Indian South Africans have tended to cluster. In such contexts group solidarities have strengthened to the extent that Indian South Africans are often accused of practicing “cultural narcissism” (Ramsamy, 2007:31). Within such contexts Indian South Africans are particularly vulnerable to ethnocentrism which encourages popular stereotypes about superiority, clannishness and particularism. Indian South Africans also practice ‘othering’. This, in turn, further invites continued anti-Indian prejudice, discrimination and racism. Hence Indian South Africans are in the predicament of a ‘vicious circle’ of anti-Indian racism and remain trapped in the space of ‘in-betweenity’.

‘IN-BETWEENITY’ AND IDENTITY FORMATION FOR INDIAN SOUTH AFRICANS

How Indian South Africans perceive themselves and have constructed their sense of identity in post-apartheid South Africa is key to understanding the concept of ‘in-betweenity’. A key tenet in the scholarship of race and racism is the centrality of matters of identity to both historical and contemporary accounts of racism and accordingly the idea that ‘race’ and in turn ‘racism’ relies on the definition of racial identities around which questions of identity and belonging revolve. According to Bozzoli and Delius (1990:20) the process of identity formation is multi-faceted and
involves “an examination of experience, community, the nature of the ruling class, and the operation of spatial and other kinds of factors”. Key attributes of identity are fluidity and context-dependence as well as constant reconstruction according to different socio-political contexts. Most people hold multiple identities and navigate between them as they transit from one social situation to the next. This discursive concept of identity exists in opposition to the notion of a ‘natural’, static and unchanging group identity, as Indian South Africans have historically been assigned.

The broad contours of Indian South African identity have been shaped by a historical process in which Indian South African have been variably constructed in terms of the political and socio-cultural contexts of colonialism and apartheid. In one sense Indian South African identity is a product of European racist logic which cast all those known as ‘Non-Europeans’ or ‘Non-Whites’ as inferior, backward and in need of white tutelage. It has been deeply influenced by the nature of colonial and apartheid relations in which the dynamics of exploitation and oppression between the white minority and indigenous black majority helped determine how Indians were accommodated and assimilated into the new society. It is within this historical context that the notion of Indians as an unwelcome element was originally developed. They were seen in colonial terms as ‘the Asian menace’, ‘strangers’ and ‘dirty coolies’. Apartheid’s vacillation between early desires to oust the Indian South Africans and later instrumental views of their as a strategic tool against black Africans, developed the historical tensions about belonging which continue to characterise the contemporary position of Indian South Africans. The imposition of racially based legal categories such as ‘coolie’, ‘free Indians’, ‘Indian/Asians’ and ‘Non-White’ for the purposes of classification as well as implementation of
discriminatory laws, intensified existing cleavages among Indian South Africans inasmuch as it strengthened a strong sense of Indian-ness. Through specific forms of asymmetrical power relations and resource distribution implemented by colonial and apartheid states Indians have historically been set up as ‘scapegoats’ bearing the brunt of anger over resource-scarcity and distributional conflicts in post-apartheid South Africa. Accordingly Indian South Africans have been ‘set up’ as targets of envy and resentment in ways which foment anti-Indian racism.

Indian South African identity is also very much a product of its bearers whom it can argued were primarily responsible for articulating the identity and determining its form and content in various historical contexts. Steadfast ties to the ‘homeland’ of India have historically been maintained, for different political, cultural and psychological purposes. The complexities of political struggle against colonialism and apartheid have strengthened a sense of attachment to an ‘Indian’ identity, which in turn has produced a dual identity vacillating between an avowed commitment to India and an essentialist sense of Indian-ness emphasising ancestral roots and links with India. As such South Africans remain in the predicament of a dual identity, which further deepens the immersion in the space of ‘in-betweenity.’

While wary of general and universalising forms of explanation, particularly with regard to different socio-political and cultural contexts, theories of identity formation of minority groups are often usefully used in the context of describing and understanding the adaptive responses of minority groups to racism and oppression. It is argued that groups adapt to socio-political realities by different processes of adaptation, such as habituation and accommodation. Atkinson, Morten and Sue
(1979) developed a five-stage Minority Identity Development Model (MID) which extrapolate various common features of identity-formation which are shared by different minority groups. The five stages include: conformity to dominant cultural values, dissonance involving conflict and questioning of the dominant cultural value system, resistance to the dominant culture, introspection and struggle for self-awareness and finally synergistic and awareness.

One of the most influential theories analysing the process of identity development within oppressed minority groups is that of ‘dialectical theory of cultural in-betweenity’ developed by Somalian psychologist H.A. Bulhan (1980). It proposes three main identification patterns among oppressed minority groups according to different stages. Each stage in this theory of identity development can be described as “essentially a mode of psychological defence” against an alienating environment (Ratele and Duncan, 2004:121). During each stage the dominated and dominant groups merge, prompting a process of modification and subsequent transfiguration of the ‘cultures’ of both groups. The first stage is described as ‘capitulation’ to the dominant culture in which subordinate groups assimilate to the dominant culture in ways which detach and devalue the indigenous culture of the subordinate group. The second stage is described as revitalisation of the indigenous culture in which the dominant group culture is rejected, often involving a romanticisation of the indigenous culture of the subordinate group. The third stage is that of ‘radicalisation’ in which subordinate groups attempt to reclaim their indigenous culture and resist immersion in the culture of the dominant group. This stage is envisioned as the most important one in terms of possibilities of autonomy from the hold of the dominant group and potential revolutionary social change.
‘In-betweenity’ is presented as a stage model but is best conceptualised as a continuous non-sequential process in which stages blend. The different stages can refer to historical eras as much as to individuals. The stages should be seen rather in “not a separable or sequential fashion but together, as cultural trajectories, directions that are linked in a relationship of dynamic tension” (Ratele and Duncan, 2004:123).

Bulhan’s theory is in many senses a thread which links the various stages of the evolution of Indian South African identity. The space of the ‘in-between’, envisioned by Bulhan as the domain of contact, confrontation and mutual influence between dominant and subordinate groups, has been transformed by adoption of South African customs and lifestyles. Indians have undergone significant changes in terms of culture and lifestyle since first arrival in South Africa. Vernacular languages have been superseded by English as the dominant language of use. Many Indian social and cultural practices have lapsed or were adapted. Caste is no longer a prerequisite for marriage. Traditional signifiers of Indian-ness such as dress and cuisine have receded. A key component of Indian culture is social and family structures, such as the *kutum*, to which both Hindus and Muslims subscribe. Such systems are less predominant in the organisation of the lives of Indian South Africans. Certain practices such as religious rituals and marriage customs have been less resistant to change. However Indian South Africans continue to be defined by fellow South Africans in terms of a wholly ‘Indian’ identity. They remain caught to varying degrees in different phases of Bulhan’s stages of ‘in-betweenity’, depending on variables of class, sex/gender, age, geographical location etc. In negotiating the polarities of an

---

21 The *kutum* is a Sanskrit word used to describe the extended or joint family system.
Indian and broader South African identity, Indian South Africans could be seen as wedded to the notion of ‘in-betweenity’.

It is understood that a negative self-image is a typical consequence of oppression and racism. The severity of the distorting effects of racism on identity formation is illustrated in the work of Fanon in which racism as dehumanisation features as a key theme. Writing in psychological terms, Fanon analyses the trauma of the ‘multiple psychological violences of racism’ due to the imposition of a racial identity by a dominant European colonial culture. The psychological damage of racism is seen in terms of the internalisation of a deep sense of inferiority and alienation and estrangement from indigenous cultural values. Fanon’s idea of ‘lactification’, in a play on the association to milk and whiteness, emphasises the pathological desire to assume ‘whiteness’-and lessen ‘blackness’- as a result of the dominance of European cultural norms. ‘Lactification’ is a manifestation of the self-contempt felt by blacks in the form of mimicry of European accents, dress, clothing, etc. in an attempt to reach equality with European colonial culture.

Though writing in rather static essentialist terms which casts the colonial relationship with subjugated populations as one of complete and domination, Fanonian ideas of internalised inferiority can be usefully applied to the situation of Indian South Africans. While the deleterious psychological effects of colonialism and oppression have been discussed as part of the condition of ‘in-betweenity’ (Fanon, 1967; Biko, 1978), it is important to note that not all Indian South Africans received their oppression with same levels of negativity. Having been afforded privileges over other racial groups, colonialism and apartheid can be seen to have offered Indian South
Africans the opportunity to exercise what can be seen as an innate sense of superiority toward black Africans.

The encounter with colonialism has had a number of contradictory effects upon the identities of Indian South Africans. Colonialism helped Indians to imbibe and embrace racist world views. Together with the prevailing discourses of scientific racism and social Darwinist thinking, it is likely that ideas of Hindu civilisational superiority transmitted particularly through early Gandhian writing on civilisations and the exaltation of the proud and ancient Indian civilisation, predisposed the early Indian arrivals toward a sense of cultural superiority to the black African majority as well as the early implantation of racism in Indian South Africans. The idea that Indians were a separate race positioned on a scale of hierarchy of civilisations, as reflected in the early loyalist phase of Indian South African relations with colonialism in which Indians agitated for the status of subjects of the British Empire, can be seen as the genesis of racist attitudes toward black Africans. Historical notions of civilisational superiority has resonance with the social hierarchies of the Indian caste system which allocates darker skinned Indians amongst the lowest ranking castes and ethnicities and generally privileges those who are lighter skinned. The early Indian arrivals brought the caste system with them to South Africa, importing a historical legacy of colour consciousness amongst Indian South Africans and influenced racism toward black Africans.

Former IFP MP Mr Faurouk Cassim has described racism by Indian South Africans as a “present-day remnant of ‘tribal apartheid’ ”. Furthermore Mr Cassim has claimed that “apartheid was invented and perfected by Indians long before the Afrikaners.
came along. That's why it was not rejected wholesale by Indians, because it in fact gave them the permission to stay in their areas and do their own thing” (Gevisser, 1996:61).

Fanonian notions of ‘lactification’ and ‘epidermalisation’ are born out in the politics of colour consciousness amongst Indian South Africans as exemplified in the continuing popularity of cosmetic practices such as skin bleaching amongst Indian South Africans. As such Indian South African identities have been bifurcated along the lines of the influences of colonialism and the caste system together with the encounter with different cultural traditions in South Africa and the consequent need for assimilation. Despite the existence of many cultural organisations and religious societies intent on preserving different aspects of Indian culture in contemporary South Africa, the exigencies of assimilation into South African society have ensured the relative unattainability of Bulhan’s stage of radicalisation as Indian South Africans remain relatively locked into a space of ‘in-betweenity’.

Fanon’s work on the psychological effects of racism was a key influence on the work of Steve Biko and the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) to follow. BCM emphasised the role of a positive self-image as crucial to countering self-hatred and inferiority and creating a sense of solidarity amongst the oppressed. BCM united Indians, black Africans and Coloureds, hitherto defined by apartheid as ‘Non-Whites’, under the banner of a new kind of liberatory politics. BCM de-emphasised ethnic identities for the broader purposes of struggle against white oppression. BCM drew many Indian South African adherents, including some very high profile activists, but it did not resonate with the majority of Indian South Africans. There is debate about the
extent to which BCM’s general lack of ‘fit’ with Indian South Africans can be attributed to issues such as conservative values, in-group attitudes or historical fears of the black majority. It is equally plausible that Indian South Africans did not feel attachment to the all-encompassing category of ‘Black’ and the corresponding implications of a negation of an ‘Indian’ identity, suggesting the internalisation of a negative group identity (Desai, 2014).

Conclusion

In sum, the condition of ‘in-betweenity’ is created by the intersection of structurally embedded state racism with the dynamics of culture and corresponding group psychologies. ‘In-betweenity’ can be seen as a specific form of asymmetrical power relations as well as a boundary creation or maintenance strategy on the part of the state in order to forge and sustain a racial state apparatus for the reproduction and continuance of racism which is necessary for the maintenance of state power. It has had the following effects on the development and continuance of anti-Indian racism. ‘In-betweenity’ allows for scapegoating whereby Indian South Africans are set up as targets of envy and resentment in resource allocation and distributional matters. It maintains historical patterns of social and spatial isolation and further perpetuates divisions. ‘In-betweenity’ encourages ethnocentricity and cultural narcissism on the part of Indian South Africans and as such facilitates a constant circulation of negative sentiment and stereotypes between Indian South Africans and other racial groups. It has also damaging psychological effects upon Indian South Africans due to the racist pathologies of the colonial and apartheid contexts. ‘In-betweenity’ has also helped in the formation of a dual identity between India and South Africa for Indian South
Africans. In oscillating between India and South Africa, it is possible that Indian South Africans may never feel a complete sense of belonging to the so-called ‘rainbow nation’ of South Africa and continue to suffer ongoing alienation, social isolation and anti-Indian racism. As such, Indian South Africans may appear permanently relegated to the status of the ‘Other’.

CHAPTER THREE: HISTORICAL CONTEXTUALISATION OF ANTI-INDIAN RACISM IN SOUTH AFRICA

CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTI-INDIAN RACISM

This chapter describes the context for the development and continuance of a tradition of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa through a particular set of historical experiences and circumstances. Given that anti-Indian racism spans a broad trajectory of events it is not possible to apply fine-grained detail to all the historical matters at hand. This chapter is of necessity deliberately sketchy.

The chapter establishes in broad brushstrokes the key patterns of anti-Indian racism through a sweep of the main strands of the Indian South African historical experience, viz.: legislative racism framed within agitations for repatriation of Indian South Africans; political organisation and activism amongst Indian South Africans vacillating between conservative and radical responses to state oppression; joint struggles with other oppressed racial groups and an uncertain positioning in post-apartheid South Africa. There are a number of recurrent themes: the changing
nature of anti-Indian racism on the part of the state; enduring racial and class
divisions with particular emphasis on the relationship between Indians and black
Africans; the circulation of low level anti-Indian racism in tandem with some specific
manifestations of anti-Indian hostilities and violence; the persistence of a dual
identity for Indian South Africans and the continued lack of resolution to the
historically-based matter of acceptance and belonging of Indian South Africans.

The chapter provides important context for the argument advanced in this
dissertation about the ‘in-betweenity’ (Bulhan, 1980) of Indian South Africans.
Through a depiction of some of the most important defining events and junctures in
Indian South African history, this chapter illustrates how Indian South Africans have
been structurally located as ‘in-betweener’ and how this structural location has
influenced the positioning of Indian South Africans as well as the trajectory of
historical events continuing to keep Indian South Africans locked into a space of ‘in-
betweenity’.

For the purposes of navigating the wide sweep of this chapter, it has been helpful to
delineate certain critical historical junctures that this dissertation has identified as key
to the understanding of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. While
guarding against a static and turgid chronological account of historical events, this
chapter sweeps through the early history of Indian settlement in South Africa (1860-
1893); a period of political mobilisation for Indian South Africans in response to anti-
Indian legislation (1893-1914); the radicalisation of Indian South African politics and
possibilities for multi-racial cooperation in the struggle against apartheid (1946-1955); the widening of the ideological terrain of struggle with the growth of non-racialism and the Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) (1960-1976); intensification of apartheid divide and rule strategies resulting in a breakdown in the relationship between Indians and black Africans in the 1980s and the contemporary uncertain ‘in-between’ positioning of Indian South Africans in a post-apartheid era.

THE EARLY HISTORY OF INDIAN SETTLEMENT IN SOUTH AFRICA

Indian South Africans were framed as ‘in-betweeners’ from earliest arrival in South Africa. The arrival of Indian South Africans upon the shores of South Africa saw them inserted into an intermediary space between the indigenous black majority and the ruling white minority. Their status in the South African social order was uncertain, being defined by the circumstances of their arrival and the nature of their contribution to the economy in terms of indentured labour and commercial activities. The system of indentured labour has famously been described by Tinker as a “new form of slavery” (Tinker, 1974). Amid conditions of brutality, exploitation and oppression, the new arrivals were positioned in opposition to the local black population, laying the foundations for the seemingly intractable conflict between Indians and black Africans which has persisted into post-apartheid South Africa. As described by Meer (2000):

*Indians and Africans were separated from each other and in separation, projected as dangerous to each other. They were at the same time within ‘viewing’ distance of each other so that they could be constantly reminded of the strange and different ways of the other. The use of African whipping boys*
on the sugar estates, the condemnation of a transgressing ‘coolie’ to the ‘kaffir’ barracks where he could be terrorised and ridiculed as the master intended: the appointment of an Indian overseer over African mill hands, the use of African police to suppress Indian strikers, were all calculated to keep the two peoples violently divided. Presiding over it all were the stereotypes calculated to present each other with an adverse image of the other.

The suspicion between the new Indian arrivals and the indigenous black Africans was facilitated by the circumstances of their arrival. The majority of Indians came to South Africa between 1860 and 1890 to provide short term labour on the sugarcane plantations of colonial Natal. Their stay was always intended to be temporary. However their arrival presented an element of threat to the local indigenous population who may well have assumed that they were being ‘replaced’. The indentured labourers were in economically similar, though somewhat improved, circumstances to local black Africans. They were drawn from poor lower caste communities from both northern and southern districts of India. Their arrival was followed by a numerically smaller group of better-resourced ‘passenger Indians’ in 1869 seeking economic opportunities from places as far afield as India, Fiji and Mauritius.

It is important to note that the Indian arrivals were a diverse grouping. The religious denomination of the indentured labourers were almost exclusively Hindu. The majority of passenger Indians were Gujerati-speaking Muslims as well as North Indian and Gujerati Hindus (Desai and Vahed, 2010). As a collective the Indians were highly stratified as South Indians, North Indians, Hindus, Tamils, Muslims,
Telegus, Gujeratis and Hindustanis. They were also stratified by class which was in turn reinforced by both caste and religious differences between Hindu and Muslim Indians. Village, region and language also sharply differentiated the new arrivals. However in light of the lack of knowledge about the new arrivals, they tended to be conflated as a homogenous grouping and the general prosperity of the passenger Indians was assumed to be typical of all Indians, including the indentured labourers.

The starting point of anti-Indian racism can be seen in depictions of Indians as an intermediary group, who, though, transplanted to South Africa for a specific set of reasons, swiftly outgrew the reasons for their arrival and thereafter presented themselves as a threat to the socio-economic structure of colonial society. The early presence of Indians was thus framed by the threat of economic competition. The indentured labourers were originally welcomed as a cheap and diligent labour source, and preferable to other sources of labour, such as the local Zulu population in Natal. Despite the uncertain environment and harsh conditions of indenture, many Indians were able to thrive in their new environment and through various occupational pursuits, gradually became absorbed into the political economy of Natal and the Transvaal. Upon expiration of indenture contracts, many former labourers bought or leased small plots of land and engaged in farming or agricultural pursuits in and around Durban and along the coast of Natal. The ‘passenger’ Indians successfully established different businesses in Durban, most notably the Grey Street commercial district in downtown Durban. With the discovery of gold in the Transvaal in 1886 and the subsequent outbreak of the Anglo Boer War (1899-1902), many Indian businessmen were drawn to participate in the booming new economy in the Transvaal and they swiftly moved out into the interior, particularly the towns and
villages in the Transvaal province and around the goldfields in Johannesburg (Bhana and Brain, 1990).

The new Indian arrivals, particularly the merchant classes, were quickly able to prosper. Their success can be largely attributed to family support systems, ethnic credit networks, mutual aid associations and an entrepreneurial ethic which allowed Indian South Africans to expand beyond their boundaries and compete effectively in the general economy. As such Indians came to occupy an intermediary economic position between the white minority and the black majority. The success of the new arrivals was such that they became the principal economic competition of the white population in trade and commerce, prompting a slew of repressive legislation intended to cripple economic progress for Indians, including segregationist measures, imposition of a £3 poll tax, restrictions on movement as well as land ownership and occupation etc. (Kuper, 1960).

Swan (1985) has drawn attention to the importance of racism amongst colonial administrators in Natal in explaining the onslaught of anti-Indian legislation. Equally pertinent is the fear of a growing migrant population requiring services and resources as well as providing business competition to the local whites. A fear of being overtaken by ‘Asian hordes’ was popularly expressed through the media of the time. The term ‘ Asiatic menace’ undergirding calls for repatriation and segregation of Indians stoked public hysteria about the threat presented by Indians to the general welfare of the white population in terms of encroachments on social and geographical space and fear of disease, poor hygiene and lack of sanitation (‘dirty coolies’). Such anti-Indian sentiments reflect the influence of scientific racism as well
as the dominant discourse of the late nineteenth century related to the advent of the industrial revolution, urbanisation and the accompanying proliferation of crime and disease (Pick, 1989).

The prevailing currents of anti-Indian racism attained a different ‘flavour’ in the Boer republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State (OFS) due to the particular influence of the Afrikaner culture. According to the Coolie Act Indians were banned from living in the Orange Free State. The Boers, bearing the influence of strict Calvinism in their religious customs and beliefs, were deeply religious and retained a sense of superiority to the other cultures they encountered in South Africa. They were suspicious and fearful of the potentially corrupting influence of non-Christian religions such as Hinduism and Islam as represented by the Indians. Islam was perceived as particularly threatening to the Boers, given the historical penetration of Islam through other parts of Africa.

Given the exigencies of combatting anti-Indian racism, a unity of interests and purposes was gradually forced upon the Indian South Africans. The heterogeneous character of the Indians appeared to mitigate against any possible alliances or possibilities of political unity (Pahad, 1972; Bhana, 1990). Class and religious cleavages between wealthy ‘passenger Indians’ and indentured labourers discouraged possibilities of collaboration. The ‘passenger’ Indians (wealthy Indian merchants and traders) often encouraged distinction between themselves and poorer darker skinned Indians. They were colloquially known as ‘Arabs’ by the local white population, a distinction they did not discourage, as they looked down on darker skinned indentured labourers. However, as noted by Pahad (1972: 11): “the
Indians, geographically, economically, culturally and linguistically separated, learned from bitter experience the necessity for coordinated action at the local, provincial and national level, through political organisations which could give concrete expression to their accumulated grievances and to their determination and desire to resist.”

In the context of increasing political oppression the divisions and cleavages between Indians gradually collapsed into a semblance of a ‘community’ however internally fractured and contentious. In time, the notion of a homogenous ‘Indian community’ with unified interests was to be continually invoked for political ends, given a continuing climate of anti-Indian sentiment from successive South African governments. Importantly the notion of a homogenised ‘community’ drove political action amongst Indians in order to resist political oppression.

Early anti-Indian racism was principally framed within anti-Indian legislation and a public discourse of fear about ‘the Asian menace’. The arrival and settlement of Indians in South Africa is coloured by the broader context of race ideas and theory in circulation in Europe at the time. Theoretical ideas about race and racism under the term ‘scientific racism’ emerged in Europe from the seventeenth century onwards, with the aim of justification of the order of the emerging imperial powers in Europe and more generally support of racist worldviews. Based on observations of different peoples encountered on European voyages of discovery in the age of seaborne empire, European scientists began the practice of tabulating perceivable differences between human beings, including moral and psychological attributes, and employed

---

22 Key propositions about scientific racism were that humanity could be divided into discrete groups called races ranked hierarchically in terms of superior and inferior races; that these divisions were immutable because of their provenance in scientifically established biological categories and that these divisions provided justification for superior races bearing the right to rule inferior races.
a range of ‘scientific’ disciplines such as anthropology and craniometry to support the classification of the human population into physically discrete races that might be considered superior or inferior races according to a hierarchy of inferior and superior races\textsuperscript{23}. Such racialised taxonomies ultimately provided the justification for political and social oppression as part of a European civilising mission for those deemed to be inferior races (Frederickson, 2002).

As new work is beginning to indicate (Hofmeyr and Williams, 2011) given the prevailing race sentiment of the time it is possible to imagine that Indian arrivals in South Africa likely viewed the indigenous black population through the distorting veil of European scientific racism and prevailing notions of black inferiority. Black Africans were viewed as inferior, barbaric and perhaps not even human. Early Indian attitudes toward black Africans could be seen as part of the toxic legacies of the era of scientific racism.

Racism itself originated in the interface between colonialism, capitalism and the slave trade. It was the ideological justification for colonial expansion into different territories, the plunder of resources and subjugation of indigenous populations. In *Capitalism and Slavery* Williams (1949) argues that slavery and racism were necessary economic conditions for European colonisation. A ready supply of cheap

\textsuperscript{23} A wide body of literature such as that by Frederickson (2000) and Bernasconi and Lott (2000) argues that certain nineteenth century theories influenced the historical development of the concept of race. For example, Joseph Gobineau is known for having produced some of the earliest examples of scientific racism through his book *An Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races* (1915). Gobineau argued that the white race possessed superior intelligence, morality and willpower, whereas blacks were characterised as animalistic, amoral and unintelligent. Gobineau’s work foregrounded theories of naturalism, as notably articulated by Charles Darwin in the nineteenth century, in arguing that the distinctions between different groups in society are not socially constructed, but naturally given.
mobile labour was vital to continuing colonial expansion and accumulation of wealth and capital as well as increasing the efficiency of capitalism. The exigencies of the labour needs of colonialism introduced a new strand of racism with the importation of foreign workers. In 1972 Wolpe argued that apartheid stemmed not from racism but rather from the structural demands of a system of industrial capitalism dependent on access to cheap migrant labour. Pertinently, Miles points out the process of racialisation is bound up with the conditions of migrant labourers and its effects are the result of the contradiction between “on the one hand the need of the capitalist world economy for the mobility of human beings, and on the other, the drawing of territorial boundaries and the construction of citizenship as a legal category which sets boundaries for human mobility” (Miles, 1988: 438). The importation of Indian indentured labourers to South Africa in 1860 bears the stamp of this profound contradiction. When the abolition of slavery in the British Empire in 1838 required another labour supply in the colonies, Britain turned to its colonies in Asia and imported thousands of poor indentured labourers into Africa and the Americas. Framed by this fundamental contradiction, the indentured labourers were positioned simultaneously as needed in an economic sense and unwelcome in a social and cultural sense.

---

24 Instrumental views of the functions of indentured labour as a solution to the economic needs of colonialism have been refined in recent literature (Bhana, 1990; Patel and Uys, 2010; Hofmeyr and Williams, 2011). Hofmeyr and Williams reflect upon the “one way problem” (2011:5) in which indentured labour is only understood in the site of the diaspora itself (in this case South Africa). Indentured labour may be seen as a means of expelling some of the ‘unwanted’ or ‘undesirable’ parts of the nation on the part of India (Hofmeyr and Williams, 2011). Such a wider perspective enables a better understanding of the conditions of famine, poverty and near-pauperisation in India which compelled the forced and voluntary movement of Indian labour as part of the coercive and exploitative strategies of colonialism. Importantly some of the human and political agency of the indentured labourers themselves have been recovered through pioneering scholarship such as that by Desai and Vahed (2010).

25 In 1904 Lord Milner, governor of Natal, described the Indians arrivals as “strangers, forcing themselves upon a community reluctant to receive them” (Ministry of Overseas Affairs (MOIA) Report on the High Level Committee of the Indian Diaspora, 2005:75).
Indian South Africans were further defined as an ‘in-between’ group by the nature of their political mobilisation and the particularity therein, which appeared to struggle to find common ground with other racial groups. Formal political organised activity among Indian South Africans embraced the need to combat anti-Indian racism on a broad platform, but remained internally riven with class and ideological conflict. Local Indian politics was the province of different regionally based organisations such as the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) in Natal; the Transvaal British Indian Association (TBIA), the Cape British Indian Council (CBIC) and later the South African Indian Congress (SAIC). These organisations were largely dominated by the Indian merchant classes and reflected their business interests as well as the notions they held of being ‘better class Indians’. Official petitions filed with the government for different grievances show their reluctance to have their interests conflated with those of poorer working class Indians as well as against any form of association with the local black population (Kelly, 1985).

Accounts of Indian South African political struggle in South Africa over-emphasised the role of the Indian merchant classes to the detriment of the Indian working class (Swan, 1985; Guha, 1985; Singh, 2004). The agency of poor Indians was generally limited as they had few means of political organisation at their disposal. High subscription rates to Indian political organisations effectively ensured that they were marginalised from formal means of political participation. One of the few tools of resistance for poor working class Indians was petitions and appeals to the colonial
government. This was not easily accomplished due to conditions of employment on white-owned estates and plantations which subjected employees to close supervision and discipline. In the absence of freedom of movement they used other modes of protest available to them such as strikes and absenteeism (Kelly, 1985).

Some of the parochialism of Indian politics was ameliorated by the advent of the young lawyer Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi who soon became a venerated leader and activist through his immersion in South African politics. Gandhi led a number of defiance campaigns against discriminatory anti-Indian legislation intended to force out the resident Indian population. The 1906 campaign against legislation decreeing the carrying of passes and fingerprinting of all Indian males can be seen as a precursor to the anti-pass campaign of the African National Congress (ANC) in the 1950s. In 1913 Gandhi led protests against a £3 poll tax imposed on former indentured labourers over the age of 16 and the non-recognition of Hindu and Muslim marriages. He also led the Great March of 1913 in protest against restrictions on inter-provincial travel. By the time of his departure from South Africa in 1914 a number of concessions had been obtained for the resident Indian population, including the delay of government efforts to register Indians in the Transvaal; abolition of the £3 poll tax; and formal recognition of Hindu and Muslim marriages (Meer, 1996).

This dissertation is careful to avoid the Gandhi-centric approach so prevalent in popular historical accounts of early South African history. However Gandhi’s legacy can be seen as immense in terms of helping counter the anti-Indian racism espoused and established by British colonialism and the Union government. Gandhi
played a key role in the establishment of Indian political organisations such as the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) in 1894 and the Transvaal British Indian Association (TBIA) in 1903. The resistance campaigns he spearheaded helped inject energy into the political consciousness of Indian South Africans. It helped cohere the internal divisions of class and religion within the Indian community and brought greater numbers of Indians of different classes and occupational diversities such as including traders, businessmen, labourers and industrial workers, into the forefront of political struggle. Gandhi’s political campaigns employed the philosophy of non-violent civil disobedience (often referred to in its spiritual sense as satyagraha), which has since served as the basis for many liberation struggles across the world, including that of South Africa’s struggle against apartheid (Guha, 2013).

Gandhi’s lack of interest in the plight of black Africans has often invited critique. His early writings incorporating use of the term ‘kaffir’ (a term then in common usage) appear to indicate notions of superiority of Indians over the local black population. Though Gandhi’s strong attachment to the British Empire evolved significantly throughout the course of his political activism, he is popularly viewed as racist toward black Africans on account of his commitment toward support for the British in the Anglo-Boer War (1899-1902) and in the Bhambatha rebellion of the Zulus against colonial rule in Natal in 1906 (Britto, 2011). Both historical events, the Bhambatha rebellion in particular, are often cited as evidence of Gandhi’s racism toward black Africans and projected to Indian South Africans in general. As such Gandhi’s legacy has been opened to accusations of racism against black Africans. While Gandhi’s support for the British Empire was an instrumental means for Indian South Africans to acquire a legitimate stake to South Africa, it had the effect of alienating many
black Africans. It has left a lasting historical legacy of suspicion and mistrust about Indian motives, which is evident today in popular discourses about the role of Indian South Africans.

Broader questions can also be raised about the overall absence of inter-racial involvement in the political struggles of different racial groups and accordingly the nature and extent of racial insularity in politics. For example, although black African leaders such as John Langalibalele Dube and Isaiah Mdliwamafa Shembe were Gandhi’s contemporaries, both sides never attempted to build solidarities with each other. Opportunities to build relationships or alliances with Coloureds and black Africans were never capitalised upon (Hughes, 2011).

Gandhi’s departure from South Africa in 1914 ended an era of political militancy and confrontation with the state. The South African Indian Congress (SAIC) filled the political gap left by Gandhi’s departure and signalled the ascendancy of a different tactical strategy in dealing with the plight of Indian South Africans. The SAIC was largely dominated by the merchant elite. In line with their business interests, they adopted a conservative negotiations-based approach in their attempts to win concessions from the state and ameliorate the plight of Indian South Africans (Pahad, 1972). Under the leadership of the SAIC the course of Indian political history and struggles against colonial and apartheid continued on a path of racial exclusivity.

---

26 Support for the British also did not fail to win any substantial concessions for the plight of Indians in South Africa. The position of Indians did not improve when the Anglo Boer War was lost and in 1910 the Union of South Africa was born. If anything the position of Indians worsened under British rule.
In 1925 D.F. Malan, then Minister of the Interior, introduced the Areas Reservation and Immigration and Registration Bill, which recommended segregated areas for Indian trading and the limitation of the Indian population through repatriation. The response of the SAIC was to request that the Bill be recalled. When their requests failed, the SAIC sought official intervention from the Indian government (Pahad, 1972; Kelly, 1995). As a result of negotiations between the Union government and India, a Roundtable Conference was held in 1926 leading to the Cape Town Agreement of 1927. The Agreement formally introduced the mediatory role of the Indian government in matters relating to Indian South Africans to the extent of which a diplomatic representative was sent from India whose status was upgraded from ‘agent’ to ‘agent-general’ and later to ‘high commissioner’ (Pahad, 1972). By the time a second conference was held in 1932, it was clear that formal negotiations and the intervention of the Indian government had not led to the amelioration of the plight of Indians. A last ditch attempt to rid South Africa of Indians included an arbitrary resettlement scheme as recommended by a special commission appointed by the 1932 conference. On the basis of research and statistics, the commission recommended that Indians settle elsewhere in places deemed suitable for their habitation such as British Borneo, British Guyana and East New Guinea (Vandenbosch, 1970: 84). Though the recommendation came to naught, it is a testimony to the failures of the SAIC leadership, largely discredited, that they were in fact supportive of the proposed resettlement scheme.

Despite the fact that the Indian government had not managed to secure any concessions for Indians and that their plight could be seen as having worsened with the intervention of the Indian government, it bears some reflection that the resident
Indian population seemed to prefer the Indian government as a political ally rather than fellow oppressed Coloureds and black Africans. The strength of attachment to the Indian government as ally and champion was such that it appeared to negate the possibilities of other cross-racial alliances in their politics. It speaks cogently to the symbolic value invested in affiliation to the ‘motherland’ of India. Bhana and Vahed’s seminal work on the construction of an Indian identity by the early Indian immigrant community reflects the profound meaning that India held for them (2005). According to Moodley, “religion, music, customs, traditions and distinctive food tastes formed part of a womb-like structure to act against a bulwark against a hostile environment” (1980:234). The affiliation with India likely reflected a means of psychological defence against an oppressive environment. It also reflects a process of myth-making in terms of an essentialised Indian identity and an implied homogeneity irrespective of the myriad of fragmentations and cleavages amongst the Indians.

THE RADICALISATION OF INDIAN SOUTH AFRICAN POLITICS

The demise of the elite and racially insular Indian politics of the 1920s is generally attributed to the influence of a new generation of political leadership as exemplified by key activists such as Drs Yusuf Dadoo and Monty Naicker. The turn to militant modes of political strategy, and cooperation with the black African majority represented a dramatic shift from the conservative leadership of the SAIC (Pahad, 1972). Under the leadership of the activists both of whom had been educated and trained abroad, the political struggle of Indians in South Africa became influenced by anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist and anti-racist traditions from other oppressed groups all over the world. Prevailing international conditions of a post war
world, including the fall of dictators such as Hitler and Mussolini and the emergence of new states and governments as a result of struggles for independence, appeared to portend the erosion of parochialism and insularity for local Indian politics. However the internal organisation of local Indian politics remained riven with class and ideological conflicts. Political struggles continued to be defined largely by the Indian merchant elites in whose business interests many of the campaigns against discriminatory legislation were waged (Ginwala, 1974; Swan, 1985).

Structural changes took place in the Congresses as a result of such class and ideological conflicts. Dadoo and Naicker were elected to the leadership of the NIC and the TIC in 1946 respectively. Both were elected to the leadership of the SAIC in September 1948 with Naicker elected as president. In Natal the Natal Indian Congress (NIC) and the Colonial Born and Indian Settlers Association had amalgamated into the Natal Indian Association (NIA). While the majority of the executive of the NIA were moderates, a cross section of key activists had strong roots amongst the Indian working class and formed the Nationalist Bloc within the NIA which later coalesced into the Anti-Segregation Committee (ASC). In the Transvaal similar structural changes took place. Unhappy with the conservative class-based politics of the TIC, Dadoo and a radical cross section of TIC members formed the Nationalist Bloc within the TIC. Dadoo founded the Non-European United Front in the Transvaal and joined the Communist Party of South Africa (CPSA) in 1939 (Raman, 2004).

Two draconian pieces of legislation aimed at restricting the rights of Indians to own or occupy land were passed in 1943 and 1946 respectively: the Trading and
Occupation (Natal and Transvaal) Restriction Act also known as the ‘Pegging Act’) and the Asiatic Land Tenure and Indian Representation Act (also known as the ‘Ghetto Act’). Dadoo and Naicker travelled to India in 1947 in order to appeal for official Indian support. India subsequently took the matter to the United Nations (UN) and mobilised world public opinion in support of the struggle against oppression in South Africa. A passive resistance campaign was mounted in 1946. The effects were far-reaching, helping erode some of the relative isolation of Indian South African politics. It drew supporters from across race, class and gender divides and helped forge the beginnings of multi-racial cooperation between Indians and black Africans to the extent that a joint declaration of co-operation (which came to be known as the ‘Three Doctors’ Pact) was signed in 1947 between Drs Xuma (ANC), Naicker (NIC) and Dadoo (TIC) (Mayosi, 2015). Notably, it was the last mass civil disobedience campaign before the election of the National Party (NP) in 1948 and the implementation of apartheid, a comprehensive and far-reaching system of social engineering and institutionalised racial oppression, which elevated the anti-Indian racism hitherto experienced into a complex eco-system of racism, differentially and systematically implemented, against all those who were not white (Padayachee, 1999).

The NP’s grand vision of apartheid in 1948 is exemplified in one of the key slogans on which it was elected: “die kaffir op sy plek en die koelie uit die land” (keep(ing) the kaffir in his place and the coolie out of the country). In line with this slogan, the apartheid state set about making life so uncomfortable for Indians that there would be no choice but to leave as well as to create the conditions which would permanently subjugate black Africans. The response of Indian South Africans was to
eschew state assistance and instead turn inward to the Indian business community for funds to build the schools, hospitals, clinics, welfare organisations and recreational facilities which were intended to sustain the entire Indian South African community and decrease dependence on state resources.

Despite the general resourcefulness of the Indian South African community and the internal capacity for self-help, they were, however, less able to circumvent the ‘divide and rule’ state tactics employed to create divisions between black Africans and Indians. The signing of the Doctors Pact between the African and Indian National Congresses in 1947 was an indication of a possible threat to South Africa’s white minority. It had raised the worrying spectre of the possibility of a unified Indian and black anti-apartheid opposition and the consequent need to defuse the threat posed to the security and stability of the apartheid state (Xaba, 2001). The role of the state in engineering divisions between Indians and black Africans is documented in some key works, both historical and contemporary (Hemson, 1979; Edwards and Nuttall, 1990; Xaba, 2001). The state was enabled in this divisive role by the nature of the socio-economic context in which Indians and black Africans were located. Inter-racial solidarities were mitigated by the physical realities of spatial segregation for different racial groups. Divisions were engineered in the workplace, in which Indians were most often located in supervisory roles to black Africans, which were intended to break the power of multiracial trade unions and undercut possibilities of alliances (Hemson, 1979). At the community level Indians served as direct targets of resentment and frustration of black Africans in their economic role as ‘in-betweeners’ providing services to poor black Africans as landlords, shop-owners and operators of
the transport services they used. The 1949 conflict between Indians and black Africans took place amidst such conditions of socio-economic crisis.

The effect of the 1949 conflict (only a year after the assassination of Gandhi in India) was devastating to both Indians and black Africans. It resulted in deaths, injuries and damage and wholesale destruction of Indian property and homes (Xaba, 2001). The scale of the violence appeared to devalue the sentiment of the Three Doctors Pact as well as to derail the tentative cooperation and trust which had begun to develop between Indians and black Africans. According to Desai (2014:61), “for Indians, it became an abiding memory of fear and sense of vulnerability”. It also appeared to decisively confirm the most basic tenet of apartheid policy, viz. that the racial separation of different racial groups was necessary to prevent competition and conflict between South Africa’s different racial groups.

Despite the political damage done to the cause of Indian-African unity, the Indian and African Congresses resolved to continue to work together in the spirit of the Three Doctors Pact. Representatives from the two Congresses testified before an all-white commission appointed to investigate the cause of the conflict but boycotted the commission on account of being disallowed from cross-examining the witnesses. The findings of the Commission were said to be biased and particularly oriented toward blaming the Indians (Meer, 1960). The Commission subsequently reported that the violence was caused by the Indians (Webster, 2000).

The 1949 conflict preceded the implementation of the Group Areas Act of 1950. The Group Areas Act removed black Africans, Indians and Coloureds to designated
townships and residential areas on the outskirts of cities. Property owners were poorly compensated and long standing communities were broken and dislocated. The old established Indian communities of Natal were effectively destroyed by the Group Areas Act.

It is important to understand the specificity of the political struggles of Indians in South Africa, waged both singularly and collaboratively at different points, and the implications for the way in which it defined and shaped a political space for Indians. Despite the contention by Marks (1994:6) that “cross-racial alliances, whether born of a common oppression or of self-interest or a calculated combination of the two-go back in South Africa’s history almost as far as the much-cited thorn hedge that its founding father Jan van Riebeeck allegedly planted across the peninsula in order to keep the small Dutch East India settlement and the local Khoisan people apart”, cross-racial alliances did not come easily to oppressed racial groups. Indian-African unity eventually became consolidated in the multi-racial Congress Alliance leading to joint struggles during the Defiance Campaign of 1952, Campaign for the Congress of the People and other significant political struggles in the 1950s.

The Congress Alliance was influenced by the ideology of non-racialism, a doctrine based on a common South African, rather than ethnic or racial identity (Frederickse, 1990). Under non-racialism, all South Africans were ‘united by the experience of history, shared ideas and a sense of destiny’ (Marx 1992: 15). The theme of the 1955 Freedom Charter was ‘The People shall govern’. The Freedom Charter was a common programme for a free and democratic South Africa which eschewed ethnicity, tribalism and racism in favour of a non-racial national agenda known as
non-racialism (Lodge, 1991). In spite of the avowed declaration among Charterists that race, ethnicity and tribalism was irrelevant to the future politics of South Africa, the centrality of matters of race and racism-and the consequent inability to sanitise organised politics of matters of race and racism-is evident in the politics of the Congress Alliance. Despite avowed commitment to the principle of non-racialism each member of the alliance continued to address the ethnically based needs of its own constituents. The ANC spoke to the needs of black Africans, Indians the South African Indian Congress (SAIC), Coloureds the Coloured People’s Congress (CPC), and whites the Congress of Democrats (CoD). Only the South African Communist Party (SACP) drew its membership from across racial and ethnic boundaries.

It is important to note that racial exclusivity has always been a defining feature of organised politics in South Africa. The ANC remained an exclusively African nationalist organisation with membership restricted only to those who were termed ‘black’ until 1969. The formation of the Pan African Congress (PAC) was the consequence of a breakaway by an Africanist element of the ANC in response to the contested matter of working with other racial groups. The integration of other racial groups into the ANC, the proposed open membership policy for the ANC and the broader fate of ‘non-Africans’ within the liberation struggle featured as key matters discussed at the ANC’s first national consultative conference in Morogoro, Tanzania. This conference was held from 25 April to 01 May 1969. The position adopted at the Morogoro Conference, the Strategy and Tactics document, decisively resolved the matter of the place of other racial groups in the national liberation struggle. It was decided that black Africans should be at the vanguard of the liberation struggle, given that the nature of their oppression was different to other racial groups:
The chief content of the liberation struggle is the liberation of the African people. Nobody can doubt that however other racial groups may be oppressed, Africans are oppressed in special ways. As a result, the immediate grievance, aims and outlook of Africans, their daily needs and aspirations, are not identical with those of other racial groups in South Africa, however identical their long-term aim of liberation might be” (cited in Ndebele and Nieftgodien, 2011:575).

This articulation from the ANC was an assertion of the need to balance a commitment to the struggle against racial domination with that of the struggles of the most oppressed members of the working class. However many Indians received the outcomes of the Morogoro Conference with trepidation. In light of the interests of Indians in staking a claim to South Africa, and the struggle to obtain rights, the Morogoro Conference appeared to invoke a prescient notion of an imagined future in which the interests of those with an indigenous claim to South Africa, trumped those of other racial groups.

Contestation over the place of Indians within the Congress Alliance bears testimony to the contradictory politics practiced by the Alliance. An Africanist lobby within the Congress Alliance argued against the suitability of Indians for participation in the Alliance as they were not regarded as indigenous Africans. Indian communists such as Yusuf Dadoo were particularly viewed with suspicion as possibly being the bearer of foreign influences. Opponents of Indian participation in the Alliance also argued that the historical use of passive resistance in the Indian political struggle was at
odds with the radical orientation of the Alliance and particularly given that the use of violence as a tactical strategy against the apartheid state was under consideration by the ANC. The fallacy of the latter argument is borne out by the leading role which was to be played by Indians in the emerging underground and formation of Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK) after the banning of the liberation movement in 1960. Indians featured prominently in the regional commands of MK, particularly in Natal and the Transvaal. Divided views toward the participation of Indians in the Congress Alliance and the broader political struggle acquired further complexity through increasing visibility and participation of Indians in key positions of political activism and leadership.

In parallel to debates about the place of ‘non-Africans’ in the liberation struggle, the prevailing Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) and its strong emphasis on African nationalism was a problematic notion for Indians. Although BCM called for an inclusive ‘Black’ identity that included black Africans, Coloureds and Indians collectively, it generally proved an awkward fit for many Indians who felt as if BCM implied a rejection of Indian identity. Indians were also not readily welcomed in the BCM movement and the BCM leader Stephen Biko was often criticised for associating with Indians (Desai, 2014: 5). BCM was more readily embraced by Coloureds for whom the label of ‘black’ was a less problematic notion.

27 Some well-known Indian South African members of MK are Billy Nair, Sunny Singh, George Naicker, Natrival Babenia and Siva Pillay. The role played by Indian South Africans in MK and the anti-apartheid struggle is not well-known, contradicting general perceptions that Indians did not contribute to the anti-apartheid struggle. A ground-breaking Masters dissertation by Lalla (2011) from Rhodes University explores the experiences of Indian South African MK members, how they reconciled their political and ethnic identities as part of their political activism and the factors which set Indian South African members apart from the rest of Indian South Africans who did not join MK.
The contours of anti-Indian racism on the part of the state changed significantly after 1960, coinciding with the Sharpeville massacre on 21 March 1960 and the consequent banning of the ANC and the PAC. While the Indian Congresses were not banned, key Indian leadership figures such as Naicker and Dadoo were banned and exiled. A draconian period of state repression followed (Lodge, 1987).

In the wake of the widespread international condemnation and the consequent enforced withdrawal of South Africa from the British Commonwealth, one of the responses of the apartheid state was a reassessment of its position toward the Indian community. With the appearance of having accepted the permanent presence of the Indian population, hitherto reviled as a “foreign and unassimilable element”, state policy focused instead upon ameliorating conditions and improving the general quality of life for the beleaguered Indian community. The apartheid state tactically used specific forms of preferential treatment for Indians in relation to black Africans in order to generate resentment from black Africans and sow discord between the two racial groups. The Department of Indian Affairs was set up in 1961 with a white Minister at the head. In 1973, state-financed education was made compulsory for Indian children up to the age of 15. In 1975 inter-provincial travel and residence barriers were eased. A state-sponsored Indian Development Corporation (IDC) was established in 1977. An all-Indian New Republic Bank was set up to promote the growth of Indian entrepreneurship. The racially based University College for Indians was established in 1960, allowing for entry into higher education. Such forms of state assistance helped to facilitate the development of a rising Indian middle class (Report of the High-Level Committee on the Indian Diaspora, 2005).
In stark contrast to earlier anti-Indian agitation and calls for repatriation, Indians were granted citizenship in 1961. The granting of citizenship to Indian South Africans was especially vexatious to black Africans who, by contrast, were denied any significant rights and protections as citizens and effectively designated as aliens in their birthplace. Under apartheid black Africans were consigned to poorly serviced townships and informal settlements as well as ten ethnically-based quasi-independent ‘homeland’ territories located in economically depressed, overcrowded and inhospitable parts of the country. Black Africans were also subject to the humiliation and degradation of ‘pass raids’ (which Indian South Africans were spared) (Marx, 1992).

In line with apartheid’s policy of ‘divide and rule’, apartheid spatial planning located Indian townships in close proximity to black areas, thus allowing for easy observation of the conspicuously different living conditions and lifestyle contrast. When viewed in contrast with the living standards of Indians, the fate of black Africans seemed to serve as an example of fundamental injustice. The motivation behind the changed attitude toward the Indians was two-fold. According to the state’s ‘divide and rule’ mind-set, it was reasoned that popular discontent could usefully be deflected onto the Indian community who would create a buffer against a possible uprising from the oppressed black African majority. South Africa was now seen as an international pariah and an apartheid ‘success story’ could possibly ameliorate some of the damage done to the country’s status and standing abroad. If the Indian community were seen to prosper under apartheid, it would serve as ‘proof’ of the success of the
principle of separate development of different race and ethnic groups (Report of the High-Level Committee on the Indian Diaspora, 2005).

In a study of the economic history of the Indian working class in Durban *Insiders and Outsiders* Freund (1995) suggests that apartheid was a system within which Indians could generally thrive. With the spectre of the 1949 conflict looming large in historical memory, many Indians feared black majority rule and felt especially threatened by increasing numbers of black labourers, it could be argued that it was not in the general interests of the Indian community to oppose apartheid. The state often used the visible prosperity and success of the Indian middle class as a success story for apartheid, and a justification of the policy of separate development.

A key ‘divide and rule’ tactic of the apartheid state was the establishment of the tricameral parliamentary system in 1983 in which whites, Coloureds and Indians were intended to self-govern their respective communities through racially based chambers. Black Africans had no such means of political representation and the white chamber had the power of veto over the Indian and Coloured chambers. The participation of a minority of Indians in the Indian chamber, the House of Delegates (HOD) became the cause of division in the broad front of non-racial unity forged therein and threatened the alliance between Indians and black Africans. The tricameral system was also the cause of internal dissension within the Indian population itself, with those who chose to support the tricameral system seen as traitors and sell-outs. Some Indians did participate in the tricameral elections. Many, however, refused to support an illegitimate system and chose solidarity with black Africans who did not have a vote (Adam and Moodley, 1986).
The extent to which the commitment of non-racialism had filtered to the grassroots community level is vividly demonstrated in the outbreak of anti-Indian violence in the Bhambayi (a Zulu derivative of the word ‘Bombay’) settlement in Inanda, Natal in 1985. Despite many high level commitments to the principle of non-racialism, community level tensions between Indians and black Africans had never been addressed. The Bhambayi settlement in Inanda was the site of multiple contestations between both Indian and black landlords in competition for tenants as well as the state which had earmarked Bhambayi for incorporation into the KwaZulu homeland. Resident Indians were expected to leave Bhambayi so that the area could be upgraded for occupation for black Africans. Indian resistance to the plans for Bhambayi resulted in a violent attack upon Indian homes and properties. The attack caused at least 19 deaths, destruction of homes and properties and the virtual elimination of an Indian presence from the area. Gandhi’s Phoenix settlement, a historic landmark and of great spiritual and emotive value to the Indian community, was destroyed in the course of the violence (Johnson, 1994).

Desai (2014) has provided a critical analysis of the conflict in Bhambayi, which situates the role of multiple political actors including the state, amongst a range of material and non-material factors such as poverty and economic competition, as contributing factors responsible for the violence. Hughes (1985) and Meer (1989) attributed the Inanda violence to the hidden hand of the state. Of particular contestation is the extent to which the attackers were instigated or aided by the so-
called ‘third force’\textsuperscript{28} or the Zulu nationalist organisation, the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP)\textsuperscript{29}. Meer pointed out the parallels between the 1949 race conflict and the outbreak of the violence in Bhambayi some four decades later, indicating the complexities of Natal’s racial dynamics and the unresolved nature of the historical conflict between Indians and black Africans. Fifteen years later the reconstructed Phoenix settlement was opened by President Mbeki in a gesture of what Xaba (2001) has termed “symbolic reconciliation”. While useful, Xaba contends that symbolic reconciliation “ensures that causes of tensions and conflict remain unresolved. Consequently, the tensions and conflicts of the past captivate the imagination and pervade the social relations of the relevant groups” (Xaba, 2001: 38).

The matter of community-level anti-Indian racism was subsumed under the politics of the United Democratic Front (UDF), a broad-based multiracial coalition different various civic, religious and political organisations formed in order to mount a unified organisational response to apartheid. In tandem with its non-racial stance and common civic appeal among all South Africans, the UDF projected an image of an undivided and inclusive South African nation free from the irrelevancies of race and ethnicity. In light of the need to avoid alienating particular constituencies and to enhance its overall mass appeal, the UDF did not adopt a specific policy platform.

\textsuperscript{28} The ‘third force’ was a term used by the ANC leadership to refer to a clandestine force responsible for instigating and fomenting violence in KwaZulu-Natal and black townships in the Witwatersrand. The official TRC finding was that: “while little evidence exists of a centrally directed, coherent or formally constituted ‘Third Force’, a network of security and ex-security force operatives, frequently acting in conjunction with right wing elements and/or sectors of the IFP, was involved in actions that could be construed as fomenting violence and which resulted in gross human rights violations, including random and target killings.”

\textsuperscript{29} The IFP has previously espoused anti-Indian sentiments, often couched in terms of a threat of violence or civil war. In 1976 Chief Mangosuthu Gatsha Buthelezi, then minister in the KwaZulu homeland and president of the IFP, responded to students at the Indian-dominated University of Natal with the threat of the 1949 conflict between Indians and black Africans: “Remember 1949”.
and remained vague on policy prescriptions beyond the central need to challenge white domination. The banning of the UDF in 1988 allowed for the ascendancy of the union movement, lending a class-based ideological cast to the orientation of the liberation struggle. The union movement was distinguished from the UDF in its focus on working class interests, which provided a platform for joint collaboration between Indians and black Africans on different forms of industrial unrest. Indians and black Africans also jointly participated in boycotts against rent and bus fare increases (Seekings, 2000).

The state was forced to unban the ANC in 1990. This was in spite of a plethora of draconian measures to contain anti-apartheid opposition such as the declaration of a state of emergency in 1986, the unleashing of a reign of terror on anti-apartheid resistance by state security forces and numerous attempts to divide and conquer its opposition. The inception of a ‘new’ South Africa brought about a redefinition of the ‘Indian question’.

INDIAN SOUTH AFRICANS IN A POST-APARTHEID CONTEXT

The positioning of Indian South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa involved an adjustment to the dynamics of a new era in which their political loyalties would be tested and where they were often called upon to account for their economic and professional success and atone for the relative privilege bestowed upon them by apartheid. It may be useful here to turn to the truism of ‘continuity in change’. The combination of political uncertainty and fraught social relations which characterised the arrival of Indians in 1860 is ironically mirrored in their contemporary situation in
post-apartheid South Africa. Indian South Africans continue to occupy the same contested space as they had always done since their first arrival (Ramsamy, 2007).

Under the new post-apartheid dispensation Indian South Africans became subsumed under the ‘rainbow nation’. The new democratic state adopted a multiculturalist conception of the South African ‘nation’ through the notion of the ‘rainbow nation’ in order to foster a sense of unity among South Africa’s diverse population groups and seal some of the cracks and fissures of particularism. Given the perceived irrelevance of representing ethnically-based needs in a non-racial South Africa Indian Congresses underwent a process of dissolution. Different forms of ethnic mobilisations soon surfaced. Weaknesses and fragilities in the positioning of Indian South Africans hitherto concealed by the exigencies of the anti-apartheid struggle, began to emerge and ethnic consciousness became conversely heightened. Some Indian South Africans are said to be retreating into an insular ethnic consciousness as part of the refashioning of identities in the post-apartheid period. This ethnic consciousness has been partly facilitated by the onset of the communications revolution. The advent of satellite Indian channels and the cultural phenomenon of Bollywood may well be said to have helped re-establish an emotional connection to India for many Indian South Africans feeling estranged from South Africa. Although many Indian South Africans are unlikely to enjoy more than a largely abstract relationship to India, the cultural bond remains strong. It may even be surmised that the Bollywood-related cultural influence of light skin and straight hair may have had the unintended effect of playing into the intense colour and race consciousness engineered by apartheid (Vahed and Desai, 2010).
Episodes of anti-Indian racism have flared up sporadically in the form of matters such as use of the derogatory term ‘coolie’, matters of access to universities, discrimination against learners for wearing of the Hindu red string bracelet or other religious symbols, physical violence targeted against Indian South Africans etc. Facebook and other forms of social media have sporadically featured episodes of anti-Indian racism, in relation to particular societal issues\textsuperscript{30}. Class vulnerabilities of Indians in post-apartheid South Africa showed through controversial issues such as job security and access to educational institutions (Nyar, 2012).

Tensions about the loyalty of Indian South Africans emerged firstly in terms of the political preferences of Indian South Africans for the New National Party (NNP) in the elections of 1994. With Indian ANC support largely drawn from upper income Indians, the focus of concern was the more economically vulnerable Indian working classes who feared marginalisation in a post-apartheid dispensation. According to Habib and Naidu (2006:89):

\begin{quote}
It would appear that the reluctance of lower income Indian and coloured people to vote for the ANC stems from their material vulnerability in the post-apartheid economy. Attitudinal surveys have demonstrated that the concerns of the Indian working class are exactly the same as those of the African working class: unemployment, crime, and lack of access to housing, water, electricity and social welfare. But the point of departure is that unlike the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{30} In January 2011 a Facebook/Twitter comment about Durban posted by the acclaimed South African comedian Trevor Noah resulted in a storm of anti-Indian social commentary. Some of the posts called Indian South Africans to return to India. The posts were subsequently removed.
Indian working class fears were exploited by opposition parties such that rumours circulated about the fate of Indian South Africans in a post-apartheid dispensation. Opposition parties claimed that Indian homes would be sold for R2 to black Africans and that Indian belongings and property would be appropriated by black Africans. In fact a number of incidents of black Africans claiming homes in Indian townships in KwaZulu-Natal were reported in the media, including local community newspapers, which created panic amongst poor working class Indians. The ANC invested considerable effort in courting the Indian South African electorate with appeals to historical solidarities between Indians and the ANC. The ANC Indian recruited Bollywood actress Shabana Azmi to help the ANC campaign. However South Africans voted largely for the NNP and DP in the 1994 and 1999 elections, adding to the widespread notion of Indian South Africans as politically disloyal (‘backstabbers’). The majority of Indians voted for the ANC in the 2004 elections. The reclaiming of support from Indian South Africans can be seen as due in part to a concerted campaign to win Indian voters which drew on different cultural symbols and imagery calculated to win support (Ramsamy, 2007: 27).

Tensions continued to fester between Indians and black Africans, often in public spaces such as the media. Prior to the 1999 elections an inflammatory anti-Indian editorial was written by Amos Maphumulo in the popular Durban-based daily newspaper *Ilanga*. Entitled “The nation suffers due to non-indigenous people”, the editorial accused Indian South Africans of complicity in the suffering of black Africans.
and called for the birth of “a South African Idi Amin” who would expel Indians. The reference to Idi Amin alluded to violence and genocide against Indians as happened under in Uganda in 1972 when the Ugandan dictator expelled all Indians from the country. The editorial was widely condemned, including by the IFP who through Matla Publishing owns the Ilanga newspaper, and Maphumulo was forced to resign from his post as editor. The range of public sentiment generated thereafter in the wake of the controversial editorial indicated that the matter of historical tensions between Indians and black Africans should be investigated and addressed (Ramsamy, 2007).

In 2002 the acclaimed South African musician and playwright Mbongeni Ngema released the song ‘AmaIndiya’ (the Indians). The song ‘AmaIndiya’ was an overt expression of anti-Indian racism, with lyrics claiming that “whites are better than Indians” and that what is needed are “strong brave men to confront Indians” in the manner of Ugandan dictator, Idi Amin. The song was banned by the Broadcasting Complaints Commission (BCC) on account of its promotion of hate speech. Although the song was widely denounced, public reactions on the basis of radio phone-ins and letters to newspapers appeared to indicate approval of the message of the song as well as pleas to address the matters raised in the song (Vahed and Desai, 2010).

In contrast to the doctrine of non-racialism, Indian South Africans fear that they have been excluded from the definition of ‘an African’ in post-apartheid South Africa. While former president Mbeki’s African Renaissance policies and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) initiatives are presented as inclusive of and empowering to all ‘Black’ (non-white) South Africans, their increasing emphasis on indigeneity is seen
as a regression back to a more essentialist conceptualisation of ‘African’ that restricts ‘Blackness’ to indigenous Africans. Accordingly Indian South Africans “frequently doubt whether they are genuinely included in the official definition of an authentic African when popular perceptions emphasise cultural African traditions” (Moodley & Adam 2000: 55). The increasing Africanist orientation of the ANC has created alarm amongst Indian Africans.

Indian South Africans as well as Coloureds have been particularly implicated in debates over workplace transformation and employment equity, given contestations over attempts to achieve a South African workforce which is representative of race, gender and disability and the consequent failure of transformation policies to create opportunities for black Africans in top and senior management positions. In 2011 the Department of Labour proposed amendments to certain sections of the Employment Equity Act (EEA) in order to fast track employment equity and allow black Africans an advantage over Indian South Africans and Coloureds in the employment market. In 2010 Mr Jimmy Manyi, then deputy general of the Department of Labour (DoL) and President of the Black Management Forum (BMF), addressed the Durban Chamber of Commerce on the subject of proposed amendments to equity legislation. Mr Manyi remarked that there was an over-representation of Indians in KwaZulu-Natal that “Indians have bargained their way to the top”. A month later, Mr Manyi made similar controversial remarks about an “over-concentration of Coloured people in the Western Cape” (Hartley and de Lange, 2011). The alarming implications of a racial realignment of employment quotas raised further instability and fear for Indian South Africans and Coloureds who are geographically concentrated in particular provinces such as KwaZulu-Natal, Western Cape and Northern Cape. More
worryingly, the matter of spatial concentrations of particular racial groups revived the traumatic memory of forced removals under apartheid social engineering policies and spoke cogently to the continued racialisation of South Africa through different means in a post-apartheid context.

Anti-Indian sentiment has been publicly fomented in KwaZulu-Natal by Mazibuye African Forum, a local pressure group campaigning against employment equity for Indian South Africans and accusing Indians of racist and exploitative behaviour toward black Africans\(^{31}\). Members of the Mazibuye African Forum, the AmaCde (The Comrades) released a controversial rap song ‘Umhlab Uzobuya’ (the land will come) whose lyrics contain a provocation to violence against Indian South Africans: “You Indian, what do you want in this country? Black people, let us stare them in the eyes and tell them to go back and cross the ocean. If they refuse it is time for action” (Sosibo, 2014). The anti-Indian campaign mounted by Mazibuye African Forum speaks to the pressures of job creation for black Africans, and resentment against local Indian businesses seen to be exploiting black African labour as well as benefiting from government tenders.

The advent of the wealthy and politically connected Gupta family in South Africa has provided further grist for anti-Indian racism. The Guptas are a family from India with a large

\(^{31}\) In 2013 the Mazibuye African Forum was implicated in a series of anti-Indian editorials published in the City Press newspaper in the wake of a highly publicised altercation between Mr Afzul Rehrman, the mayor of Newcastle municipality in KwaZulu-Natal, and a local traffic official. The City Press editorials accused Indian South Africans of being opportunistic aliens who benefited from colonialism and apartheid at the expense of black Africans and called upon Indian South Africans to return to India. Mfeka wrote to Mr Rehrman, “First and foremost you are and Indian and contrary to what you have been taught and what you believe, South Africa is an African country with its land in totality and proportion rightfully belonging to its indigenous African people” (Evans, 2013).
number of business interests in South Africa, including the *New Age* newspaper. The Gupta family has earned wide public censure for a number of well publicised scandals such as the appropriation of South Africa’s Waterkloof military base for personal use, allegations of racist behaviour toward black Africans at a wedding hosted by the Gupta family at Sun City resort in North West Province as well as a number of opportunistic political and economic interests in South Africa (Pillay, 2013). Close links with the ANC including the family of President Jacob Zuma, have revived long held stereotypes of political and financial corruption associated with Indian businesspeople. Khumalo (2010) described the association of key ANC politicians with Indian business interests as “an Indian businessman finding a politically powerful darkie or vice versa”\(^3\). Such stereotypes are reinforced by President Zuma’s long standing association with prominent Indian businessmen such as Mr Schabir Schaik and Mr Vivian Reddy (Khumalo, 2010).

Many public statements of anti-Indian racism have been made from public forums, often within ANC government circles. During a dispute in Parliament former Correctional Services Minister Sipho Mzimela notably told Mohammed Valli Moosa to “go back to Bombay” (Gevisser, 1996:60). In 1995 the late Mr Peter Mokaba, then Deputy Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism, remarked controversially that Indians were over-represented in Parliament and began a politically charged conversation in state circles about possible attempts to marginalise Indian

\(^3\) The column by Sunday Times columnist Mr Fred Khumalo ‘When our leader sneezes, the media must catch a wake-up’ was the subject of a Press Council Appeal hearing in 2012 on account of allegations of anti-Indian racism and stereotyping of Indian South Africans as unethical and politically corrupt. The complainant, Prof Ziyad Motala, argued that the column by Mr Khumalo,”draws from the infamous stereotype of Indians as unethical and dishonest, referring to cases where Indians abused political connections for financial gain, to reinforce a secondary stereotype…namely Indians in general-owing to their corrupt and corrupting behaviour-seek and exploit politically connected blacks to enrich themselves” (Press Council Appeal Hearing: Ziyad Motala vs Sunday Times, 2012). The complaint was rejected by the Press Ombudsman.
participation within the ANC (Ramsamy, 2007). In 2007 Mr Fikile Mbalula, then president of the African National Congress Youth League (ANCYL), told a June 1976 Memorial Lecture at the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) that the predominance of Indian students at the University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) threatened transformation at the institution and that black African students were suffering as a result. Controversially Mr Mbalula stated that transformation at UKZN had turned the institution into “nothing but Bombay” and that “when you get into that university, you can think it’s an exclusive university of Indians only” (Naidu, 2007). A subsequent clarification about racial quotas at UKZN revealed that black Africans constituted 53% of the student body in relation to 31% of Indian South Africans. However Mr Mbalula did not receive official censure for such inflammatory remarks and instead rose to the position of Minister of Sport and Recreation in 2010. ANCYL leader Mr Julius Malema has often made anti-Indian remarks to poor black audiences where such sentiments are likely to stir tensions against Indian South Africans. In 2011 Malema used the derogatory term ‘amakhula’ (a Zulu derivative of the word ‘coolie’) while addressing black residents of the Thembelihle informal settlement. Thembelihle is located near Lenasia, a former Indian township (Narsee, 2015).

The question may be asked here: Can Indian South Africans claim also to be ‘African?’ If cognisance is taken of prevailing political sentiments in the matter of affirmative action and equity as well as the sentiments raised in the data sources used herein and more generally about Indian South Africans needing to return to India, it may be unlikely that Indian South Africans can be generally viewed by the state as ‘Africans’. The matter of belonging and ‘authenticity’ for Indian South Africans has not been addressed and its controversies have
gone a long way toward entrenching perceptions of Indians as an alien minority grafted onto South Africa’s history by virtue of British colonialism. Hence tensions and ambiguities continue to deepen about authentic citizenship and a sense of belonging for Indian South Africans.
This chapter describes the methodological approach undertaken in this dissertation. The methodology is fundamentally qualitative in orientation. Denzin and Lincoln (2005: 52) define qualitative research as the following:

> Qualitative research is multi-method in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of or interpret a phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials case study, personal experience, introspective, life story interview, observational, historical, interactional and visual texts that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals lives.

The dissertation utilises a phenomenological interpretive method of inquiry. The methodology is discussed in two parts, firstly a justification of the theoretical application and secondly a description of the two data sources used herein, i.e. focus groups and individual semi-structured interviews.

As stated before, the aim of this dissertation is to understand anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. There are two principal data sources used in the dissertation: (a) focus groups are used to illustrate the strength of anti-Indian attitudes on a national scale; and (b) in-depth semi-structured interviews were then
conducted in order to probe for subjective understandings of anti-Indian racism from the perspective of a selected sample of Indian South African participants. The semi-structured interviews were conducted for the purpose of ‘drilling down’ into the anti-Indian issues raised in the focus groups. The preceding chapters provide an understanding of racism, anti-Indian racism and ‘in–betweenity’ and serve as a conceptual platform from which the research process was launched.

In-depth qualitative research is seen as the most appropriate approach for the purposes of this dissertation on anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. Unlike quantitative research which seeks causal determination, measurability, statistical prediction and generalisation of findings, qualitative research is focused on in-depth understanding, illumination and possible extrapolation to other situations (Blaikie, 2007). For the purposes of this study on anti-Indian racism, qualitative research would look beyond numbers, offer rich descriptions of a complex phenomenon, allow for a measure of finely grained analysis and give voice to minority views that may be otherwise rarely heard. Qualitative research is seen as especially appropriate for the purpose of researching a research topic which has been identified as particularly sensitive, taboo and potentially inflammatory.

Lee (1993:1) defines a sensitive research topic in terms of the degree of threat to those who are involved in the research. The notion of threat is elucidated in different ways, i.e. “intrusive threat”, which deals with areas that are “private, stressful or sacred”; “threat of sanction” involving the possibility that research may reveal information that is stigmatising or incriminating in some way and “political threat” involving vested
interests of powerful actors and institutions in society (Lee, 1993:4). Sieber and Stanley (1988:49) suggest that sensitive studies are those “in which there are potential consequences or implications, either directly for the participants in the research or for the class of individuals represented by the research.” Lee argues against the generality of Sieber and Stanley’s definition of sensitive research in that it focuses on the “consequences of the research rather than the specific technological and methodological issues that are inherent in sensitive research” (1993:3).

Racism is universally acknowledged as conforming to the definition of a sensitive research topic (Romm, 2011). As noted by Sue (2005:109):“During my 35 years of work on racism, diversity and multiculturalism, I have come to realise that people and communities often do not wish to deal with such a potentially explosive topic because it pushes buttons in all of us and elicits strong emotions of defensiveness, guilt and hopelessness” (2005:109). As noted by Douglas (1988: 8) there is a strong emotional element involved in interviewing around matters of race and racism: “the emotions which are often attached to the experience of discriminatory incidents (frustration, irritation, shame, anger, boredom, despair, confusion, pain, sadness) means that they are often rationalised and treated as important or repressed. Returning to such incidents, via for example through the interview process, is therefore not an easy process for the participants.”

Racism is a deeply confronting issue and particularly so in South Africa and the contextual conditions of a post-apartheid society suffering from the apartheid legacy of violence and psychological trauma. The propensity toward avoidance and
curtailment of discussions of racism at the level of individuals or groups is echoed in
government and policy settings. Racism is thus tended to be downplayed or trivialised
as something less intentional or oppressive. The overall prevailing environment of
‘new racism’ (McConahay, 1986; Bobo, Kluegel and Smith, 1996) as discussed earlier
in this dissertation in which overt forms of racism have been replaced with more subtle,
indirect and hence rationalisable forms, encourages the idea that discussions of
racism are risky and socially unacceptable and mitigates against participants being
able to speak freely.

The full scale of the sensitivity of this research was not apparent to the student at the
outset of this research and only gradually emerged in the course of the work. In line
with Lee’s argument, methodological and technical considerations had to be taken into
account about the precise conceptualisation of the topic; formulation of the research
sample and the nature of the relationship between the researcher and the research
participants. In confronting the different challenges of undertaking research on racism,
it was clear that undertaking studies on racism involves a particular conundrum, which
has doubtlessly confounded many a researchers embarking on their research. This
conundrum is about how to conceptualise and organise a methodologically and
academically sound approach toward a subject which is conceptually ambiguous,
operates in a generally invisible and undetectable fashion and which arouses varying
degrees of anxiety, fear and general discomfort among participants in such research.
A thoughtful, responsible and open-minded methodological approach would therefore
be required on the part of the researcher.
The researcher then embarked upon the specific project of learning about the different methods and approaches which other social scientists have utilised in undertaking challenging research in the domain of race and racism, with the aim of designing the appropriate methodology for this work (Morgan, 2007; Bobo and Fox, 2003; Bulmer and Solomos, 2004; Romm, 2011; Quraishi and Philburn, 2015). Although there is an expansive terrain of research investigating racism and particularly what is now known as ‘new racism’, there is less to guide the researcher about the appropriate style and method of enquiry used to proceed in such research. The scan of the literature revealed that researchers, largely based in the United States, have experimented broadly with options for qualitative enquiry on race and racism. Different research methods include hierarchical modelling (Quillian 1996), survey-based experiments (Bobo and Kluegel, 1993; Kinder and Sanders 1990; Schuman and Bobo, 1988), and the linking of in-depth interviews with survey data (Krysan, 1999). This diverse literature would appear to recommend avoidance of narrowly focused singular methodologies in favour of mixed method approaches.

The complexity of the role of the researcher in qualitative interviews is underlined in research which raises concerns about the degree to which interviewees are candid about attitudes and opinions on matters of race and racism in interviews and that such interviews sometimes may understate or conceal actual levels of prejudice (Bonilla-Silva and Forman, 2000). The ‘race-of-interviewer effect’ is the contention that research participants may adjust their responses on questions concerning race according to the race of the researcher (Hatchett and Schuman, 1975; Cose, 1993). The ‘race of interviewer’ effect suggests that participants may possibly conceal or not fully express authentic responses in interviews based on the researcher’s race.
Toward this end it was further suggested that matching the researcher and participant race may increase comfort levels on the part of the participant and better facilitate rapport between researcher and participant. However researchers argue that matching the race of the researcher and the participant does not guarantee rapport or quality of data. In fact some research indicates that some racial groups may respond with increased racial resentment when faced with an interviewer of the same race (Dovidio and Fazio, 1992; Wittenbrink, Judd and Park 1997). Other research resists the assumption that data quality is enhanced when research participants speak with a person of the same race and argues instead that cultural sensitivity, rather than race of the researcher, builds a stronger research relationship (Cox, 2004; Ridley, 2005).

The issue of the appropriateness of focus groups for researching sensitive and personal issues such as race and racism has received its fair share of analytic attention from the race researchers (Kitzinger, 1995; Lee, 1993). Focus groups have been popularly utilised as research tools for matters of race and racism on the main assumption that a group dynamic best supports free and open disclosure in terms of sensitive research. It is recognised that while focus groups have many of the limitations of other qualitative methods, those limitations assume greater import in the context of matters of race and racism. Sample sizes for focus groups are generally small and purposively selected and do not allow easy generalisation to larger populations. Bias can sometimes be introduced by cross cultural language and translation issues. This is important where there are no equivalent vernacular translations for English words such as ‘racism’. Romm (2011) has written thoughtfully about the significance of focus group enquiry for matters of race and
racism and suggested some alternative conceptions for focus group work which addresses matters of racism. Romm specifically proposes that moderators of focus groups may play a key role in helping avoid particular epistemological orientations by “a consciously interventive approach” (2011:249) i.e. suspending traditional roles of detachment and objectivity and instead actively directing the focus group discussions as an agent and active presence in the research.

An initial exploration of possible study participants for this dissertation was conducted at the outset of this work. It was highly tentative and was broadly intended to ‘test’ what the general reception might be toward this work. This exploratory approach involving semi-structured face to face interviews can be understood as what is termed “the big net approach” (Fetterman, 1998:32) in which the researcher mingles with everyone, relies on his or her judgement to select research participants and utilises all available opportunities to create the conditions to facilitate a space for research. Purposive sampling, considered by Welman and Kruger (1999) as the most important kind of non-probability sampling, was used herein to identify the primary participants. The sample of 10 included key figures in the anti-apartheid struggle, some members of the higher education community and two government role-players. The sample was diverse in terms of race, sex/gender and geographical origin (the two provinces of KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng). All the participants were based in urban settings. It was expected that this sample of participants would offer in-depth insights about anti-Indian racism and specifically about how they have constructed or understood their experience of anti-Indian racism, i.e. the ‘thick’ description (Creswell, 2007).
In order to trace additional participants or informants, snowball sampling was utilised. Snowballing is a method of expanding the sample by asking one informant or participant to recommend others for interviewing (Babbie, 1995). The purposive sample interviewees were requested to give, at their discretion, the names and contact details of persons who would be appropriate interviewees for the purposes of this research. Those through whom entry to additional research participants is gained, are called “gatekeepers” and those persons who volunteer assistance “key insiders” (Creswell, 2007).

The initial exploratory interviews did not ‘take’ very well. One of the key outcomes of this exploratory process was the surfacing of considerable levels of ambivalence, trepidation and discomfort among participants. Participants appeared uncomfortable and anxious with the subject matter, and requested clarity on research findings would be documented without compromising their confidences. Two participants enquired about possible censure in their professional lives from confidences divulged in the interviews about personal or private aspects of their lives. Overall the degree of participants’ sensitivity about racism and then particularly anti-Indian racism differed significantly between individuals and can be seen to be socially influenced and politically and culturally determined. Some participants requested anonymity and displayed anxiety about the ‘right’ responses and in particular as ‘right’ for the purposes of an academic study. One high-profile participant (who withdrew from the interview sample when it was later finalised) shared the fear of ‘over-thinking’ responses. It was a point of particular interest that two older Indian South African participants in the exploratory sample appeared to associate the subject of anti-Indian
racism with a measure of embarrassment. The matter of ‘bringing up old memories’ was raised.

From the initial set of exploratory interviews it was evident that racism is a potentially inflammatory subject area which resides in the private sphere of people’s lives and if openly discussed, has the potential to destabilise or jeopardise personal and work relationships. Given the difficult nature of the exploratory interviews, it was envisaged that anonymous surveys, rather than face to face interviews, might be possibly more suitable for the purposes of protecting participants. However it was acknowledged that should anonymous surveys be used, the valuable qualitative insight that could be gained from face to face interviews, would then be lost. At the same time a robust search for funding for this research did not succeed. Many but not all of the funding sources included those foundations, grants and bursars on various higher education funding databases. To the researcher it then appeared, discouragingly, to reflect a general lack of ability or possible unwillingness to engage with a complex, divisive and seemingly intractable socio-political issue. It was then that the methodological complexity of this work began to emerge most clearly for the researcher. In working toward an appropriate methodological and epistemological foundation for the research, the researcher would have to focus less on searching for a set of rules of how to proceed ‘correctly’ with research on racism and attempt to imaginatively reach beyond the attendant methodological challenges. A simpler approach was needed. As the subject of racism is so complex, it is possible to contend that the approach toward researching and analysing study of racism should rather be simplified in response. Methodological prescriptiveness should possibly be
regarded as secondary to more empirically grounded investigations of the means by which research knowledge is produced.

An additional point of interest is that through the process of researching different methodological options for studying matters of race and racism, it became clear that while an abundance of literature is available, very little of it has been produced in South Africa. It is less clear about where the responsibility lies for the failure of South Africa to innovate and experiment with methodologies for studying matters of race and racism. It may well be seen as a shortcoming of the academy in South Africa. It could also be seen as a consequence of the ‘colour-blind’ post-apartheid environment in which open discussions of racism are restrained. This represents a relevant and very necessary avenue of methodological enquiry. However it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to fully explore this.

All of the issues above were given due cognisance in helping inform and conceptualise the eventual simplified methodological design for this study. In sum, this early exploratory process of critical learning and reflection as well as initial methodological experimentation describes the general contours of the process by which a simple research paradigm for this work was shaped and emerged.

KEY EPISTEMOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

A key area of concern was to establish as sound an epistemological foundation for the study as possible, such that there is an equal balance of academic attention to choice of methods and techniques as to that of the epistemological considerations
for the methodological foundation of this work. The term ‘epistemology’ can be described as the theory of knowledge and the assumptions and beliefs that are held about the nature of knowledge (Crotty, 1998; Bryman, 2004). Epistemologies are theories about the nature of knowledge: who can know, how we know, and what counts as evidence for our claims (Harding, 1987). Gunzenhauser and Gerstl-Pepin (2006: 332) argue that “epistemology is a theory of what gets to count as knowledge.” As the researcher, the epistemology used here is the theory of knowledge which decides how the matter of anti-Indian racism will be approached and analysed.

Accordingly the epistemological approach to this work was tempered by the awareness of the influence of racial thinking and epistemologies on knowledge making and/or production in the academy and the impact thereafter. Epistemologies are fundamentally shaped by those who construct and use them in order to interpret their social reality and arrive at his or her version of the truth, which is influenced by the individual or group’s background, culture or particular world view. According to Hunter (2002: 120):

> Epistemologies do not exist outside of the people who construct and use them. Individuals and groups adopt various epistemologies at different points in time to make sense of the world. Epistemologies are also not equal in status, in society at large, or in the academic community. Epistemologies are situated within political, historical, and economic contexts that can provide power and legitimacy to their knowledge claims.
In contrast to the traditional positivist social science argument that a strict application of the scientific method protects the research process from external influences, Blair (1996:20) argues that, “what often passes for neutrality in social science research is no more than a mask which hides taken for granted partisan notions of what constitutes ‘good’ research. It is partisan because it ignores the possibility of diverse systems of knowledge production and multiple interpretations of social phenomena.”

Scholars argue that in order to challenge racism in social science research, researchers must remain aware that ideological and discursive racism, which usually white and Eurocentric, is an inextricable part of the process of research and knowledge production. For example, Stanfield (1985) states that the Eurocentric epistemologies which privilege a patriarchal white European perspective have been so deeply embedded in contemporary discourse for so long that they have become ‘naturalised’. Social reality is constructed through a cultural-hegemonic lens which casts ‘European whiteness’ as the norm. Feagin (2006) has described this racial framework as an archetypal way of thinking about race relations in the United States. However race and racial representations are not just social constructions, they serve real material interests of dominant groups in society and as such, impact directly on how research is conducted from the choice of research questions to the interpretation of data (Hill Collins, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2000).

Gramsci’s concept of ‘hegemony’ is an example of the power of dominant epistemologies to shape forms of knowledge and elicit submission to elites through a combination of coercion and consent (Gramsci, 1971). Gramsci’s insights about how power is constituted in the realm of ideas and knowledge has shaped the notion of
knowledge as a particular kind of social construct which serves to legitimate social and political structures. For example, some forms of racial knowledge are used to perpetuate state racism through social and economic policies. Gramsci’s theory defines hegemony as exercised by civil society as well as the state. Hence it is imperative to understand the ways that power relations validate some ways of knowing and denigrate others. Power not only coerces people to do things against their own interests, power has the ability to affect understandings of the world and perceptions of society (Gaventa, 1980).

Critical reflexivity is an important tool in examining epistemologies, and according attention to unequal power relations in society and in turn how they affect knowledge creation and production processes is equally vital. According to Coghlan and Brannick (2005: 62) reflexivity is “the constant analysis of (your) own experience as well as your theoretical and methodological assumptions”. Reflexivity implies “thinking about the conditions for what one is doing and investigating the way in which the theoretical, cultural and political context of individual and intellectual involvement affects interaction with what is being researched” (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000:245). In turn, researchers should acknowledge that “their interpretation of the studied phenomenon is itself a construction” (Charmaz, 2006: 187).

A number of attendant responsibilities are therefore placed upon the researcher. The researcher is called upon to deconstruct the nature of truth and reality upon which epistemologies are generally based. It was important that the researcher remain attuned to how racial thinking and knowledge is and can be deeply infused in the
research process and through a commitment to critical reflexivity, avoid possible hidden assumptions and bias about race and racism in the pursuit of the research. De Souza states that researchers need to develop a cognitive awareness of “how social position, personal histories and lived experiences matter” (De Souza, 2004: 473). The subjective stance of researcher should be acknowledged as “construct(ing) (our) grounded theories through (our) past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives and the research practices” (Charmaz, 2006: 10).

According to Romm (2011:13) researchers are therefore required to, “take account of their involvements in social life and to acknowledge the possible social impacts that their research arguably may be creating.” The researcher-participant relationship is therefore seen as “subjective, interactive and interdependent; reality is multiple, complex and not easily quantifiable, the values of the researcher, participants, research site, and underlying theory cannot help but undergird all aspects of the research and the research product is context specific” (Petersen, 2006: 47). In the context of the interpretive research paradigm, some researchers reject the concept of validity in qualitative research altogether. The matter of validity in research is suggested to be replaced with a range of concepts such as credibility and trustworthiness (Patton, 1990), confirmability (Healey and Perry, 2000) and dependability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Creswell argues that the concept of validity is not relevant to qualitative research. Claims about the knowledge acquired should be defensible and at least plausible from the perspective of the researcher.
In a South African context, racial epistemologies are most often framed in a black-white or majority-minority binary opposition in ways which appear to relegate other those groups not identified as ‘black’ or ‘white’ to the periphery of society and neutralise their experience of racism and discrimination. Black Africans are typically constructed as the proprietors of an ‘authentic’ racism, as well as the ‘worst’ of racism, due to their having experienced the worst of the apartheid system according to apartheid’s hierarchically organised structures of deprivation and less so than Indian South Africans or Coloureds. Groups such as Indian South Africans and Coloureds are therefore framed as a subordinate and marginal. This epistemology downplays matters of cultural domination between black Africans and whites and the extent to which ‘whiteness’ has largely provided the raw materials out of which many South Africans have largely constructed their sense of class, ethnicity and race, nationality and the sense of ‘us’ and ‘them’. Given the apparent invisibility and universality of ‘whiteness’, its power to define epistemology in South Africa tends to have gone mostly unacknowledged and unexamined33. As South Africa undergoes profound socio-cultural and political shifts in the two decades since the formal end of apartheid in 1994, it is hoped that this epistemology may undergo some critical re-evaluation in broader society.

Critical race theory (CRT) as formulated in the United States (Feagin, 2006; Delgado and Stefancic, 2001; Omi and Winant, 1994) is generally posited as an alternative epistemology to mainstream orthodox thinking about race. CRT is centrally concerned with a subversion of racialised hegemony through the structures and

33 Having said that, it is acknowledged here that ‘whiteness’ is establishing itself as a growing field of study in South Africa.
relations that maintain racial inequality and prioritises the voices and experiences of marginalised groups in society as central to research processes. CRT rejects the idea of objectivity or neutrality in research on race and racism.

AN OUTLINE OF THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL APPROACH

In line with the qualitative interpretivist orientation of this dissertation, a phenomenological approach was deemed appropriate for this type of study. The phenomenological approach used in this dissertation helped in understanding the meanings that research participants attached to their experiences and understandings of anti-Indian racism and the role played by Indian South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa.

Phenomenology is an interpretive approach which originated as a form of philosophical enquiry from the work of influential philosophers such as Husserl and Heidegger. In contrast to positivists, phenomenology believes that the researcher cannot be detached from his/her worldviews and that these experiences are inevitably infused into the research process. As a form of enquiry phenomenology attempts to understand people’s perceptions, perspectives and understandings of a given situation. According to Patton (1990:71), a phenomenological approach is essentially about “descriptions of what people experience and how it is that they experience what they experience”. Moustakas (1994:13) described phenomenology as “a return to experience in order to obtain comprehensive descriptions that provide
the basis for reflective structural analysis that portrays the essence of an experience”.

As the study of subjective experience, those engaged in phenomenological research focus in-depth on the meaning of a particular aspect of human experience. Phenomenology seeks to eliminate bias or preconceptions and emphasises the importance of making clear how interpretations and meanings have been placed onto findings. This approach involves two perspectives of phenomenological analysis, those who are being researched and the researcher. The researcher is seen as an active figure in the research process rather than in terms of neutrality and detachment. The researcher has to be aware of his or her own experience being infused into engagement in the interviews and the analysis of data. This approach therefore utilises a dual interpretative process, which is referred to as ‘double hermeneutics’ (Clarke and Braun, 2013).

In the phenomenological tradition the researcher must go beyond words. Language is viewed as the primary system through which meaning is both constructed and understood (Creswell, 2007). Through language and linguistic analysis the quintessential meaning of the experiences of participants will be extracted and then later reviewed and analysed. This involves ‘bracketing’, i.e. suspension of the researcher’s “prejudices, viewpoints or assumptions regarding the phenomenon under investigation” (Katz, 1987:37) in order to identify the data in its purest form, unsullied by ancillary impositions.
While the phenomenological tradition discourages prescriptiveness and specific ‘techniques’ or steps, some procedures of phenomenological enquiry are deemed mandatory. Creswell (2007) has usefully provided guidelines for a typical phenomenological approach. The phenomenological process should begin with an internalisation by the researcher of the deeper epistemological and philosophical perspectives behind the phenomenological approach or rather, assumption of the ‘phenomenological attitude’. Research questions are accordingly designed and written. The researcher selects a particular sample of individuals. The sample size of the interviewees is dependent upon the research questions at hand and the knowledge which needs to be obtained. Qualitative research tends not to be as prescriptive as that of quantitative studies with regard to sample size. Researchers (Bertaux, 1981; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; Green and Thorogood, 2009) often avoid prescribing estimated sample sizes and suggest the concept of ‘saturation’ to help guide matters of qualitative sample sizes. According to Creswell (2007:69) researchers should “interview so many subjects that you find out what you need to know”.

---

34 The concept of saturation may not be particularly useful in terms of PhD research, in which PhD students are required to draw up a clearly defined rationale and strategy indicating sample sizes and representativeness for the methodological aspect of their studies. An open-ended concept such as saturation may be seen as a luxury for PhD students who have to ensure that their sample sizes are defensible for the purposes of their research. For the purposes of this PhD study, with its focus on sensitive and controversial research matter and the related objective of understanding the subjective perception-led nature of anti-Indian racism, the issue of representativeness was not considered unduly significant. A large number of in-depth interviews were conducted in order to ensure that the sample size is considered defensible and that there is enough data from which to work.
The major data source for the phenomenological tradition is open-ended or semi-structured interviewing. The questions for phenomenological interviews should be as open-ended as possible. Patton (1990:71) stated the purpose of interviewing specifically as “to find out what is in and on someone else's mind”. The process of phenomenological analysis is seen as different from more traditional or even quantitative methods of research. Phenomenological data analysis involves a process of ‘horizontalisation’ (Moustakas, 1994). The researcher is intended to summarise the data and present a set of themes, both collective and individual, through a process of phenomenological reduction. Phenomenological reduction involves the analysis of specific statements, sentences and quotes which in turn lead to ‘clusters of meaning’. A composite summary of the data is then made which is then transcribed and translated into a meta-narrative of knowledge.

An additional or peripheral data source used in this study is that of ‘memo-writing’ (Miles & Huberman, 1984: 69). Memo-writing is defined as “a process of recording analytic insights that provide more depth and complexity than codes” (Clarke and Braun, 2013: 215) and refers to field notes taken by the researcher during the data-collection process. A total of 30 self-reflective and analytic memos were written during the course of this study. These memos include questions, musings and speculations about the data and the emerging findings. The language of the participants guided the development of codes and analytic categories which would later influence the themes of the overall data findings. When fully compiled, with comparisons made of codes and analytic categories, the memos helped inform the process of data analysis.
Data Sources

GCRO/AKF Focus Groups

The first data source utilised herein was that of focus groups conducted by the Ahmed Kathrada Foundation (AKF)/Gauteng City-Region Observatory (GCRO) project on non-racialism (Everatt, 2014). The focus groups were conducted as part of a national project on non-racialism conducted jointly by the AKF and the GCRO. Given the remarkable findings revealed therein about anti-Indian sentiment, the focus groups were considered appropriate and relevant for use in this dissertation.

The main purpose of the focus groups was to investigate non-racialism, and to “understand what ‘ordinary South Africans’ are doing for themselves, or at least how they understand and approach non-racialism” (Everatt, 2014: 7). The set of findings about non-racialism traversed a complex and unwieldy socio-political reality. The findings encompassed a range of diverse issues from the centrality of race and racialised discourses for South Africans, confusion and incoherence about non-racialism as a concept to the enduring predicament of socio-economic woes. One of the key findings about non-racialism was that of remarkably high levels of anti-Indian sentiment. Of all the racial groups, Indian South Africans emerged most strongly as a target of hatred and resentment in the focus groups. The aforementioned anti-Indian sentiment was widely expressed ‘across the board’ in the various focus groups. The strength and ferocity of anti-Indian sentiment expressed by the focus groups merited a closer examination of anti-Indian sentiment and accordingly served as an important catalyst for the inception of this dissertation.
In line with the objective to understand the state of non-racialism in post-apartheid South Africa, the GCRO conducted 18 focus groups nationally in South Africa during the months of July and August in 2011. The focus groups were located in different provinces in South Africa across the divides of race, class, age and gender/sex and spanning the urban-rural divide. Although the focus groups were not intended to be representational, the spread of different variables such as age, sex, employment status, geographic location such as urban, rural or suburban, ensured that a broad and inclusive sample of South Africans was reached. Focus group participants were recruited on the basis of race, an acknowledgement to the unfortunate centrality of race in the organisation of South African life.

Details of the AKF/GCRO national focus group sample are noted below in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Gender/Sex</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Northern suburbs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>46-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Northern suburbs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Southern suburbs (Afrikaans)</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Lenasia</td>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>46+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gauteng</td>
<td>Eldorado Park</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>26-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Paarl</td>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Stellenbosch</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Gugulethu</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>18-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Cape</td>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Blue-collar, all unionised</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape</td>
<td>Motherwell</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>36-45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Details of the AKF/GCRO focus group questions are enclosed below in Table 2.

**Table 2**

1. We have been a democracy in South Africa for 17 years. Some people say that many things have changed, including how we relate to each other as people; others say that not much is different, and others say things are worse. What do you think?

2. What, in your view, what holds us together as South Africans? And what tears us apart?

3. The Constitution tells us that South Africa is based on values including human dignity, equality, non-racialism and non-sexism. What does non-racialism mean to you?
4. Do you think we are succeeding, as a country, in building a non-racial society? Why do you say that?

5. Some people think that South Africans are more united now as South Africans and race doesn’t matter. Others say that race matters a lot. What do you think?

6. Do you think that some people find it easier to get on with people from different races than others? For example, do women have more in common as women than they do as whites or blacks? Do you think race matters less for the rich than for the poor? Or do the poor of all races have more in common with each other, regardless of their race?

7. How often, if ever, do you socialise with people of different races outside of work – whether at a party, or at dinner, having a braai and so on? How easy or difficult do you find it to genuinely relax with people from different races? What kinds of places bring people of different races together socially – not at work, but where else do you interact positively with people of other races or cultures?

8. Do people think of themselves as South Africans first or as other identities (such as Indian, African, Griqua, Greek, Xhosa, Jewish, etc.)? Thinking about your own friends and family, how would they describe themselves?
9. In South Africa, with such large gaps between rich and poor, do you think we can build a non-racial society? What should government do? What should we as citizens do?

10. Finally, what do you think whites/Africans/Indians/coloureds should be doing to build a non-racial society? And what should other races do to build a non-racial society?

11. End: Postcard: Please write a message to the person you think can do most to help build a non-racial South Africa – write down who it is for, and what you think the one main thing they can and should do to help us build a non-racial South Africa.

An additional data source from the AKF/GCRO non-racialism project is a set of 26 in-depth, semi-structured interviews conducted with a range of South African leaders drawn from diverse fields such as civil society, the private sector, government, media and the faith sector (Anciano-White and Selemani, 2014). As with the focus groups, the interviews with South African leaders primarily examined a range of issues related to the relevance of non-racialism in post-apartheid South Africa. They simultaneously yielded fruitful findings in terms of anti-Indian racism including the impact of socio-economic inequality on race relations, the state of black African-Indian South African relations, political alienation of minority groups through affirmative action and black economic empowerment (BEE) and the enduring effects of socialised racism on all racial groups in South Africa.
In-Depth Semi-Structured Interviews

The second data source utilised in this dissertation is that of in-depth individual semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are a useful research tool in addressing matters of sensitive research such as racism. The interviews are guided by a structured protocol prepared prior to the interview. The semi-structured format allows for the researcher to examine particular responses, issues or themes within the context of the pre-determined interview outline.

The purpose of the interviews was to ‘drill down’ into the hostility expressed against Indian South Africans in the AKF/GCRO focus groups and accordingly, critically examine the phenomenon of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. Given that the perspectives of Indian South Africans were captured in only two focus groups in poor and working class former Indian townships, the interviews looked to broaden the range of voices of Indians. By purposively seeking out professional high-income research Indian South African research participants, it was hoped to see whether adding another class dimension would uncover similar or different attitudes on the part of Indian South Africans.

Of an initial wish list of 50, a total of 32 interviews were eventually conducted. The sample size of the interviews was influenced by Creswell's recommendation of “long interviews with up to 10 people” (2007:65) for a phenomenological study. The sample was based on the researcher’s judgement and the purpose of the study. It included 30 Indian South African participants and 2 additional participants (1 Coloured and 1 Black African). Personal contacts and snowball sampling were used
to purposively locate participants from urban, suburban and rural environments. All the participants were of different sexes, and both middle and working class. They were all in approximately the same age group of 45 to 60 years. The age group was chosen in order to ensure that participants would be equipped with sufficient life experience and personal maturity to provide substantive analytical insights on the matter of anti-Indian racism.

The participants were mainly located in suburban and geographical urban contexts in the South African provinces of KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng. Only one interview was conducted in the Western Cape. The choice of locale for the research participants was intentional. Of all the provinces KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng hold the largest share of the Indian South African population. Indian South Africans are largely concentrated in KwaZulu-Natal, having first migrated to the port city of Durban or Ethekwini in 1860 and thus remained relatively settled in the province thereafter. Durban is the centre of cultural life for Indian South Africans. Many religious and cultural organisations, and different forms of Indian-based media such as newspapers and radio stations are based in Durban. Gauteng is another prime location for the concentration of Indian South Africans seeking job opportunities. It is the most urbanised province in South Africa attracting the highest share of high-skilled workers in South Africa. Hence KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng are important locations in which to seek Indian South African research participants.

Details of the participant profile for the in-depth semi-structured interviews are enclosed below in Table 3:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex and Race</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant 1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Government leadership position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Higher education management position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Higher education management position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 5</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Research professional and former government actor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 6</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male; Black African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Small business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male; Coloured</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Administrator in government organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; peri-urban former Indian township</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Administrator in government office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 11</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Administrator in government office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; peri-urban former Indian township</td>
<td>Home executive; former small business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Business owner in industrial park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Senior Academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 15</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Medical professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Researcher at executive search agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; former Indian township</td>
<td>Full-time teacher and part-time administrator for a prominent local church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Attorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Director of non-profit organisation (NPO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Head Librarian at institution of higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Small business owner in Durban Central Business District (CBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; peri-urban former Indian township</td>
<td>Principal of local primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Medical sales representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Independent film-maker and artist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; suburban</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Insurance salesperson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>Gauteng; peri-urban former Indian township</td>
<td>Teacher at a religious school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 28</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Male; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Owner of transport company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Call operator at local security company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 31</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; peri-urban former Indian township</td>
<td>Retired factory machinist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant 32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Female; Indian South African</td>
<td>KwaZulu-Natal; suburban</td>
<td>Has taken early retirement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interviews were conducted in the interpretivist paradigm of a broad phenomenological approach. This approach privileges the perspectives of marginal voices of subordinate groups hitherto neglected in the academy. The key objective of the interviews was to enable the articulation of voices and experiences of Indian South Africans and their insights into the operation of anti-Indian racism and their broad understanding of being racially minoritised. The interview question outline is enclosed below.

The question outline for the in-depth semi-structured interviews are enclosed below in Table 4:

1. The new South Africa has been in existence for two decades now. Some say racism has become more, not less, entrenched in the post-apartheid dispensation. This research is interested in exploring the extent to which racism is directed at Indian South Africans. Survey research appears to indicate high levels of anti-Indian racism amongst the general population. Political leadership and media personalities have often contributed to a
climate of racial tension toward Indian South Africans by making controversial public statements. What are your thoughts (broadly) about anti-Indian racism in South Africa?

2. There are differing interpretations of the concept of racism in the social sciences. The prevailing conception of racism (with minor modifications) in the social sciences is that of a set of beliefs or ideas which predispose individuals or groups of people toward prejudicial attitudes and implementation of such prejudicial actions against racial minorities. How would you interpret racism generally? How would you identify a particular action or attitude as racist?

3. Academic literature on racism often talks about overt and covert racism. If and when you experience what you identify to be racism, do you feel as it is overt or covert (i.e. invisible or ambiguous) or both?

4. Have you had any experience (direct or indirect) with incidences of anti-Indian racism at an individual or personal level? If so, please (briefly) describe.

5. Have you had any experience (direct or indirect) with anti-Indian racism in your particular field or industry? If so, please (briefly) describe.

6. Do you feel that your field or industry offers sufficient quantity and quality of opportunity for you, which is regardless of matters of race?

7. How is your particular identity in post-apartheid South Africa informed by your positioning as an ‘Indian’ person? Do you see yourself as an ‘Indian’ first and then a South African or is it the other way around?

8. Qualitative research has shown that certain historical events appear to hold significant emotional currency within the Indian South African community in terms of anti-Indian racism, such as the 1949 race riots between Indians and black Africans and the 1985 violence in Inanda in KwaZulu-Natal (KZN). Do
you see any relationship to past history in terms of anti-Indian racism, i.e. do you see that there are historical factors which come to bear on contemporary forms of anti-Indian racism?

9. Indian South Africans are frequently accused of practicing isolationist behaviours which exclude other races and may contribute to increased levels of anti-Indian racism and hostilities. What are your thoughts (broadly) about this popular perception of racism on the part of Indian South Africans?

10. The social category of caste and its prejudice toward darker skinned people might be believed to influence negative perceptions of Indian South Africans toward black Africans. Given the above, do you believe that the social category of caste (still) holds relevance for Indian South Africans?

11. Do you think that there are enough safe spaces for Indian South Africans to express feelings or grievances about their position in post-apartheid South Africa?

12. Would you possibly propose any ways for state policy to address the issue of racism toward minorities such as Indian South Africans?

An interview guide was prepared and shared with the interviewees before the scheduled interview. The interviews were transcribed and coded by thematic topic areas.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Ethics was an important part of the formulation of the methodological design for this study. The intention of the researcher was to proceed with the utmost regard for the sensitivities and interests of all participants in the research. Ethical considerations
guided the management of this research from preparation through to the actual execution and then the completion. As Babbie (1983:45) accurately points out, “All of us consider ourselves to be ethical; not perfect perhaps, but more ethical than most of humanity…unfortunately one of the problems with social science is that ethical considerations are subjective.”

Prior to any collection of data approval was sought from the University of the Witwatersrand (Wits) Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC-Non Medical). This was to ensure that the proposed research complied with established university guidelines on research on human participants (subjects) involving key matters such as full disclosure, non-coercion and privacy. Issues outlined in the application to seek ethics approval was the selection and identification of participants, confidentiality and storage of data upon completion of the research. Seeking of ethics approval from the Committee was a further attempt to secure and safeguard the rights and dignity of each participant. Data was not gathered until permission was granted from the Human Research Ethics Committee.

In line with the requirements of the Wits Human Research Ethics Committee, letters of consent and participant information sheets were sent to all research participants. Each participant was fully informed verbally and in writing as to the course of the research process and the rationale behind the study. Participants were afforded the opportunity to make enquiries and seek clarification on matters which were not clearly understood. They were also informed of their right not to take part in the research and to withdraw or discontinue for any reason or for none. A total of 12
participants who had verbally agreed to participate withdrew at the stage of acquiring consent. Of the 12 participants who withdrew, 7 provided no reason, 2 cited discomfort with the subject matter and 3 felt that it would be too time-consuming to do full justice to the research questions in the context of the time they personally had available. These participants were reassured that they were fully within their rights to do so and that there would be no negative repercussions associated with non-participation or withdrawal from the study.

Confidentiality was a particular consideration for this study, given the subject matter as well as the fact that the initial exploratory interviews revealed a great deal of reticence on the part of participants to engage with the subject matter of anti-Indian racism. Queries about confidentiality had been made more than once. Participants were assured that all information would be treated confidentially. They were also informed that their personal or demographic data would be detached from their interview responses and they would be referred to by means of their demographic profile only. Participants also had the option of being anonymised, i.e. choosing an alternate name to protect his or her identity. The former option was chosen. All material emerging from the research, written and recorded, is to be stored with the property of the researcher for a period of five years and then destroyed.

Permission to conduct the research was granted in May 2013.
This chapter presents a qualitative summary and analysis of the two main data sources, i.e. (a) 18 national focus groups and (b) 32 individual in-depth semi-structured interviews used herein to examine anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. The data sources were intended to ‘complement’ each other. The insights into anti-Indian racism generated from the Gauteng City-Region (GCRO)-Ahmed Kathrada Foundation (AKF) focus groups were used to inform the interview guide for a set of individual interviews intended to drill down further into the matter of anti-Indian racism from a (largely) Indian South African perspective. In line with Miles and Hubermans’ advice to isolate patterns and commonalities in qualitative research such that they can then be “taken out to the field in the next wave of data collection” (1994:9), the interview guide was designed such that it would correlate to some extent with the recurring themes and issues expressed in the focus groups. A collective themed analysis of both data sources is presented in this chapter.

According to Miles and Huberman (1994:10), qualitative data analysis consists of “three concurrent flows of activity: data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification”. As the first step in the process of data analysis, the organisation and analysis of the two data sources followed the basic methods and procedures of phenomenological reduction. Having generated a large and somewhat unwieldy amount of transcripts, notes, memos sources and personal texts, the
resulting data had to be firstly transcribed and then organised by means of a ‘mind-map’ linking different observations and parts of the various discussions. The data sources were read repeatedly in order to gain what Kruger (1998: 153) calls an “intuitive and holistic grasp of the data.” The data was also entered into an Access database according to a set of broad headings. A mail merge facility was used to compare and extract entries, which proved particularly useful in identifying relationships between different themes and factors. In a sense the aforementioned methods represented a basic process of phenomenological reduction in which a search was undertaken for key issues for the purpose of listing and subsequent transformation into a cluster of themes. With the help of a number of keywords, six key themes emerged from the data analysis process.

The data analysis presented here captures a slice of the broader attitudes of a particular sample in relation to the matter of anti-Indian racism. In line with phenomenological data collection principles, it does not claim to be representative. It is also important to note that this dissertation does not look to ‘test’ the accuracy of claims put forward by the sample of research participants. It rather seeks to portray a broad sweep of popular attitudes toward Indian South Africans anti-Indian racism and the place of Indian South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa. The distillation of six key themes from the data represents an important step in moving toward a critical understanding of anti-Indian racism and the reasons for its prevalence and persistence in post-apartheid South Africa.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS ON ANTI-INDIAN RACISM

Theme 1: The continued social reality and significance of race in the post-apartheid context

Both data sources revealed a high degree of racialisation amongst the participants. The general tone and narrative of both the focus groups and the interviews involved an automatic and even ‘natural’ recourse to race, and in the case of the focus groups, employed many offensive terms and expressions of racism. Both data sources used racial categories as natural descriptors for fellow South Africans and the conceptions of race and racial identities employed therein appear to be seen as relatively fixed and immutable. Therefore there is some irony in the fact that more than a decade after Posel (2001:15) argued that “the idea that South African society comprises four distinct races – whites, coloureds, Indians and black Africans – has become a habit of thought and experience, a facet of popular common sense still widely in evidence”, these data sources show race to still function as a fundamental organising principle of South African life as well as an explicit cognitive category in interpersonal relationships. It can well be said that the national public discourse remains obsessed with race.

It is particularly ironic that the racialised sentiments employed in the focus groups are simultaneously embedded within a general avowed commitment to a culture of non-racialism and what one focus group participant termed “a culture of pro-South

---

35 Some examples of derogatory racial names and terms include ‘Oppenheimer’ and ‘golden boy’ to refer to Jewish people, ‘coolie’ and ‘amakula’ to refer to Indian South Africans and ‘boesman’ and ‘bushy’ to refer to Coloureds.
Although focus group participants generally declared an adherence to the principles of non-racialism, they were nonetheless able to deliver robust critiques of the negative qualities of each racial group in ways which clearly showed the inability to sanitise their thinking of racial thoughts. Similarly interview participants articulated their desire to belong to the ‘rainbow nation’, whilst demonstrating a deeply racialised awareness of other South Africans. While this can be seen as a residual effect of apartheid social engineering, it can also be said to be a consequence of the post-apartheid imperative to implement redress for equity and affirmative action purposes. This could be seen, in a sense as a possible ‘re-racialising’ of South African society. Some participants attributed the continued salience of race in post-apartheid South Africa to the ongoing use of race by the state as a category of analysis, and objected to the racial categories by official state documentation. A focus group of unemployed males in Eldorado Park, Gauteng stated, “the only time you say you are South African is when you fill out a form.” An Indian South African participant from a focus group of employed women in Lenasia, Gauteng stated, “We are not classified, we classify ourselves...(but) I am saying, even if a Black comes to you he is still going to call you an Indian, although in the time of struggle he called you a black cause he needed you, but if he is black he is going to say that you are Indian, we still have that, we don’t see each other as one”.

---

36 Generally the focus groups struggled to articulate a coherent sense of non-racialism and cited a range of explanations of non-racialism ranging from legalistic conceptions of “equality” (professional males from Gauteng northern suburbs, 46-55 years), “non-sexism”, generalised ideas about ubuntu (employed Indian females from Lenasia, Gauteng, 46+ years) to “open(ing) our hearts to one another and see each other as human beings” (employed African males from Alexandra in Gauteng, 26-35 years). A “colour-blind culture of respect for all races” was raised by a Coloured respondent from the Western Cape: “You know we see colour now-but not at the hospitals, where what you see is blood. What colour blood do you see, red. Whose blood is that? Is it a Coloured or white person’s blood? It’s the same colour” (mixed blue collar group in the Western Cape suburbs). The contradiction between an avowed proclamation of adherence to non-racial values and the inability to eliminate racialised thinking, can be seen as indicative of a general need for education about matters of race and racism.
A group of mixed-race professional females in the northern suburbs of Gauteng similarly complained about being “graded” in the sense of a post-apartheid recourse to the dehumanisation and humiliation of apartheid racial classification policies. Respondents claimed that it was a degrading experience to be classified and ‘graded’ according to apartheid racial classification systems:

*During the apartheid area Indians used to feel that they were better than blacks and Coloureds used to feel that they were better than blacks…it was white and then Indian, then it was coloured and then it was black and that is how they have been treating people based on that, I am more important than you or I am less important…It was so degrading, like you were being graded.*

(Gauteng, mixed-race, females, professional, age group 26-35)

One of the respondents in this group went on to say that she still felt that sense of being ‘graded’ and classified in the post-apartheid era but now only “partly”.

Race is shown to be a key part of political life in South Africa, with different political parties and stakeholders using race to win votes and discredit opponents. The role of ANC Youth Leader Julius Malema is cited across the board in all the data sources as a source of racial division. Several of the leadership respondents in Anciano-White and Selemani’s contribution to the AKF/GCRO non-racialism project also express concern about the dangerous effects of Malema’s racist rhetoric. Mr Mondli Makhanya, chairperson of the South African National Editors Forum (SANEF), stated that the “*the youth league spews out comments that are racial, racial, racial*” and furthermore “*(the statements) are dangerous and alienating and will serve to make a
section of the population feel that they do not belong here and that they are not as South African as everyone else” (Anciano-White and Selemani, 2012: 19).

Accordingly a participant in the Lenasia focus group of employed women stated that, “Malema is what tears us (South Africans) apart” and that, “whatever Mandela went for, he is tearing it apart.” Three of the 13 Indian South African interview participants cite Malema, as Participant 4 of the individual interviews, an academic in KwaZulu-Natal notes “a troublemaker (who) keeps stirring up bad feelings against us Indians. However he seems to be getting away with it quite well.”

According to Anciano-White and Selemani (2012), leadership respondents raised the matter of affirmative action and BEE as being particularly divisive in promoting perceptions of opportunistic exploitation of the category of ‘Black’ by Indian South Africans. It was suggested that the polarisation between Indians and black Africans is exacerbated by poor political leadership as well as the advent of “an opportunistic and crass” African nationalism. For Mr Laloo Chiba, veteran ANC activist the term ‘African’ is being manipulated in many ways to refer to a particularly divisive strain of black nationalism. According to Mondli Makhanya, African nationalism is “finding a place in the ANC…and that it is trickling into different parts of our society. It’s not sophisticated at all, its chauvinism in its rawest form and it manifests itself in (Julius) Malema.” The actions of certain members of the ANC have alienated Indian South Africans is raised by the respondents, hence they have switched party allegiance.

It has become increasingly clear that the exigencies of redress and equity in post-apartheid South Africa have breathed new life into apartheid racial categories and
that race and matters of racism remain stubborn features on South Africa’s socio-political landscape.

THEME 2: THE WIDESPREAD AND MULTI-FACETED NATURE OF ANTI-INDIAN RACISM

The most important theme emerging from the data sources is that of the widespread and multi-faceted nature of anti-Indian racism. Indian South Africans emerged as a singular focus of hatred and resentment from the majority of the focus groups. Given the context of criticism of other racial groups such as whites and Coloureds, the strength of anti-Indian hostility stands out as a startling finding. The anti-Indian sentiments were widespread and expressed in variable forms along the lines of resentment, hatred and prejudice. They generally cut across different variables such as class, sex/gender, geographical location and professional status. Different reasons were cited for anti-Indian hostilities. Indian South Africans were broadly interpreted by focus group participants as being racist, resistant to integration, and not ‘real South Africans’ i.e. not belonging to South Africa. Hostility and resentment is particularly expressed toward Indian South Africans in terms of access to jobs and affirmative action. Indian South Africans are specifically raised as a factor in what “tears South Africans apart” in a focus group of unemployed women in Ulundi in KwaZulu-Natal: “Race matters a lot even at schools. Race and money matter a lot. Our children can be educated in Indian schools, white schools, but they are excluded. Indians look after their own and they don’t mix with other races”. The participant concludes, “They came here to work in the sugar (cane) fields and now they think they are above us.”
While anti-Indian sentiment was shared across different focus groups, this sentiment was predictably strongly expressed in the province of KwaZulu-Natal. This can be seen as predictable in light of the historical nature of poor relationships between Indian South Africans and black Africans. A rural-based focus group participant in KwaZulu-Natal explained:

*I can say that Indians are still racist. I get a job from one Indian lady, but she refuses for me to use her ladies room. She says I should go and ask where I can get one. Secondly, the dish she gave me to use and the teaspoon she gave me to eat with, was a plastic one. Nobody would use those. I was really surprised by this because I had got another job with a White lady and she treated me so well. She also told me to use the same utensils that she was using. We would all eat at the same time, but with this Indian lady that gave me funny dishes, I would eat much later than them, at least 2pm. I would not even know what meal it was* (KwaZulu-Natal, Ulundi, African females, unemployed, age group 36-45)

The same focus group elaborated at some length on the racist ways of Indian South Africans, explaining that “*Indians are very racist, much more so than the whites. Indian kids are taught in English and Black kids are taught in ‘fanagalo’* ” and that Indian South Africans disrespect black Africans on account of their poverty.

The participants in this focus group stated that Indian South Africans look down on Zulu traditional customs, to the extent of calling the police in objection to cultural
traditions such as animal slaughter or sacrifice. This appeared to suggest a lack of knowledge about cultural differences, especially when juxtaposed against the contention of another focus group participant that, “*Indians get days off for their Christmas and we do not*”. Some of the anti-Indian sentiment expressed by focus group participants about Indian South Africans objecting to Zulu traditional customs, giving black males “dirty looks” or being too religious suggest a history of socialised racism related to the lack of interpersonal contact and cultural communication between different racial groups. For example, a group of mixed-race professional males in suburban Gauteng commented on perceived difficulties of working with Indian South Africans:

*(in) Durban I am mixing with the Indian people, I have got to learn how to do business with them (all talking, inaudible, laughter) it took me sometime, took me about two years and now I know how to handle them, at first they were sort of a headache, when I had to go down to Durbs if it is an Indian person I would say shit*. (Gauteng, mixed-race, males, professional, age group 46-55)

Interestingly, some middle class professional focus group participants suggested that racism in post-apartheid South Africa could be perceived as more about misunderstandings about cultural differences than racism per se.

*We are in this transition of creating this new democracy and feeling our way around try to get to know each other, building, bridging those gaps on cultural differences and understanding why Themba would do something different to*
the way that I would do it, the way he would entertain differently to the way I entertain, or why we would drink our beer out of a can as opposed to a glass, those sorts of cultural differences, they are differences that have accrued over years. (Gauteng, mixed-race males, professionals, 30-45 age group)

A young employed male respondent from Alexandra in Gauteng stated unequivocally that he refused to accept Indian South Africans:

There are races that you can accept and there are those that you can’t. I won’t accept Indians because they don’t know where they stand in life. When Indians are with blacks they hate white people and when they are with whites, they hate blacks. I like Whites even though there has been apartheid, but they can work as hard as black people. They don’t just stand there and point for you to show you where to dig. Only if it comes to a push, will they do the digging too. The people who are too racist, are the Indians. (Gauteng, African males, employed, age group 26-35)

It was further stated in the same focus group, “I have seen it with Indians. There is no way they will choose a Black man over a White man. Indians complain mostly about Black people. Indians would not communicate with us Blacks. They wouldn’t come to ask for anything. They don’t want friendship in return”. Often anecdotes of racist behaviour by Indian South Africans were cited in order to support accusations of racist behaviour on the part of Indian South Africans. A focus group of unemployed Coloureds from Eldorado Park in Gauteng accused Indian South Africans of racism. One participant commented:
I had an Indian friend who owned a jive club, but believe me, he is still racist…

I worked at that nightclub, but believe me he always kept me there under. Even if we go to his friends they’ll talk about Coloured people badly in front of me. Just shows that they look down on us, they think nothing of Coloured people. They will never invite you to sit down for supper. They will never invite you for supper. Instead they will dish up for you and rather sit outside with you. We use to drink sometimes, but when we need to go buy alcohol they’ll never send their Indian friends, they’ll send me to go and buy. You will stay the ‘boy’. (Gauteng, Eldorado Park, mixed-sex, Coloured, unemployed, age group 36-45)

Another participant from the same focus group cited racism amongst Indian South Africans as “the worst” and cited an anecdote:

The boss of the garage (an Indian), he was tramping this guy’s head…. this owner of the garage is hitting another worker there, he is jumping on his head-so I asked what is happening there, and they told me the worker stole money. How can you hit your worker like that, why don’t you fire him? (Gauteng, Eldorado Park, mixed-sex, Coloured, unemployed, age group 36-45)

A focus group of unemployed black women in Motherwell in the Eastern Cape stated:
I think Indians are more racist (than coloureds) because they feel they are superior since they have money and are educated. Most of them are doctors and attorneys, they own their own businesses, their kids grow in the business environment some of them respect us because you are going to get into his shop and buy. The educated ones feel so high up they don’t see us at all. They have racism, Indians for instance, I was a waitress at a certain restaurant an Indian man came with his family he ordered something I don’t know what but something else not what he had ordered was brought to him, he started swearing and doing funny things, talking about poverty of Black people, he was escorted out of the restaurant. (Eastern Cape, Motherwell, African females, unemployed, age group 36-45)

Indian South Africans are popularly compared to whites and seen as oppressors in the same manner as whites. A focus group of black employed males in KwaZulu-Natal complained that Indian South Africans disrespect black Africans and can be compared to whites in their historical oppressive relationship to black Africans, in that Indian South Africans dominate the provincial economy along with whites and that “they (whites and Indians) can’t accept that a black person can do better with his life. Indians too are just like the whites in this”. Indians and whites were similarly compared by males located in Alexandra, Gauteng in the 26-35 age group: “a white and an Indian can drop water and then they ask you to come and wipe it.” A focus group participant from this group explicitly confirms, “When I see whites, I include Indians.” “Indians think too much of themselves just as the whites do.”
The issue of Indians “having a township” of Malabar was raised as a point of sensitivity with the focus group of unemployed black African females in Motherwell in the Eastern Cape. A participant from this group complained that they would not be able to afford a house in Malabar and this possibly seemed to indicate to the participant that this was an attempt to self-segregate on the part of Indian South Africans: “If they really want this non-racialism why should there be a solemnly Indian area known as Malabar? You can’t go and live in Malabar, you will get an R1 million worth of house there and you will not afford it.” The participant went on to say that, “They (Indians) built those houses so that they can only accommodate their own people”.

In turn Indian South African participants generally articulated a wide list of grievances against black South Africans, suggesting that they are victims of discrimination in post-apartheid South Africa. Casual usage of the racially offensive term ‘coolie’ was cited by one female focus group participant in Lenasia, Gauteng as evidence of anti-Indian racism intended to demean and humiliate Indian South Africans.

No, if a White person says, you coolies, very few people, we do take exception to it, but if any person had to say, any person say kaffir, then it is a big deal. Then you have got a lawsuit on your hands. Definitely the kaffir word is a greater deal, a greater deal than coolie. They are using this as a weapon now, because this is the only weapon they have. (Gauteng, Lenasia, female, employed, age 46-55)
The same participant defined racism as “black people against the minorities”.

Key state institutions such as clinics, hospitals and schools were cited as sites of anti-Indian racism by the focus group of employed Indian South African females in Lenasia. For example, one female Lenasia focus group participant emphasised the discrimination and alienation experienced in public hospitals:

*You as an Indian, you are walking into a Black town (Baragwanath hospital), what do you need to do, you know some of us, I promise you my father in law is paralysed and every now and again, we sit the whole day, but the thing is when you go there you are going into somebody else’s territory…. I am being honest with you, being an Indian, when you enter into Baragwanath and you see these Black nurses and as an Indian they give you these looks. They intimidate you.* (Gauteng, Lenasia, female, employed, age 46-55)

This view of anti-Indian racism in hospitals is echoed by Participant 15 of the individual interviews, an Indian South African medical doctor in KwaZulu-Natal:

*The medical field is supposed to be colour blind, hence the oath that we take. Race can’t be avoided though. When I was a medical student we were absurdly segregated, we couldn’t practice on white patients. Sometimes I ask myself have things changed so much now. I see the problems in the hospitals,*
especially the altercations between black nurses and Indian patients. We are too overworked, rushed off our feet to take the time to deal with these things, I’m being honest here. I don’t have the time to confront, especially when as a doctor I need the cooperation of the sisters. They are also doing their best in a way, I suppose, the best that they know anyway. If it’s going to endanger lives, which it often does not, I will get involved. My business is taking care of patients. (Participant 15, male, Indian South African, medical professional, age 54)

Participant 23, a medical sales representative based in KwaZulu-Natal, argued that the medical industry is inherently racist toward all “non-white” races such that a focus on the racism experienced by Indian South Africans should be seen as irrelevant:

Let me be honest, this (thing) of anti-Indian racism may be a case of barking up the wrong tree, so to speak. Racism is rife everywhere. The medical field (that I work in) is pretty bad. Everyone feels it, blacks, Coloureds, Indians, all the non-whites. It’s the same in Wentworth hospital as it is in Addington. If you are poor it’s even worse. Being black and poor is a horrific thing. (Participant 23, male Indian South African, KwaZulu-Natal, medical sales representative, aged 43)

Discrimination in the workplace was cited by many Indian South African participants. It was a continuing refrain in the focus group of mixed sex employed Indian South Africans in Phoenix, KwaZulu-Natal, expressed in a wide range of complaints from
“You can have matric, you can have a diploma, you can have whatever you want, if you start as a bank teller, you stay as a bank teller” to “I had more qualifications than this lady, she was black, and because she was black she got it”. In a similar vein Participant 14 in the individual interviews, an academic in Durban, remarked that,

The feeling of an Africanist agenda being propagated all around oneself is oppressive. Take for example the university which has undergone a fundamental change. Look at how Indians have been basically side-lined and marginalised at UKZN. It was called ‘Africanisation’ and that made it pretty much okay. Unfortunately we are expected to keep silent. How can we say anything, if we say anything we will lose our jobs. (Participant 14, male Indian South African, senior academic, age 52)

Indian South African participants largely viewed anti-Indian racism as assuming invisible and covert forms in post-apartheid South Africa which is difficult to openly challenge. All 12 Indian South African participants articulated the challenge of defining particular actions as racist, as in the assertion by Participant 10 of the individual interviews, an office administrator in KwaZulu-Natal, “I feel it but I won’t speak out against anyone. It’s like a bad feeling that you got to live with” or Participant 12 of the individual interviews, a home executive in KwaZulu-Natal “People always try to twist it around and deny. It was better in the old days when you knew what was what”.

Participant 2 of the individual interviews, a higher education professional in the Western Cape, stated:
It can sometimes be difficult to distinguish between plain bad behavior or attitudes and racism and I am cautious not to jump to conclusions in a knee jerk fashion. However, I would consider a particular action as racist if I have been prejudicially treated, in ways that, for example, restrict my access to opportunities etc. (Participant 2, female Western Cape, higher education professional, age 62)

It was further noted that there is now reliance in a post-apartheid context on feelings and perceptions, i.e. a ‘gut’ sense that their rights are being infringed. Participant 10 stated:

It’s there, I know when people are hating (on) me, it’s a feeling I know too well. I try to ignore. It’s in my gut. To be honest, I don’t know why Indian people are hated so much. You get into the lift and if it’s black people they greet everyone but you and then they will ask me why I don’t speak Zulu if I live in this country. It’s not easy, especially when people are pushing your buttons. I don’t like it when it involves a confrontation in front of my kids, sometimes in public places. I have to ignore the haters. What other choice does a person have to ignore? The best thing to do is hope one day we can all get along. After all we are all South Africans we fought together hopefully they will see we belong here too. (Participant 10, female KwaZulu-Natal, office administrator, age 51)
Participant 2 of the individual interviews, a higher education professional in the Western Cape, stated that she has had the experience of covert racism:

*I have experienced covert racism in my work. This stems from the view held by some people that there are too many Indians in powerful leadership positions in post-apartheid South Africa. Although not told to my face, my (African) colleagues informed me of a former Vice Chancellor who spoke of the ‘Al Qaeda’ in the Department of Education”. Ironically, my white colleagues did not face similar levels of hostility. I was appointed, as a Deputy Director General (DDG), by the first post-1994 Minister of Education, Prof. Bhengu, and I later worked for Kader Asmal but there was always an undertone that I was appointed by Asmal.* (Participant 2, female Western Cape, higher education professional, age 62)

The majority of the Indian South African interview participants expressed reservations about the consequences of articulating and challenging anti-Indian racism in light of possible consequences for their work and career. Participant 30 of the individual interviews, a senior librarian, revealed her experience of racial tensions and disputes at her place of work, and that the anti-Indian element tended to be hidden or obfuscated on account of avoiding further conflict.

*We have had numerous problems in the library and of course it’s racial in nature. The problem at the library is that most of the staff are black and the supervisors are Indian. We’ve also had tensions here with one of the*
Coloured supervisors too. Small issues have gotten blown out of proportion here. It’s been a bit ridiculous at times, with people threatening to use muti against the supervisors here. I think what bothers me is the assumption from the staff that the supervisors are always in the wrong and that the grievances of the staff are legitimate. The black staff seem to be feeling this constant sense of injury. We have to smooth things out and pretend it’s not what it is. It’s taboo, it’s not to be talked about. (Participant 30, Indian South African female, senior librarian, age 56)

Participant 15 of the individual interviews, a medical doctor in KwaZulu-Natal, articulated the challenge of confronting anti-Indian racism with regard to professional repercussions:

It’s difficult to know how to draw the line with racism. You can’t just call out people. As a professional I can’t just cause waves. I’ve worked hard to establish my medical practice and I can’t just compromise my reputation by crying racism when it happens and it does happen often. But Durban is a small town and word gets around. Of course it goes without saying medical professionals are obligated to stand up for what is right for our patients. (Participant 15, male, Indian South African, medical professional, age 54)

Participant 13 of the individual interviews, a local businessman in KwaZulu-Natal, declared, “In our parent’s day it was easier to call someone a racist. The racist laws were there, you couldn’t argue with them. You knew you were living in a bad
environment and you could say it. Now everyone is against racism. Indians know their place in any case. You can’t say anything.” (Participant 13, male, KwaZulu-Natal, local business-owner, age 54)

According to Participant 18, a practicing attorney based in Durban, covert racism or racism that “operates beneath the radar” is immune to the law.

When I was a young attorney starting out in my twenties, I felt hopeful that the law could protect the rights of all. After a decade or two, my faith was shaken and quite severely I would say. Racism lurks everywhere and when it operates beneath the radar, it’s even more disillusioning. Beneath the smiling faces, you know when you are being shafted. It doesn’t help to be assertive either. You just get shafted even worse. My African black colleagues have it far worse than me, let me be brutally honest. It’s tough to be black but being Indian means you’re stuck in a weird place. You don’t fit in with the white suits and as for the blacks, they (keep) look suspiciously at you until you prove yourself to them. Let’s say, I’m travelling, I’m abroad, and someone is treating me like shit, you pretty much know that person is a creep. But here, you never know. That weird ambiguity never leaves, it’s kind of always there. (Participant 18, male, KwaZulu-Natal, attorney, age 46)

THEME 3: INDIAN SOUTH AFRICANS ARE COMPLICIT IN PROPAGATING ANTI-INDIAN RACISM
The idea that Indian South Africans are also racist is borne out by perceptions that both black Africans and Indian South Africans are equally responsible for propagating anti-Indian racism. Drawing from the work of Anciano-White and Selemani (2012), many of the leadership respondents for the AKF/GCRO non-racialism project expressed concern about the relationship of black Africans with minority groups such as Indians and Coloureds with two of the leadership respondents, social justice activists Mr Trevor Ngwane and Dr Ela Gandhi, specifically raising concerns about Indian-black relationships in KwaZulu-Natal. Both respondents see racism emanating in equal parts from both Indians and blacks.

According to an interview with Gandhi conducted by Anciano-White and Selemani (2012:21) “there’s that view (among Indians), in particular in KZN that African people can’t run a country, they don’t have that ability, which I think is the height of prejudice.” According to the interview conducted with Ngwane by Anciano-White and Selemani (ibid):

Black people are still the worst suffering, but they come with their own reverse racism…in Durban amongst African people there is a strong anti-Indian ideology, and it is spoken about, the Indians are bad…I wrote against that, because fortunately I lived in Chatsworth, an Indian area and the Indians embraced me…so I got sensitive to that, working class Indians. But, at the university, my problem was that there was a lot of Indian racism against Africans and sometimes I was a victim of that. So it became quite agonising to me.
The matter of Indian racism toward black Africans as raised by Ngwane is borne out by two focus groups conducted with Indian South African participants in former Indian townships of Lenasia in Gauteng and Phoenix in KwaZulu-Natal. Both focus groups show that issues of race and colour consciousness loom large for the Indian community and in ways which may be seen to predispose them to prejudicial or racist attitudes toward darker skinned black Africans. This is strongly evidenced by the focus group of older Lenasia women discussing straight hair and light skin as important markers of acceptance and belonging in the Indian community. A participant from a focus group of older employed Indian South African females in Lenasia in Gauteng recounts the significance of light skin in her family for a sense of acceptance and belonging to the family unit:

*I am just going to give you two examples, one of my daughter anyway she is my complexion, my husband is a little lighter but his hair is curly, her father in law refuses to accept her, he calls her cocoa, he calls my daughter cocoa and she had a baby and throughout her pregnancy he said to the son, imagine that baby is going to be cocoa and God made it, when that baby was born, my granddaughter she is fair, when he looked at her he wanted (unclear), my daughter said she is now milky bar she is not cocoa.* (Gauteng, Lenasia, females, employed, age 46-55)

A participant from the same focus group explained how marriage to her husband resulted in personal and family trauma because of the curly texture of his hair.
Now my husband he has got curly, curly hair but he is Indian, I mean he is an Indian, they had a lot of problems at the time going into an Indian school, whatever, whatever, so I got married to my husband I had hell, I had hell because of the way that he looked on the outside, I come from a full gospel Christian home, very well off in Pietermaritzburg, they didn’t accept my husband, took me out of the wills whatever, so I had to stay in Johannesburg, have his children one after the other and then when they used to see, I am talking about my family looking at the children with a nose like this and hair like that, I was always left aside. So here comes my son and he is like 23 now, and anyway he is dating but his hair is now a little straighter, curly-ish whatever and if he goes out with an Indian girl, the father and mother don’t want to accept him. (Gauteng, Lenasia, females, employed, age 46-55)

The same attitudes have been transmitted inter-generationally to her similarly curly-haired son who is unable to date amongst Indian South Africans for fear of rejection due to his hair. The respondent describes herself as a “pure Indian”, suggesting that the skin colour-based discrimination of apartheid bears resemblance to the one practiced internally amongst some Indian South Africans. The issue of the social repugnance attached to curly or frizzy hair is reminiscent of the apartheid pencil test technique once used for racial classification purposes (Posel, 2001).

As pointed out by Participant 11 of the individual interviews, an office administrator in KwaZulu-Natal, black Africans are as colour conscious as Indian South Africans. Black Africans are seen as having embraced prevailing race and colour consciousness through the influence of global cultural norms and particularly cultural
industries such as Bollywood, raising Fanonian notions of ‘lactification’ and adoption of white standards of beauty. Participant 11 commented:

Indians love to be fair it’s true but look at the blacks. Sorisha Naidoo is selling her creams to the black women in government, look at Winnie Mandela who is rumoured to be a big client. She has changed her colour, she no longer looks black. All those ministers, they have changed their colour. Those creams are maybe R1000 and people are buying them, I have seen it in the beauty salons. I believe Bollywood has made it worse, far far worse because all of them have bleached themselves, do they want to be white or what, I don’t really know. Is this normal. When a child is born, they tell you to use manja powder to whiten the skin, even the ones that are born naturally fair.

(Participant 11, KwaZulu-Natal, female, administrator, age 54)

Participant 16 of the individual interviews, a researcher at a global executive search agency, has similar experiences of being exposed to colour-consciousness from an early age and attributes this to the city of Durban having a “small-town mentality”.

Colour consciousness is the way with Indians. There is no getting around it. If you grow up in Durban, you’re breathing in that colour consciousness, you’re soaking it up in your skin. You are graded on account of how light and dark you are. It’s quite crude in Durban. Durban remains a small town with that closed small-town mentality, in spite of globalisation and the whole opening up thing that happened after apartheid. If anything it made things worse. Satellite tv brought Bollywood and its whiter than white influence right into the
living room……. Indians just don’t change that easily, they’ll still keep their prejudices. Maybe it will take a good few generations before Indians stop looking at the colour of each other’s skin. Maybe I’m too negative because I know the Indian community just so well from having grown up in Durban. It would be good for the Indian community to look in the mirror when it is said Indians have problems with Africans in KwaZulu-Natal. (Participant 16, KwaZulu-Natal, female, researcher, age 47)

Participant 17, a teacher who works part-time with a local church, points out that colour consciousness is pervasive in both Indian South African and black African communities and bears a close relationship to racism. He claims a strong kinship with local communities and is attuned to attitudes and sentiments generated at grassroots level, on account of his work as a teacher and church administrator. His view of the racism to which he bears witness on a daily basis, is that it should be seen as unintentional:

*When you are talking of anti-Indian racism, you are using big words, they have power. They have so much power that you have to be careful when you just say racism. You have to be careful of big words that have power. I know the people here, they are not so bad. Blacks come to this church, Indians, Coloureds, some whites. They like to look at light and dark and for them light always means the better thing. The Blacks and Coloureds like their straight hair. I do know that what they say and do, can be seen as racism. Unfortunately they teach their kids the same bad habits, ways of speaking. They say coolie, kaffir, boesman, whatnot and it is what they have been*
taught. People use the word amakhula to say Indians, they don’t really know how offensive the word is and that there is a whole history behind the word. How would they know without a whole lot of education? So it’s not intentional, (like) to hurt. They don’t really know any better. The Good Book is the best teacher but people need a lot of education to learn that this was the old way and you have to speak and act different(ly) now. Why don’t you talk about education instead of racism? (Participant 17, Gauteng male, teacher, age 36)

Participant 27 of the individual interviews, a religious instruction teacher based in Gauteng, agreed that the colour consciousness of Indians may cause trauma to individuals, families and communities, but similarly argues (as does Participant 17) that the Indian community is unaware that they may be promoting racism toward others:

From my work in this community I can see that there is a problem with people’s awareness of colour. Let me give you examples. There is a lot of heartache and agonising when a new baby is born and the baby’s complexion is not as light as the family would like it to be. Mothers sometimes don’t want to accept new people into the family if they are too dark. It causes a lot of hurt, especially to the boyfriend or girlfriend in question. However I do know that there is no bad intention behind this. People do what know and what they’ve learned. They wouldn’t question what their parents and grandparents have taught them. They just need to be taught differently. (Participant 27, Gauteng, male, teacher, age 61)
The two focus groups with Indian South African participants in KwaZulu-Natal and Gauteng suggest that there may still be resistance to social integration with other racial groups. This is borne out by an employed, mixed-sex participant from Phoenix:

*A rainbow nation doesn’t mean you have to marry a certain person, a rainbow nation can also mean if we were in this group now and there were all races, rainbow nation means, well from my point of view, could mean that you have to get along, it doesn’t mean that I have to marry another race but we have to get along.* (KwaZulu-Natal, mixed-sex group, employed, age 26-35)

The participant later concedes in response to a question about her possible acceptance of a non-Indian daughter-in-law, that “(she) would probably disown him”. Such attitudes implying tolerance without full social integration indicate that social acceptance of other racial groups is not yet a norm.

Participant 3 of the individual interviews, a higher education professional, acknowledges that racism is rife amongst Indian South Africans and further notes that such racism is mediated by variables such as class, age and sub-ethnicity. It is noted that caste is no longer a key influence as it may have been several generations ago, and that Tamil, Hindi and Muslim Hindus may apply racism differently.

*I think reverse racism is very variable amongst Tamils, Hindis, Muslims etc.*

*For example for Muslims it would be criminal to discriminate against dark skin.*

*Belal was black and was the Prophets best friend. It is less of an issue for*
Muslims, perhaps more so for Gujeratis. Remember the same applies to black people. I heard my housekeeper say how could my daughter date a dark Indian… (Participant 3, Gauteng, female Indian South African, higher education professional)

While racist attitudes can and do apply equally to other racial groups, it can be seen as an important factor validating the notion that “Indians are racist and keep to themselves”.

THEME 4: INDIANS ARE SEEN AS EXPLOITATIVE OF BLACK SOUTH AFRICANS

One of the most prominent themes which emerged from the data sources is the perception of exploitation and opportunism on the part of Indian South Africans. This is borne out in many claims that Indian South Africans are self-serving and exploitative of black Africans in the workplace:

*We can do the same kind of work as them but they want to earn more than us. They don’t want to get the same amount of money as the Blacks. Another thing, they promote themselves only at work. When you work with them you will not be getting to a higher position, but it will be given to another Indian guy who has started working there after you even though you have a longer service record compared to them. Within a few years he will be your boss although you might have initially taught him and only Indians will be working the job. So this is why most Blacks are not employed. Indians dominate the economy of KwaZulu-Natal. Indians want to crook whites of their company,*
they want to remain bosses (KwaZulu-Natal, Ndwenwe, employed African males, Ndwenwe, age 36-45).

A focus group of Eastern Cape professional women commented,

Indians are the worst…Indians don’t know if they are blacks, they don’t know if they are coming and going. They don’t want to be black, they don’t want to be black, even if they are told that they are black, they don’t think that they are black. They don’t associate themselves with us, they think that they are more high than black, they are just using their blackness to their advantage to win tenders. (Eastern Cape, female, employed, professional, age 36-45)

In tandem with the idea that “(with) whites running the country, there is economic inequality and blacks will always be poor”, Indian South Africans are seen as having grown wealthy at the expense of black Africans and black Africans have grown increasingly impoverished as the Indian community has (visibly) increased in affluence and privilege.

The perception of Indian South Africans as undeserved beneficiaries of the resources of democracy is a key theme running through the focus groups and more particularly across the board for black African participants across class, sex, age groups and different geographical locations. For the majority of focus group participants Indian South Africans appear to be deeply implicated in matters of inequality and unfair resource-acquisition. Indian South Africans tend to be perceived as opportunistic, and “on the fence” and “just riding along, not sure of where they
stand” (mixed race group, professional females, Gauteng northern suburbs). They tend to be accused of trading on the category of ‘Black’ for business purposes whilst contributing very little to the building of South Africa’s democracy.

The question of the rightful entitlement to the spoils of South Africa’s democracy is raised for critical examination here. This is exemplified in the idea that Indian South Africans do not belong to South Africa in the same way as indigenous black Africans. Focus group participants have stated for example, “(Indians) “talk about South Africa as their country and not as people who are not here permanently” and that “(Indians) they feel they are above us, they know this is our country it has never been their country” (KwaZulu-Natal, Ndwedwe, males, employed, age 36-45).

Black Africans are seen as:

_The real people of South Africa they see themselves as South Africans though the most important thing that gives you life, is to have money. Though we are poor it makes you wonder why you should be poor in your country South Africa when other South Africans have so much money. This won’t stop us from being South African though. We will always be South Africans_ (KwaZulu-Natal, Ndwedwe, males, employed, age 36-45).

The matter of inequality is prominently configured in black African discourses of racism and can be seen as a key driver of anti-Indian racism. The relationship
between inequality and racism is evident in the debates around education, employment and general access to resources as argued by many black African focus group participants. As noted by some focus group participants, the matter of inequality is inextricably bound up with social constructions of migrant and minority communities as ‘enemies within’ by many poor black communities, as exemplified in South Africa’s increasing culture of xenophobia against blacks from the rest of the African continent (Hassim, Kupe and Worby; 2008)

Participant 3 of the individual interviews, a higher education professional in Gauteng, pointed out that stereotypical ideas about corrupt Indian shopkeeper or businessmen contribute to the perception of Indian South Africans as exploitative.

*Don’t you see that when you read about foreigners it’s often the Pakistani that’s being targeted. It’s always a Somali-Pakistan shop…Almost every bad scandal ironically seems to have had Indians aligned to it, for example the Shaiks, Guptas and Vivian Reddys of the world. There’s always sensationalism and the perception of breaking of rules and regulations. Look at the Pahads affiliation with the Guptas, the media has made it larger than it actually is. Then of course the arms deal. The perception is that Indians are generally corrupt and always on the take.* (Participant 3, Gauteng, female, higher education professional, age 45)

Participant 5 of the individual interviews, an academic researcher, concurs Indian South Africans tend to be unjustly stereotyped as corrupt. It was commented that:
Corruption tends to be pretty much associated with Indians. The Schaik brothers and the Guptas have caused a lot of problems for Indians in this way. Yet it is ironic there are many ‘tenderpreneur’ scandals with black Africans implicated in huge corruption scandals. It is now seen as an Indian ‘thing’ to be corrupt. However once you have been tarred with that brush it seems you cannot go back. Unfortunately you have to work that much harder to get rid of the stereotype and it’s pretty unfair. (Participant 5, male, Indian South African, researcher, age 54)

THEME 5: RESENTMENT AND ENVY AS KEY FACTORS IN ANTI-INDIAN RACISM

Indian South Africans are generally perceived as wealthy. A female participant from the Eastern Cape stated,

It is very hard to see a poor Indian, we don’t know where are they hiding, but it is very easy to see a poor black somebody moving up and down, I don’t know really where they are hiding (Eastern Cape, employed professional females, age 36-45).

In tandem with notions of Indian South Africans as exploitative and opportunistic, the prevailing perception is that of wealth which has been unjustly earned at the expense of black Africans and therefore earns a measure of resentment and envy. Perhaps
unsurprisingly this attitude shows itself as largely prevalent amongst the unemployed. A male participant from the Alexandra focus group states:

*I think some people realize that they are progressing and buy themselves expensive cars, as compared to their background, whereby they had nothing. We people don’t like it when one has a beautiful car and is progressing. Then we become jealous and organise people to kill him* (Gauteng, Alexandra, employed African males, age 26-35).

The notion of envy as an important driver of anti-Indian racism is acknowledged by Participant 6 of the individual interviews, a small business owner in Gauteng who is black African. Participant 6 explains that traditional black Africans are culturally inclined to value different forms of wealth such as cattle in contrast to the high premium placed on education by Indian South Africans. Hence Indian South Africans are able to advance economically ahead of black Africans, which leads to envy of Indian South Africans.

*We black people don’t have the same focus on education that the Indians do. It is a tradition in the rural areas to have a lot of kids. People generally aren’t able to take care of all the kids. Indian people don’t have kids in the way that black people do. Also in the rural areas people value herds of cattle. You are rich if you have cattle. Cattle, not education, is prized but what happens if the cattle get sick? In black families it’s enough if one family member is educated. But then there is a lot of jealousy in the family of that person and that person*
who is educated must then take care of the whole family. Educating a woman is seen as useless and for males as long as you know how to read and write, it is fine. Black people don’t have this tradition of taking care of each other the way Indians do. If one person in the family gets educated, that person is relied upon to take care of the family. That’s why black people get jealous of Indians. Now things have changed, people are encouraged to go to school.

(Participant 6, Gauteng, male, black African, small business owner, age 48)

In support of the idea of envy as a motivating factor in anti-Indian sentiment, Participant 3 of the individual interviews, an Indian South African higher education professional, stated:

*Indians are generally well educated and tend to have a business and entrepreneurial mentality. Indians have the tradition of focusing on education. Many of the schools to which we went were built and supported by Indians, then became state-aided. Our schools originated from this tradition, hence the correlation between success and education. Remember that the Indian population is small, 1 million, so very visible and there is the perception that you have done well. There’s always the assumption that you’ve been bankrolled by the state or the assumption is that you’ve been bankrolled by a parent.* (Participant 3, Gauteng, female, higher education professional, age 45)
Participant 28 of the individual interviews, the owner of a transport company based in KwaZulu-Natal, identified the matter of envy as a challenge to his business operations as well as more generally to the success of Indian South Africans as a group. It was commented:

*I have been working since I was a young boy and I built up this business myself. No handouts. I didn’t have the help of parents or family or even the state. There were no handouts in those days. You worked if you wanted to have food on the table, end of story. I employ black drivers and we have black staff here in the office. They are all okay, happy, they have steady jobs. No one has too much cause to complain around here. But I have encountered too many problems from the blacks. This small business prospered in spite of all the problems. We (Indian South Africans) supported the blacks in the bus boycotts in the eighties. Now does anyone remember that? The white man turned blacks against Indians a long time ago and that’s one thing you can’t get away from. You definitely will not get away from the fact that this is South Africa and that blacks hate the success of Indians. It will be a problem for all Indians, regardless of what you do. You get a bit successful and you (get) hated. You have to feel grateful that you get allowed this much.* (Participant 28, KwaZulu-Natal, male, company owner, age 56)

Participant 19 of the individual interviews, the director of a non-profit organisation in KwaZulu-Natal, introduced a different nuance to the issue of envy toward Indian South Africans. Participant 19 suggests that there is a strong element of victimhood
Yes Indians are envied and all of those things, but I am going to say this. Indians have a tendency to act like they are victims. Also they act like they will be victims forever in South Africa. That attitude won’t help anyone at all. I hear friends and family moaning about being denied opportunities and all of these things. After a while it starts to grate on me. Of course I do believe Indians have the right to be aggrieved. I just think they take it too far. It would help if Indians spread out and stopped concentrating amongst themselves. If apartheid put us into ghettoes, it does not mean we have to stay there.

(Participant 19, Gauteng, male, Indian South African, age 54)

A pervasive and deeply pessimistic sense of insecurity and fear about every day and future daily life in South Africa is evident in the data gathered from Indian South African respondents. There is a pervasive fear of crime being perpetrated against Indian South Africans, with two Indian South African interview participants citing incidents of crime specifically targeted against Indian South Africans. Participant 10 of the individual interviews, an office administrator in KwaZulu-Natal, stated:

*We live in fear. We read the Tabloid (community newspaper) (in which) it’s reported all the time but we also see this happening around us all the time. Our neighbour suffered a shocking experience she was approached by a*
group of women wanting to do washing, when she said no, they just attacked her. They locked her in a cupboard, what with her asthma and all. Mind you this all happened right there in the yard as she was hanging up the washing where are we expected to feel safe? Then they ransacked the house. We are living in fear I am telling you. We must just stay here and hope they don’t target us. Living here near the townships we feel fear. We got chased out of here (Phoenix) in 1985, who’s to say they won’t do it to us again? We all know 1949 it was big trauma for the old people no one really recovered from the fear. They think we must go like Idi Amin chased the Indians but where to? We can’t go back to India. This is our home. (Participant 10, KwaZulu-Natal, female, Indian South African, age 51)

Similarly Participant 13, a local businessman, cited an anecdote about an attack upon his family which was specifically targeted at Indians:

We can’t say what we think, what is happening around us. There is a lot of bad feeling going around here to do with the blacks feeling angry about Indians. When we were robbed the men asked where is the jewellery we know Indian people keep gold jewellery they pulled out the fridge even to see if we had the jewellery box there, they slapped my wife on the face. It seemed they were watching us and our movements all the time which is a terrible feeling. Being watched, who wants to live like that? It was frightening. This is our home where should we go? Troublemakers like Malema keep stirring up bad feelings against us Indians. However he seems to be getting away with it
quite well. No-one backchats him, not even Zuma. (Participant 13, KwaZulu Natal, male, business owner, Indian South African, age 54)

Participant 25 of the individual interviews, a teacher in Gauteng, also complained of a crime wave in his neighbourhood that he unequivocally attributed to black perpetrators and of “having nowhere to go”. He remained adamant that South Africa was his home and that sufficient commitment had been demonstrated by the Indian community in order to disprove prevailing negative perceptions about Indian South Africans:

The area is now rife with crime. You wake up and your garden has been raided of tools, the post-box or the birdbath carried away, the alarm system tampered with, the mags stolen off your tyres. And that’s discounting the actual break-ins. Nothing is sacred, cars, furniture, sometimes they even trash sentimental things like family photographs for no good reason. We know it is the young boys from the location. This area borders the township. Now we have a neighbourhood watch. What more can we do? I believe Indians are being watched and targeted. We are not going to leave our homes, in any case we have nowhere to go. The time is over for Indians to keep proving that they are friends with the black man. We have done enough. We also fought during the struggle. What more is needed for Indians to now prove? It is time to be accepted. That’s what Madiba wanted for everyone. (Participant 25, Gauteng, male, Indian South African, teacher, age 48)
Participant 15 of the individual interviews, a medical doctor in KwaZulu-Natal, stated that:

*I might say that the Indian community is full of historical fears. Do people let it affect them? No. You don’t stop and think about it, life goes on, that is just how it is. Life is a wheel that’s got to keep turning. The fear is there. However that fear of blacks turning on Indians is ingrained and it doesn’t help that the people in government keep silent. It’s not healthy for trauma to be suppressed. My parent’s generation stifled a lot of the trauma they experienced as a result of 1949 (race conflict in Durban). They were marked by the experience. History is printed on us.* (Participant 15, KwaZulu-Natal, male, Indian South African, medical doctor, age 54)

The practice of self-segregation amongst Indian South Africans as an adaptive response to a hostile and uncertain environment was pointed out by Participant 3 of the individual interviews, a higher education professional in Gauteng. Participant 3 sees self-segregation as a form of exclusion and cautions that this practice can lead to bigotry and ethnocentrism. It is also suggested that clustering together excessively can imply rejection of other racial groups.

*The historical memories run deep. It is still in people’s memory that all you have is the clothes on your back and your education. At any time you could be packed away like Idi Amin did with the Indians in Uganda. Indian create their own world. They know they’re not wanted or liked so they create a semblance*
of being happily engaged and rooted wherever they are. A lot of Indians live in those circles. The outside of the circle is not engaging and inside the circle is engaging and safe. It is a problem because it can be too closed. For example the emergence of religious schools have created bigotry and some Indians are unexposed, backward and stay rooted in an India that doesn’t exist. It also puts the fear of God into people... it becomes segregation of a different sort. (Participant 3, Gauteng, female, Indian South African, age 45)

In a different vein, Participant 29 of the individual interviews, a worker at a call centre based in KwaZulu-Natal, expressed support for the notion of separate neighbourhoods for Indian families and said that she personally would not wish her family to live in a mixed neighbourhood.

*People are friendly enough but they don’t say what they really feel. I wouldn’t want to live in a mixed neighbourhood where my neighbours are not Indian. How would my kids celebrate Diwali? There would be all kinds of complaining about noise and fireworks and all. Our kids are harassed enough as it is in school. But they should be able to come home to a nice area where they can play and be free without harassment. Our neighbourhood is a long way from town and it is a big commute to get to work and for kids to get to school. However I don’t want us to leave the area. I really believe we are better off with our own kind. I’m not afraid to say it.* (Participant 29, KwaZulu-Natal, female, Indian South African, call centre operator, age 45)
Notions of ethnocentrism are borne out in the mixed sex employed Indian South African focus group in Phoenix, KwaZulu-Natal through claims Indian South Africans are fundamental to South Africa’s success and that South Africa would be “another Zimbabwe” without the contribution of the Indian South Africans.

You look at every corporate company today and there is an Indian standing there. If you are taking away the Indians you are taking away South Africa itself, financially it is not going to happen and nobody is going to sit back and allow that to happen, if they wanted it to happen it would have happened years ago. Go back, but the Indians took a stand if you go back to our history and we still turned the White man down, there is a tax, we will match his tax, otherwise we would have been shipped out a long time ago. (KwaZulu-Natal, mixed-sex, employed, age group 26-35)

The sense of fear on the part of Indian South Africans is connected to perceptions of vulnerability on account of being ‘in-between’. Many Indian South African participants articulated a sense of themselves as marginalised, “caught in-between” (mixed-sex employed Indian participants in Phoenix, KwaZulu-Natal) and uncertain of their place in South Africa. In depicting the general state of ‘in-betweenness’ felt by Indian South Africans, Indian South Africans saw themselves as the “jam in the sandwich” which is “sitting between blacks and whites” (Participant 12 of the individual interviews, a female home executive based in KwaZulu-Natal) and “a group that has always been in the middle” (Participant 5 of the individual interviews, a male researcher based in Gauteng).
The sense of being “caught in-between” is seen as the result of an uncertain positioning in post-apartheid South Africa and a profound tension between an Indian South African identity as “charous” and that of a wider South African identity. The ambivalence of the position of Indian South Africans, poised between affiliation to South Africa and the country of descent, is expressed as such: “Because if the jobs are only given to the blacks, what happens to the Indians, where do we go? Where do we get employed? Shipped back to India?” (mixed-sex employed Indian respondents in Phoenix, KwaZulu-Natal). The matter of being ‘in-between’ was succinctly summarised by one female Indian South African participant in Lenasia, Gauteng, “We Indians, we don’t know where we fall. When we started up in the apartheid time we were the blacks with the blacks, now we automatically have been pushed under the whites”.

A counter-perspective to the matter of insecurity amongst Indian South Africans was advanced by Participant 21, a small business owner in KwaZulu-Natal. This participant expressed concern about an exaggerated sense of injury or “victim-mentality” which has developed amongst Indian South Africans and that this may detract from future relationships with other racial groups.

I personally have no problems with blacks or whites. My customers are black and my suppliers are white. We work together quite well. There are some hairdressing salons here that are owned by the West Africans. They are friendly enough and from what I can see, their work is good and their salons are clean. What’s to worry about? When we have load-shedding, the lady
there has no problems sharing her candles. Indians fixate on things that have happened to them and they don’t look beyond that. They see themselves as victims, being left out, being treated poorly. If you keep doing this, you might not ever get along with others, because they see that you don’t value a relationship with them. Some shop-owners here do treat their workers badly. (Participant 21, KwaZulu-Natal, female, Indian South African, small business owner, age 39)

Participant 24, an independent film-maker based in Gauteng, agreed that Indian South Africans have a tendency toward self-consciousness and hyper-sensitivity regarding the matter of race. He suggested that a reconfiguration of public space may allow all racial groups to interact more freely and that this may alleviate some of the insecurities and anxieties experienced by South Africa’s minority groups. It was said:

*Indians are incredibly self-conscious about the whole race issue but who isn’t. This is where we are right now as a society, and we have to accept it. There isn’t any shortcut to recovery after centuries of oppression. Everyone feels some self-consciousness around other race groups, and I guess if you had to probe hard enough, most people might actually prefer to hang out with their own race right now. We need more inter-racial spaces. It happened to a limited extent during the 2010 World Cup. Events like that are once-off, you don’t get a World Cup happening every day. It’s going to take a concerted*
effort to find ways to integrate people. (Participant 24, Gauteng, male, Indian South African, film-maker, age 53)

All of the participants utilised in the data sources generally demonstrated acute race-consciousness. Only two of the interview participants, Participant 31 (a retired factory worker in KwaZulu-Natal) and Participant 32 (a former administrative manager at a large insurance company in KwaZulu-Natal who has taken early retirement), articulate a sense of being generally unaffected by matters of race and racism. Both participants share the common experience of having taken retirement after many years of formal employment. For both participants the variables of sex and gender have shaped their worldviews in ways which supercede matters of race.

According to Participant 31, the sexism of the work environment diffused her awareness of matters of race:

Now that I’ve got the time to think, it has been such a hard slog for me. It was two buses in the morning and a bus and a taxi in the evening. This was my daily routine. I worked in the factory since I left school. You don’t get the time to sit down and think. My two kids are studying now, both are interested in IT as a career, and I hope they won’t be living the same life I did. Was there any race conflicts, I don’t really think so. To me, we were all in the same boat and we meaning the Indian ladies, the Coloured ladies, the black ladies. The factory environment is rough and you got used to the supervisor hanging around, being touched too and there’s nothing you can do about it. We all went through it and I never noticed that I was an Indian and the other girls
were something else. So what you are asking me, I don’t know too much.

( Participant 31, KwaZulu-Natal, female, Indian South African, former factory worker, age 62)

Participant 32 articulated a similar sense of lack of awareness of race and that the experience of being a woman was more important than that of being an Indian South African. It was stated:

I’m from a pretty conservative family and I think you can say the same thing about the culture. You learn your place as a girl then as a woman. You cook and you clean and then you go out and work and earn for the family. I didn’t know too much about racism or how Indians are treated or mistreated because I worked in a nice office. There might have been some grumbles but I never had any. To turn 50 was an interesting experience for me because I had the time and the space to reflect on things. (Participant 32, female, Indian South African, retired, age 51)

For the majority of the participants utilised in this study extreme race consciousness was evident. However it appears that there is less clarity about the extent to which old apartheid racial identities are being entrenched and specifically in ways which undermine possibilities of progress toward a truly non-racial South Africa. With all the participants in the data sources used in this dissertation, racial identities seem to hold a ‘taken for granted’ primordial validity, and there never appears to be an awareness of the historical, social and political ways in which these identities have been constructed.
Conclusion

In sum, this chapter represents a summary of 6 (six) emergent themes, on the understanding that phenomenological reduction has been maintained throughout the process of data analysis, a structure for the findings has consequently been articulated and the resulting themes can be verified through the raw data sources.

The resulting picture which has emerged from this specific process of data analysis is a complex one. It largely depicts the extreme subjectivity of perceptions of anti-Indian racism, situated against the background of a constant circulation of racist discourse against Indian South Africans in the context of a deeply divided and racialised post-apartheid society which generally reinforces and entrenches race and racism. The anti-Indian racism depicted here can be seen as a generalised list of complaints and grievances and mostly avoids structural issues of power or economics or the specific role of the state. In turn this anti-Indian racism is fed by racism internal to the Indian South African community and the adaptive responses adopted therein which encourage stereotypes of Indians as clannish and racist.

An important qualification at this point is that the conclusions of this dissertation are not dependent upon the veracity and representativeness of the data sources used in this dissertation. Sufficient evidence is provided in this dissertation by way of popular sentiment and discourse (through the media, certain political actors, attitudes and policy of the state etc.) to indicate the widely felt and long-standing presence of anti-
Indian racism in South Africa. The data sources used in the dissertation only serve to help support the ideas advanced herein.

An explanatory framework for the prevalence and persistence of anti-Indian racism will be constructed in the following chapter. This will be done by taking into account the general picture of anti-Indian racism as presented by popular sentiment and discourse in South Africa, as well as the data sources used in this dissertation.
CHAPTER SIX: TOWARD AN EXPLANATORY FRAMEWORK FOR ANTI-INDIAN RACISM IN POST-APARTHEID SOUTH AFRICA

Introduction

This chapter draws together the key ideas and arguments established throughout this dissertation about anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. It is clear that anti-Indian racism is a real and long-standing phenomenon which appears to be widely felt and deeply entrenched. The chapter concludes that a single explanatory framework for anti-Indian racism is not possible. It cannot be explained only in reference to attitudes and psychologies, economics, culture or even the political structure of society. Anti-Indian racism is the result of a multi-faceted interplay of multiple determinants whose significance varies according to context.

This chapter depicts the complexity of the matter of anti-Indian racism. It provides a critical reflection on anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa from the perspective of having reached the end of the dissertation and with the benefit of the cumulative findings of the combination of theory, analysis and some qualitative research. It illuminates some of the forms that anti-Indian racism takes (i.e. covert and overt, ‘new’ and ‘old’ forms of racism) and has taken throughout successive periods in history, as well as attempts to advance a set of explanations for the origins, dynamics and persistence of anti-Indian racism. The concluding section describes and outlines some of the key characteristics of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa.
REVISITING ‘IN-BETWEENITY’ AS A DEFINING CHARACTERISTIC OF ANTI-INDIAN RACISM

What has emerged from this study is a complex picture of the operation of anti-Indian racism in both historical and contemporary contexts. The dissertation attributes the operation of anti-Indian racism to the phenomenon of ‘in-betweenity’ and the characteristics and effects of the space of ‘in-betweenity’ in which Indian South Africans have historically been imprisoned. As shown in the theoretical chapter, ‘in-betweenity’ springs from a competing set of pressures from both the state as well as society itself. ‘In-betweenity’ can be seen as a boundary creation/maintenance strategy on the part of the state in order to forge and sustain a racialised state apparatus for the reproduction and continuance of racism which is necessary for the maintenance of power. Theories of the ‘racial state’ cited in the theoretical chapter support the view of the state as enforcing and facilitating racial divisions and fundamentally shaping the realities of life in South Africa. ‘In-betweenity’ as facilitated and implemented by the state then has the peculiar effect of forcing Indian South Africans to respond to this positioning in a number of complex ways, such as self-segregation and retreating into ‘ethnic enclaves’, which invites hostilities, prejudice and racism toward them. As shown in the theoretical chapter with reference primarily to the work of Bulhan (1980) as well as to Foucault (2003), Fanon (1967) and Biko (1970), ‘in-betweenity’ has several different effects on the process of identity-formation. In adapting to the space of ‘in-betweenity’, Indian South Africans have experienced a bifurcation of identities, vacillating back and forth throughout different historical periods and in varying intensities between attachment to South Africa, the land of settlement and India, the land of origin often seen as the ‘homeland’ (Hofmeyr and Williams, 2011; Vahed and Desai, 2010). In encouraging
the formation of a dual identity, ‘in-betweenity’ ensures that Indian South Africans are positioned in a space of uncertainty about belonging, leaving them vulnerable to the hostilities of other groups in society. It is possible therefore to see that the question of identity and belonging is a central aspect of racialised discourses and mobilisations in South Africa and remains one of the most important factors in understanding anti-Indian racism. The preoccupation with identity can be seen as one outcome of concerns as to where minorities and all groups defined as ‘others’ in post-apartheid South Africa actually belong.

‘In-betweenity’ is also seen as a specific form of asymmetrical power and resource allocation for particular groups seen as ‘in-betweener’ calculated to sow dissension. In essence, ‘in-betweenity’ is a divide-and-rule tactic. By allocating Indian South Africans in an ‘in-between’ role mediating between black Africans and whites, and disproportionately allocating resources therein, the state effectively ensured that resentment and frustration would be diverted from itself and usefully transferred to Indian South Africans. State-engineered processes of myth-making about the ‘nation’ (Andersen, 1991) play an important role in demarcating spaces of belonging for those seen to be part of the ‘nation’. Herein the ‘nation’ is conceptualised as a pure space uncontaminated by those who are deemed not to belong. Similarly, the economy is seen to be controlled by the ‘nation’ and the economy should not fall under the control of those defined as external to the ‘nation’. As ‘in-betweener’ Indian South Africans tend to be seen outside the boundaries of the ‘nation’, and this

---

37 It is possible that ideas about the purity of the South African ‘nation’ may underlie some of the prevailing anti-Gupta sentiment in South Africa and the widespread fears about the extent of their influence in South Africa’s affairs of government, business and media. As the Guptas are from India, it may well be surmised that at least some of the popular revolt against the family is partly based on the fact that they are non-indigenous and hence, deemed not to ‘belong’.
sense of ‘in-betweenity’ is particularly exaggerated and amplified in contexts of resource scarcities and distributive conflicts. ‘In-betweenity’ has thus fed into a growing and highly disturbing politics of indigeneity in South Africa in which debates about who constitutes an indigenous South Africa, feed into crude and over-simplified forms of racism. As a result, Indian South Africans are set up as targets of hatred and resentment directed at them from other groups in society. In fact some proponents of middlemen theory such as Stryker (1974) and Zenner (1991) claim that hatred toward ‘in-between’ groups develops specifically in the context of societies influenced by nationalist ideologies.

It is in this context that Indian South Africans have become largely perceived as symbols of privilege, affluence and prosperity and products of preferential treatment. An example of this view is that which is offered by Mngxitama as part of an article on anti-Indian racism: “All this talk of ‘Indian excellence and hard work’, half-truths and bad faith that serve to annoy the African more, because we know it’s not the Indian’s hard work but apartheid that apportions privileges and thus enables these achievements” (Mngxitama, 2013). Such perceptions are generally couched in sweeping terms which obscures class and other divisions and renders Indian South Africans perpetually vulnerable to pre-judgement in different contexts as part of everyday life in South Africa.

In sum, this dissertation offers the following set of observations about anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa:

1) Anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa is historically inherited.
One of the aims of this dissertation has been to illustrate the origins of anti-Indian racism in South Africa. The starting point for an understanding of the origins of anti-Indian racism is that of the role of history. As argued by Soudien (2010:9):

*History is a major influence of people’s behaviour. How people position themselves in relation to history, or rather, its dominant evocations, is what is at stake centrally. Do they see themselves as subjects of it, or are they able to imagine themselves outside of and independent of it? Are they simply actors in a pre-scripted text, or are they able to determine their own texts? More importantly, how does personal agency present itself in the presence of racial history? Does ‘race’ pre-determine our diverse repertoires-the stories we can tell, the relationships we might be able to imagine, the postures we might take in relation to good and bad, to our sense of the public and what constitutes our public responsibility?*

Many of the questions posed by Soudien are relevant to the experience of Indian South Africans and the influence of history on the trajectory of anti-Indian racism. In order to provide context for the matter of the development and continued trajectory of anti-Indian racism, Chapter Three of the dissertation has laid out a broad historical sweep of anti-Indian racism through key historical junctures and events in South Africa. The old truism that ‘history does not repeat itself but it rhymes’ is borne out in some of the repetitive patterns in the history of Indians in South Africa. Many of the historical events which define these patterns bear striking similarities to each other. These patterns have been principally shaped and defined by the broad contours of
the ‘in-between’ positioning of Indian South Africans. Such of the recurrent thematic patterns can be described as: the notion of Indian South Africans as an alien element; the perceived transience of Indian South Africans; ambiguity about a lack of belonging; tensions between Indian South Africans and black Africans and contestation over rights of Indian South Africans to resources.

A recurrent theme in the Indian South African experience is that of ‘in-betweenity’ as originally conceived by colonialism. The original conception of the place of Indians in South Africa as designed by the colonial state has retained remarkable vitality throughout various historical periods, albeit with some modification and variation. Colonialism defined the role of Indians in a set of circumscribed ways. In commenting upon the colonial experience in Africa as a whole, Naipaul (1996:93) remarked:

The assumption has always been that it is only the relationship between black and white that really matters. The African was taught-and eventually came to believe-that his destiny was inextricably linked with the destiny of the white man. Marginality was thrust upon the Asian. Both black and white could regard him as an outsider intruding their special relationship. From the earliest days the European has been, at best, indifferent to the fate of the Asian in Africa. The Asian represented dangerous competition: he too wanted a share in the spoils of Empire; he tended to have ideas above the station assigned to him and to make demands; he was seen as a possible source of contamination amongst the ‘unspoiled’ natives. The European could metamorphose, whenever it suited him, from depredator to the Platonic
guardian of native ‘interests’. He has always been quick to subscribe to the doctrine of Asian ‘exploitation’ and ‘oppression’. Indeed, he invented that doctrine.

Anti-Indian racism in South Africa has been principally framed through racial discrimination and a racist discourse about the threat presented by ‘the Asiatic menace’ as enforced by the colonial state. Indian South Africans were always viewed as an alien-and transient- element. The newly arrived Indian South Africans were primarily defined as intermediaries to be slotted into a specific ‘in-between’ position between the indigenous black majority and the ruling white minority and accorded circumscribed economic and social roles to play with the expectation that this role would be transient. This pattern has subsequently repeated itself in political positioning throughout different historical periods. It is particularly exemplified in the anti-apartheid struggle in which Indian South Africans were largely seen as marginal to broader political processes principally defined by black African political actors and this is in spite being swept under the all-inclusive rhetoric used for political mobilisation purposes such as non-racialism, Black Consciousness (UDF) and that which was deployed by the United Democratic Front (UDF).

The conception of Indian South Africans as an alien element has persisted into post-apartheid South Africa, despite official exhortations of inclusivity such as that of ‘South Africa belongs to all who live in it’. The entrenchment of this view is particularly borne out in the focus group data cited in Chapter Five which generally casts Indian South Africans as parasitical, preying upon resources which ought
rightly to belong to black Africans. The most pervasive sentiment expressed by the majority of black African focus group participants is that of Indian South Africans as unwanted outsiders who do not belong in South Africa. This sentiment is exemplified in the statement that “(Indians) “talk about South Africa as their country and not as people who are not here permanently” and that “(Indians) they feel they are above us they know this is our country it has never been their country” (employed African males, Ndewde, KwaZulu-Natal).

George Simmel’s concept of ‘the Stranger’ (Simmel, 1908) serves as a fitting descriptor of popular perceptions of Indian South Africans, particularly in terms of the early history of Indian South Africans as immigrants and state efforts to structurally locate them in an intermediary position. As part of an essay looking to understand the roots of anti-Semitism against Jewish merchants in Europe, Simmel’s work describes the stranger as “a wanderer who comes today and stays tomorrow”. The stranger is characterised by aspects of both nearness and remoteness and is simultaneously attached as well as mobile and transient. While the stranger is not an outcast, serving a particular set of economic and social purposes in society, the stranger essentially remains an outsider. In writing about the Jewish experience of anti-Semitism, Simmel conceptualised the stranger as a trader and equated ‘strangeness’ with that particular occupational space inhabited by Jews in Europe. As ‘strangers’ in South Africa, the stereotype of the exploitative Indian trader has endured, despite the occupational diversity of Indian South Africans. Moreover the concept of the Indian as ‘stranger’ was not restricted to occupation but subsumed all Indians in South Africa. State racism and discrimination, most explicitly through the institutionalised racism of apartheid, effectively ensured that qualities of the ‘stranger’
remained embedded as part of how Indian South Africans were viewed and how they in turn viewed themselves\(^{38}\).

Certain historical events have defined the stranger status of Indian South Africans more decisively than others. For example, the Gandhian period of South African history has shown to resonate deeply in contemporary perceptions of Indian South Africans. It has continued to generate critical historiographical work debating Gandhi’s political legacy, particularly in terms of racism toward black Africans. It also continues to feature in contemporary socio-political discourse, often in terms of attributing a particular form of racism to Indian South Africans with historical roots which began with Gandhi. When debates about Gandhi’s political legacy are raised in public forums such as the media, they are often posited in simplistic ways which appear to imply generalised racism by all Indians toward black Africans. As pointed out by Mngxitama (2013), “even the great Mahatma Gandhi was afflicted by similar problems (racism) to the extent of siding with the whites.” A particularly vitriolic form of anti-Gandhi rhetoric has recently been revived by the Mazibuye African Forum, a local pressure group based in KwaZulu-Natal who have become well-known for their anti-Indian rhetoric.

For Indians themselves there have been a number of defining historical events which has influenced their positioning in South Africa within the broader context of
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\(^{38}\) Many works on discrimination against new immigrants draw upon the archetype of the stranger as a form of explanation for prejudice and racism. Leading race theorist Michael Banton has pointed out in his book *White and Coloured, Behaviour of British People toward Coloured Immigrants* (1959) that the adverse reaction of British society to black and coloured immigrants is characterised by a form of avoidance of strangers, which is to be found in any society. Interestingly Banton concludes that the relationship between Britons and coloured immigrants has changed due to increased levels of social interaction in everyday life and greater inter-personal familiarity.
oppression and discrimination. As has been raised in the interviews with Indian South Africans in Chapter Five, the historical trauma of the 1949 race conflict between Indians and black Africans in KwaZulu-Natal continues to loom large in the popular consciousness of Indian South Africans as a threat of ‘what might happen again’. The resumption of violent conflict between Indians and black Africans in the Bhambayi settlement in KwaZulu-Natal in 1985 has further exacerbated vulnerabilities and the worrying notion that “It is still in people’s memory that all you have is the clothes on your back and your education. At any time you could be packed away like Idi Amin did with the Indians in Uganda” (Interview participant 3, higher education professional, Gauteng).

The sense of vulnerability experienced by Indian South Africans is captured in a statement by Hindu religious leaders to the Truth and Reconciliation hearings conducted in 1997 (Meiring, 2004):

My fear in the new South Africa is that in the past many Indians had to leave the country to gain an education of their choice…Will we have to retrace similar steps for our children in a post-apartheid South Africa? Is it that once we were not white enough, that today we may be considered to be not black enough? Will the ghost of colour consciousness never leave this country?

It is possible that the sense of vulnerability expressed by Indian South Africans may lead to a victim mentality amongst Indian South Africans. It is important to acknowledge the role of racism. Indian South Africans are not passive victims of racism, nor are those inflicting racism upon Indian South Africans full agents of
racism. Both Indian Africans and wider South African society are complicit with
systems of racism and domination and in resisting those systems.

2) Anti-Indian racism is the consequence of a racial order enforced by the state
and buttressed by dynamics in society related to identity-formation processes.

As the theoretical chapter has explained, anti-Indian racism is generated by the state
and was framed in the context of a generalised racism toward all those who were not
white. While part of a broader system of structural racism, anti-Indian racism has
been centrally situated in specific anti-Indian and racist legislation of colonial and
apartheid governments in the interests of supporting white domination of South
Africa. ‘In-betweenity’ has shaped and defined the specific forms that anti-Indian
racism has taken in South Africa. State racism toward Indian South Africans was
essentially rooted in the conception of Indians as an intermediary ‘in-between’ group
which could be manipulated to suit the different economic and political imperatives of
apartheid and colonial governments. Indians always served a set of instrumental
purposes in terms of state objectives. Colonialism viewed Indians purely as units of
labour. Colonial attitudes towards Indians changed over the course of two decades
from an appreciation of the contribution of Indians to the success of the colonial
economy to alarm about what Du Bois (2012) has called “the coolie curse”. Fears
about the Indian presence and a perceived economic and social threat to their
interests resulted in virulent anti-Indian agitation. Apartheid continued the same trend
of anti-Indian agitation until it became expedient post-1960 to utilise Indians as a
scapegoat for the ills of apartheid society and a buffer against the conflict from
oppressed black Africans. Scapegoating and divide and rule tactics served as two
insidious state strategies designed to prevent a united coalition of forces against apartheid and to divert attention from the real sources of inequality and oppression. In this way, real problems are left unresolved and often worsened. Marziani (2001:3) explains the scapegoating of minorities as “basically a process of alienation; it is the way in which a dying society disguises its septic lunacy into the sickening madness of stigmatised individuals and minorities”. The process of alienation is further summarised as “(i) an awareness of the real urgency is lost, nothing is done to solve real problems that may worsen or become unsolvable with time; (ii) the real view of the scapegoat is lost; the label enforces stereotypes and perceptions that become a self-fulfilling prophecy” (ibid).

The role of the state intersects with other dynamics related principally to identity formation amongst Indian South Africans. When forced into the role of an ‘in-between’ group, Indian South Africans have had no choice but to adapt and respond to this positioning in ways which have reinforced their standing as outsiders in South African society and as a marginal, extraneous group without any real sense of belonging. A host of negative perceptions about Indian South Africans have flourished in this context, to the extent that Indian South Africans have internalised the opinions and perceptions that society has of them and tended to behave in the way in which they are generally perceived. According to Healey and O’Brien (2015:72):

*Once a stereotype is learned, it can shape perceptions to the point that the individual only pays attention to information that confirms the stereotype.*

*Selective perception, the tendency to see only one what one expects to see,*
can reinforce and strengthen stereotypes to the point that the highly prejudiced individual simply does not accept evidence that challenges his or her views. Thus, these over-generalisations can become closed perceptual systems that screen out contrary information and absorbs only the sensory impressions that ratify the original bias.

Chapter Five of the dissertation has vividly demonstrated a small slice of general perceptions held about Indian South Africans by focus group participants juxtaposed against the fear and insecurity articulated by Indian South African interview participants. Articulated with a particular kind of fervour, it appears that the perceptions articulated by the focus group participants spring from a place of deep conviction. In turn it is possible to see the grievances articulated by Indian South Africans, possibly bordering on victimhood and martyrdom, as a response to such negative perceptions and the threatening environment in which they see themselves situated. With reference to the findings of the data sources utilised in this dissertation, it is possible to see that the multiple descriptors applied to Indian South Africans such as racist, exploitative, mercenary, corrupt and divisive etc. have reinforced and strengthened negative perceptions and tended to promote a pervasive focus on Indian South Africans as a primary source of South Africa’s problems. In the context of limited socio-cultural contact, Indian South Africans are viewed mainly in terms of a common set of stock images and in the most stereotypical of terms. Misunderstandings, mistrust and misrepresentations are reinforced and the cycle and counter-cycle of negative perceptions deepens existing divisions in society, creating the environment in which anti-Indian racism continues to fester.
Social identity theory, based to a large extent on the work of Tajfel and Turner in 1979, is useful in outlining the processes by which negative stereotyping of groups affects identity formation and influences the nature of group interactions with others. According to Tajfel and Turner, 1979 and Turner, 1982, the self-image of groups is derived from the nature of their interactions with others in an inter-group environment and as such, groups may absorb and internalise stereotypical negative traits as part of the group self-concept. The veracity and accuracy of such stereotypes is less important, as groups may suffer from “stereotype threat”, i.e. “being at risk of confirming, as a self-characteristic, a negative stereotype about one’s social group” (Steele & Aronson, 1995) and the consequent anxiety that groups may be behaving in ways which confirm existing stereotypes.

The work of C.H. Cooley (1902) can also be cited as a key point of reference in explaining how identity formation and negative stereotyping has influenced the self-image and in turn the behaviours of Indian South Africans such that anti-Indian racism is reinforced. Although Cooley’s unit of analysis is the individual and not groups, it can be seen as a useful way of depicting how the self-image of Indian South Africans has been powerfully shaped by external environmental influences. According to Cooley in his work Human Nature and the Social Order originally published in 1902, the self is developed as a result of interactions with others in society. Self-image is derived from how others perceive us and influences our behaviours accordingly. Cooley coined the term ‘looking glass self’ to describe how an individual develops his or her identity in response to how he or she understands others perceptions of him or herself. According to Cooley, “each to each a looking
glass/reflects the other that does pass” (Cooley, 1961: 824). People reflect back to
each other real or imagined images of themselves and essentially act as ‘mirrors’ for
each other. “The thing that moves us to pride or shame is not the mere mechanical
reflection of ourselves but the…imagined effect of this reflection upon another’s
mind” (Cooley, 1961:824). Cooley argued that the self is particularly sensitive to the
perceptions of others when the reactions of others are perceived as distorted or
flawed. The individual responds to the perceived reaction rather than to the actual
reaction. The power of the ‘looking glass self’ is not necessarily based on logic or
evidence but on pure perception. There is a large emotional and psychological
component to the ‘looking glass self’. This theory does not imply a passive
absorption of external perceptions. Cooley explains that people filter external
information, often to the extent of selecting and manipulating external perceptions to
create the kind of ‘looking glass’ that is complementary to the self. Cooley also
acknowledges that while of key importance, reflected perceptions of others constitute
one of several processes related to the development of the self.

If applied in a group context, Cooley’s ‘looking glass self’ theory can be seen as an
apt metaphor for how Indian South Africans have responded to the external
environment in which they have been set up as ‘in-betweeners’ by the state. It can
be explained in the following way: The self-image of Indian South Africans is shaped
by the ‘in-between’ positioning enforced by both the state and the negative
perceptions held by society. The negative perceptions ascribed to Indian South
Africans have caused their behaviour to resemble the accusations and stereotypes
propagated against them. When viewed in generally negative stereotypical terms,
Indian South Africans have had to act in ways which conform to such perceptions.
For example, when positioned as an ‘in-between’ group, Indian South Africans have taken on such roles and acted accordingly, such as by adopting ‘in-between’ occupational roles, self-segregating in ethnic enclaves and withdrawing into cultural spaces etc. This can be seen as an example of a self-fulfilling prophecy described as “a false definition of the situation evoking a new behaviour which makes the originally false conception come true” by theorist Robert Merton (1968: 477). The notion of a self-fulfilling prophecy stems from a concept developed by social scientist W.I. Thomas: “If men define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (quoted in Merton, 1948). People react to the situations they are in, but also to the way in which they perceive the situation and the meaning attached to such perceptions. Behaviour is determined in part by their perception and the meanings ascribed to the situations, rather than the situations itself. Negative perceptions set in motion behavioural patterns resulting in outcomes that ‘prove’ the initial idea true, perpetuating a continuous cycle of error. Anti-Indian racism can therefore be seen as a product of how Indian South Africans are perceived by other South Africans, how they perceive themselves and believe that they are perceived.

3) Anti-Indian racism is closely related to economic and political instability

Studies of other ‘in-between’ groups in the world such as the Chinese in Southeast Asia, Indians in east Africa, Koreans in major cities in the United States and Lebanese merchants in West Africa, have shown how racial tensions are particularly exacerbated during times of economic hardship and reinforce racism toward ‘in-
between’ groups\textsuperscript{39}. As shown in the theoretical framework of this dissertation, middlemen minority theorists have suggested that the vulnerable economic position of ‘in-between’ groups, along with their visible prosperity and outsider status, provoke hostility, resentment and scapegoating from host societies in which they are situated (Blalock, 1967). Middlemen minorities are hated by the groups between which they are positioned, i.e. dominant groups and those who are oppressed by the dominant groups in society. Therefore they serve as convenient targets for the anger and resentment of those who are oppressed by dominant groups in society. During periods of economic distress middlemen minorities are vulnerable to being blamed, rather than the direct sources of oppression. According to Sowell (2010:109):

*High prices for example may be charged by others, but it is the middlemen minorities who directly charge these prices who are likely to be blamed. The manufacturer may be raising his prices, or the government may be raising taxes, or the cost of doing business in a given neighbourhood may be higher because theft, vandalism and violence raise the cost of insurance, or for other reasons. But in any case, those who charge the customers these higher prices are more likely to be blamed than those who cause the price to be higher or other reasons. But in any case those who charge the customers these higher prices are more likely to be blamed than those who caused the prices to be higher. Where those who cause the higher prices are of the same ethnic background as the customers and the middleman is ethnically different,*

\textsuperscript{39} Studies also show that race is perceived differently during conditions of economic scarcity. Recent research by psychology researchers Amodio and Krosch (2014) at New York University (NYU) indicates that people may become subconsciously more prejudiced against those who are darker skinned in times of economic hardship. The findings may suggest that exposure to resource scarcity promotes racial discrimination.
then it is a virtual certainty that the middleman will be blamed by the customers and by their political and other leaders.

Typically middlemen minorities are subject to persecution and violent discriminatory actions such as mob violence, riots, boycotts, mass expulsion and genocide during times of economic distress (Zenner, 1991). Indian South Africans who have become associated with the middlemen niche have been particularly vulnerable to this type of persecution under conditions of economic hardship. A key example is that of the two major conflagrations between Indian South Africans and black Africans in South African history, i.e. the conflict between Indians and black Africans in 1949 and that in Bhambayi, Inanda settlement in 1985. These two defining historical events in the history of Indian South Africans in South Africa occurred in conditions that displayed some remarkable similarities. Both events took place against the background of severely depressed economic conditions and a struggle for land and residential rights, particularly between black African tenants and both Indian and black African landlords.

According to Edwards and Nuttall (1990:21) the 1949 conflict was framed by “a continuum of African-Indian tension running through the workplace, the food shortages, co-operatives and trading, public transport, and housing”. Hughes (1987) has written about economic crisis in Inanda, exacerbated by bitter conflict between landlords, tenants and the state, and punctuated by outbreaks of drought and typhoid. Both events involved speculation about the complicity of the state in stoking popular frustrations against Indian South Africans and deflecting attention away from
the role of the state. Theories of state conspiracy advanced in 1949 (Meer, 1960) are similar to those of the so-called ‘third force’ in 1985.

Both events were situated against the background of tumultuous political activity and unrest. The 1949 conflict was preceded by the implementation of apartheid by the National Party in 1948 and early attempts to create African-Indian unity against the apartheid system by the National Indian Congress (NIC) and the African National Congress. In 1985 the Bhambayi settlement in Inanda was caught up in the spiral of violence which was part of the insurrection of the 1980s and revolt in the African townships. The violence in Inanda preceded the assassination of anti-apartheid activist Victoria Mxenge in August 1985 as part of a campaign of high-profile apartheid activists. Inanda was also the site of violent battles between the Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) and the United Democratic Front (UDF).

In both cases Indian South Africans, as a vulnerable ‘in-between’ group, formed convenient targets for popular anger and frustration in particular moments of economic and political insecurity. Desai’s pertinent enquiry (2014:60) as to, “Why would an indigenous majority strike out at a disenfranchised minority rather than at a white ruling class which, after all, set the rules of the game?” is answered in terms of:

the structural location of the middleman minority, with an immediate relation to the indigenous population as buyer and seller, renter and landlord, client and professional. In the struggle for scarce resources of land and housing, jobs, and opportunities for capital accumulation, it is the middleman minority that the indigenous majority faces, the former are visible, accessible, and
vulnerable because of the immediacy of their spatial location and the lack of a security force to protect their interests.

Due to their ‘in-between’ positioning, it appears likely that Indian South Africans are unlikely to avoid friction and conflict because of their structural location as ‘in-betweeners’ in South African society. The ‘in-between’ status of Indian South Africans has set Indian South Africans up for an in-built conflictual relationship with dominant and subordinate groups in society. This may suggest a very pessimistic future for Indian South Africans and particularly so under conditions of economic and political instability. It may further suggest that Indian South Africans who are involved in commerce and business may need to stop servicing black African customers, possibly leave this particular economic niche of trader and shopkeeper and actively work to achieve reconciliation with black Africans.

It is important to note that there are some instances in which Indian and black African communities co-exist with some degree of harmony, including the developmental work done by Indian religious organisations such as the Divine Life Society as well as the Hare Krishna and Ramakrishna movements in traditional black African areas and townships. Such work needs to be capitalised upon as a counter to the prevailing tide of negative perceptions and sentiment about Indian South Africans.

4) Anti-Indian racism is difficult to pin down because it is often expressed in different ways due to the interplay of ‘old’ and ‘new’ racism
Like other forms of racism, anti-Indian racism is a challenging concept to pin down when it is officially “more indirect, more subtle, more procedural, more ostensibly non-racial” (Pettigrew, 1979:118). As Chapter one has established, new racism is conceptually distinguished from old racism. The end of apartheid in South Africa was an important turning point in the repudiation of old racism. Old racism is more direct, personalised, blatant, rooted in biological essentialist notions of race and buttressed by legislation (Romm, 2010:34). Writing with reference to racism in the United States, Bonilla-Silva (2006:184) states that ‘new’ racism “denies the salience of race, scorns those who talk of race and increasingly claims ‘we are Americans’ ”. ‘New racism’ is explained by Van Dijk (2000:34) in terms of the following:

*Especially because of their subtle and symbolic nature, many forms of the new racism are discursive...they appear mere talk, and far removed from the open violence and forceful segregation of the old racism. Yet they may be just as effective to marginalise and exclude minorities. They may hurt even more, especially when they seem to be so normal, so natural, and so commonsensical to those who engage in such discourse and interaction.*

As noted by Van Dijk (2000) above, ‘new’ racism is much more difficult to detect, identify and hence challenge than new racism. The challenges of ‘new’ racism are borne out, for example, by the inputs of all the Indian South African interview participants who agreed that they experienced covert racism. Some examples of such statements from interview participants include: “It’s there, I know when people are hating (on) me, it’s a feeling I know too well. But I also know living in the new South Africa it’s got to be something concrete before I challenge someone on it”
(Interview Participant 10); “In our parent’s day it was easier to call someone a racist. The racist laws were there, you couldn’t argue with them. You knew you were living in a bad environment and you could say it. Now everyone is against racism. Indians know their place in any case. You can’t say anything” (Participant 12) or even “(But) we are expected to keep silent and how can we say anything if we say anything we will lose our jobs. It’s a hopeless situation in many ways. I would say its covert but it’s also right out there in your face” (Interview Participant 13).

As noted by Friedman (2015) “we cannot fight racism until we agree that it exists” (Friedman, 2015). In this light, ‘new’ racism is particularly pernicious because it appears in different guises. In the context of ‘new’ racism, the mechanisms which reproduce racial inequality become more covert and racism accordingly grows more pernicious. Reference is made here to Chapter one which robustly argued that discussions of racism have largely been muted in the post-apartheid era due to the influence of a ‘colour blind’ approach to race. The official ‘non-racial’ environment represented by post-apartheid South Africa has made it possible for anti-Indian racism to masquerade as part of a discourse of equity and affirmative action. It is possible, also, for anti-Indian statements by key political actors to be presented as part of politics and thus to avoid any form of public accountability or censure. Large issues of national interest such as that of corruption or economic equity are able to be framed and packaged in ways that may confirm negative stereotypes about Indian South Africans. In this context Indian South Africans become larger than individuals and instead become representative of “them” who are “corrupt”

40 Some scholars argue that 'new' racism can be located outside the contemporary era. A key example is that of colonialism. Although colonialism did not explicitly espouse racism, it was a fundamental constitutive element of colonialism and expressed through concepts such as ‘the white man’s burden’ and the ‘civilising mission’. 
“exploitative of black Africans” or “holding back the progress of black Africans” etc. Negative racial stereotypes can be seen as the active ingredient in ‘new’ forms of racism.

Part of the complexity of the advent of ‘new’ racism is that ‘old’ forms of racism have not completely disappeared from South Africa’s socio-political landscape and co-exist with ‘new’ forms of racism. Despite the prevailing climate of ‘new’ racism, anti-Indian racism does often emerge in public and hence visible forms in the media. Flagrant forms of anti-Indian racism often appears, for example, in the media and have been promoted by high profile public role-players as well as on social media such as Facebook. Some scholars argue that ‘new’ racism is characterised by a focus on cultural racism, which uses cultural differences and arguments to exclude certain minorities. Indian South Africans are typically enmeshed in discourses of cultural racism which reify and hence naturalise them groups into distinct cultural communities presumed to be incapable of bridging racial divides. Indian South Africans tend to be depicted as ‘the other’, i.e. not “like us” and cultural traditions are seen as ‘different’, resistant to change and hence incapable of integration with the rest of society. Such notions of ‘other-ness’ provide a basis for social exclusion. This ascription of ‘otherness’ to Indian South Africans can be seen, for example, when sporadic disputes occur over different signifiers of racial and ethnic diversity, such as that of the right of school learners to wear the Hindu red string or the hijab to school. Therefore the interplay of both ‘old’ and ‘new’ forms of racism challenges easy identification and recognition of anti-Indian racism.

41 Anti-immigrant racism in Europe is a key example of cultural racism, with cultural arguments invoked to justify the denial of rights to immigrants.
Conclusion

This dissertation has established several important characteristics of anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. In summary: Anti-Indian racism is fundamentally shaped and defined by the enduring contours of ‘in-betweenity’ which Indian South Africans have historically been assigned and within which they continue to reside. Anti-Indian racism lives in the present, draws from the past, is reinforced during moments of economic and political uncertainty and manifests itself in a number of complex ways, some less blatant and overt than others. It is difficult to recognise and address anti-Indian racism decisively because it tends to be often hidden between the cracks of non-racialism and race avoidance which characterises post-apartheid South Africa.

It is also more difficult to recognise and address anti-Indian racism because Indian South Africans will not easily relinquish the Indian South African identity. The Indian South African identity is typically invoked as a defence mechanism in the context of a threatening environment, a means of safeguarding privilege or creating ethnic solidarity. Identities forged for such particular purposes will not be easily relinquished. According to Gilroy (2000:12), “when ideas of particularity are inverted in this defensive manner so that they become sources of pride rather than shame and humiliation, they become difficult to relinquish. For many racialised populations, ‘race’ and the hard-won oppositional identities it supports are not to be lightly or prematurely given up.” A rationale for relinquishing such identities must be
presented, or as Gilroy (2000:12) maintains, “precise historical reasons why these attempts are worth making.”

In this way the prognosis for Indian South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa does not appear duly promising. To be an Indian South African is to battle the forces of a negative social identity. Negative racial stereotypes have historically been ascribed to Indian South Africans. Such stereotypes have been imprinted indelibly upon the identity formation processes and general consciousness of Indian South Africans. Two key psychological theories, i.e. Cooley’s ‘looking glass self’ and social identity theory, aptly describe the process by which Indian South Africans have imbibed such negative stereotypes and allowed it to define their identity and position in South Africa.

Having reached the end of this dissertation, it may be asked if Indian South Africans may well be resigned to a perpetual status of ‘in-betweeners’. The ‘in-between’ status of Indian South Africans is a key element in the South Africa’s socio-economic make-up. Having been formatively defined as an ‘in-between’ group, breaking out of rigid historical categories bearing the weight of South Africa’s race and class dynamics presents a formidable challenge. It is particularly challenging, given that a large part of the Indian South African identity is intertwined with the notion of ‘in-betweenity’.

In challenging ‘in-betweenity’ and the historical weight of negative stereotyping, Indian South Africans must also confront their own innate race and colour consciousness. It is likely that to do so may be unsettling and uncomfortable,
particularly for those who have internalised a victim mentality toward the positioning of Indian South Africans in South Africa. For others such as former Inkatha Freedom Party (IFP) Mr Farouk Cassim who claims, “The downfall of the Indian in Africa has been his insularity” (Gevisser, 2006) it could be seen as a challenge for Indian South Africans to stake a new claim of belonging to South Africa.

The colour consciousness of Indian South Africans is often translated into racism against black Africans. Indian colour consciousness bears a complicated history, intertwined with caste beliefs and European scientific racism and coloured by the South African experience of state racism. While Indian South Africans are no more colour consciousness than other racial groups in South Africa, colour consciousness is well known as a particularly ‘Indian’ trait. For example, a black African journalist travelling in India describes the “disdain for dark skin” as follows:

*Racism is never a personal experience. Racism in India is systematic and independent of the presence of foreigners of any hue. The climate permits and promotes this lawlessness and disdain for dark skin. Most Indian pop icons have light-damn-near-white skin. Several stars even promote skin-bleaching creams that promise to improve one’s popularity and career success. Matrimonial ads boast of fair, very fair and very very fair skin alongside foreign visas and advanced university degrees. Moreover, every time I visit one of Delhi’s clubhouses, I notice I am the darkest person not wearing a work uniform. It’s unfair and ugly* (Kuku, 2013).
Anti-Indian racism should also be seen as a critical reflection of the society at large. As described by well-known Mail and Guardian journalist:

> Ultimately, Indian South Africans are like any other South Africans, and indeed human beings. Some are open-minded, some are not, some have fought against racism with all their might while some are racist themselves. There is not a particularly higher incidence of racism among the Indian community, I would imagine, even if one were to try to measure something like that (Pillay, 2013).

In dealing with anti-Indian racism, South Africa will have to confront its own pervasive racism and stereotyping processes. Accordingly South Africa will need to assess the extent of distortion and exaggeration in negative stereotypes generated about Indian South Africans and how accurately such stereotypes reflect where Indian South Africans are currently at.

In summary, it is believed that the aims of this dissertation in analysing anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa have been achieved. This has been done through a combination of relevant theory and literature with qualitative research processes. Chapter one attempted to explore concepts and definitions of racism, which helped provide an understanding of racism, thereby solidifying the aims of this research and providing a useful foundation on which to study anti-Indian racism in post-apartheid South Africa. This chapter also covered the origin and development of racism, sweeping from historical to contemporary interpretations of the concept of racism. Chapter two used theory to foreground the concept of Indian South Africans
as an ‘in-between’ group inviting racism against the group as well as propagating racism against others outside the group within the context of multiple sets of pressures configured into the space of ‘in-betweenity’. Chapter three constructed a historical framework showing the different phases of anti-Indian racism shaped by the general experience of ‘in-betweenity’. Chapters four and five grounded the multi-faceted contours of anti-Indian racism in a qualitative phenomenological research process yielding a particular set of findings about how Indian South Africans are generally viewed by other South Africans. The concluding chapter 6 has attempted to outline the key arguments made about anti-Indian racism in this dissertation.
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