

https://dspace.org/

A discourse analysis of the racial talk and identity construction of a group of working class Afrikaans-speakers

Binnell, Brynn

2016-08-05
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/20827

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

3. Rationale for the research

Existing theories of prejudice and racism appear to have had little or no effect in combating racism and prejudice in societies around the world. According to Van Dijk (1987), racist presuppositions and goals still inspire much academic work on ethnic groups and race relations, for instance, in the denial of the structural nature of racism in society. He argues that because most of the research conducted to date ignores this important level, it leads to the confirmation and reproduction of the subtle racism that permeates all social levels:

> "...from the decisions, actions, and discourses of the government or the legislative bodies, through those of the various institutions, such as education, research, the media, health, the police, the courts, and social agencies, all the way down to everyday interaction, thought and talk (Van Dijk, 1987, pp 14-15).

He points out that these areas are often regarded as being too subjective by social scientists - the very individuals who ought to be studying and criticising these phenomena (Van Dijk, 1987, pp 14-15).

There is also a gap in the existing body of research that has resulted from the dominance of the experimental tradition in the discipline of psychology. Sampson argues that the more recent paradigms (such as discourse analysis) have led to a realisation that it is necessary to search for the basic processes that lie beyond individuality and human awareness - and out of which the individual as such is constituted. One of the means by which one is able to attain this goal is to analyse language and symbolic practices (Sampson, 1989, pp 6-7). This study represents an attempt to build on studies such as those conducted in New Zealand by Wetherell & Potter (1992), the Netherlands and the United States (Van Dijk, 1987), applying these ideas to a local situation and problem in the South African context.

Finally, much of the previous work done in the area of race relations participates in emancipatory, modernist discourse. These studies usually offer to get to the roots of racism so that it can be eliminated from society to bring about greater freedom and equality. This study, on the other hand, will suggest that racism is structured into the social body in such a way that makes this impossible, given the existing configuration. It supports a variety of institutions and practices, performing certain key functions that make it not only an indispensable part of our identities, but also an indispensable part of the way that

gathered, the exact nature of the problem under investigation became clearer and it was found that a mere descriptive study would serve no real useful function. After all, the widespread employment of phenomenological research techniques during the apartheid years seldom led to any conclusions that could undermine the logic that underlay the system and practices that were dominant at that time, often merely reproducing them. It was recognised that a firm conceptual and theoretical foundation was required, but one that was itself not already implicated in the dominant discursive formations. The discourse analytic approach offered itself as a means for overcoming many of these shortcomings, as it provided a theoretical set of tools that enabled one to view the research phenomena from a perspective that is outside of their own frame of reference - yet without the illusion and pretence of scientific objectivity.

2. Aims of the study

The main purpose of the study was to examine the ways in which the participants presented themselves in relation to questions put to them about their daily lives. This was to establish the extent to which racial constructs formed part of their identity. These racial constructs would then be analysed in terms of their relation to broader cultural, ethnic and national identities. The analysis would attempt to demonstrate the manner in which these racial self-representations both depended on and supported broader social, economic and political structures.

Another strong motivation was to provide a response to some of the existing theories that account for the rise of Afrikaner nationalism and the apartheid state in terms of a class-based explanatory framework. It was felt that these explanations tended to be overly reductionist, relying on assumptions that essentialised or over-simplified complex webs of events and historical processes. For example, a grossly simplified version might be described as follows: "Whites acted in accordance with their position as members of a ruling class and developed a racial consciousness that was used to justify and legitimate the unequal allocation of resources, and to entrench their privileged position in society." This type of explanation often tends to suggest that the process was governed primarily by economic self-interest - and that, aside from that, there were no other significant factors that played a role. From this follows the notion that racism is an irrational strategy, a negative ideology that can only be properly understood in terms of the class struggle.

It was felt that these approaches overlook a number of important dimensions. This research represents an attempt to establish their nature and to deconstruct some of the ideas and concepts that are often taken for granted in research in this area. It was thought that one of the many possible strategies might be to show the existence of a logic behind the supposedly irrational racist beliefs and actions. That is, to attempt to identify factors other than class that may have played an important role in the rise of the apartheid state - and to do so in the light of the recent theoretical advances in critical theory that provide an insight into the existence and functioning of other relatively autonomous elements that were previously regarded as being mere superstructural reflections of the material base.

The research was originally intended to be phenomenologically grounded, using ethnographic research techniques. However, during the time that the data was being

Although racism and prejudice were not areas that Foucault himself focused on in his many studies, his concepts of discourse, power-knowledge-truth and the subject are important tools that can be employed in an analysis of the dynamics that underlie this transformation of the socio-political landscape. This is particularly true where his ideas are applied to questions of identity and subjectivity - and their relation to broader discursive or ideological formations. One strategy in this direction would be to establish the manner in which the present practices (such as affirmative action) produce new forms of subjectivity, and with them new relations and forms of domination, while promising to liberate and bring about a more egalitarian, equal-opportunity society.

To do full justice to this endeavour would be beyond the scope of this research project, but the basic concepts could nevertheless be productively employed in a limited area to shed some light on some of the mechanisms that are in operation at present. While Foucault usually preferred not to be prescriptive, there were nevertheless moments when he did so cautiously, such as in the following quote:

> "Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are, but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and to build up what we could be to get rid of [a] political 'double bind,' which is the simultaneous individualisation and totalization of modern power structures. The conclusion would be that the political, ethical, social, philosophical problem of our days is not to try to liberate the individual from the state, and from the state's institutions, but to liberate us both from the state and from the type of individualisation which is linked to the state. We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through refusal of this kind of individuality which has been imposed on us for several centuries" (Foucault, cited in Rabinow, 1991, 22).

This study aims at gaining a better understanding of the complex relationship between the subject positions adopted by the participants in the interview settings and broader socio-economic institutions, such as patriarchy, capitalism, racism and gender oppression. An attempt will be made to demonstrate the subtle ways in which subject positions and identities are always imbricated with forces of power and control, in that they have power effects even when they are seen as neutral or non-ideological by those who live through them. It is precisely this illusion of a neutral individual identity that disguises the fact that this type of subject is formed through (micro) relations of domination and power, such that it becomes yet another cog in a vast machine that produces and reproduces itself throughout the social body. Some of the ways in which this occurs with regard to race will be examined in this study.

very different to the old in content and function - but that that power is now exercised in a different form.

The question might be thus formulated: In what way has the shift to an ostensibly non-coercive, democratic form of government facilitated, or necessitated this extension and legitimation of racial discourse? A tentative Foucauldian response would perhaps be along the lines suggested in Discipline and Punish (Foucault, 1977) where it is shown that a shift occurred from about the middle of the 17th century, whereby social control was no longer maintained by means of brute force and physical coercion of bodies (*repressive* power), but rather by means of a complex web of self-surveillance and confession - what Foucault terms *disciplinary* power.

Similarly, one might argue, a shift has taken place in South Africa whereby the racial compartmentalisation of the population is no longer effected through a coercive state (exercising power from above), but rather through the self-surveillance and confession practised by the population in general (from below). Power no longer has a molar centre that radiates outward to encompass all, but rather is exercised at the local, capillary levels. Of course, it is important to note that Foucault's writings in this area were specific to differences in the exercise of power between the Classical and Modern *epistemés*. Thus in apartheid South Africa, as repressive as it was in many ways, one might argue that the primary exercise of power was also conducted through disciplinary technology. It is therefore recognised that the analogy is perhaps an overstatement, or even misrepresentation of Foucault's intentions. This study will examine the extent to which power operates in South African society according to the disciplinary technological apparatus outlined by Foucault as being typical of modern societies. The "new South Africa" can thus be regarded as representing a refinement of this technology, and an extension of it into areas where it was not able to penetrate previously. It is also important to note that many of the features of a repressive power apparatus were exercised concurrently with those associated with a disciplinary apparatus in South Africa. This study does not suggest that the interview data supports the view that either of the above technologies of power are dominant in the South African context, but rather that Foucault's concept of disciplinary power and its operation in modern societies can be usefully employed in analysing the functions and effects of the talk elicited in the interviews.

1. Introduction

Despite the recent abolition of apartheid and adoption of a new constitution that prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, creed, gender or sexual orientation, it is clear that generations of enforced racial segregation have left their imprint - and the deep colour-based divisions in South African society remain. The prevailing view of the situation is that South Africa is moving away from being a racist society to embrace non-racism. However, Foucault's comments on the "sexual revolution" may be productively employed here. Instead of abandoning racially defined categorisations of groups, the system of racial categorisation may be argued to have been extended. The overwhelming majority of South Africans now willingly embrace the new system of racial self-disclosure that is required to facilitate the affirmative action polices and quota systems now being implemented. One may draw the analogy further by stating that there has been an explosion of discourse about race, and racial matters - a proliferation and multiplication of discourses surrounding the topic. Like sexuality, the concept of race has been shown to have rather dubious scientific status, and does not necessarily exist as an object of nature that should be the proper focus of study.

Much previous research done in this area could be argued to have had the effect of entrenching the notion that races, cultures and nations are an important foundation to our being, are entities that have an objective existence in nature, are universally applicable, and immutable - and are therefore valid objects of study. For example, even studies conducted to refute the claim that there are significant differences between the respective racial groups, nevertheless continue to operate on the assumption that there are, in fact, separate racial groups to begin with. Such studies provide scientific justification and motivation for extending the racial gaze, and application of the racial lens into areas that were formerly not considered to be legitimate (thanks to the failed hegemony of the apartheid state) by the majority of the South African population. Formerly, the prevailing view (outside of government and right-wing circles) was that race was of no relevance to one's ability to work for organisations, hold positions of responsibility, study at institutions, conduct one's business affairs, enter into a personal relationship, and so on - and should be abandoned altogether. It could however be argued that the new social order in South Africa is not at all

List of Tables:

TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS*.....33
TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "WHAT IS AN AFRIKANER?".....48
TABLE OF GRIEVANCES, PAST INJUSTICES, THREATS TO THE VOLK.....55
CODING OF THE TRANSCRIPTS OF THE RECORDED INTERVIEWS.....105

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 7

2. AIMS OF THE STUDY 10

3. RATIONALE FOR THE RESEARCH 12

4. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL GROUNDING 14

4.1. DEFINITION OF TERMS: RACE, *RAS*, CULTURE AND NATION 14
4.2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT 17
4.3. THEORETICAL GROUNDING 22
4.3.1. Identity 22
4.3.2. Subject Positions 23
4.3.3. Discourse 24
4.4. ADORNO AND HORKHEIMER'S VIEWS ON REPRESSION AND PREJUDICE 25

5. METHODOLOGY 31

5.1. RESEARCH TECHNIQUES 31
5.1.1. Selection of Participants 31
5.1.2. Interviews and Open-Ended Questionnaires 32
5.1.3. Cassette Tapes, Transcription and Coding 36
5.2. DATA INTERPRETATION: DISCOURSE ANALYSIS 37
5.3. PROBLEMS EXPERIENCED WHILST CONDUCTING THE RESEARCH 39
5.4. ETHICAL ISSUES 42

6. RESEARCH FINDINGS 44

6.1. IDENTITY 45
6.1.1. A Positive Definition of Afrikaner Identity? 45
6.1.2. Afrikaner Identity as Constructed 50
6.1.3. Afrikaner Identity as Constructed out of Necessity 51
6.1.4. Afrikaner Identity as threatened 54
6.1.5. The Afrikaner as "persecuted" 57
6.1.6. Afrikaner Identity as "lost" 61
6.2. MODERN SOUTH AFRICA: THE NEW VS THE OLD SOUTH AFRICA 64
6.3. PERCEPTIONS OF INTER-RACIAL MARRIAGE 69
6.4. BLACK ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIOUR PRESENTED AS PROBLEMATIC 74
6.4.1. Blacks as Childlike, Irresponsible, dependant, destructive and dangerous 74
6.4.2. Black culture and history as defective, backward and stagnant 91

7. CONCLUSION 96

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY 98

9. APPENDIXES 93

9.1. APPENDIX A: OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS USED AS A GUIDE IN THE INTERVIEWS 93
9.2. APPENDIX B: VAN DIJK'S LEVELS OF DISCOURSE ORGANISATION 93
9.3. APPENDIX C: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT OF AN INTERVIEW WITH COUPLE C 95
9.4. APPENDIX D: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT OF AN INTERVIEW WITH FAMILY D 100
9.5. APPENDIX E: SAMPLE TRANSCRIPT OF AN INTERVIEW WITH MAN B 103
9.6. APPENDIX F: CODING OF THE TRANSCRIPTS OF THE RECORDED INTERVIEWS 105

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor, Estelle Zietkiewicz for the support, encouragement and advice I received while conducting this research over an extended period of time. Thanks also to Martin Terre Blanche and Dr Susan Van Zyl for going over the draft version of this research report for me. Their suggestions were invaluable. I would also like to thank Professor Reingard Nethersole for the excellent guidance and insights I received in her Adorno-Horkheimer reading group, as well as for her advice on the final draft of this report. Lastly, I would like to express my appreciation to Hannes Louw for all the time spent on this project over the past fifteen months.

Declaration

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts by coursework and research report in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before any other degree or examination in any other university.

Signature of Candidate: 

Brynn Binnell

15 th day of October, 1997.

Supervisor: 

Ms. E. A. Zietkiewicz

Abstract

This research project set out to explore the racial identities of a selected group of South African whites who were Afrikaans-speaking. Unstructured, in-depth interview techniques were employed, in which the conversations with the participants were recorded and transcribed. These transcripts were then subjected to a discourse analysis, whereby any possible effects and functions of the talk were examined. A number of theoretical approaches informed this task. These included Foucault's concept of discourse and his account of the functioning of disciplinary power in modern societies. Adorno and Horkheimer's ideas on prejudice and racism were also found to be of great relevance to this research, as well as Althusser's formulation of the concept of ideology, ideological state apparatuses, interpellation and subject positioning. The relationship between psychic and social structures was also explored in the light of Adorno and Horkheimer's formulation of prejudice as a defence mechanism. Within this broad framework, it was shown that aside from its overt content, racist talk could be described as having important ideological effects. These included normalisation, legitimation and justification of the existing unequal relations in society. The discourse analytic strategy facilitated an analysis of the conditions under which the participants were constructed as subjects, and the manner in which the terms they used (such as race, culture and nation) were imbricated with broader discursive and ideological formations. The influence of social class, gender and age variables in the interview settings were also evaluated.

A discourse analysis of the racial talk and identity construction of a group of working class Afrikaans-speakers.

by

Brynn Binnell

Student Number: 9307678j

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Arts,
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts in the Field of Psychology
by Course Work and Research Report: 1996-7

Supervisor: Ms. E. Zietkiewicz

Johannesburg, 1997

> meanings suggest a form of power which subjugates and makes subject to" (Foucault, 1986, p213).

For Foucault then, the free individual subject that is taken for granted (particularly in the West) is a recent construct, and should be seen as being imbricated with broader social structures that involve relations of domination and subjugation. Aside from the constraining or limiting effects of such a regime of power, there are also certain productive effects, such as the maintenance and reproduction of the existing social order.

4.3.3. Discourse

A precise definition of the concept of "discourse" is essential, given that this research project is grounded in a "discourse analytic" framework. Ian Parker, for example, defines discourse as "a system of statements which constructs an object" (Parker, 1992, 5). It could be argued however, that this definition does not do justice to the complex manner in which the "system of statements" is linked with other institutions and practices. It also tends to conceal the *concrete*, material nature of discourse, as shown by Foucault (1970, pp64-65). David Harvey argues that Foucault's view of the micro-politics of power relations is that there exists:

> "...an intimate relation between the systems of knowledge ('discourses') which codify techniques and practices for the exercise of social control and domination within particular localised contexts" (Harvey, cited in Hall, 1993, pp259).

Foucault himself states that:

> "The problem is at once to distinguish among events, to differentiate the networks and levels to which they belong, and to reconstitute the lines along which they are connected and engender one another. From this follows a refusal of analyses couched in terms of the symbolic field or the domain of signifying structures, and a recourse to analyses in terms of the genealogy of relations of force, strategic developments, and tactics. Here I believe one's point of reference should not be to the great model of language (*langue*) and signs, but to that of war and battle. The history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of a language: relations of power, not relations of meaning. History has no "meaning," though this is not to say that it is absurd or incoherent. On the contrary, it is intelligible and should be susceptible to analysis down to the smallest detail - but this in accordance with the intelligibility of struggles, of strategies and tactics. Neither the dialectic, as logic of contradictions, nor semiotics, as the structure of communication, can account for the intrinsic intelligibility of conflicts. 'Dialectic' is a way of evading the always open and hazardous reality of conflict by reducing it to a Hegelian skeleton, and 'semiology' is a way of avoiding its violent, bloody, and lethal character [illegible]ving it to the calm Platonic form of language and dialogue" (Foucault, 1972, cited in Rabinow, 1991, 56).

It is important to note that this notion of discourse is thus not to be confined to talk or conversation - as is frequently the case in other discourse studies. The interview data in this study are not being analysed because they are discourse - rather, they are *talk* that

4.3.2. *Subject Positions*

Another useful way of looking at (racial) identity and the manner in which it is constructed is by means of Louis Althusser's notion of interpellation. According to Althusser, "ideology interpellates individuals as subjects". In order to appreciate this, an understanding of what he means by "ideology" is essential.

Prior to Althusser's reformulation of the concept, the notion of ideology was limited as it usually referred to a systematic distortion of an objective reality out there - one that could best be understood through scientific Marxism. This distortion was thought to function in such a way as to legitimate power relationships based on class. Althusser argued in Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (1970) that ideology should not only be conceived of as a system of ideas and beliefs, but rather as an integral and indispensable part of the material structures, institutions and relations of a society. He distinguished between the "repressive state apparatuses" (military, police, penal system) and the "ideological state apparatuses" (ISA's). The ISA's consist, for example, of the religious ISA's, which perpetuate patriarchy. In line with this argument, this research will demonstrate how religion can be used to perpetuate racist ideology. Althusser also identified educational ISA's, which perpetuate stereotypical notions about race and gender, for example, as well as the family, legal, communications (radio, TV, press), cultural and trade union ISA's. These all serve to maintain existing social and class relations.

Ideology thus makes a variety of subject positions available to us. We are interpellated (hailed) and every time that we "accept the interpellated call of an ideological product" we confirm and reproduce our ideological situation. We thus know where we are supposed to fit in. Of particular relevance to this research report would be an examination of the ways in which subjects are interpellated as racial subjects. It will later be shown in the analysis section how some of the participants recognised themselves in racial, cultural and ethnic ways, and how this is implicated with broader social forces.

While Foucault clearly dissociated himself from ideological study, his concepts of discourse and disciplinary power function similarly. As Foucault describes it himself:

> "This form of power applies itself to immediate everyday life which categorises the individual, marks him by his own individuality, attaches him to his own identity, imposes a law of truth on him which he must recognise and which others have to recognise in him. It is a form of power which makes individuals subjects. There are two meanings of the word *subject*: subject to someone else by control and dependence, and tied to his own identity by a conscience or self-knowledge. Both

4.3. Theoretical Grounding

4.3.1. Identity

Johan Louw-Potgieter, following Billig's (1976) notion of identity, states the following about the concept of identity and the process of identification:

> "...identification is a social process and not an isolated, individual act taking place within the individual psyche. It is transitive, because we do not simply identify, but identify *with* something, or someone. The process of identification is a complex dialectical one because social groups, as identification agents, may actively attempt to ensure identification and in this way transform the individual. Lastly, identification can always be situated within a specific historical context (e.g. a context of social stability or social change) (Louw-Potgieter, 1992, p 319).

This definition lays emphases on both the social and transitory aspects of identity. Where common sense dictates that one's identity arises from within, needing to be discovered in order for one to attain fulfilment in life, this definition lays stress on the social context within which one finds oneself. It is seen as arising as a product of interaction with the environment and others.

Stuart Hall argues that at least three different basic conceptual formulations of identity can be identified. These are the Enlightenment subject, the sociological subject, and the post-modern subject. While the former two are similar to the traditional views held of identity, in that they posit a reasonably stable, cohesive, centred, rational subject the postmodern subject, on the other hand, is conceptualised as:

> "...having no fixed, essential or permanent identity. Identity becomes a 'moveable feast': formed and transformed continuously in relation to the ways we are represented or addressed in the cultural systems which surround us...It is historically, not biologically defined. The subject assumes different identities at different times, identities which are not unified around a coherent 'self'. Within us are contradictory identities, pulling in different directions, so that our identifications are continuously being shifted about" (Hall, 1993, 277).

These formulations of identity facilitated a greater understanding of the interview data that follows. This study sought to overcome the shortcomings of previous studies in the area by including contradictory material that was elicited from the participants when describing themselves. Where a conception of identity that required relatively stable, cohesive constructs would have required that the researcher attempt to filter out and ignore the contradictory material, this study was able to account for this material and include it in the analysis as evidence of the fragmented, contradictory, non-unitary nature of identity discussed above.

made MacCrone's work so unique was that he regarded the frontier as not merely a place or a population but rather as a socio-psychological *process* (Foster & Nel, 1992, pp 142-143).[4]

Some of the very recent work on prejudice and racism in South Africa was conducted by John Duckitt. This research was built on an extensive review of all the existing local and international work done in this area, which was integrated into a cohesive, multi-level framework and conducted using quantitative methodology (Duckitt, 1990, 1992). While Duckitt's model makes provision for the different levels of analysis that are relevant to research in this area, his own research remains based in a quantitative tradition. In his discussion for future research, he states that:

> "...a major redirection of attention and research towards alternative social processes and perspectives may be necessary. These could include the role of early learning and socialisation, perceived interests stemming from real intergroup conflict, and perceptual-attributional responses to "social realities" of intergroup differentiation (Duckitt, 1990, pp 340-341)

This is precisely what this research undertakes to examine. Foster and Nel (1992) concur with Duckitt's view, pointing out that:

> "After MacCrone, with but a few exceptions...almost no attention has been given to theoretical considerations of attitudes by South African researchers who have concentrated on descriptive studies and developing South African scales...In terms of explanatory attempts, the bulk of South African research since the 1950's has been devoted to "authoritarianism"...[and] has not really been informed by alternative theoretical views (Foster & Nel, 1992, pp 158-159).

Foster and Nel go on to identify three of the important alternative views. That is, social identity theory (SIT), discourse analysis and the social representations theory of Moscovici (Foster & Nel, 1992, pp 158-163). The following section will show that the present research forms an attempt to explore the question of racial identity by making use of the discourse analysis paradigm mentioned above.[5]

---

[4] "Lacking any social centre, alternative institutions developed, functioning chiefly to provide for cohesion and survival of the group. For example, the family, increasingly patriarchal, played a prominent part in social organisation. Social attitudes became strongly shaped in these increasingly self-contained units. Lacking the checks of the usual social institutions, authority was imposed in a narrow, hard, intolerant and often cruel manner. Particularly concerning those regarded as being of inferior status the frontier was characterised by an arbitrary imposition of the white person's will...Race attitudes increasingly became the pivotal foundations upon which the whole society rested. These attitudes to blacks were bound up, in turn with characteristics of group unity, cohesion and self-consciousness and provided the powers of persistence and resistance required to overcome the severe difficulties of frontier life" (MacCrone, 1937. Cited in Foster & Nel, 1992, pp 142-143). It can be seen that this *frontier hypothesis* describes a very similar process to that elaborated by Adorno *et al* with regard to the social factors implicated in the formation of an authoritarian personality.

[5] For a more detailed and more general analysis of the above, refer to Duckitt, J.H. *Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework.* In *American psychologist; October 1992, Vol. 47, No. 10, 1182-1193.*

elsewhere using similar techniques, such as the studies conducted in the United States, New Zealand and the Netherlands.

The early work of Theodor Adorno *et al* on prejudice and the authoritarian personality has been of great relevance to this research project. Adorno *et al* argued that prejudice was associated with basic personality traits, but that this personality type (and its associated traits) tended to emerge more noticeably in social configurations that were conducive to their formation. These traits were not only those that could be more obviously associated with prejudice towards members of other races, but included items such as: identification with authority figures; unquestioning and rigid adherence to rules and 'laws'; and rigid parenting styles. They found that ostensibly unrelated items such as these could be correlated positively with statements such as: "blacks are inferior". They thus provided an account of prejudice that focused on both the individual and social factors - rather than being rooted solely in the mental and emotional deviance of certain individuals, who were exceptional or 'abnormal' (Adorno, 1950). The theory of the authoritarian personality was criticised mainly on methodological grounds, particularly as it related to the use of the F-Scale (Duckett, 1992, pp 172-179). The later ideas of Adorno and Horkheimer were situated in a more socio-historical framework. These will be discussed in a subsequent section as they facilitated greater understanding of the socio-cultural aspects of identity and prejudice, much of which was manifested in the interviews.

While the dominant approach that emerged in the United States tended towards an excessive reliance on an individualised account of prejudice (Foster & Nel, 1992, pp 123-129), I.D. Macrone conducted a number of studies in South Africa in the 1930's and 1940's using a theoretical approach remarkably similar to modern social identity theory (SIT), as well as to that of Adorno *et al*.. He found that Afrikaans-speakers consistently held the most negative views towards blacks, Coloureds, Indians and Jews. He explained this finding partly by means of a "frontier hypothesis" (MacCrone, 1937). According to this view, life on the Eastern Cape frontier during the 17th century was characterised by physical, social and political isolation. This necessitated the development of a distinct personality type that was able to survive under these harsh conditions. However, what

Afrikaans-speakers were intermediate and blacks the highest (Du Preez, 1987: In Foster & Louw-Potgieter, 1992, pp 382-384).[2]

It was expected that if individuals from the working classes were interviewed[3], they would be less likely to be inhibited in their responses to questions about racial attitudes and beliefs.[1] This would be important in the present context in which South Africans are being bombarded with the new "politically correct, non-racial" way of thinking. For this reason, it was thought that it might also be productive to target the older generation, as they were denied the benefits of exposure to multi-racial schooling, or would at least be more likely to remember the old racist ways of thinking that supposedly characterised apartheid hegemonic discourse: it was thought that these individuals might provide insight into a kind of tacit, "salt-of-the-earth" type of folk knowledge.

The sub-group under investigation is of particular interest as, being Afrikaans-speaking, they belong to the group in South Africa that has been most often implicated in the oppression of the other ethnic groups in the country. Yet this sub-group consists of lower working-class members who would usually themselves be regarded as being victims of the socio-economic system. The manner in which class and race variables intersected or contradicted one-another proved to be of great significance, as shown in subsequent sections of this report. It cannot be stressed enough that the group was not selected because it was felt that racism is a problem that is peculiar to Afrikaans speakers. Rather, it was precisely this stereotype of "the Afrikaner" or "Boer" that this research set out to deconstruct. It is certain that research conducted along the same lines as the present study, but focusing on any of the other "ethnic groups" in South Africa would prove to be equally fruitful in eliciting racist talk. It will also be shown that the structure, function and effects of the racist talk identified in this study are also evident in non Afrikaans speaking groups in South Africa. In addition, the findings of this study are in line with those conducted

---

[2] Examples of local content in Afrikaner identity prototypes include heroes like Hitler, Verwoerd, Vorster, Thatcher and Paul Kruger. Events listed by the Afrikaans speaking respondents include Republic and Union, the arrival of Jan Van Riebeek at the Cape, Jesus' life and Blood river. These can be contrasted with the English students in the study, who listed heroes as Churchill, Jesus, Ghandi, Kennedy and Einstein. They listed important events as including the World Wars, Jesus' life, the Industrial Revolution, the Nationalists' accession to power, and the French revolution (Du Preez, 1987: In Foster & Louw-Potgieter, 1992, pp 382-384).

[3] Working class in this study refers typically to those engaged in manual labour, earning lower incomes and who have often not completed schooling.

points out that the early efforts of the *Afrikaner Broederbond* were not primarily concerned with questions of race and ethnicity. He states that:

> "Significantly, during the thirties this ideological elaboration of Christian-Nationalism did not involve detailed debate or discussion of policy on the 'native question'. White supremacy was taken for granted. The detailed development of the concept of apartheid only began in the 1940s..."(O'Meara, 1983, p 71).

Yet, in spite of this, he continues to construct an account of the rise of Afrikaner nationalism that overlooks this important detail (and racial consciousness in general). In addition, despite O'Meara's clear awareness of the importance of the influence of religion (Calvinism in particular), on the development of Afrikaner nationalism, he insists once again that only the class-based explanations have any real value (O'Meara, 1983, pp 67-77). While there can be little doubt that class has a significant influence on ones consciousness, it remains but one of many.

An attempt was thus made in this study to establish the extent to which white supremacy is taken for granted today by the participants. Even if one accepts a structurally based account of events, such as O'Meara's, it would still be of interest to establish the extent to which this manufactured identity has persisted until the present time, and the means of its transmission. Aside from class, differential responses that could be related to the participants' gender or age were also analysed in this light.

There is abundant empirical evidence that demonstrates that Afrikaans-speakers have, for example, the most negative attitudes towards the other language groups and are the most ethnocentric (Malherbe, 1938. In Mynhardt & Du Toit, 1992, p 287; Mynhardt, 1976; Niewoudt, Plug & Mynhardt, 1977; Thiele, 1988). Importantly, Du Preez found that Afrikaans-speaking students produced far fewer identity prototypes than other language groups. This led him to suggest that this is indicative of them having a far more clearly defined identity than English-speakers, with blacks somewhere in between. In addition, English-speakers showed very little local content in their identity prototypes, whereas

---

of race and colour, so that it was intolerable for any decent Christian to bow down beneath such a yoke, therefore we rather withdrew in order thus to preserve our doctrines of purity" (Cited in Paton, 1979, p 27). Lastly, I.D. MacCrone developed a "frontier hypothesis" to account for his consistent findings that Afrikaans-speakers had the most negative attitudes toward other racial groups (MacCrone, 1937). This idea is developed further in a later section of this proposal.

4.2. Literature Review and Historical Context

Dan O'Meara argues convincingly that the predominantly Afrikaans-speaking urban working class in the 1930's and '40's was manipulated by D.F. Malan's *Gesuiwerde Nationale Party* into becoming more race conscious. This was to make them set themselves apart from the increasing numbers of non-whites who were entering the labour market at the time. It was thus an attempt by an elite Afrikaner minority to fragment the working class - that is, to prevent the Afrikaans speaking poor whites from forming labour alliances with their non-white counterparts. The Malanites manufactured a new Afrikaner identity that selectively used or forgot parts of its own history, introducing notions of racial purity, religious righteousness and the memory of an heroic past (O'Meara, 1979, pp 60-83).

However, when one speaks to those directly involved in the apartheid system's implementation, economic explanations of this kind are usually the last things on their minds. The usual response to this is that their racist or religious ideology is a distortion of what is actually taking place at the material, economic level. Nevertheless, over the last few decades it has been made abundantly clear that race, ethnicity, and religion can serve as focal points for resistance in disadvantaged communities. It is equally clear that race and religion can be used to mobilise a population to further reactionary goals, as demonstrated by O'Meara (1979) in the South African context in the period between 1920 and 1960. These structural interpretations are often criticised as they provide little room for agency and resistance outside of class struggle.

More importantly, as far as O'Meara's arguments go, is the fact that historical evidence suggests that the seeds of racial segregation were to be found at the Cape from the very beginning (Elphick & Giliomee, 1979). It could be argued that O'Meara underestimates the extent to which an Afrikaner *volk* mentality and identification system was already established from the earliest times.[1] O'Meara' appears to recognise this, as he

[1] This is perhaps beyond the scope of this study, but one could nevertheless make a few brief points in defence of this proposition. One could argue, firstly, that the fact that Afrikaans was only recognised as a language in its own right in the 1920s and 1930s is immaterial. The point is that this group of people in South Africa were opposed to British rule and colonisation (hence the Great Trek), culminating with the establishment of the Boer Republics. It is significant that these republics were established with racial criteria for citizenship. In addition, one of the events that exacerbated the tensions in the Cape Colony between the British rulers and the Trekboers was the Slachtersnek rebellion - a series of events with clear racial underpinnings (Elphic & Giliomee, 1979). One might also mention the monumental efforts of the poet C.J. Langenhoven, in the earlier part of this century to have Afrikaans accepted as a language in its own right. Anna Steenkamp, niece of Piet Retief, commented as follows on the emancipation of the slaves at the Cape Colony - one of the events that precipitated the Great Trek: "And yet it is not so much their freedom which drove us to such lengths as their being placed on equal footing with Christians, contrary to the laws of God, and the natural distinction

link exists between the above and with notion that we are born into a symbolic order, in which meaning and values are always-already there, pre-existing us as individuals.

A similar situation exists when one examines the concepts of "culture" and "nation'. While many of the recent approaches have questioned the meaning of these terms, they continue to be used in ways that suggest that the existing racial divisions, and their hierarchical arrangement, are legitimate - being based on natural differences in abilities. Margaret Wetherell and Jonathan Potter, for example, point out that multiculturalism has become *the* preferred capitalist strategy for dealing with ethnic groups, as it presents the situation as being one where all groups are equally able to realise their cultural ambitions (defined as tastes and values). They argue that the "politics of the dispossessed are fobbed-off as mere 'ethnic politics'" - and are thus not questions that concern mainstream fundamental injustices. Inequality is presented as a problem of backwardness and individual identity, rather than of resources, social class and the needs of capital (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, pp137-138).

Wetherell and Potter refer to Bowers and Iwi (1991), who argue that discourse analysis should be concerned with the performative definitions of society, rather than ostensive definition work - which treats individuals' accounts or descriptions as the means of discovering or revealing the natural. For them, it should instead be concerned with the reason behind the descriptions - attempting to show the purpose or function of the utterings (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p149).

Many of the other important terms and concepts employed in this study have been subjected to critique and deconstruction from a number of quarters over the past few decades. Community and race are good examples of concepts that have been shown to be of little scientific use, as shown above. Others used in the context of this proposal include: Afrikaners, Blacks, Whites, Coloureds and Indians. While terms like these have not always been indicated by placing them in inverted commas in this proposal (for practical reasons), it should be born in mind that these are all contested and controversial terms. Derrida's strategy of placing such terms under erasure (*sous rature*), is possibly of relevance here, as one has to "employ the familiar and commonly known in order to deconstruct the familiar and commonly known" (Sampson, 1989, pp 7-8).

The relationship between language and identity will be discussed in a subsequent section, along with the manner in which ideological values, are transmitted from one generation to the next. But before this is embarked upon, it is revealing to note the differences in the meaning and usage of the word "race" in Afrikaans and English. The *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal* (HAT) (Odendal *et al*, 1985, 879) defines *ras* as:

> "1. Groep mense, diere, plante verbind deur 'n gemeenskaplike oorsprong, en gekenmerk deur min of meer vaste erflike eienskappe, deur oorerfdoms wat belange, gewoontes en uiterlik betref. *Die Germaanse, Angelsaksiese, Helleense ras. Ras, nasie en volk word tegnies wel onderskei maar in die omgangstaal dikwels gebruik om 'n afdeling van die mensdom aan te dui wat as 'n afsonderlike eenheid beskou word. Ras word meestal as 'n antropologiese en etnologiese begrip beskou. 'n Suiwer, 'n gemengde ras. 'n Ram van die edelste ras.* 2. *(sonder mv)* Karakter, karakter eienskappe, pit, oorspronklikheid: *Iemand van ras. Daar sit ras in die som.*" (Odendal *et al*, 1985, 879).

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English, on the other hand, defines race as follows:

> "1. Each of the major divisions of humankind, having distinct physical characteristics. 2. A tribe, nation, etc., regarded as of a distinct ethnic stock. 3. The fact or concept of division into races (*discrimination based on race*). 4. A genus, species, breed, or variety of animals, plants, or micro-organisms. 5. A group of persons, animals or plants connected by common descent; 6. Any great division of living creatures (*the feathered race, the four-footed race*). 7. Descent, kindred (*of noble race, a man in language, and race*). 8. A class of persons etc. with some common feature (*the race of poets*)..." (Thompson, 1995, 1128).

It could be argued that the HAT definition places far more emphasis on the socio-cultural aspects of the meaning of the term. If one compares the first definitions (1.), the English specifies that the term is used to indicate the "major divisions of humankind" that have "distinct physical characteristics". The Afrikaans, on the other hand, states that the term indicates "common origin, characterised as far as interests, habits and appearance are concerned". It is particularly striking that the second HAT definition (2.) concerns "character" and "character traits" with the example provided being: "Someone of race" and "The boy has race in him."(which, has no counterpart in the English definition of race). Lastly, while the fourth (4.) English definition includes "breed" and "variety of animals", this is not in current usage, whilst the Afrikaans does. For example: "*Wat se ras is daai hond?*" Would be translated as: "What breed is that dog?". It will be shown in the analysis section that these aspects of the meanings of the term have implications as far as the participants' attitudes to race are concerned. For now, suffice it to say that a tentative

4. Literature Review and Theoretical Grounding

A number of theoretical positions were found to be of relevance to this study. Some of Foucault's views have already been introduced above, while Louis Althusser, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's views will be discussed subsequently. This does not suggest that these divergent theorists' views can be integrated into a cohesive framework in their totality. Rather, certain features of these positions have served well to theorise and contextualise some of the material that was obtained in the interviews. While there may well be certain areas of overlap between these theorists' work that can be explored productively, as is attempted in this study, there can be no doubt that there are strong grounds for resisting the temptation to amalgamate them in any way. One might argue that the empirical work of this study represents an attempt to capture a slice of reality, and that the above three groups of theories respectively enable one to understand different aspects of the empirical data with greater clarity.

4.1. Definition of Terms: Race, *Ras*, Culture and Nation

Race is frequently taken for granted as a significant factor in common sense explanations of various social phenomena. It is held to be related to significant differences between individuals - to the extent that one could conclude that the concept of race was one that was imbued with essentialist implications.

Gould argues that:

> "...the concept of "race" originated fairly recently (around the middle of the nineteenth century) as a pseudoscientific category used to provide a biological justification for socially determined differences in the treatment of different groups" (Gould, 1981, Cited in Smith & Mackie, 1995, p 175).

Although it has been widely recognised that "race" is a socially constructed phenomenon, the debate continues unabated in some social science circles about the significance of differences between the respective race groups. With much of this material (that has attracted a lot of media attention and book sales), the conclusions reached have had the effect of entrenching ideas about "natural" racial differences. These include, for example, the notion that: "It has been proved that Blacks are genetically less intelligent than whites". It is usually overlooked (or not sufficiently understood by the general public) that, with regard to the above example, there is more variation within racial groups than between them (Morris, 1988, 316-323).

society is held together at present. Eliminating racism and prejudice, as they appear in their many guises and variations, will involve far more than a few adjustments to the existing social order. Instead, it will have to involve change at the most fundamental levels, such that life for all becomes both qualitatively and quantitatively different. At present, there are few known ways that this can be achieved. Given this, it appears that critique is all that is available at present. Perhaps, one might argue, a few furtive glimpses through the cracks in the wall may bring about greater realisation of both the undesirability of the present order, and the possibility of better alternatives.

Thus, rather than wasting time and deceiving the participants, it was recognised that discourse analysis is ideally suited to these situations. It was also felt that a climate of greater congruence would be attained by the researcher being honest and non-condescending in the interview situation. To facilitate this atmosphere of congruence, the researcher was careful to wear casual clothing and to limit the amount of notes taken while the interview was in progress. The question, as mentioned previously, is not to establish the frequencies of racist responses, for example, to prove a statistical point. It is rather to establish the *structure* of racist talk - especially in relation to broader discursive formations and the reciprocal interaction between them. This is in line with Van Dijk's point that the very purpose of discourse analysis is not to gather objective data, but to actively seek out the subjective as he argues that this will provide greater insight into the contents of, and strategies behind ordinary talk. In short, he argues that the point is that:

> "We want to know, for instance, how people tell stories or argue rather than how often they do so. This means that we systematically analyse the respective levels of (interview) talk, such as overall thematic (macro) structures, narrative or argumentative schemata, local semantic strategies, lexical style, rhetorical operations, and more specific conversational properties of talk (van Dijk, 1997, p 20).

Thus one attempts to establish what is being justified or legitimised by such talk? What is its *function*? What does it *do* for "us whites", or "us blacks" when we discuss members of other races in essentialist and stereotypical ways?

It is nevertheless highly significant that not one of the respondents wanted to portray themselves in a negative light (e.g. as a black-hater, or racist). This has been noted in much of the literature conducted using middle-class samples, but is surprising when one considers that most of these people would amongst themselves speak in extremely derogatory terms about members of other race groups. Some evidence for this could be found for example, in situations where participants who had started out talking about "*swarres*" would, later accidentally switch to "*kaffirs*" in a heated moment. Although the researcher was careful to show no reaction to this whatsoever, there would always be a moment of hesitation, or even censure from the other participants present. No doubt the presence of a tape recorder was responsible for this to a large degree, as well as the fact that the researcher was obviously English speaking and "polite". The influence of the tape recorder appears to have had a greater impact on the responses than originally anticipated, partly evidenced in the fact that the three interviews conducted without a recorder elicited

2. the same (as in point 1.) was true where the researcher would interpellate the participants as Afrikaners. While a neutral question would often elicit data that was far removed from the topic, the instant that it was formulated ideologically one would obtain a response that was of direct relevance to an analysis of racist talk and stereotypes. Once the interpellation had occurred, the responses would be such that one could be sure that this was not something that the researcher had planted in a simplistic way. That is, the responses were elaborated along the kind of lines that went far beyond the question. For example: "As an Afrikaner, how do you feel about the current situation in South Africa?" - might be greeted with a response that starts as follows: "Well, the blacks have now taken over and things have really changed for the worse for us white people...".

3. It was argued in a previous section that the majority of studies conducted in this area were limited in that they functioned according to the logic of the dominant discursive formations, particularly of racial identity, which was either not theorised at all or was theorised in an uncritical manner. The present research was able to explore precisely the contradictory nature of subject positioning in the interview context. Examples of previous research provided evidence that suggested that "Afrikaans speakers had more clearly defined identities, along with the most negative attitudes towards other ethnic groups (Malherbe, 1938. In Mynhardt & Du Toit, 1992, p 287; Mynhardt, 1976; Niewoudt, Plug & Mynhardt, 1977; Thiele, 1988; Du Preez, 1987: In Foster & Louw-Potgieter, 1992, pp 382-384). Taken in the light of the more recent theoretical advances outlined above, one is able to appreciate that, for example, the subjects of the previous studies were interpellated in a certain context that questioned them "as Afrikaners" - thus triggering off the kinds of responses that were observed in the present interviews.[7]

[7] A similar example from the United States is well known. LaPiere toured visited hotels and restaurants around the United States accompanied by a Chinese couple. Six months later, he sent questionnaires to these establishments, asking whether they would be prepared to accept Chinese guests. More than 90% of those who replied stated that they would not (LaPiere, 1934, cited in Duckett, 1992, 26). One of the conclusions drawn from this subsequently by Rose (1956) was that individuals' behaviour could be determined by the roles and situations rather than by their attitudes (Duckett, 1992, 27). Thus, in the first situation, the proprietors were faced with members of other races in a subject position "as proprietors dealing with customers", while in the questionnaire situation they responded - to questions which made race a salient issue - "as whites who didn't want trouble

consciousness (*i.e.*, do they see themselves as "White people"? Is their whiteness a salient identity construct that emerges spontaneously?). They were not to be asked anything about race directly, with the researcher leaving it to them to bring it up of their own accord. Once racial matters were brought up by the respondents, the researcher would then encourage them to continue along these lines for the purposes of the study. An important part of the pilot studies was thus to attempt to identify neutral questions that almost always give rise to a racial response in this sector of the population. For example, the respondents were asked how they felt about their future in South Africa, or whether or not they thought their parents' generation had had it any easier than what theirs does now. These kinds of questions could then be used to avoid wasting time talking about matters not directly relevant for the purposes of the study.

However, it transpired that this was in some cases impractical. On arrival on the premises, the researcher needed to set the participants at ease as soon as possible and gain their confidence. It was found that the best way to bring this about was to be completely honest and open about the purposes of the research. Delaying this resulted in the situation where the participants played somewhat of a guessing game in trying to discover what the objective of the interview is - so that they could tailor their responses accordingly. They were, for example, unable to answer the initial questions with confidence, as they couldn't understand why someone from a University would want to know about their views on life in South Africa, *etc.* While most research paradigms would perhaps have dealt with this situation by formulating a false research goal that could be used to get the participants at ease, this was found to be unnecessary within the present framework as the object of the analysis is precisely to observe phenomena such as:

1. the manner in which subjects are interpellated by ideological products. For example, one of the things that emerged was that if the researcher referred to everyone present (including himself) as whites, the participants would respond to this by speaking along the same lines - including feeling free to discuss blacks in a way that they may not have felt as free to do if they were not sure about the researchers own racial category (i.e. he might just look white). Considering that the research was specifically aimed at analysing racist talk, it didn't matter that it was deliberately triggered in some instances. This was avoided wherever possible, as it was hoped that the talk would arise naturally and spontaneously.

TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS*

Interview Code	Number of Participants	Participant Codes	Participant's Gender	Approx Age	Occupation
A	2	M:	Male	65+	Retired Actor
		F:	Female	60+	Retired Actress
B	2	F1:	Female	60+	Retired Teacher
		F2:	Female	26	Nurse
C†‡	2	M:	Male	55	Garage Mechanic
		F:	Female	53	"Housewife"
D‡	3	G:	Female	60	Pensioner
		F:	Female	23	Bank Clerk
		M:	Male	20	Unemployed
E‡	1	M:	Male	35	Security Guard
F	1	M:	Male	21	Technicon Student
G	2	M:	Male	35-40	Clerk
		F:	Female	35-40	"Housewife"
H/	3	F:	Female	40+	Supermarket Packer
		M1:	Male	26	?
		M2:	Male	17	Scholar
I/	2	M:	Male	35	Factory worker
		F:	Female	35	"Housewife"
J/	1	M:	Male	40	?

* All participants lived on the Western Rand, Gauteng. The areas they lived in were still predominantly "white" and Afrikaans-speaking, although some "coloureds" and Indians had started to move in.

† This couple lived in an area that was "being taken over by blacks", a situation they did not feel comfortable with.

/ These participants did not want to be recorded. Hand-written notes only recorded the main points raised in the interview.

‡ A sample of this transcript appears in the appendix section.

5.1.2. *Interviews and Open-Ended Questionnaires*

Initially, it was attempted to omit the fact that the research was specifically about racial identity. This was because it is one of the goals of the research to establish whether or not the respondents themselves actually have anything that might approximate a racial

5. Methodology

5.1. Research Techniques

5.1.1. Selection of Participants

Working class status suburbs in the Gauteng provincial area were identified that contained a high proportion of Afrikaans-speaking Whites. These suburbs were then visited early in the evenings during the week and on Saturday afternoons. On these visits, streets were targeted if the appearance of the houses justified classing the occupants as being working class. As the houses in the areas were very closely knit, it was usually only feasible to visit one house in the street on any given day, as it was feared that the appearance of the researcher going from house to house would result in somewhat of a spectacle. This also meant that there was less danger of the neighbours discussing the interviews amongst one-another, resulting in contamination of the data. Related to this was the possibility that participants would be unwilling to divulge details of life in the neighbourhood for fear of their neighbours being tipped-off by the researcher about things that were said about them. In addition to the working class interviews, two additional interviews were conducted with middle class participants who were referred to the researcher by friends who had Afrikaans relatives.

The researcher would typically knock on the door of the house that was targeted, or stand at the gate if the family was already outside in the garden. The purpose of the visit was stated more-or-less as follows:

> "I am a student and am doing some research on identity in your area. Would you mind if I came in and asked you a few questions?, [or] would you mind if I took up about a half an hour of your time?"

This would usually be done in Afrikaans, the participants' language being established at the outset. The researcher would present a student card as identification prior to entering the premises. The participants would then be informed of the broad purpose of the study, emphasising that the information obtained would be held in the strictest confidence. The following table lists the participants in the study and provides an idea of their demographic profile.

arguably preconditions for the functioning of modern technological societies. The analysis that follows will therefore not be restricted to the symbolic field, language, and the internal relations that govern the interview transcripts (which are revealing in themselves), but will attempt to examine the talk in relation to the entire discursive domain.

> "Europe has two histories: a well-known, written history and an underground history. The latter consists in the dare of the human instincts and passions which are displaced and distorted by civilisation. The Fascist present in which the hidden side of things comes to light also shows the relationship between written history and the dark side, which is overlooked in the official legend of the nationalist states, as well as in the critique of the latter" (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p231).

The above links-in well with Foucault's work, most notably in the case of his history of Madness and Civilisation (Foucault, 1977), which offers itself as an amplification and exegesis of the last quote in particular.

The image presented by Adorno and Horkheimer is therefore of humanity alienated from nature and subject to his own domination. They argue that racism is a product of the hatred felt by those who have repressed their animal instincts to fit-in with the rest of society. They project a fantasy onto a group who have come to be defined as Other. This Other represents, through the mechanism of projection, all the repressed qualities that are denied the subject in bondage. This evokes intense destructive lust, anger and hate (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, pp171-172). They also refer to the subjugated body (under the control of the ever-vigilant rational ego) as being a "dead" body, and this results in the need to take revenge - and to destroy any signs of a living, noble and vital body (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p234).

The relevance of the above to this study was the emphasis on the relation between a particularly kind of subjectivity - most notably the modern bourgeois individual - and the subjection of both self and others through discourse. This subjection involves primarily a will to knowledge, particularly about the self, which is implicated in the domination and mastery over self and nature. It is important to note that this self-knowledge does not originate from within a rational, knowing subject, but is a culturally and historically mediated product - a reified commodity, to use Adorno and Horkheimer's terminology. In Foucauldian terms, the subject is formed through discourse. Where Foucault examined the relation between knowledge about sexuality and the production of a knowing modern subject (especially in relation to the recent development of the human sciences), this study will attempt to show that the production of racial subjects and knowledge about race can also be seen as being implicated with the kind of modern subject described by Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer. As shown by these theorists, modern society requires the emergence of these sexualities, races and other subjectivity's to function productively. Or, more accurately, these sexual and racial subjectivity's are productive in ways that are

some of the participants, and these will be linked with broader ideological formations. For Adorno and Horkheimer, this instrumentalism undermines the utopian goals of the Enlightenment and the project of Modernity, as it results in the situation where means are pursued without proper reflection on the desired ends (Weber, 1971; Habermas, 1985).

In a section that outlines a "theory of crime," Adorno and Horkheimer draw an analogy between prison cells (prisoners) and monads. They state that "a man in prison is the virtual image of the bourgeois type which he still has to become in reality" (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p226). He presents the contemporary deviant, criminal or prisoner as one who has *failed* to master (his own) nature, and must therefore be separated from the rest of society. He argues that:

> "In former times prisoners were placed in enforced isolation. Today that isolation has entered into men's body and soul. The well-trained soul and happiness of the individual are as bleak as the prison cell now that the Fascist rulers have seized the whole labour force of the nation. The punishment of imprisonment is as nothing when set against the social reality in which we live" (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, pp228-229).

This is precisely the kind of concern that Foucault was addressing, particularly in Discipline and Punish (Foucault, 1977). In this work he used the Bentham Panopticon metaphor to describe the functioning of modern technologies of power - where everyone is subjected to an ubiquitous gaze. Because one can never know precisely when the gaze will be focused on oneself, one has always to behave as if one is being observed and monitored *all the time*. One therefore monitors oneself constantly to ensure that one's behaviour falls within the range of what is considered "normal".

Adorno and Horkheimer link all the above phenomena to modes, relations and forces of production, particularly with the development of capitalism and instrumental reason, with which these phenomena have an "elective affinity" (in the Weberian sense). They argue that in bourgeois society, domination and objectification have become so complete that there is no longer any satisfaction of human needs. Alienation, reification and objectification are now so widespread that, in order to survive, deception and artifice now become essential elements of people's characters (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p56). Adorno and Horkheimer point out the irony in late capitalism that heroic deeds are simply a waste of energy. Instead, the "cheap" and average are idolised and made heroic. A false identity exists between society and the individual (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p154; pp154-156). They state that:

while "free to respond" to the call of the Sirens, their senses have been removed so that they are not even aware of the call. The image is thus of Odysseus, the master, able to sense the allure of nature, but having mastered nature, is unable to give in to his sensuous desires. He is in "bondage," but an ironic one that results from his own domination and mastery of nature and the senses. His "workers" have obeyed the command of their master and work mechanically and without sensory perception - they are not in danger of being seduced away from their task, as their senses are dulled. One is able to see in the myth the separation of master and servant, domination of man over nature, mastery, and the Cartesian split between subject and object - with the senses and external world under the control of the rational Ego (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, pp43-79).

Starting with the myth of Odysseus, Adorno and Horkheimer identify a number of features that they argue are characteristic of the "bourgeois individual". These include: cunning, rational calculation, mastery over the environment or nature, sacrifice and renunciation of pleasures, individual identity (*i.e.* ego integration, separation-individuation), repression of the natural or animal instincts, and so on (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, p xvi). Most importantly, this rational domination over nature has at the same time an irrational side, which comes to light as the insanity and barbarism witnessed under late capitalism this century. They argue that this "insanity and barbarism" is the direct consequence of the repression of our "dark", "animal" or "irrational" side.[4] They argue that:

> "As soon as man discards his awareness that he himself is nature, all the aims for which he keeps himself alive - social progress, the intensification of all his material and spiritual powers, even consciousness itself - are nullified, and the enthronement of the means as an end, which under late capitalism is tantamount to open insanity, is already perceptible in the prehistory of subjectivity. Man's domination over himself, which grounds his selfhood, is almost always the destruction of the subject in whose service it is undertaken; for the substance which is dominated, suppressed and dissolved by virtue of self-preservation is none other than that very life as functions of which the achievements of self-preservation find their sole definition and determination: it is, in fact, what is to be preserved" (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, pp54-55).

This is, of course, to extend Max Weber's views on the consequences of instrumental rationality in the modern age. This study will attempt to demonstrate how this "instrumental reason" is evident in some of the justifications for racism outlined by

---

[4] For Adorno and Horkheimer, the "insanity and barbarism" includes the two world wars, Fascism and Nazism, the concentration camps and killing of Jews, Stalin's atrocities, widespread poverty, and social injustice generally.

order, or of attaining a position that would be outside of this mediated, reified reality. Like Foucault, but using different terms, they argue that it is only through the aesthetic realm that a form of rupture can occur, subverting the established reality principle. Where Foucault favours, for example, an *ars sexualis* that lies outside of the dominant discursive regime, Adorno and Horkheimer speak of the true work of art that brings about a rupture in the established order. Both emphasise the imperative in modernity to be productive and normal, and both claim that there can be no rational agendas or principles that can be applied universally. Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer share the notion that the Enlightenment produced a kind of subjectity that was defined through "normality" (or deviations from the norm). While being unique to Modernity, it constructs a particular modern rationality and an attendant "irrationality". This rationality, which is taken for granted by modern subjects as being universal, timeless and natural, accompanies or necessitates the disciplinary apparatus described by Foucault. For Adorno and Horkheimer, this reified ("normal") form of subjectivity and rationality leads to what they describe as the "totally administed world". This reified, totally administed world, or disciplinary regimes, thus serve as the objects of their critique of the Enlightenment. These ideas and their implications will be pursued further in the analysis section of this study.

Nevertheless, there are important differences between these theorists - the least of which would be represented by the different subject matter of their work. At the same time however, there are sufficient points of convergence between them for this study to comfortable employ them side by side in specific areas. What facilitates this partly in the case of Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer is the fact that their theories are all based on a constructivist, historicist methodology and epistemology.

In the Dialectic of Enlightenment Adorno and Horkheimer argue that the prototype of the bourgeois individual can be found as early as Homer's Odyssey, in the person of Odysseus. They claim that the Odyssey is the basic text of European civilisation (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, 46). In essence, they show how Homer evokes the image of Odysseus, who has knowledge of the dangers to himself and his crew presented by their immanent contact with the Sirens, and then sets about to use rational calculation and cunning to ensure their survival. As master of the ship and its destiny, he instructs his men to put him in bondage so that no matter how alluring and seductive the voices of the Sirens, he is unable to respond. At the same time, he instructs his crew to block their ears so that,

order. or of attaining a position that would be outside of this mediated, reified reality. Like Foucault, but using different terms, they argue that it is only through the aesthetic realm that a form of rupture can occur, subverting the established reality principle. Where Foucault favours, for example, an *ars sexualis* that lies outside of the dominant discursive regime, Adorno and Horkheimer speak of the true work of art that brings about a rupture in the established ord r. Both emphasise the imperative in modernity to be productive and normal, and both claim that there can be no rational agendas or principles that can be applied universally. Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer share the notion that the Enlightenment produced a kind of subjectity that was defined through "normality" (or deviations from the norm). While being unique to Modernity, it constructs a particular modern rationality and an attendant "irrationality". This rationality, which is taken for granted by modern subjects as being universal, timeless and natural, accompanies or necessitates the disciplinary apparatus described by Foucault. For Adorno and Horkheimer, this reified ("normal") form of subjectivity and rationality leads to what they describe as the "totally administed world". This reified, totally administed world, or disciplinary regimes, thus serve as the objects of their critique of the Enlightenment. These ideas and their implications will be pursued further in the analysis section of this study.

Nevertheless, there are important differences between these theorists - the least of which would be represented by the different subject matter of their work. At the same time however, there are sufficient points of convergence between them for this study to comfortable employ them side by side in specific areas. What facilitates this partly in the case of Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer is the fact that their theories are all based on a constructivist, historicist methodology and epistemology.

In the Dialectic of Enlightenment Adorno and Horkheimer argue that the prototype of the bourgeois individual can be found as early as Ho dyssey, in the person of Odysseus. They claim that the Odyssey is the basic text of European civilisation (Adorno & Horkheimer, 1973, 46). In essence, they show how Homer evokes the image of Odysseus, who has knowledge of the dangers to himself and his crew presented by their immanent contact with the Sirens, and then sets about to use rational calculation and cunning to ensure their survival. As master of the ship and its destiny, he instructs his men to put him in bondage so that no matter how alluring and seductive the voices of the Sirens, he is unable to respond. At the same time, he instructs his crew to block their ears so that,

forms part of broader discourses - the systems of rules, exclusions, divisions and practices that govern what can or can't be said, or even wh * can or can't be known. These are imbricated with larger power networks, relations and institutions that shape and are shaped by this micro-interaction. Foucault points out that a complex relationship exists between power, knowledge and truth - and that these are formed by discourse, which concerns anything that is, or can be taken as an object of knowledge.

As mentioned previously, for Foucault, modern power is not something that is monolithic and exists outside of subjects, exerting physical force and coercing them to behave in certain ways. Instead, he argues that power is produced by and through subjects. In their daily interaction they are exercising power, either reinforcing the existing power relations or perhaps challenging them in some way. He emphasises the diffuse and molecular nature of power. For example, when most people think of power, they would think in monolithic terms and would mention images of the power of the state or the police, or army. One of the advantages of this way of looking at power relations is that it makes one realise that repression is perhaps not so much about external agencies, social institutions and organisations stifling a pre-existent self, but rather ones own practices and patterns of interaction - ones self-regulation - that produce certain relations of power and subjection. His is therefore a productive conception of power, rather than a limiting or repressive one.

4.4. Adorno and Horkheimer's Views on Repression and Prejudice

One can expand on this further by introducing Adorno and Horkheimer's ideas on the relationship between repression and prejudice. They argued that the seeds of prejudice are to be found in the kind of repression that is required for modern civilisations to function. While it may seem obvious that a fundamental contradiction e s between their conception of repression and Foucault's work, it must be made clear that they are not using the concept of repression in a way that suggests that "if we could only throw off our chains we would be free, as we are in nature". Rather, they also see identity as mediated by historically contingent events and processes. This mediation is performed by the various cultural formations, or hegemonic forces (such as language, the family, the state, the media, and religion, for example). Aside from these institutions, they devote much of their work to examining the role of popular culture in transmitting hegemonic norms and values. Somewhat pessimistically they argue that there is no way of subverting the existing social

case that should the impoverished segment of Afrikaans speakers grow in size (perhaps as a consequence of affirmative action), a more clear link could be established between class inequalities and race. This could facilitate organisation along racial lines, as was done in the 1930's and 1940's (O'Meara, 1979, 1983). Many of the participants emphasised their view that Afrikaners were a very diverse group. This perception of diversity militates against organisation along racial lines, as Afrikaans-speakers do not perceive themselves as an homogenous group with clearly defined common interests.

A list of the characteristics regarded as being typical of Afrikaners by the various participants can be found in the table that follows. The diversity referred to above is clearly evident. It is also interesting to note the concordance between this list of features and the generally held stereotypical view held by others of Afrikaners on some of the clusters of points.

> ander manier skaam, en jy wil ook nie met hulle assosieer word nie. So..ek meen, verskillings vloei sterk uit mekaar uit" (B).

Already evident here is the notion of a social hierarchy, with the range extending from the AWB to the "cream of Afrikanerdom". It will later be shown that this hierarchy extends to members of other racial or ethnic groups - with whites at the top. The above quote reflects the feeling, common to all the participants, that they were "ordinary" people - not at the top (like the Germans, or the English with their world-languages and cultures), but not at the bottom either (like the blacks). However, it is important to note that these phenomena were more clearly evidenced among the middle class participants.

What was particularly striking for the researcher was that the working class participants were unable to articulate their Afrikaner identity very clearly. Far more pressing for them were the issues surrounding daily survival - such as unemployment, putting food on the table, getting into trouble with the law, crime and violence. Because mere survival was such a salient problem for them, questions of racial or cultural identity assumed lesser significance. In addition, the fact that Afrikaans-speakers are a very diverse and divided collectivity makes this identification more difficult. One of the factors that mitigates against a strong and cohesive Afrikaner identity amongst the working class participants possibly results from the fact that middle class Afrikaners look down on them. That is, the leaders in the Afrikaner community look upon them with derision and contempt. Most of them saw themselves as victims, rather than as oppressors, and this is reflected in many of the transcript samples that will be analysed subsequently.[14] Having access to better facilities and opportunities can be argued to have been more important for them than preserving the white race, for example. Many of them reflected that there was nothing that they could do to change their situation, whether they liked the changes currently in progress or not. In short, their perception of themselves as powerless victims (a consequence of their unfavourable position in the social hierarchy) meant that they entertained no hopes of resistance (for example, taking a stand to maintain white standards). This perception of victimhood may well be responsible for the inability of the right wing political organisations to mobilise support. Their organising principles and theories of "racial superiority" tend to remain in the realm of mere theories, which are of no use to the working class who have other, more immediate concerns. It may well be the

[14] A clear statement of this notion of "victimhood" can be found in interview b (Appendix F).

6.1. Identity

A number of theoretical comments were made above on what is argued by many recent theorists to be the transitory, social nature of identity and the identification process. The following section will attempt to delineate some of the major themes that emerged in the interviews, which might be taken to be indicative of an Afrikaner identity. It will be seen that factors such as class, gender, age geographical location and religious affiliation were significant influences on the participants' responses and identities.

6.1.1. A Positive Definition of Afrikaner Identity?

On embarking on this research venture, one of the objectives was to investigate whether or not the participants would be able to identify certain features (or traits) that they regarded as being characteristic of an Afrikaner identity. However, the significance of this endeavour should be viewed in the light of recent theorists who claim that one's identity is often formulated in terms of what one is not, rather than in one's own positivity. When asked about being an Afrikaner, would the respondents formulate their responses in terms of positive statements about what, for them, constitutes a typical Afrikaner - in their own right? Or would they define themselves in negative terms, such as by comparison with stereotypical representations of other ethnic or racial groups?

Generally, it was found that there was less confusion on the theme of Afrikaner identity than on questions about race (being white). Most of the respondents had relatively clearly defined views on exactly what constituted a typical Afrikaner and understood the question (as opposed to the tendency not to understand the questions regarding race and racial differences).[13]

Most of the participants identified a number of sub-categories of Afrikaner in their responses. These included the far right wing (Eugene Terreblanche in particular) and another group that tended to be "snobbish" and "pretentious". Neither were regarded to be truly representative of ordinary Afrikaners. One of the respondents described this situation as follows, when asked about her feelings on "*die Volk*":

> P1: Ek dink dit word nou al hoe minder en minder, want daar is so veel verskillings onder Afrikaans sprekende mense wat tans, um, verwyder van hulle - jy weet, soos hierdie AWB mense. Hulle het sy skaam, en hulle wil nie geassosieer word met hulle nie. Die room van die Afrikanerdom laat mens op 'n

[13] This finding is, of course, in line with those of related research that has been conducted over the years - including that conducted, for example, by I.D. MacCrone in the 1940's (MacCrone, 1937).

6. Research Findings

Usually when one is conducting qualitative research, one attempts to identify the major themes that emerge from the data. However, the point has already been made above that these themes are more likely to emerge in response to a particular social situation - namely the interview. The interview should be seen as a device that was designed and used to obtain data that related to racial talk, so one needs to be suspicious from the outset of the themes that are discussed below. Nevertheless, the fact that the researcher is able to make use of certain subtle coding mechanisms in the interviews that bring about a racial response, indicates the all pervasive nature of ideological interpellation. The same coding, although often not employed in subtle ways, are precisely what enable negative stereotypical portrayals of out-groups to be reproduced in society.

The interview situation is, after all a constructed one. Perhaps not as far removed from laboratory experiments as some qualitative researchers would wish. Had the interviewer arrived and announced to the participants that he was from "The Freedom and Equality under the New Constitution Society", and avoided any references to race, language and culture, it is certain that a very different picture would have emerged. Likewise if the researcher himself been black, or wearing an ANC badge. No doubt, had the researcher been Afrikaans-speaking himself and announced that he was from the *Blanke Bevrydigings-Organisasie*, a very different picture would also have emerged.

It is important to note, that a lot of incongruencies, or even blatant contradictions appear in the interview data. This does not necessarily suggest that the participants were lying deliberately. It more likely refers to the very contradictory nature, and wide variety of subject positions available to Afrikaans-speakers in South Africa today. The subject positions they adopt and scripts they read-off depend in part on the situation in which they find themselves at any given point in time. The interview presents (bombards) them with a set of questions that force them to link a variety of objects and associations together that would not normally be required in one's daily routine. It can thus be expected that there would be some confusion and errors. This was especially evident with the working class participants, who tended to be more comfortable with concrete, present events and descriptions, rather than abstract concepts and general ideas. At the same time, these errors are nevertheless revealing where they occurred.

were asked, for the first time, to explain exactly what they meant when they stated that they were "white" - which turned-out to be no easy task for some of them.

quickly interrupted the transgressing speaker, or changed the subject away from the tabooed topic. Nevertheless, in spite of the participants attempts to purify their accounts, and present themselves as "nice people" (*i.e.* not prejudiced), we will see that their talk still succeeds in perpetuating racist stereotypes and prejudice. One such example can be found in appendix E (lines 10-24). This interview is characterised by a number of glaring contradictions. What was most obvious to the researcher was that on arrival the participant stated that he was a "big racist" and "hated blacks". Once the cassette recorder had been switched on however, he attempted to present a very different (non-prejudiced) view of himself. This situation provided a particularly vivid demonstration of the kinds of strategies employed by individuals when they are engaging in positive self-presentation with the overall goal of negative other description (Van Dijk, 1987). Some of the techniques that he employed to sanitise his talk (while nevertheless continuing to present blacks as inferior) will be discussed further in the analysis section that follows.

5.4. Ethical Issues

The participants were all fully informed of the purpose of the study and their consent obtained prior to the interview. Where possible, the racial focus of the study was avoided and the participants were told that the study was about identity and life in contemporary South Africa. Their permission was also asked before anything was recorded in the interviews. This was declined on three occasions and hand-written notes were taken instead.

While the researcher did as little talking as possible during the interviews, it was found that while the participants were discussing their views, the researcher needed to indicate at least some kind of positive affirmation to enable them to feel comfortable and speak freely. For example, when making a very racist statement, the participants would check to see if there was any reaction from the researcher. It would have been abnormal to sit impassively and would have disconcerted the participants, so to get them to continue the researcher would nod or say "yes", or "mm" - as one would in a normal conversation. The researcher, in a sense, had thus to collude in the racist talk, lending it further legitimacy and providing an opportunity for its reproduction. On the other hand, one might argue that at least some of their unspoken assumptions were now brought out into the open, and the participants made to see them in the light of cold reason. For example, some of them

with greater proficiency in this area would have been in a position to be able to attend to the subtle nuances in the talk that would undoubtedly provide key insights into what was being said. On the other hand, the advantage of not being familiar with the language and terms used was that the researcher would immediately question the participants on things that were not clear to him. For example, in interview A, one of the participants referred to Afrikaans as a language (in the late nineteenth century) that one "only spoke as a *kombuistaal* - you used it on the farm, to talk to the *volkies*". Questioning the participant about the meaning of the term *volkies* provided some valuable insights into a number of associations that the participant had regarding this term. Despite presenting himself as a very open-minded individual who didn't regard other racial or cultural groups to be inferior in any way - nevertheless explained this single term in such a way that he disclosed his underlying view that "the coloured people on the farm are the 'little people', you could talk to them in Afrikaans because it didn't matter what they thought, and they didn't know any better". Of greater significance in this example, was that the interviewer could use his poor understanding of Afrikaans as an excuse to get the participants to elaborate their views in a more natural way. In other instances, questioning a participant about something that they said often had the effect of putting them on guard.

Van Dijk (1987) points out several problems that he encountered whilst conducting his own research that are relevant to the above. Cardinal among them was his finding that individuals' talk is often aimed at positive self-presentation within the overall goal of negative other description. He argues that face-saving is an essential technique employed by the respondents in his study to hide their own racism. But he points out that it is precisely these types of conversational techniques and strategies that facilitate the subtle transmission of phenomena like racist ideology and prejudice. He argues that it is vital that these subtle techniques be recognised as the proper object of any discourse analysis so that the link between the psychological and social levels be exposed (Van Dijk, 1983; 1985; 1987).

There are also several instances in the interviews where one is able to see that one or more of the participants actively attempts to intervene in the conversation to prevent someone else from disclosing certain information. One clear example can be found in transcript sample D (lines 52-65). There were many other instances of this phenomenon, most of which took place in more subtle ways, such as when the other parties present

phenomena in a kind of organic unity of culture, race and history. Instead, the working class participants simply indicated that they "knew they were white" and found the questions surrounding this slightly bizarre. An example can be found in interview D (appendix D) where the researcher resorted to questioning them from a "Marsian perspective". While *he* was accustomed to this level of abstraction (thanks, in part, to philosophy studies), the participants clearly found it difficult to relate to. While the interviewer was accustomed to working with clearly defined concepts, the participants were not - the terms that they employed were not regarded as being concepts, but rather simply reflected reality directly - to question these was slightly absurd to them. Related was the very status of the researcher. Many of the working class participants found it difficult to cope with the fact that the researcher was a psychology student. For example, the grandmother in interview D started out by talking about her *senuwee probleme*. The participants in interview H simply refused to accept the researchers stated identity (in spite of examining his student card intently throughout the interview). This interview was characterised by the participants listing their problems as they would to a government official who would go and sort them out for them (for example, install robots in the street, improve the policing in the area, and provide better employment prospects). It should also be remembered though, that one of the reasons why a group of working class white Afrikaners were chosen as the focus of the study was because it was felt that this would provide a modicum of critical distance between the researcher and the participants. The problems associated with conducting ethnographic research within one's own culture have been well documented, and there may have been even more serious problems had the researcher stuck to his own social group.[12] As stated elsewhere, some middle class participants were interviewed for comparison purposes, and here the language distance nevertheless provided some critical distance.

As one would expect though, another significant problem was with language. The interviewer's home language is English, and there were many instances where he was unable to understand words and phrases in the participants' talk. Again, this was partly due to the formal way in which he had learnt Afrikaans, having had little opportunity to practice the language, particularly with working class Afrikaans speakers. A researcher

[12] Initially consideration was even given to conducting the research using Xhosa or Zulu participants, but the language problems associated with such an effort would have been immense, given the limited resources available to this project.

The present research attempts to draw linkages between the racist talk and the broader ideological or discursive formations, rather than reducing the analysis to the level of either linguistic or cognitive structures.

5.3. Problems Experienced Whilst Conducting The Research

One of the advantages of a discourse analytic approach is that one recognises that the study is subjective and biased from the outset, as the researcher constructs the research framework (for example, in the way that the research questions are asked). This fact is often overlooked when quantitative methods are used.

A problem that is often mentioned in the literature concerns the class difference between the interviewer and interviewees. Derek Phillips, for example, reviewed the literature on mental health studies, most of which suggests that there is a greater prevalence of mental illness amongst those with low socio-economic status. Philips concludes from this that:

> "The frequently discovered relationship between social class and mental health may well be due to a greater willingness of lower class persons to *admit to* or *report* certain behaviours and experiences which middle and upper class persons regard as highly undesirable" (Phillips, 1971, p 43).

This was not found to be a problem in this research project. Indeed, one of the main reasons why this sector of the population was targeted for the interviews was due to their relative lack of inhibition with regard to discussing questions of race and culture. It was also felt that the status of the researcher as an outsider came with certain benefits - such as that the interviews remained calm, polite, mutually respectful and didn't get out of control.

However, it is more useful to view this along the lines suggested by Pierre Bourdieu - that the interviewer is also middle class and that this would result in the situation where he would comfortably buy into the sophisticated and subtle coding built into "middle class parlance" (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1977). According to this view, the middle class participants would have the cultural capital required to provide the kinds of answers that would satisfy a middle class researcher. Indeed, the initial questions of the research project possibly were tailored to elicit middle class responses. The researcher expected that the working class participants would have a "folk" knowledge that would include a reasonably cohesive account of their feelings on racial matters. For example, that they would have clear views that linked their beliefs in white superiority with "natural"

the objective existence of underl; ing (measurable) properties.[9] However, at the same time, *a discourse analytic strategy facilitates an analysis of the conditions under which these "properties" come to be imbued with the status of the "real", or of "objective reality"*. For example, it is widely accepted that the race category has a very dubious scientific status - yet it remains a very real and problematic issue in society - and also has very real negative consequences in the daily lives of millions of individuals. One might argue that these techniques enable one to arrive at the *pre-conscious foundations* of knowledge. That is, one is able to deconstruct the taken-for-granted reality within which we are immersed (Sampson, 1989, pp 7-8). Such an endeavour could include an examination of language as a structure and thought structuring agent in socialisation.

Van Dijk, on the other hand, outlines an approach that blends linguistic theory and research methods with those developed in the field of cognitive psychology.[10] Van Dijk's approach was based on his view that the mechanisms involved in the transmission of racism and prejudice in society can only be ascertained by means of discourse analysis. He conducted his own research in the Netherlands and California (USA). An important consideration for van Dijk was to link conversational discourse with cognitive representations, structures and processes (van Dijk, 1987, p 25).[11]

Alternately, it could examine the manner in which subjects are constructed as racial subjects. In this endeavour, one might start with a reworking of O'Meara's detailed account of the ways in which the working class was fragmented in the 1920's and '30's - by the construction or manipulation of a racial meta-narrative that became a more salient identity construct. This was so much so that it grew to assume greater significance than the class struggle metaphor in transforming South African society.

---

[9] For example, *psychological* properties have traditionally included individual-difference dimensions that might determine susceptibility to prejudice. This includes conformism, authoritarianism, over-generalisation, self-esteem, psychological adjustment, frustration, intelligence, dogmatism, rigidity or intolerance of ambiguity, political belief systems such as conservatism, and a number of psychodynamic constructs (Duckitt, 1992, p 1191).

[10] Van Dijk's approach has been criticised by a number of authors. For example, Wetherell and Potter cite Levinson (1983), where they argue that his model relies on a cognitively reductionist idea of coherence (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p88).

[11] Van Dijk sums up his another important aspect of his position as follows "...such structures and strategies are not simply cognitive in the individual or personal sense but are rather forms of social cognition. This socio-cognitive perspective also allows us to connect explicitly ethnic prejudice with social interaction (and hence with conversation) and with social structures of discrimination and racism (van Dijk, 1987, p 25).

were not asked to provide this information directly. To do so was considered to be undesirable as it could have affected their responses. Part of the strategy for gaining their confidence was to assure them that *none* of their personal details (name, address, *etc.*) were required, or of any interest to the study. It transpired that many of them mentioned their age, place of origin, employment and marital status in any case during the course of the interviews.

The data that was recorded on tape were transcribed in detail, including hesitations, false starts and repairs. The transcripts were then coded as shown in the table in appendix F. Samples of these and other transcripts ca also be found in the body of the findings section, using the same coding system. They are indented slightly less than standard quotes.

Initially the analysis followed the course outlined by Van Dijk (1987), where he argues that the central question being asked is: "How do the interviewees talk about themselves in relation to members of other race groups in their social milieu?" This is in addition to scrutinising what the participants said about themselves *per se*. Many of the previous studies (such as Van Dijk's) were conducted on white people in countries such as the Netherlands and New Zealand, where white people constitute the majority and have had little cause for questioning their own identities. In South Africa, on the other hand, Afrikaans speakers report having had to fight for the recognition of their language and culture. One of the consequences of this was that they were able to discuss their own group in terms that did not depend as much on comparisons with other groups. That is, they were able to articulate various characteristics of their own culture, in ways that suggested that it was not something that was taken for granted.

5.2. Data Interpretation: Discourse Analysis

> "How, under what conditions, and in what forms can something like a subject appear in the order of discourse? What can it assume, and by obeying what rules? In short, it is a matter of depriving the subject (or its substitute) of its role as originator, and of analysing the subject as a variable and complex function of a discourse" (Foucault, cited in Rabinow, 1991, 118)

Discourse analysis enables one to arrive at an understanding of the conditions under which knowledge, thought and action are made possible. That is, it doesn't assume

far more unashamed racist talk.[8] One might also mention the possibility that five years ago, not even a television camera would have prevented most of the participants from using racist talk. It has only been in the last few years that many of the participants have had access to more positive information about members of other races, and had greater opportunities for socialising with them.

Importantly, most of the discussion about race that takes place in the public arena today is aimed at overcoming the old racist ways of thinking. One might thus infer that the contradictory ways in which the participants discussed racial matters could be regarded as evidence of this discursive shift in South African society. On the one hand, the participants went to great lengths to distance themselves from the stereotype of "*Boere*", "racists", or "AWB right-wingers", stating for example, that they had no problems with regard to members of other races. On the other hand, the conversation inevitably switched to negative portrayals and stereotyped depictions of other racial groups that demeaned or dehumanised them - often without the participants even appearing to realise this. This will be explored further in the analysis section. It is also important to note that the popular notion of a racist conjures up the image of hard-line right-wingers, who are tough and aggressive in promoting their obnoxious views. It must be emphasised however, to the contrary, that even the most racist of the participants in this study came across as being incredibly nice, kind and even harmless (who didn't want trouble). Initially, this led the researcher to conclude that the participants he had selected were indeed not racists. However, once work began with analysing the transcripts in terms of the theoretical framework outlined above, it was possible to understand how these incredibly nice, non-racial, normal people were, in fact, transmitting and perpetuating racist ideology in subtle and complex ways.

5.1.3. Cassette Tapes, Transcription and Coding

The data that were obtained from the interviews were recorded on numbered tapes. A notepad and pen was also used to jot down any important comments or themes that needed to be pursued, as well as the tape numbers used and their sequence. The approximate age, income level and gender of the respondents was also noted, although they

[8] Although it might be "obvious" that these respondents preferred not to be recorded precisely because they intended making racist comments, this is unlikely as they did not know in advance that these avenues would be pursued in the interview that was to follow.

any blame for anti-black thoughts and deeds. One of the ways in which this is achieved, is to link present [illegible]ing and oppression with blacks. This provides an justification for hating them, as they are perceived as presenting a threat to "us whites - especially Afrikaners".

The couple in transcript C, for example, listed: rape, violence, theft, murder and death (lines 122-126). They also mention how their son was almost stabbed at the prison where he works. Like the old lady in D, the wife in C mentions that if she were to insult a black, he would kill her (C, line 39). Her husband describes the difference between blacks and whites as follows:

> M: Kyk, die verskil is...die swarte sal jou dood maak vir 'n paar rand...
> F: ...maar die Witte nie...
> M: Laat ek dit so stel, hy sal jou kerf afsny, en die kleur van jou bloed is <?>...al het hy nie regtig eins nodig nie. En hy kom hier aan <?>...dit is instink, sy natuur. Kyk hoe maak hulle die ou mense dood. Nou as hy wil gaan steel, as hy nou regtig werkloos is, en hy ly honger, hoekom moenie seer maak en dood maak as hy net wil steel. As hy by my kom en hy wil steel, wat wat hy wil hê...maar hoekom moenie dood maak? Maar as hy 'n mes het, hom het dan gaan hy dit gebruik, as hy 'n vuurwapen het dan gaan hy dit gebruik, of dit nodig of nie nodig is, hy sal hom gebruik" (C, lines 156-162).

This participant claims that blacks are killers by instinct, or by nature. This theme will be pursued further in a subsequent section, as it is a very important one. The head of the household (the mother) in interview H did not want the interview to be recorded as she was convinced that someone would come and get her. She also seemed unable to accept the fact that the researcher was a student, and kept asking him to see that a robot was installed at the corner of her street, as she had almost been run over twice by blacks - despite repeated assurances that nobody else would ever see the notes that were being taken. She also stated that her two sons were away during the week, during which time she lived on her own. She reported that she feared being attacked at night, as the police would do nothing to help the people in the area (being themselves involved with the criminals). She reported that she frequently heard knocks on her door late at night and was convinced that it was "the coloureds" that lived in a nearby slum area.

These sentiments were in no way restricted to the working class participants though. The middle class participants however, usually described their fears in a less direct and graphic way.

> "F2: Jack meen, dis net soos in dan Riaan Malan boek, waar hier het 'n man gaan bly saam met die swartes, maar op die ou end word hy doodgemaak. Met ander woorde, hulle het hulle hele lewe gegee, aan die opheffing, of die...
> F1: Hulle wou Afrika word...

6.1.5.1. Swart, Rooi, en Roomse Gevare

Most of the participants in this study reported feelings of anxiety about the present and future in South Africa. Amongst the many present fears raised, economic considerations are at the forefront. This is, of course, particularly true of those (working class participants) living in impoverished areas. As one of the participants expressed it:

> "M: White people have been forced out of their jobs. They've become victims - you should have seen them the other night in the soup kitchens on TV. These people in this area have *always* suffered. They've always been undermined.
> I: Like none of the people in power now really care either?
> M: Ja, the government doesn't care...especially about the whites. They should be there to help. They should force people to study until they are 18. All they are doing now is caring about black people. They are not concerned...they don't care about us "(F).

As stated previously, most of the middle class participants claimed that hardships and suffering were the main reason why the *volk* had to mobilise in the earlier part of this century. The following extract from interview (D) sums this up concisely:

> M: "Maar as jy so 'n klomp mense so plat geslaan ...van hulle plase afgebrand en so voorts, dan vind jy baie stadig, it's a very slow process - wat te doen het met *haat*, nê Wanneer jy so plat geslaan is word jy gedwing om te dink - you are *forced* to think, when you have nothing. En daai hele periode van na die Anglo-Boere oorlog, tot ons sogenaamde verstedeliking, toe die Afrikaner stad toe begin kom, was 'n onstaglike moelike periode. Dit het eits in die gemeen gehad met die Kleurling en die Swartman van vandag...
> F: Ja, maar dis hoekom ek sê, die wiel draai. Maar wat ek daarmee wil sê, dat ek het erens gelees het,dat jy kan 'n volk ook begin reken, en jy kan die sypathie met die land begin reken...en die leifde-haat met die land met sy mede volkere, teen opsigete van die hoeveelheid mense wat begrawe is in daai grond. Met hoeveel *bloed* jy en jou eedernaaste gestort het, in die grond, waarop jy leef" (A).

This account can be seen as serving as justification for the relatively favourable position in the hierarchy occupied by Afrikaners at present. In effect, what is being said is that because they died for the land and made great sacrifices, it now belongs to them - they are entitled to it. In the above two extracts, where the middle class *was* oppressed, the working class *are* oppressed - as members of the Afrikaner race. These accounts thus serve as justification for the sins of the past and inequalities in the present. The working class participants are able to use their present unfair situation to justify their hostility towards blacks. The middle class participants, on the other hand, have to resort to historical injustices as justification for their present negative feelings towards members of other racial groups.

6.1.5.2. Blacks as dangerous

> "M: You can't trust them, I know I can trust a white person. I can always trust a white person, but not a black - I don't trust a black." (F).

It has already been argued in the previous section that the working class participants emphasise their suffering in the present, partly to exonerate themselves from

changing reality. One can be pretty sure that these individuals would have vowed never to live in a mixed area only a few years ago - before it actually started to happen.

If one examines the transcript of interviews C and D (in the appendices), it is clear that the participants in C have far more rigid and inflexible views on racial identity and difference. The participants in D, on the other hand, tend to be far more sensitive and understanding about racial issues - and are far less aggrieved about the changes that are taking place around them. Their attitudes, no doubt, are a reflection of their situations. The participants in C live in a troubled area. They report overcrowding, litter, crime, lots of noise at night, invasions of privacy, joblessness and unhygienic conditions (for example at the hospital where F: was taken up). The participants in D on the other hand, live in a relatively well tended area. They reported very little crime and violence, and that not so many members of other races had moved in ("only a few coloureds"). Everybody supposedly went about their business and didn't cause any disruptions. The two younger participants had even begun socialising with the non-white neighbours. From this, one might conclude that, given the right conditions, even totalising ideological systems, such as the race-based one experienced under *apartheid*, can literally fade away. This would, of course be a very simplistic way of viewing things - and there are many other dynamics in operation (ref. Smith & Mackie, 1995, 219-396). One of the more obvious ones being that of individual difference - the family in D were far more sophisticated than that in C. This is also reflected in their respective occupations (D manual labour, C clerical).

Yet, despite their relative open-mindedness and more favourable situation, the participants in D were still very negative in their portrayal of blacks, and condescending towards their coloured neighbours. This is particularly noticeable in the case of the young male (M). Even more remarkable, was the fact that the old lady twice requested the researcher not play the tape recording to anyone as she feared that they would be killed for it. This phenomenon will be pursued in the section that follows.

6.1.5. The Afrikaner as "persecuted"

> "If we have been affected with joy or sorrow by any one who belongs to a class or nation different from our own,...we shall not love or hate him merely, but the whole of the class or nation to which he belongs"
> (Benedict Spinoza, 1677, *The Ethics*)

colonialism, and moving towards a greater acceptance of Africanisation. This was, of course, directed at British imperialism and the pro-British whites.

This theme of struggle, resentment and injustice was so much so that one might conclude that it has been precisely the sense of onslaught over a long period in time that has given rise to the identification with being an Afrikaner. The fact that the working class participants in the study all expressed feelings of present injustice and hardship is perhaps also of significance. The present efforts to right the wrongs of the past could have the effect of deepening the divisions in society, as the salience of racial difference continues to be an issue. Even though the thrust of discourses about race today are to combat racism - coupled with the hardships experienced by these working class people, many of whom have already bought into apartheid ideology about black inferiority and dishonesty, the result could be even more negative racial feelings about blacks. At the same time, it is important to note that blacks' perception of prejudice (from whites) is precisely what is claimed be responsible for their negative perceptions of whites. A viscious cycle thus exists, where the artificial racial divisions in society are perpetuated as individuals perceive their own group to be under threat from others. One can only hope that continuing structural transformation of the South African socio-economic landscape will have corresponding positive effects as far as individuals' attitudes to members of perceived out-groups are concerned.

It was of great interest to note that the participants, regardless of any other factors, did not express any hostility about the fact that members of other racial groups were moving into their area. This was only perceived as being a problem where there were definite signs of deterioration in the area. For example, if the neighbours blended-in and lived like everyone else, the participants accepted it. However, those who had experienced what they perceived to be a definite decline in standards (rising crime, litter in the streets, overcrowding, etc.) tended to be very hostile towards the black neighbours (an example can be found in sample transcript C in appendix C). Although this may sound like a trivial point, one ought to bear in mind that it could have been the case that these individuals felt that living in a mixed neighbourhood was *morally* wrong, or sinful, or, at least, wrong on principle. Instead, they tended to be pragmatic about the issue. The exceptions being on the issues of socialising with members of other races, or of mixed marriages - although it will no doubt be shown elsewhere these reservations too, tend to dissolve in the face of a

have an Afrikaans school in Johannesburg". She describes how her emotions are stirred-up at the playing of *Die Stem*, as it evokes memories of how her people struggled to establish themselves in the world.

This was a common theme among the participants, most of whom felt that Afrikaners were a downtrodden, oppressed people who had many enemies. They expressed a strong attitude of resentment at the injustices of the past, as well as their treatment at present. The middle class participants tended to emphasise past injustices (British occupation, the Anglo-Boer war, concentration camps, the struggle to have their language recognised, *etc.*) All of the participants expressed a sense of hardship and suffering that had been endured by their people over the years. What follows is a table that lists some of the main grievances listed by the participants:

TABLE OF GRIEVANCES, PAST INJUSTICES, THREATS TO THE VOLK
British occupation (Early Cape Colony)
Emancipation of the slaves
Murder of Piet Retief's party by Dingaan
Wars with the black tribes
Anglo-Boer war
Concentration camps
Loss of farms
Urban poverty, slums
Forbidden to use Afrikaans formally due to Anglicisation policies (e.g. Milner)
Struggle for language recognition
Struggle for a republic (separate from Britain)
Struggle to put "South Africa first"
Black resistance to apartheid (i.e. for them this represented a threat to their hard-won self-determination and independence from colonialism).

Particularly striking to the researcher, was the fact that many of the terms used by the participants to describe these historical grievances were identical to those used in the "black" liberation struggle. Some of the articles read surrounding these issues were also particularly ironic in today's context, given that they were written by supporters of the apartheid policies at the time. For example, one of the articles read was about opposing

personal level, despite their attribution of this unity (common blackness) as arising from some essence that lies deep within them, binding them together organically as a race.

However, the situations described abo[illegible]ern those who perceive themselves as suffering or oppressed - where powerful racial feelings could be evoked so that they become more easily discernible. It should be emphasised that these more extreme effects of perceptions of hardships, coupled with racial attributions could almost certainly be found amongst even the most content individuals, but in a less overt and conscious form. They could also be related to positive racial identification. An example of this would be where individuals belong to a group that enjoys high socio-economic status, and attribute this to a trait in their perceived racial or cultural group. It can thus be seen that racial identification is a complex phenomenon, as both these factors come into play for the participants. They both express feelings of inferiority (with respect to other "white nations"), and superiority (over the "lesser non-white nations"). These contradictory themes will be explored further in this report.

6.1.4. Afrikaner Identity as threatened

Most importantly, all of those interviewed reported that they did not feel as though they belonged to a cohesive, homogenous entity that stood together or provided a solid foundation to *Afrikanerdom*. Rather, they pointed to the sharp divisions and sub-categories of Afr[illegible]ners who, perhaps, had few similarities aside of (at least) a common language and skin colour. Interestingly, perceptions of attacks on Afrikaners was reported to be a reason for identifying oneself as an Afrikaner. That is, w[illegible] there was little intrinsic value in mobilising a community spirit amongst individuals from such diverse backgrounds, this became necessary as the group perceived themselves to be under attack from a number of sources. It could thus be argued that these accounts serve to provide a justification for Afrikaner nationalism and its negative consequences in the latter part of this century. One of the participants described her feelings on this matter as follows

> "F1: Maar, soos ek sê, daar *is* 'n tiepiese Afrikaner - ek gee nie om *wat* sê die koerante, wat sê alles nie. En ek dink dis sielkundig baie *diep* in die wese...
> F2: Hoe jy reageer...
> F1: Ja. Elke een wat 'n Afrikaanse naam dra, en wat...en wat groot geword het in ons tyd wat ons regtig geveg het om *net* 'n Afrikaanse *Hoërskool* hier in Johannesburg te hê. Jy weet, ons sal *nou* nog regop staan as, en in *trane* sing as hulle Die Stem speel. Want dit was...dis nie 'n indoktrinasie nie, dit was 'n nasie *bou* besigheid. Wat in Laerskole begin het, en deurgegaan het, jy weet, veral <?>..." (B).

Particularly clear is the participant's interpellation of "every person who has an Afrikaans name" and those who "grew up in a time where they really had to fight, just to

Before concluding this section, it is important to note that perhaps the key aspect of identity is the personal dimension. When one thinks of races and cultures, the first thing that springs to mind is the fact that these are social constructs. It is often forgotten that what keeps these entities functioning are the individuals who identify with them, so perpetuating them. Bearing in mind the comments that were made in the "definition of terms section", that race has no respectable scientific status, one might argue that races and cultures depend in large part on the imaginations of individuals for their very existence. Careful attention thus needs to be paid to this personal (symbolic) dimension in order to gain a better understanding of how racism is perpetuated. This personal dimension of what is normally categorised as "national" or "racial" (in the sense of being non-individual) is apparent in the first transcript sample in this section (in the first sentence), where the participant (F:) states that she "grew up with no concept of what she was" in terms of the different nations. In the second transcript sample in this section, the participant (F1:) states passionately that she knows how bad her people had it, how they were done in, and how they were made inferior. Another example can found in interview C, where the participant states that she strongly preferred the "old South Africa", because she felt that:

> "...It was *my* people, it was *my* government, it was *my* country...until it begun to mix. Now I don't have a government, I don't have a white country, I have nothing for myself. Because the bloody thing, he walks along the road and says: "Hello my darling!" (Appendix C, lines 129-131: Translated from the original Afrikaans).

All of these examples show that for these participants, belonging to a racial group is not just about an abstract national category, but is something that touches them emotionally in a very individual and personal way. One could relate this to attribution theory, whereby individuals attempt to make sense of hardships and alienation that they have experienced personally. Their suffering can be represented psychically through the metaphor of "my people", providing some comfort that one is not so alone after all. The national or *volk* narrative serves as an emotive vehicle for the common expression of pain and hardships. The "*volk* under threat and struggling" can thus be seen as an articulation of personal threat and struggling. This suggests that the reason why the Malanites (in the earlier part of this century) were able to mobilise Afrikaners along racial lines so effectively was because they (as individuals) were experiencing hardships, poverty and betrayal by the system. Similarly, blacks around the world are able to mobilise along racial lines in response to feelings of oppression, injustice and hardships that are experienced at this

government's propaganda strategy for mobilising support for apartheid policies and practices.[18] One of the middle class couples described the situation as follows:

> "I: Dink julle daar is 'n ding soos 'n tipiese Afrikaner? Of, ek dink die woord is 'n *opregte* Afrikaner?
> F1: Ja, ek dink daar's definitief 'n onderliggende, motivering vir 'n Afrikaner om 'n Afrikaner te wees, en ek dink dis gebore uit die geskiedenis. As gevolg van die *vyande* wat die Afrikaner altyd gehad het, en sy pogings om 'n eie identiteit op te bou, en sy taal te bou. En van daar af het dit net uitgestroom in *alle* igtings - soos Afrikaner besigheidsmense geword het, soos hulle akademici geword het, soos hulle...is daar nie 'n tipiese Afrikaner nie, maar 'n onderliggende *anker* wat Afrikaners bymekaar hou - sielkundig.
> I: Ja, so dis seker moeilik om presies te sê wat is die eienskappe van so 'n persoon?
> F1: Ja wel, ek dink die eerste eienskap is die saamhorigheidsgevoel, dat hulle *wil* saam leef, soort van laertrek. Ek dink hulle sal dit baie moeilik uit die Afrikaner uitkry, daai laertrek ding. Hulle *wil* eksploreer, hulle *wil* uitgaan ander nasies, ander mense leer ken, hulle lees wyd, hulle ondervindings is wyd. Maar hulle *wil* daardie saamhorigheidsgevoel hê. En eimand wat dit nie het nie is baie maklik gemerk as 'n vreemder.
> I: Ja,
> F1: Dis 'n sielkundige ding, 'n volkssielkundige ding, dat as die mense nie hulle eie mense beskerm dan niemand anders gaan. Ek meen tot vandag, kyk hoe word ons vandag nog afgetrap...
> F2: Maar, *doen* ons dit, beskerm ons ousself?
> F1: *Ja!, Here!* Ek meen, as hy *nou* eits sê teen die Afrikaners gaan ek hom uitsit! Dis nie dat wat hy sê is nie *waar* nie. Dit is net 'n instinktiewe ding, maar luister, ek weet hoe swaar het my volk gekry. [132]. Ek weet hoe's ons ingedoen, ek weet um, hoe minderwaardig ons *gemaak* is. Daai tipe ding, dis baie <?>
> I: Ja, dis seker soos meskien met die Britse, hulle is 'n groot volk en hulle kan met mekaar stry, en dis normaal vir hulle, want hulle het nie sulke vyande, soos jy gesê het van die Afrikaners?
> F1: Nee, en hulle het te veel sekuriteid deur die eeue gehad. Ek meen hulle't 'n ryk gehad oor die hele wereld. Ons het nie. Ons het probeer om 'n plek hier uit te kap hierso op die Suid punt van Afrika. Weet, dis soos 'n kind wat in 'n geborge huis groot word - die Engelse, of die Afrikaners om <?> jy weet dis nooit veilig nie. Daaroor was daar sulke goed soos ons gesê die swart gevaar, die Roomse gevaar, jy weet, al daai dinge " (B).

The above was fairly representative of the way that the middle class participants would discuss their perception of the Afrikaner as under threat. All of them made frequent references to historical injustices and the hardships experienced by their people. One of the things that is evident in the sample above is the notion that Afrikaners had to actively build their own identity and language in the face of their enemies. This can be contrasted with the English language and culture, for example, which is seen as having evolved naturally, or organically over many centuries. The participants, on the other hand, felt strongly that their language and identity had to be developed through their own conscious effort and struggle for recognition. This is often linked with the belief that "the blacks should now also build themselves up, as we did". The fact that the participant is middle class is significant as it lends credence to O'Meara's view that the Afrikaner middle class was responsible for the racial mobilisation of working class Afrikaners in the 1920's and 1930's.

---

[18] For example, P.W. Botha's frequent references to the "total onslaught" against the people of South Africa in general, rather than *apartheid* in particular.

contact. She commences by stating that she grew up with no concept of what she was, in terms of different *volkere*. She relates how she had grown up thinking that coloureds were also white people - and was completely amazed to discover that they were in fact a separate nation. She also describes "blacks as the people of the land, who were the workers who *we* employed, who didn't have education, background or training". What is most interesting about all of this is the fact that she is anxious to emphasise that there was *absolutely* no discrimination against members of other racial groups, claiming that they didn't even have a category for "coloured". Yet, in spite of this innocence, the fact that they all knew their place stands out very clearly, demonstrating that ideology is not only about ideas, thoughts and theories. This can be related back to the fact that we are born into an existing order that already has meaning coded into it. Thus, although the respondent hadn't learnt the racial vocabulary that we possess today, she nevertheless knew the rules - who not to interact with, who to employ, *etc.* Elsewhere she expands on this by stating that there was no social interaction between members of the different racial groups in the neighbourhood ("they had their houses, and we had ours" (A)). This phenomenon can be used to illustrate the manner in which ideology glues us into our places. It demonstrates the manner in which we adopt certain subject positions on being interpellated, thereby confirming the existing order. It also demonstrates that ideology, in the sense of a discursive formation, is not something that is immaterial, or in our heads, but rather built into the coding that grounds the entire social order. This is also why it was argued earlier that discourse is not to be equated with talk, as one has to consider the entire discursive domain, rather than particular manifestations of it. Regardless of whether or not one knows about certain relations consciously, one is nevertheless constrained to act in ways that are consistent with what is perceived to be natural, rational, logical, or practical (especially in the sense of being economically productive, as will be shown later in this report).

6.1.3. Afrikaner Identity as Constructed out of Necessity

The frequently expressed idea that Afrikaners were under threat from all sides was offered as being the reason why it was important for Afrikaners to stand together to protect themselves from these onslaughts. It is interesting to note the degree to which this theme has perhaps been exploited in recent times, and integrated into the former

language or race. They might have moved away from the old ways of thinking (ref. interview F), but continue to be treated as though they have not. This then feeds into their existing feelings of persecution and sense of injustice against "their people", with the ultimate effect of perpetuating the stereotype.

6.1.2. Afrikaner Identity as Constructed

O'Meara argues that the National Party deliberately played on white (Afrikaner) insecurities in the context of rapid urbanisation, impoverishment, and intense job-competition in the 1930's and '40's. In his view, this was in order to conscientise and fragment the working class along racial lines with the ultimate effect of promoting middle class interests. One of the participants in this study recalled her early views on social and racial matters:

> "F:...Maar ek het byvoorbeeld, hier in die stad, ek het nie groot geword met enige konsep van wat ek is, jy weet, ons as verskillende volkere nê. Ek het net geweet ek is Afrikaans, en ek moet trots wees daarop, en daars min versil tussen my, en die Jode oorkant die straat, en die Engelse oorkant die straat,
> M: Ja, but you did live very closely...
> F: Very closely, like living in a microcosm of...en ons het *hoegenaamd* geen diskriminasie teenoor swartes gehad nie! Swart mense was swart mense, en hulle was die mense van die land, en daar was nie 'n ding nie, maar hulle was die werkers, ons was die mense wat die werk verskaf het aan daai mense, want hulle't nie geleerdheid gehad nie, hulle't nie agtergrond, en opvoeding gehad nie - het ons gedink. Dis hoe *ek* groot geword het. Ek het hoegenaamd byvoorbeeld nie geweet wat is *kleurling* nie. Die eerste keer wat ek in my hele, gunse lewe te doene gehad het met 'n kleurling is nadat ons getroud was...ek het vir hom gevra: "Watse nasie is daai mense, en daai mense?" En hy [her husband] was mos van die Kaap, en het beter geweet van Kleurling mense - ek het nie geweet van Kleurling mense nie. Ek het gedink dis blad, blas wit mense! 267 Ek het nie geweet van Kleurling nie. Ek was totaal verstom! En toe is ek al 25/26 jaar oud, en nog nie geweet dit is 'n kleurling nie. My ma het net gese: "Ag, dis 'n baster", en as ek vra wat is 'n baster dan sê sy dis 'n wit man en 'n swart man wat, em, 'n swart vrou , of anders om, wat kinders gehad het. 273 En dis die gevolg daarvan. Ek meen, selfs my ma kon nie vir my sê van 'n eerbare groep soos die Malleins nie - nie eers geweet nie! Ons [she lived in the Transvaal, her husband in the Cape] het in verskillende provinsies gelewe, en dit kon netsowel under hunde gewees het. En die kleurlinge as 'n nasie, as 'n volk, het ek eers gaan ontdek *lank* na [M:] en ek getrou het toe ek in die Kaap gaan werk het. Toe't ek vir die eerste keer gesien maar dit is 'n totale volk op sy eie, dis 'n totaal kultuur op sy eie, maar met geweldige raakpunte met ons, want hulle praat die selfde taal as ons, so dis basies net..." (A).

This can be argued to fit well with O'Meara's claim that racial consciousness was promulgated and refined as an ideological system during this period. The participant states that the different racial groups, who all lived in the same neighbourhood, were not clearly defined in those days. Yet, at the same time, it is also evident that despite the absence of a clearly demarcated classification system (that was to come later), there are indications that the participant and her family certainly knew that the other races were different to their own. This individual, who was born in approximately 1940, describes above how her racial identity became more clearly defined in relation to other races with which she came into

In terms of subject positioning, Afrikaans speaking children would be socialised in an environment where significant others (the family) and other institutions (such as the media, churches, schools and political parties) would transmit these ideas of what an Afrikaner is to them. These will intersect with, and be contradicted by the plethora of other possible identities available to them - a phenomenon that can be evidenced in the interviews conducted in this research project. Aside from the significant class variable, discussed above, one is also able to see that the younger participants held different views from those of the older participants. Another of the more obvious class-related differences was the fact that the middle class respondents were far better able to express detailed and elaborate justifications for their views. Their accounts were based on books read, places visited, and even friends in high places. The working class respondents, on the other hand, were often very hard-pressed to explain or justify their views. Their responses relied more on what one might describe as being a tacit or intuitive knowledge - one that could not be articulated clearly (at least, to a middle class interviewer).

All of the participants in the study felt very strongly that they were South African Afrikaners. There was little spontaneous identification with European origins, particularly amongst the working class participants. Yet, when pursued, there was a closer identification with being like the Dutch, or Germans rather than being at all similar to black South Africans - in spite of having shared a common history over the past three hundred years. A clear example of this can be found in interview D (appendix D, lines 11-30). On the other hand, one might argue that their identity as Afrikaners was characterised by a large degree of ambivalence. When asked questions such as: "Who are *your* people?", or: "Do you feel that you belong to any particular group of people?", they would sometimes mention, for example, their local church affiliation, their family, or that they were South African. Once provided with the right cues however, they would say that they were Afrikaners. Perhaps this identity has indeed become more diffused, to the point that it is less coherent and uncritically assumed than previously. A lot of discussion in the media characterises Afrikaners in a negative light, resulting in the situation where some of the younger Afrikaans speakers prefer to adopt other identities that result in less cognitive dissonance (Smith & Mackie, 1995, 318-321). Yet the interpellation still has a demonstrable effect, as witnessed in the interviews. Thus, for example, when Afrikaners are criticised in the media many Afrikaners feel that they are being unfairly criticised on the basis of their

TABLE OF PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION: "WHAT IS AN AFRIKANER?"

Characteristic	Interview Code									
	A[1]	B[1]	C	D	E	F	G[2]	H[1]	I[1]	J[1]
Saamhorigheids gevoel, of *gevoel* van Afrikaans wees	1	1								
Afrikaanse taal en kultuur	1	1		1						
Lewenswyse			1	1	1	1		1	1	1
Wil Laertrek		1								
Wil eksploreer		1								
Stubborn	1	1								
Tough	1	1								
Volatile	1									
Resilient	1	1								
Ingedoen deur andere	1	1								
Nooit veilig	1	1			1			1		1
Geestelik ontwikkeld	1	1								
Verwesterd	1	1								
Self-sugtig						1				
Resentment of British mistreatment	1	1								
Was onderdruk gewees, of gedreig met onderdrukking	1	1	1		1	1		1		
Afgetrap	1	1			1			1		
Minderwaardig (at "earlier stages of development")	1	1			1					
Mense wat swaar gekry het	1	1			1			1	1	
Konserwatief	1					1	1			
Teruggetrokke						1				
Kerk Gebonde	1			1		1				
Christens	1			1				1	1	
Beperkte maniere van denke						1				
Seksuele denke konserwatief						1				
Unieke karakter en identiteit verlore						1				
Jong manne soos Amerikaners						1				
Soos Hollanders	1		1							
Verbande met Duitsers	1		1			1				
Verbande met Franse	1	1								
Verbande met Kleurlinge (of "Maleiers")	1						1			
Wit			1	1	1			1	1	1
Begin om meer Engels te word, deur die Engelse beinvloed	1	1			1	1				
Mengelmoes van 'n klomp verskillende rasse	1	1	1			1	1			
Konflik onder mekaar	1	1				1		1		

[2] This couple consisted of an Indian male and "Coloured" female.

[1] Middle class participant.

[3] These couples did not wish to be recorded. Hand-written notes only

significant. The frequent reference to *baster* in the talk of some of the participants is perhaps a way of articulating their association of other races with the dreaded Other. It is onto this Other that *tame* subjects (Foucault's docile bodies, or Adorno and Horkheimer's modern subject who has attained mastery and domination over all the objects of the world and nature) project their own repressed "nature" - their "*wildness*". Once again, one can appreciate then, the full import of the notion that we are born into a symbolic order that already contains meaning. In the above example, the language (one of the systems of symbolic representation, along with culture) spoken by a group of people who settled in Southern Africa is shown to be structured in such a way that it still reflects the experience of a Calvinist mentality, one that included belief in predestination, and that they were God's chosen people. This can be associated with the social hierarchy, where the chosen white Afrikaners are the "pure", the "masters", the *herrenvolk*.[19] The chosen Afrikaner race will also have certain behavioural and character traits bred-in, just fying their status as masters, while the *basters* would perhaps be contaminated in such a way as to have lost the essential traits that would justify equal status with the white masters. In the Great Chain of Being, one finds that beneath the *herrenvolk* are the lesser races, the animals and the plants that the *Voortrekkers* encountered in their history. These meanings (or codes) exist in the structure of the language itself, which then becomes a means of perpetuating this *herrenvolk* mentality, even after those who use the language have stopped believing consciously that they are a superior race. These meanings exist perhaps as *relics*, or archaeological traces of a bygone age within the language.

Another interesting example of the hidden influence of Calvinism can be found in the frequent reference to the "One God" by the participants. God is seldom mentioned by any of the participants without being referred to as the "One God". One particularly striking example can be found in appendix D (interview D, line 32), where the participant actually stumbles verbally and repeats the word "one" four times.[20] One of the possibilities of this phenomenon is that if one considers that "God" is a projection of the self, or of the Super Ego, then a case could be made that this "oneness" is a projection of one's own

---

[19] Interestingly, J.H.H. Meyer delivered a speech at a graduation ceremony here at the University of the Witwatersrand, in which he warned against the consolidation of such a *herrenvolk* mentality in South Africa at the time. The HAT defines it as: "Volk van here, heersers, base". This can also be associated with the widespread practice of insisting that blacks address whites as "baas" (Cited in Paton, 1965).

[20] "...Geloof, ons almal glo aan een, een, een, een God al..." (Interview D, appendix D, line 32).

this with the fact that the Afrikaans *ras* has connotations with character. One could also perhaps argue that what is *meant*, is that "Die kleurlinge het nie *ras* in hulle nie, en daarvoor is hulle nie opregte Afrikaners nie."[17] According to this view, their bad behaviour disqualifies them from membership of the *Volk*. Furthermore, the bad behaviour is *in the breed* and not simply the result of poor socialisation.

He then explains his view that inter-marriage should not take place on the grounds that "a nation, a white nation must stay white, a black one should stay black" and that the consequence of racial "mixing" will be "*baster*" children. The HAT definition of *baster* is:

> "**Baster**[1], (-s). I n.w. **1.** Onegte kind. **2.** Persoon van gemengde bloed, bv. Met 'n Blanke vader en 'n Nie-Blanke moeder; halfnaatjie. **3.** *(Bot.)* Dier ontstaan uit die vermenging van verskillende maar verwante soorte; bv. 'n muil. II ww. (gebaster). Deur teling kruis basters voortbring: *Dit ernstemakrameer het met die inheemse gebaster. Gebaster plant; diere.* III bw. En b.n.w. Taamlik, nogal; min of meer: *So 'n baster partytjie gn; Dis baster winter vandag; 'n Baster reënseun; 'n Baster maand reën.* **Baster ..ens, ..skap.**
>
> **Baster**[2], 1. Onegt: *'n basterkind.* **2.** Van gemengde bloed: *'n basterras.* **3.** *(Bot.)* a. Geteel uit 'n vermenging van verskillende maar verwante soorte. b. Aanduiding van 'n selfstandige soort wat groot gelykenis toon met die in te 2de lid genoem: *Basterkanferie.* **4.** *(plantk.)* a. Gekweek deur kruising: *Basterwiedie, kakiebos.* b. Van minderwaardige gehalte: *Basterkoppie.* c. Wat min of meer so lyk: *Basterkanferie.* d. Wilde; teenoor *mak*: *basterappelliefie.*
>
> **Baster**[3], (-s). Kleurling van gemengde bloed: *Rebelsbaster*" (HAT, Odendal *et al*, 1988, p68).

It is immediately apparent that the word *baster* is not the same as the English *bastard*.[18] *Baster* is associated with both humans, animals and plants in the same way that *Ras* is. Aside from the fact that both languages use *bastard* or *baster* in a negative, derogatory way (with reference to people), the HAT states that in botany, it refers to something that is of "*minderwaardige gehalte*". Again, this is not directly translatable as inferior quality, but rather as "something with a quality that is of less *value*". This connotation has already been discussed elsewhere in this report, but the fourth botanical usage of the word (d. Wilde; teenoor *mak*: *basterappelliefie*) is also noteworthy. If one considers this is the light of Adorno and Horkheimer's notion of prejudice as an expression of repressed nature, one can see that the connotation with "wild, the opposite of tame" is

---

[17] Following the second HAT definition of the word *ras*, namely: "Karakter, karakter eienskappe, pit, oorspronklikheid: *Iemand van ras. Daar sit ras in die saak.*" (Odendal *et al*, 1985, 879).

[18] "Bastard ...1 *archaic* or *offens.* A person born of parents not married to each other. 2 *coarse slang* a an unpleasant or despicable person. b a person of a specified kind (*poor bastard; rotten bastard; lucky bastard*). 3 *coarse slang* a difficult or awkward thing, undertaking, etc... 2 (of things) a unauthorised, counterfeit. b hybrid. Bastardise ... 1 declare (a person) illegitimate. 2 corrupt, debase..." (The Concise Oxford Dictionary, Thompson, 1995, pp108-109).

of the other working class families who participated, and this may well be an important factor in their feeling comfortable charting these new territories.

Their positive interaction across the perceived colour barrier is however, not without contradiction. They make it clear that they regard coloureds as being different to and better than blacks. They reported very negative views of blacks, even though this needed to be implied from what they said in the interview. For example, without actually stating that they thought that blacks were dirty or untidy, their repeated statements to the effect that coloureds were "neat" and hygienic implied that blacks were not (see appendix D). Nevertheless, it is perhaps more significant that the family has adapted to the situation they were confronted with in a positive manner, and made the most of it. Had the new neighbours been black, it is possible that they would have displayed the same resilience and pragmatism in dealing with that situation. While verbally articulating racist ideology (at least, in the interview), they have nevertheless been open to experiences that were previously tabooed. One is reminded here of Foucault's view that what is needed is not a science that will enable one to *know* something better, but an art that can subvert or, at least, transcend the dominant discursive formations.

6.3. Perceptions of Inter-Racial Marriage

Some of the more revealing comments about race were made in the context of discussion about the issue of racial intermarriage, such as in the following sample:

> "I: Nou wat van, nou's daar hierdie hele kwesie van Kleurling Afrikaners...in die Kaap sê nou...hulle sê hulle is ook Afrikaners...voel jy nou hulle is op die selfde vlak as jouself, of is hulle maar ook Afrikaners, maar nie in die volle sin van die woord nie?
> M: As hy hom kan gedra soos 'n blanke Afrikaner...dan sal ek sê ek sal saam met hom lewe...Maar onder trou, glad nie. Ek glo 'n nasie, 'n blanke nasie moet 'n blanke nasie bly. 'n Swarte moet swart bly.
> I: Nou, hoe bedoel u nasie? In watter sin 'n nasie?
> M: Kyk, 'n Wit man kan met 'n Engelse vrou trou, of met 'n Duitse vrou, of 'n Hollandse vrou, of 'n Franse vrou - sy's blank, die kinders sal blank wees - hulle gaan nie baasters wees nie. So met die Swart nasies, as hy onder mekaar trou, dis 'n ander swart nasie - hulle lyk buitendien ontrent almal die selfde, daars nie 'n verskil nie...swart met swartes. 23
> I: Soos Khosas, Zoeloes, kan trou, want hulle is die selfde mense, soos met Duitsers en Engelse..
> M: Ja, as hulle onder mekaar trou. Ek meen, dis 'n wit nasie, - wit kinders - jy gaan nie...baasterkies daaruit kry nie.
> I: Wat van...sommige mense sê dis baie moeilik om te sien...aan watter ras 'n mens aan hoort. Stem u saam met dit, of dink jy dat 'n mens kan altyd sê as iemand swart, kleurling, of blank is, en so aan?
> M: Wel, jy kry ligte kleurling, en jy kry wat donker is, en jy kry wat swart is...
> I: Ja
> M: Maar, as jy die swart nasie vat, en jy kyk hulle so, hulle lyk maar die selfde. Party se neus is maar 'n bietjie plat as die ander s'n" (G).

What is evident in this transcript is that the participant states that "coloured" Afrikaners are acceptable if they "behave the same as a white Afrikaner". One could link

don't need to intervene drastically in modern societies, as subjects now "take care of themselves". Adorno and Horkheimer demonstrate the role of popular culture - television, radio, films, popular music (jazz and rock and roll for example) - in lulling the general population into a stupor of inactivity. Any tensions that may result from the stirrings of some kind of sensory awakening, or protest, is quickly doused-out by an exciting film, a drug induced adventure over the weekend, a couple of hours spent on the Internet having cybersex. Anything to take ones' mind off work, so that one can be fresh again for the next day's productive activities. While all the exhilarating activities that the modern technological world has to offer might *feel* like they are "liberating", "breaking with tradition" or "a unique expression of personal identity in the faceless modern world", do they not have the effect of ensuring further domination of self over self? Instead of the "New South Africa" being about a creative experiencing of selfhood that is not framed in the terminology of a racist past, a new will to knowledge about race and racial differences is being propagated. The state no longer has to impose racial systems of exclusion on the general population, as individuals now carry their own internal *dompases*. Increasingly, those who regard themselves as being blacks are conscientised *inter alia* to the effect that they have to own this "blackness" and understand fully what it means to be black. They are taught that, no matter what their individual circumstances, they share in a universal "blackness". At the same time, dissenting whites are also objectified and stereotyped as "white racists", implying that they share traits of racism and prejudice that are essential to their being.

Following Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer on the other hand, one might lay more emphasis on the moments of rupture from these totalising systems of domination. Some of the participants, discussed elsewhere, indeed provide evidence of these moments. Examples include the younger members of the family in transcript sample D (appendix D). Whilst clearly being embarrassed about their new non-white friends and neighbours, they have begun to embark on a range of new experiences and contacts that were unimaginable only a few years ago. This also demonstrates one of the advantages of using qualitative methodology, as these participants might not otherwise have disclosed information about their new friendships with their (new) non-white neighbours. For them previously, anyone socialising with non-whites would quickly be labelled a *kaffer-boetie*. It has also been mentioned previously that this family was also characterised by better prospects than many

Related to this, was the way in which they reported their feelings about the National Party victory in the general election in 1948. The kinds of terms that they used to describe the situation included:

> "We couldn't believe it, that at last we have become our own masters!" (A, F:).
> "Ons het *mag* gekry! Politieke mag!" (A, M:).
> "Fyftig jaar gelede het hulle nie mooi geweet of hulle kom of gaan - sit hulle, die eerste minister, Dr Malan - Afrikaans! And suddenly *they* swing the rod!" (A, M:).
> "...But this sort of struggle, and this dramatic development of the volk, wat skielik gesê het, 'Jal Ons *is* 'n volk! Wragtig!" Almost in a dramatic sense, het. skielik al die mag! Nie al die mag nie, but *mag* - not all, no, that's nonsense, but a *lot* of power!" (A, M:).

What is interesting about these comments is that they are all about "power", "swinging the rod", and "becoming masters". One could argue that this reflects the situation as it was then quite accurately. If one compares the context in which the National Party came to power in 1948 with the situation today in which the ANC came to power, there are some striking differences. For example, at least up until the defeat of the Fascists and Nazis in Europe at the end of the war, the (political) discursive formation : at the time were very different to what we are accustomed to. Even the main non-Fascist parties in Europe and the United States were far more paternalistic than those in power at present. Today, instead of having a ruling party talk in the terms described above, reference is made to "building our democracy", "developing a human rights culture", "levelling the playing field" and so on. One could conclude that the present discursive climate is one that is far more inclusive, less authoritarian, and more egalitarian (certainly in respect of other racial groups). This is not only true of South Africa, but the world-over.

However, one might also take this as evidence of Foucault's view of the functioning of disciplinary power in modern societies. As disciplinary technology becomes more refined and sophisticated - inserting itself (at the micro-level) into matters that were not previously under the control of any form of power - so the state can afford to sit back and present itself as both necessary and legitimate. The government doesn't need to "swing the rod" in an enlightened democratic order, as individuals regulate, monitor and correct themselves whenever there are signs of their thoughts (including unconscious ones) or behaviour not falling within the range of the normal. Normal, of course, being what is most rational and economically productive. As Adorno and Horkheimer put it so eloquently, the modern subject doesn't need a master - we are our own masters. In the process of attaining domination over the whole earth and all of nature, the modern subject has also (unknowingly) attained domination over his or her *own* nature. Governments

Related to this, one ought to consider the statement by Kobena Mercer that:

> "Identity only becomes an issue when it is crisis, when something assumed to be fixed, coherent and stable is displaced by the experience of doubt and uncertainty" (Mercer, 1990, p43).

This was certainly the case for the above participants. It would be true to say that they are "living on the boundary" in a very real sense. Their existence is precariously situated at the (lower) fringes of white society, and characterised by daily interaction with impoverished members of other races, who are perceived as being extremely threatening. Finally, in spite of all of the above, they are clearly aware of the new discourses about race and culture, as they would frequently make a clearly racist, "old South Africa" kind of statement, but then immediately qualify it by pointing out that whites do these things too. This was no doubt related to the interviewers presence (as discussed in the "problems" section above). They went to great lengths to portray themselves as decent, nice folk (as opposed to being hard-line right wingers), but were able to perpetuate racism by means of their frequently stated link between "problems, danger and decay" and "blacks". That is, *they* were not racists - it's just that blacks are so bad that one doesn't have any choice but to be honest and admit that blacks are *not* equal to whites after all. They are "not capable of coming up to the white man's [*sic*] standards". While this couple has been used to provide a graphic description of some of the mechanisms involved in this particular technique for producing and reproducing racist ideology, it is clear that this has nothing to do with them being Afrikaners, or working class, as this same device is exactly what is used throughout South African society, by all groups.

The middle class participants tended to be far more realistic in their assessments of the situation. They also expressed the notion that what they had done to other races over the past few decades was now being done to them. As one of them put it when discussing the "awakening" of the Afrikaners in the 1930's and 1940's:

> "Ek Die pad loop absolut die selfde pad as wat die nuwe Suid Afrika loop, waar 'n volk lank onderdruk was...of 'n nasie lank onderdruk was. Nou hier het ons te doen met verskillende volke, jy weet, met elf etniese tale en verskillendes wat nog nie ever ervaar is nie - soos Boesman, en , jy weet. Maar die punt is, wat ek net wil sê is... Dis presies die selfde geskiedenis - die wiel draai.. As enige mens enigsins reddelik of regdenkend is, dan moet jy erken - dat die wiel is besig om te draai. Die selfde stryd wat ons gestry het om *reg*. En om as 'n volk gesien te word, is ook noodwendig nou besig om homself af te speel teen opsig van die swa- volkere. En ek meen, dit is derhalwe 'n rede, een van die redes, waarom die Afrikaner op die sylyn..." (A).

The major difference being their suggested solution to the problem. What is also interesting in terms of identity, was the participants' statement that the under the former government she felt that they were her people, her government, her country - until it began to mix. Now, she states that she has no government, no white country - and nothing for herself. One could read this as being a literal statement of her former identification with the white government, people and country. She indicates clearly that this took place at a more personal, psychological level - because now that this situation no longer prevails, she has *nothing left for herself*. The personal dimension is further emphasised when she reports that blacks now even walk past her in the street and call her their "sweetheart". It is doubtful that this happens too often with her, given her general appearance, so the latter statement may be more of a perception of the situation, rather than something that happens all the time. Throughout the interview, this participant also referred constantly to personal hygiene matters, much of which was sexual in content.[16] Linked to Adorno and Horkheimer's arguments about projection and repression, one might conclude that this is a reflection of her own projected fantasies. That is, having repressed her own animal nature, she now sees elements of it reflected in an objectified image, or stereotype of blacks. Her hatred of blacks stems not only from the perceived physical threat that they pose to her (which may well be the case, given their precarious situation and relationship with their black neighbours - including squatters in the area), but represent a *psychological* threat, whereby her own "dark" side threatens to overwhelm her. Aside from the material obtained in the interview itself, it was evident that this particular couple were beset by a number of problems (aside from being poor), which might include alcohol abuse.

This couple produced the most overtly racist talk out of all the participants. One might attribute this to the emergence of anxieties that arise from the surfacing of m .erial that needs to be repressed (in order to function productively in the modern world), on the one hand, and the projection of these anxieties onto a clearly demarcated "other" that can become the focus of one's own self-loathing. Members of other racial groups are, of course, easily identifiable, especially when they tend to be of lower socio-economic status.

---

[16] For example, she relates how she catches blacks urinating outside her house. She describes how she knows everything that the black neighbours are up to because they talk so loudly. She stated that her neighbours planned on letting the next black intruder into their house find them busy having sexual intercourse, to "teach them a lesson". She repeatedly complained (in great detail) about how the blacks littered in the area, dirtied the toilets in the hospital where she was taken up and drank too much. This was all in the context of her statements to the effect that blacks were dangerous, murderous and a threat to her existence.

I: So you think that people are like that as well? The different races?
M: Ja...
I: And is this what a lot of the people you know think as well?
M: Ja.
I: So do you think that even if everybody went to the same schools, and had the same opportunities and everything, that there would still be big differences between us?
M: Ja, but they can build on it" (Appendix F, lines 37-44).

It was already argued in the "definition of terms" section, that the Afrikaans usage of the word *ras* to denote different *breeds* of dog spills-over into the conceptualisation of different types of people. These participants linked race with a biological notion that differentiated the human races, animal species (*rasse*) and plant species into a hierarchised structure - a great "chain of being".

6.2. Modern South Africa: The New vs the Old South Africa

It is clear that most of the participants presented themselves as being very pessimistic about the way that things were going in South Africa at present. This is linked primarily with the current crime and unemployment situation. The working class participants in particular stated that life was much better for them under the previous government. The following sample exemplifies some of their comments on this subject:

"F: Hy [her son] werk by die gevangenis...Hulle wou hom reeds gesteek met 'n mes by die werk. Daar is dit baie gevaarlik. Baie gevaarlik.
I: Wat van voor, sê nou 20 jaar gelede? Hoe was dit dan? Hoe was dit onder die vorige regering? Het jy gevoel dat dit *jou* regering was?
F: *Daar* kon jy gelewe het - *Beters!* - hahaha! [laughter]
F: Nou is dit net reip en verkragting, diefstal, hobos; Toe kon jy in die stad gebly het.
M: Moord en doodslag, werkloosheid - Hulle beplan nie 'n gesin nie. <?> Hulle dink nie daaraan dat die land word nie groter nie, die mense word meer, en oorbevolking, en werkloosheid neem toe., nê, dis logies, maar hulle dink nie daaraan nie.
F: En dan het die mense nie sonder werk gesit en daar was nie so hobos nie, twintig, dertig jaar terug nie. Nou volop, nou's hy heel volop <?>
M: Werkloosheid...
F: Toe kon jy *reg* in die stad gebly het.
M: Die werkloosheid, veral onder die blankes neem baie toe. Nou sit hulle 'n swarte in - of hy die werk kan doen of nie, 'n swarte moet daar wees.
I: En sê my, in daai tyd, daar was mos 'n wit regering, nê? Nou het julle gevoel dit was jou regering wat jou belangstelle in agting gehad het?
F: Ja, eindelik ja, dit was *my* mense, dit was *my* regering, dit was *my* land gewees...tot dit nou begin het om te "mix" het. Nou het ek nie 'n regering nie, ek het nie 'n wit land nie, ek het niks vir myself nie. Want die blerrie ding hy loop hier langs die pad en sê: "Hullo my liefling!" . <?>...
M: Nee, Ek dink die probleem is ook, die wit mense moes, toe hulle die land ingekom het, moes hulle die swarte al meer geleer het, jy weet. Hulle moes meer opvoeding gegee het...
F: ...Maar ek dink hierdie probleme van ons het begin toe hulle vir Nelson Mandela uit die tronk verlaat het - het dinge begin skeef...dis *tog* so, *baie* mense praat daaroor!
M: Ryk. Verwoord het die regte idee gehad...voor hulle hom dood gemaak het...Kyk daai Swarte, dis sy land daai, en hy kan hier werk in die Wit man se land. En die Wit man kan in daai land gaan werk as hy wil. Maar, die Swarte het sy *eie* land en sy eie regering...." (G).

One can immediately notice that their concerns are no different to those being expressed generally in the media today amongst all classes of South Africans (of all races).

reflected in the comments above that "in some cases you get Afrikaners who are far more British than even English South Africans" (A). It also links in with what was said in interview (B) about the existence of Afrikaners who are very "snobbish" and "haughty". What is also evident from the above is the participants' ambiguous relation to the English. That is, while deferring to them as culturally superior, they nevertheless express hatred for them because of past injustices. One might go further in this regard and argue that a similar situation exists in South African today where blacks' attitudes towards whites are concerned. On the one hand, they reject all that is perceived to be Eurocentric or Westernised, yet at the same time aspire to all the material values associated with them.

Suffice it to say that the extract from interview F above reflects, at the very least, the tendency to ascribe individuals' identities on the basis of their national character, as is one with reference to the Americans. This comes out particularly clearly later in the same interview with this individual, when he states that:

> "I: Wat dink jy is die verskil tussen Wit mense en Swart mense?
> M: Wel, dis nogal moeilik om te verduidelik. maar, ek meen, vat nou byvoorbeeld 'n herderse skaaphond, ne, Jy kan hom selfs 'n paar dae na gebore van sy ma wegvat, maar sy sal die selfde kenmerke het, en die selfde optree en alles. Dit is soos ingeprint in sy onderbuwussyn. Maar, so dink ek is ook so met die swartes. Dis in hulle onderbuwussyn, hulle's omtrent drie honderd jaar agter ons, en hulle manier van denke is nie op die selfde vlak as ons wittes nie. Ek meen, dis vir hulle moeilik om op te tree in 'n moderne wereld, en dis 'n bietjie moeilik om dit te aanvaar" (F).

The black "nation" is here imbued with this personality trait. It is even stressed that if the influence of negative socialisation is removed, the trait will still be there. Immediately striking, is the participants claim that "the fact that it is difficult for blacks to function in a modern world is *difficult to accept*", as it implies a paternalistic attitude, as one would have towards badly behaved children. The last phrase also tends to suggest that the participant, in answering the question about the difference between blacks and whites, is answering: "Their unacceptable behaviour makes me dislike them, compared to whites".

What is also significant about the above extracts is that the conflation of race and character is also reflected in the HAT definition of the Afrikaans term *nas*. The same applies to the analogy with the sheepdog - whose herding behaviour is imprinted before birth, so that even if the puppy is socialised without it's family, it will still grow up to display herding behaviour. The participant in interview E also used an animal metaphor to describe the difference between blacks and whites as being the same relation as that between a "pit bull terrier" and a "pavement special", as follows:

> "M: Its like the difference between a pit bull, and a pavement special.

I: Was daar voorheen gewees?
M: Ja, seker, hulle was baie konserwatief, baie kerk toe gegaan, hulle, was baie teruggetrokke" (F).

In this and other interviews, one is able to see that the participants all know the scripts and schemata that relate to being Afrikaans. Yet at the same time a refusal of the stereotype is evident in this sample. This participant felt that many Afrikaners have moved away from the "old ways of thinking" and are now "becoming more like the Americans". His views also reflected an anti-British bias, which one could relate to the negative information that he received during his socialisation about the ways in which the British treated the Afrikaners. Being "African" also carried negative associations for him, as he regarded Africans as being backward and unsophisticated. On the other hand, the United States represented freedom and even (economic) power. His solution was to feel an affinity with (white) American culture, rather than his own or that of the British. Even though this individual states that he does not identify with the older type of Afrikaner, it remains there as an available subject position. He has internalised the script as part of his socialisation and enculturation. The identification with being English is an interesting phenomenon, as in some of the other interviews (A and B) the participants speak of the English in terms that suggest admiration. However, this is more related to the English as they were in the past. For example, one of the participants described the influence of the British on the development of the "Afrikaans nation" in the earlier part of this century as follows:

> "Die Britte was oorwinnaars, die Britte was die oorheersers, die mense wat oorgeneem het, en hulle waardes is absoluut, in sommige gevalle is sekere Afrikaners veel meer Brits as wat selfs die Engelse in Suid Afrika is..." (A).

The participant in interview F (cited above) stated that he thought that the English are more open-minded, but that they were also more "slap gat". One might tentatively suggest that a social hierarchy exists in the minds of some of the participants. It starts with the "mature nations", such as the Germans, Dutch and English, followed (or equalled) by the powerful developed nations (the United States, Australia, etc.), followed by the new struggling, emerging nations (the Afrikaners, the Jews, the Catalans in Spain), followed by the Coloureds and Indians, and at the bottom of the hierarchy, the blacks. This however, was not established clearly in the interviews so remains in the realm of speculation. There would in any case be a lot of ambivalence about the status of the modern English South Africans, who tend perhaps to be regarded more along the lines of being "slap gat" (ref. interview F) - a term that implies "slack, unprepared, lazy, disorganised, without will or spirit, sloppy and weak" (translated from HAT). This is also

country, regardless of how badly the situation deteriorated. Examples of this can be found in interview D (appendix D, lines 92-107), as well as in interview C (appendix C, line 11)

6.1.6. Afrikaner identity as "lost"

Another common theme that emerged in the interviews, especially amongst the younger participants, was the notion that Afrikaners used to have an identity, and a cohesiveness, but that this is no longer the case.

> "I: Wat dink jy is 'n tipiese Afrikaner?
> M: Hulle is baie selfsugtig, en dink net aan hulle self. 'n Self-centered persoon. Just thinks about himself
> I: En, dink jy, voel baie Afrikaanse mense dat dit die geval is deesdae?
> M: Ja, baie voel so. Afrikaners het meskien hulle identiteit verloor. Want hulle wil wegbreek van hulle ou konserwatiewe agtergronde, maniere van dink.
> I: En dink jy daar's 'n verskil tussen "moderne" Afrikaners en tradisionele ene?
> M: Ja, daars groot verskil. Die ou Afrikaners is meer aan die kerk verbonde, en hulle manier van denke is meer beperk, terwyl die nuwe Afrikaners is meer Europieers. [265] Hulle dink verder.
> I: En watter van die twee groepe is in die meerderheid?
> M: Nee, ek dink die nuwe Afikaner is besig om toe te neem Hulle, die ou identiteit is besig om verlore te....
> I: Wat meen jy omtrent die " ou maniere" ens. ?
> M: Die ou manier van denk...soos, ...um,...hulle seksuele denke, al hulle denke verskil van die nuwe Afrikaners. Die nuwe Afrikaners is baie meer open minded. Hulle is, ek meen, baie van hulle gebruik dwelms, en dinge is besig om heltemaal te verander, as vroeer jare, toe mense net kerk toe gegaan het....
> I: En, dink jy die Afrikaners is 'n aparte ras?
> M: Wel, hulle is eintlik 'n mengemoes van baie verskillende msse. Hulle het, ek dink hulle ...die ou Afrikaners was basies soos die Hollanders en Duitsers gewees.
> I: En die nuwes?
> M: Nuwes? Die nuwes is besig om soos Amerikaners te word. [327]" (F).

This sample demonstrates the fluid nature of subject positioning, which changes in time and from one individual to the next. The tendency to ascribe individuals' identities on the basis of their national character is also evident. In this context the participant is discussing his own group (Afrikaners), and how they differ from or are similar to Germans, Netherlanders, Americans and the British. It will be shown in subsequent sections how this linking of individual character and nation can have important ideological effects, particularly as regards the relationship between race and character. The above conversation continued as follows:

> I: Sal jy sê Afrikaners het trots in hulle ras, en hulle kultuur en so aan?
> M: Wel, dit hang af, dit hang af hoe jy groot gewoon het. Daar kan dalk Afrikaners wees wat, ook patesies is...
> I: Maar op die algemeen...die mense wie , [illegible]?
> M: Wel, die meeste mense begin nou Engels word.
> I: Dink jy dis mense van die hoër klas wat nou begin, sê nou, fancy te word?
> M: Ja dalk, seker.
> I: En die res van hulle? Die gewone Afrikanse mense?
> M: Ag, ek weet nie. Daar is nie meer 'n identiteit soos voorheen nie. Daars eintlik nie meer karakter eienskappe nie.
> I: Van Afrikaners?
> M: Mm

F2: Hulle wou, en hull't nie gewen nie. Hulle's in hulle dinges...en tien teen een, onskuldig...En *daar* kom die probleem, ek meen, even as jy ultra Afrika word, as wit mense, dit gaan jy nog*niks* in die sak bring nie.
F1: Nee, <?>
I: As jy wat vir Afrika?
F2: As jy Afrika *word*. As jy word vir die swart mense, as jy totally "liberal" word, dit gaan jou *absolutely* niks in die sak bring nie, anyway
F1: Wreedheid, *hulle* tiepe wreedheid.
I: Is that like revenge, or what?
F2: I think it's power. I think it's power power power. The more you can, hoe meer iemand kan bang wees vir jou, hoe meer... <?>" (B).

Variations of this kind of talk has become very popular in South Africa today. For example, many of the newspapers feature cartoons where middle class whites sit around their sumptuously laden dinner tables, discussing how bad things have got in South Africa, their intentions to emigrate, *etc.* According to theorists like Van Dijk (1987), Wetherell and Potter (1992), it is necessary to consider what the possible functions of such talk are. However, one must first recognise that the talk referred to above is based on real fears and the real-life experiences of the participants - rather than the kinds of imaginary phenomena that may be true of Van Dijk's work in the United States and the Netherlands, and Wetherell and Potter's work in New Zealand, where this kind of talk is usually based on urban legends and folk theories about blacks' nature. Nevertheless, it does still have the effect of reproducing racism in society. While many of the (particularly middle class) respondents show that they are sensitive to the fact that black impoverishment and the consequent high crime rate is a direct result of the practices of exclusion of the past, they are nevertheless still unable to separate out these historically specific behaviours from what they perceive as being a universal black trait, or essence, that will always be there. Instead of talking about criminals and murderers, regardless of race, they speak simply of "blacks". On the other hand, and just as importantly as far as the racialisation of society goes, certain representatives of the present government play the same game, working from within the logic of race - by replying to complaints about crime by making reference to "white racists who are unable to accept that they now have to live with the same problems as the blacks". This in turn, has the effect of interpellating whites to, recognise themselves as being part of that group of "white racists who used to oppress the blacks and now want to cling to their privileges".

Related to the above, was the frequently cited fear of extinction. That is, most of the participants from the lower class held a very pessimistic view of the future for themselves and the country in general. They also insisted that they would not leave the

"normalisation" of the general population, and to thus subject them to the economically useful activities that are required by advanced industrial economies. This normalisation is a mammoth task that could only be carried out successfully if every individual were to regulate *themselves*. The fact that certain "nations of less value" exist around the world (within all the valuable ones) would almost be a literal interpretation of Foucault's argument that certain phenomena are not economically *productive*. An essential part of this package is to draw a link between "economic inactivity, value-lessness" on the one hand and "deviance, moral degeneracy" on the other, so that the general population can be made to feel *guilty* about having no economic value. The same kind of underlying forces operate in the statement by one of the participants in interview B, where she says that "going 'Africa' and trying to be ultra-liberal to help the blacks will leave you with *nothing in the pocket*."

In the above example, the normalisation is taking place at the level of countries and civilisations. This is reflected in the current wave of confidence in the performance of the "Western" economies, including those in the "Far East". The business indexes have never looked this good, and international organisations now have the *moral* justification for putting pressure on third world countries to get their houses in order and implement austerity measures (structural adjustment) that will bring them in line with the rest of the world. Recently, President Daniel Arap Moi of Kenya condemned the International Monetary Fund (IMF) for what he termed "political interference" in the affairs of his government (SABC 3 Television News, 4/8/1997). This followed their announcement of the suspension a two million dollar aid package, on the grounds that his government was too beset by corruption. It could be argued that the same underlying (normalisation) dynamics are in operation that were identified in the sample of interview F above. The situation is one where the white IMF is having problems with "blacks stealing their money again". The weight of truth, justice and morality are brought to bear on Moi - the President of a "backward and undeveloped (immature) nation" - a "nation of little value" where "helping them will get you nothing in the pocket" - and, at worst, "a knife in the back". It also demonstrates the shift from coercive colonial authority to modern disciplinary power, where guilt at one's moral failures is supposed to bring about conformity.

However, this project remains a critique of the existing power relations, and does not go on to suggest any alternatives. For example, in criticising the implementation of

M: Nee, ek dink dis so oraal in die wereld. Ek meen, daars groot kolonies in Amerika van swartes, in Engeland, en in Frankryk, en ek meen, die mense in daai lande voel presies die selfde oor hulle. Alhoewel dit nie in die wet so gesê word soos ons in hierdie land gedaan het nie. Tree die mense *presies* die selfde teenoor die swartes ook.

I: Hoekom? Want hulle's agteruit of wat?

M: Ja, hulle's net, hulle's heltemaal, hulle kan nie op die selfde *vlak* kom waar ons is. Vat elke land in die wêreld. Elke land het 'n minderwaardige rasie In New Zeeland is daar die Maoris, in Australia is dit die Aboriginies, en ek meen, vat Amerika, daar is dit Latin Americans en die Negers. En ek meen, vat Duitsland, hulle't nou probleme met die Turke. Elke land het, dit gebeur net so, en in Suid Afrika het dit dieselfde gebeur. Engiste verskil wat hier was, ons het dit *uittig* gemaak.

I: So hierdie minderwaardige rasies in die ander lande, en in Suid Afrika, jy voel dis meskien omdat hulle dit sommer nie kan doen nie. Hulle's nie, hulle het dit nie *in* hulle om beskaafd te wees?

M: Nee, hulle's vas gevang in 'n *kultuur* wat te ver agter is...Dis te moeilik om vir hulle op die selfde vlak te kom" (I).

One is able to read a lot into these statements. Whites are presented as being the bearers of a universal culture and civilisation, having brought enlightenment and development into darkest Africa. They are presented as having had to contend with blacks' destruction, theft and greed and selfishness. These traits match those listed in the section that examines the issue of blacks as children. The participant relates how the white people went out into the new world in heroic fashion and (from nothing) initiated the processes that resulted in their countries becoming the richest and most powerful in the world. These processes would include hard work, thrift, self-control and self-discipline, as opposed to abandoning oneself to sensory pleasures (animal lusts), deviance and depravity. Blacks, on the other hand, are portrayed as being incapable of trying anything out or being able to build anything up. They are stuck in time in an uncivilised culture that is unable to develop any further and will never come right. They don't have inquiring minds, as one of the other participants put it (cited elsewhere), so will never advance.

The participant then goes on to say that this is the case all over the world, and that the only difference between *apartheid* South Africa and the rest of the world is that the former made laws about it. The argument tends to suggest that because blacks are so bad and uncivilised, everybody all over the world hates them too. It also has the effect of serving as a justification for *apartheid* policies and racism in general. Blacks are "incapable" of moving forward, and they are a burden to development for the advanced white people.

Another point that one could make in respect of the above, regards the statement to the effect that "Every country has an inferior nation." The English word "inferior" is not a direct equivalent to the Afrikaans "minderwaardig". However, the Afrikaans word actually fits in better with Foucault's ideas on the functioning of disciplinary power in modern societies. According to his view, the aim of disciplinary power is the

in the interview sample above, are constrained to think and act within the present discursive regime. In this context, they are indeed enlightened, and are not racists. Yet it might be argued that a problem for all enlightened people is the question of how to deal with those who are not. This is particularly true if one's definition of enlightenment is related to phenomena that are particular to ones own cultural group. In this case one will by definition refer to others as unenlightened, backward or barbaric. Middle class whites are likely to have the advantage of having certain "universal" values in common. These values would be those that are most likely to result in economic success, for example, the instrumental reason that goes with enlightenment. What disguises ethnocentrism and xenophobia in middle class whites therefore, is the appeal to universal values, based on what is rational and that brings success in an industrialised economy. One is unable to step outside of the system and view others in the light of their own histories and cultures - as this would result in the situation where one has to appeal to the "irrational". Once again, perhaps the only way out is to appeal to the aesthetic dimension, that not linked directly to the existing order in a relation of domination.

6.4.2. *Black culture and history as defective, backward and stagnant*

Related to the above is the perception that many of the problems faced by blacks today are as a result of their culture, which was either stagnant or backward to begin with. Once again, this rests on the assumption that white culture is advanced in all ways above the rest, having pursued the one right course open for development so that it is now mature and advanced. According to this view, failure to meet the high standards set by whites means that there is something defective or pathological built into the other cultures. One of the participants reflected a diverse number of views very concisely as follows:

> "M: Ja, ek meen, wat die swart mense in Afrika, die hele Afrika is nou heltemaal 'n vakop. Daar is absolut niks nie. As dit nie sir die Wit man was wat daar aangekom het nie van oorsee af, sou dit nou nog die selfde gewees as wat dit 400 500 jaar terug was. Ek meen, Suid Afrika is die mees developde land in die hele Afrika. Seker nok die naikste land in Afrika. As dit nie vir die wit mense was, sal ons glad nie eers hier gewees nie. Ek meen, die swartes vat net advantage, um, hulle, ek meen, as jy nou in 'n fabriek sit, sal hulle jou bankiet steel. Vir hulle om eirs al te breek is niks nie. Dis net om vir hulle self te gain. I hulle gee niks vir mekaar om nie. I hulle's baie selfsugtig.
>
> I: So jy dink dat wit mense, dit was eintlik nodig om...
>
> M: Ja wel, kyk net wat die wittes gedoen het in Amerika. Ek meen, hulle't Amerika eers in die ...dis seker een van die baste lande wat ontdek is. En kyk hoe ver is Amerika ontwikkel. Die hele land is opgebou deur wit manse. Dis nou een van die grootste ekonomiese lande in die wereld. Ek meen, Europa is die selfde, en Australia en New Zealand. Dis...swartes kan net niks probeer, en niks opbou nie....[60] Dalk is swartes reds so, hulle is dalk was gehak in tyd. I hulle kultuur kan dalk nie meer groei nie, en hulle's, hulle's so oud. Jaad dat hulle net nooit sal ryksom nie.
>
> I: Is dit so oral in die wereld, of net in Afrika, of hoe bedoel jy?

P1: Wil oorneem, of...jy weet, wil neu die"goodies" nou weer hê, die groorste aandeel in die kook, en..." (B).

One could immediately establish a link between this and Foucault's ideas about the shift to *disciplinary* power and the imperative to send the unproductive and weak to surrogate homes. Previously (under a more coercive regime, using repressive technology) the "adult" Afrikaners took an active part in the "upliftment" of the black "children". Now, however, the blacks are supposed to take care of themselves - they are now "grown-ups", yet they continue to behave in a way that fills the participants with despair. As she puts it, they would *like* to help, but most of them don't know how to *go to work* on this. One could link this further with the domestic regime (still in operation) whereby many middle class females would each have had "their own" black domestic worker (the maid, or *meid*) living-in. This arrangement often included constant surveillance of the black female's private life. For example, there were strict rules that forbade her to drink or smoke, or to entertain guests in her room on the premises. She would frequently be strictly forbidden to use the same crockery or cutlery as "the family". The penetration into the domestic worker's life was often also extended late into the night, as she was invited to join the family to watch television. This facilitated her normalisation, as she could be integrated into most of the families activities in an ostensibly enlightened way, but always as a servant.

It is difficult for them to understand why the blacks don't want their help, because it is abundantly clear to them that "blacks are not up to standard" and "incapable of getting it right" - as they witnessed their "*meid's*" daily errors, transgressions and failings. The participants find it difficult to deal with the way that "blacks are always blaming others for their situation". They feel that blacks should take responsibility for themselves now, assuming that there is no structurally-based inequality, and that as the Afrikaners did for themselves, so should the blacks build themselves up. This kind of talk sends a punitive message to non-productive blacks to step in line, and talk their places as responsible, normal adults.

The significance of this for Foucault was not merely to make an historical point. It is rather to demonstrate that the entire epistemological framework on which modern psychology (for example) is based is still rooted in the repression of the "abnormal", unproductive or useless. At the same time, modern subjects, such as the middle class couple

insane, sick, thieves and murderers. In the new world, on the other hand, they were simply classed as "animals" and killed, or enslaved.

Later, in the mid-eighteenth century, the birth of the age of humanitarianism in Europe was marked by Pinel and Tuke's reforms. The insane were sent to separate institutions where they could be rehabilitated. He argues that what was taking place was precisely the shift to the modern form of power - where the insane were sent to somewhat of a substitute family, where the aim was to cure them. The technique was to introduce a regime of self-monitoring, of rewards and punishments - and endless procedures for *repression, moralisation* and *normalisation*, which were achieved by making the madmen feel guilty about their moral degeneracy. Where in Europe, the unproductive were subsequently confined under more humanitarian circumstances, in the new world they stopped killing the "natives" and "emancipated" the slaves. Their humanitarian confinement was maintained through repressive technology as administered by the Colonial administrations around the world (for example, to normalise the "savages" and turn out "little Englishmen", or "little Afrikaners") - a technology that South Africa was among the last to abandon in favour of the current disciplinary technology proper.

The participants' perceptions of their role in the present context proved to be a fruitful avenue of inquiry, as the following extract from interview B shows:

> "F2: Ja, maar die ding is, daar is soveel *haat* dink ek, verstaanbare haat met die swartes. Ek weet nie hoeveel reuse gaan dit vat!
> I: Haat, *in* die swart mense, of teenoor die swart mense?
> F2: Ja, swart mense teenoor die wittes. Want ek weet nie eintlik hoe lank dit gaan vat om dit van hulle *uit* te kry nie.
> F1: Ek weet nie of dit *haat* is nie...
> F2: *Ja!*
> F1: ...of *wantrou*.
> F2: Ek kan nou vir ma sê, as ek sit in die nag en werk en ek hoor net "iwhites" vyftig maal 'n nag!
> F1: Iwhites! Iwhites [laughter]
> F2: Enige ding, ek noem, daars ingedore haat. Hulle haat ons vir alles wat nie reg is nie.
> F1: Mmm. Soos elke probleem wat nuut opkom, is dit vir hulle van Kolonialisme af, en daai tiepe ding.
> F2: Of *whatever*, wat aan hulle gemeen is.
> ...
> F1: [327] Ja, jy sien, daai kinderjare, jy weet. Dit is nie dat *hulle* enige gevaal het nie. Dit is wat einmand *anders* op hulle opgedwing het" (B).
> "F1: Maar die meeste Afrikaners het nog nie vir hulself uitgemaak wat hulle *doel* is, met die swartes nie. Watter aandeel *hulle* moet neem. In die opheffing van die swartes, om hulle te help om die naad te regeer nie, jy weet? Dink almal sit nou terug en wag.
> F2: Maar die ding is, ma, ek dink nie Afrikaners *kan* veel doen, *regtig*.
> F1: Ja, ja, daai soort gevoel van waanhoop, mens*wil* help, maar die meeste mense weet nie presies *hoe* om te werk te gaan.
> F2: Ja, daar is te veel wantrou en haat, ek sê jou, Um...
> I: So as hulle probeer om te help, dan sal dit in die verkeerde manier gevat word, dat hulle wil inmeng, of...?

M: Daar was 'n onmiddelike apartheid daar...
P: 'n *Onmiddellike* apartheids begrip, van *ons*, en *hulle*.

One of the possible functions of the section that acknowledges the diversity and rough nature of the early *Voortrekkers* is to present them as simple folk, who were very ordinary. This emphasises that they were not a privileged elite who exploited those less fortunate around them. Then, using a vocabulary of liberation similar to what we are accustomed to today, with phrases like: "flight from oppression", "a free people", "rebels", "rise up against suffering, general oppression and conquest" - they nevertheless slip into a romanticised version whereby these ordinary, pure folk are threatened by the heathens and barbarians. This is also related to the Israelites of the old Testament, along with the biblical injunction to destroy the heathens. The above participants make it clear that they distance themselves from the Christian-heathen dichotomy they refer to, and at every moment demonstrate their sensitivity to and awareness of the new *verligtheid* about racial matters. They make it clear that they now know better what they did in their youth, and from what their forefathers knew centuries ago. As a well established, middle class couple, they report feeling comfortable working and interacting with members of other racial groups. However, they will only tolerate "civilised standards" of behaviour. Yet even this injunction is tempered by their reported knowledge that blacks "have so many problems today because of the way that we treated them". Their interview data thus serves as a fine example of the sanitised talk mentioned by Van Dijk (1987), and Wetherell and Potter (1992). Yet this is not to suggest that their sanitised talk is consciously employed by the participants to hide a real racism deep-down inside (that they are aware of). To view the participants' talk in this way would perhaps be to fall prey to the current tendency to debase the concept of racism itself by labelling anyone who dissents from one as racist. Eventually its usefulness as an analytic tool is diminished as those who harbour real prejudice against other groups are lumped with those who do not. This is where recourse to the broader picture becomes necessary.

The context of the above sample can be related to the seventeenth century (Classical age) situation, as described by Foucault, where anyone who fell outside of the realm of reason was sent to prison. A similar situation prevailed in Europe at the time, with squalid living conditions, unemployment and vagrancy being rife. Those locked away included anyone who was basically not economically productive - those who were poor,

present is met with yet another justification: "Well, if we Afrikaners could stand together and pull ourselves up, then why can't the blacks? Must be something defective in their culture!".

The account discussed above also leaves out a lot of historical detail, and tends to lend credence to O'Meara's account of the selective remembering and forgetting that was encouraged by the Malanites in their efforts to fragment the working class in the 1920's and 1930's. For example, much of the evidence about the Voortrekkers suggests that they were a very rough and uncouth bunch. Much of the evidence also makes it clear that they intermarried with other races (or at least had sexual relations with them). The participant also showed elsewhere that he was fully conversant with these facts, for example he states that:

> M: Ok, jy vra, "wat is 'n volk?" 257 'n Volk is Hollanders, Duitsers. 'n *verbastering* nog met die slawe uit Malei [Malasia]. 'n Baie bruin bloed in ons aare. < <?< > > said that we were beginning to admit that during the apartheid years...baie het gemeng! En *horrible* stories wat daarmee [gebeur het]" (A).

...and the couple in this interview later also state that:

> F: "...en dit is grond waarvoor hy, jy weet, geweldig hard geveg het - as jy net kyk vir die trekkers se *paaie* - deur die Baviaanspoort, oor die Drakensberge, jy weet, deur die vlaktes van die Karoo...172
> M: Hulle't maar altyd weg gevlug van die...
> F: Oorheersing!
> M: Hollandse *en* die Engelse...
> F: Hulle wou dit nie gehad het nie. Hulle was in die red [?] 'n vrye, 'n *vry* klomp mense.
> M: Ja, ook 'n klomp rebelle...
> F: En rebelle, en 'n mens moenie weg skrum van die veit, dat hulle gekom het van oral oor - a *very* mixed bunch of people. Daar was dié wat gegloo het, wat gevlug het vir hulle godsdiens ...
> M: ...die Hugenote...
> F: Die Hugenote, maar daar was ook *dié* wat op skepe gesit is - soos in Australia, en soos in Amerika, as gevolg van, van misdrywe en, jy weet, ensovoorts ensovoorts - and its a mish-mash of people who were forged together *as a people* by suffering and by a *general* meerdruking en oorheersing van 'n volk wat hulle gevoel het wat geen *bestaansreg* hier het nie. En derhalwe moes hulle daar teen oproer [?]!
> M: Ja, en nou kan 'n mens nou ook net byvoeg...maar ek sit en praat as of jy niks weet....maar al hierdie goed van hierdie mish-mash en ...het te doen ook met seker probleme van die swartes se kant af - die "kafflroorloë". So op die ou end kry jy tog maar 'n wit - swart ding. Godsdienst, ons is die Protestante, die Rooms Katolieke, ...jy weet, die Hugenoote het gevlug vir hulle godsdiens...en jy kry hierdie soort van band tussen hulle bestaan want *ons* is *Protestants*. Of Rooms Katolieks selfs as hulle wil, want dis nog steeds Christendom. Teenoor, die Khoi, die San en die swartman, wat 'n *barbaar* is, nê. Die godsdiens maak so groot 'n kloof daar dis ongelooflik! Dit is eindlik die eerste groot kloof. We are Christians - ons is Christene, dis heidene. Dan dink jy aan die bybel, die ou testament nê? Ons is baie ou testamenties nê? Ons mense...Israeliete..lees die ou testament, jy weet, daai ding van "heidene" - "barbaare". Die opdrag om die heidene uit te rooi. Ons het die Boesman uitgerooi - jy weet dit self! Ons het hulle uit geskiet nê! 200 Uitvermoor, hulle het hulle met die masels uitvermoor!
> F: Ja, maar kyk nou net na die basies begrip van, ek meen, jy sien mense wat naak rondloop, en jy kom van 'n erg Kalvinistiese agtergrond waar vrouens hulle toe maak - dis 'n sonde, basies om jou arms of selfs jou nek te toon. Dit gaan, dis 'n siekliese ding [cyclic] waar dit op een stadium, heeltemaal aanvaar word om boesems kaal te bloot, word dit *net* 'n paar jaar later - word dit 'n ding van toemaak, van toeskil, en dan kom jy hierso in jou toegeskilte era, en jy *ontmoet* hierdie mense wat *heidene* is volgens hulle denke. Hulle liggame ontbloot, wat nie jou taal praat nie, wat nie die God ken wat jy ken nie, wat nie die God aan bid in die selfde manier wat jy aan hom bid...

By this logic, *apartheid* was entirely reasonable - the response of the civilised and advanced races to the ocean of darkness that surrounded them. Desperate measures were called for, as the pure, superior race's existence was threatened on all sides. These views have literally been set in stone - at the Voortrekker Monument in Pretoria. Images of a small, courageous group of God-fearing, noble Afrikaners are set in large marble friezes on the walls. The noble beings are at every turn betrayed and threatened by the barbarians (who are portrayed as disgusting, treacherous and terrifying)[21]. One of the more benign and sophisticated (middle class) accounts put it:

> "M: Ons is Christene! *En* jy weet, nou wil ek noem - daar's so baie om te sê, dat hierdie verskil tussen Christene-Heiden, né, toe hierdie mense hier gekom het, en die Boesman, die San, die Khoi gevind het, en die Stranlopers...I let hierdie mense hier gekom en hulle was Christene, en die groot verskil destyds was nie 'n taal verskil nie, dit was 'n *Godsdiens* verskil. "Ons glo in die Enige God as Protestante, en daai mense het nog nooit gehoor van God....of so het hulle gedink, so het hulle *gedink*! En hulle het niks omgegee oor wat daai mense gegloo het, en wat hulle godsdiens is...they're not interested... Like what the Spaniards did in South America - the conquistadores - they just *ruined* everything that those *immense* civilisations built up. Jy weet dit tog nie, hulle't alles vernietig daarso, en die kerk, *en* die Rooms Katolieke kerk. Kyk, they weren't Afrikans! They were the *barbarians*. So to these people, these people -the Khoi, the San, the Xhosa, they were *barbarians* - heidene!
> F: And once again, you have the language barrier, separating the one from the other so that they don't understand or acknowledge ..." (A).

While admitting the destruction of entire civilisations, and the lack of sensitivity on the part of the Afrikaner pioneers, the account is still arguably having the *effect* of justifying the deeds that were committed. Firstly, the account presents the early Voortrekkers as being devoutly religious "folk" who are confronted with a situation that they had no means to understand. Secondly, it wasn't only them - even the Roman Catholic church condoned what was done in South America. One of the possible ideological effects that sympathetic historical justifications (such as the one above) might have is to imply that the error was in the past. Although they committed these errors in the past, it was excusable because they didn't know any better. It is thus accepted that an error was made, but at the same time little or no recognition of the present injustices is demonstrated. Any talk of the present is focused on crime, violence and the murderous hate the blacks are felt to have for white people. So even though they "made mistakes" in the past, the present is a different story because "the blacks have got so bad that you can't help hating them". Any talk of structural inequalities and institutional racism in the

---

[21] An obvious example being the portrayal of Dingaan, who has a young warrior kneeling at his feet with his hands raised to Dingaan as if in supplication. It is pointed out very clearly though, that the young warrior is there to act as Dingaan's spittoon. Perhaps one should contrast this with the elegant brass spittoon that can be found discreetly positioned next to President Kruger's favourite chair in his house in Church Street, Pretoria.

this sample, one is able to see devices he employs to justify his real view that "blacks aren't up to standard":

> "I: Do you think blacks are born different. Do you think it's something in-bred?
> M: I don't believe that they are inferior. They can be equal, but, they must learn to accept what they've been taught, maybe it comes from feeling inferior. But its not. *We've* been taught, *they* must be taught. So its for *them* to realise.
> [tape fades out]
> ..And what we know, they know.
> I: So its like they just haven't had the opportunities. Do you think that if they had the same opportunities as us that there would be very little difference? Or would there still be like, some difference?
> M: ...Can they cope? ...They must ask themselves if they can cope. Before they accuse us...they must ask themselves if they can cope.
> I: Cope? In what way do you mean cope, like with what sort of stuff?
> M: If they can bring themselves to the standards where we are.
> I: Ja..
> M: What we do...can they do? I mean. Can they bring themselves up to our standards? From the education system [tape fades out]. Bring *them* up to where we are, don't drop the white education. Bring the black children *up* to the white education. The way I feel, hey, my standard 8 is their standard 6, you see? Now that's not right. Let him go and write the same education as I wrote, and get the same marks as I got, then he will be equal. He must be equal. If *he* becomes equal, it must work *both* ways" (E).

Two contradictory elements are contained in this extract. The participant starts out by insisting that "we are all equal" - but then goes on to say that blacks are inferior. That is, *he* doesn't have a problem with them personally, but the unfortunate reality, his rhetorical question suggests, is that they have brought all their problems on themselves. It is also important to note that his views are based on a number of assumptions. Firstly, the existing social order is treated as a "fact". There are absolute standards of education "out there" that are not in dispute. Following his argument, whites went to the trouble to master the repertoire and so now blacks ought to do the same. What is also implied is that because blacks have failed to do this, they are not worthy of being regarded as his equals. While he bases his argument here on meritocratic principles - whereby we can all be equal if we work at it, the fundamental injustices built into the system are completely ignored, both historically and in terms of the present arrangements.

The examples provided above demonstrate the manner in which ideology functions to legitimate the existing social order. White cultural superiority is a taken for granted to be an undisputed "fact" - an unalterable and universal part of nature. The course that Western civilisation has taken is treated as being the standard - the golden road to advancement. The participants show this conflation of contingent social arrangements with what is natural and timeless, for example, with their references to "childlike by nature". From this assumption, one can then go on to judge all other peoples and cultures by this yardstick, find them lacking and thus justify one's beliefs in one's own superiority.

productive existence). The effect therefore, of religious beliefs in this context, is to act as a projected Super-Ego - a projection of the guilt that is felt at the breaking of socially established taboos. This can also be related to Foucault's concept of disciplinary power, as individuals punish themselves psychically for transgressions. With the modern form of power, the state has no need to intervene juridically to keep the races apart. The participants above felt from within that racial purity was normal, natural, and ordained by God. To transgress would be abnormal, unnatural and sinful.

6.4. Black Attitudes and Behaviour Presented as Problematic

6.4.1. Blacks as Childlike, irresponsible, dependant, destructive and dangerous

One of the more central themes that emerged, was the perception that blacks were childlike and dependent. As one of the participants put it:

> "F1: Wel ek persoonlik beskou hulle as kinders, ewige kinders. En in dié opsig, rasisties gehoude kinders. Jy weet, ek dink hulle kan *verskriklik* baie vermag, as hulle soos kinders, (Jy het dit ook een keer gese [F2:] as hulle van alle...soos 'n skool waar die kinders regtig goed doen in skool en so. Kan jy maar lees in al die artikels - die ouers het hulle bygestaan, die onderwysers het hulle bygestaan, die gemeenskap het hulle bygestaan, jy weet, hulle is verskriklik geboost. En het hulle alles wat elke mens het, hulle kan akademies en op elke gebied net so goed doen, maar hulle instelling is nog soos natuurkinders, jy weet. mense moet vir *my* dinge doen. Hulle't nie baie ondersoekende geeste nie. Jy weet. Hulle sal verteer wat vir hulle gegee word, maar uiteraard gaan hulle nie die reel ontdek nie" (B).

A number of points can be made in respect of the above. The participant lays emphasis on the fact that she feels that this childishness is a *racially determined* feature - one that can not be altered through socialisation. She also emphasises what she considers to be a tendency of blacks to expect others to always do things *for* them, regardless of whether they are in a position to do things for themselves or not. She presents them as spoilt children who are never satisfied, even if when they have everything that one could possibly want. The participant concludes by extending the childhood metaphor, by stating that blacks do not have inquiring minds, and will destroy what is given to them (by a responsible adult, by implication). They are presented here as being non-rational, impulsive and destructive. The fact that black cultures may predispose them toward group co-operation, rather than individualistic competitiveness is ignored. Once again, blacks' behaviour is here measured against the yardstick of Western norms and values, and found wanting.

The participant in interview E (appendix E) held a similar view, but used different terms to describe his view. As already mentioned in the "problems with this research" section, this participant went to great pains to present himself as being not prejudiced. In

"hidden" messages to one-another is of relevance here. Only those (insiders) who knew the coding at the time could have appreciated the full import of what he meant, and could have really understood why it was important and logical that each nation had its own separate country.

A bit further on in the interview (C), the same participant goes on to say that:

"M: Kyk, as die here net een nasie wou gehad het sou hy net een nasie gemaak het.
I: Ja
M: Nou hoekom moet hulle nou onder mekaar gaan uitbaster...tussen wit en swart en, al daai - dan kry jy nou weer 'n ander nasie...So as swart en wit trou, dan skep hy 'n ander nasie. 49
I: Ja.
M: Die selfde as met Wit en Indiëer, of <?> gaan trou...kyk almal van hulle se hare is swart. Party se hare is redelik lig van kleur, maar sy hare is nog swart.
I: Ja.
M: Dis nie 'n blanke nasie nie.
I: Dink u dis 'n soort van 'n sonde as mense van verskillende rasse groupe, inmeng, soos, trou, en...
M: om te trou?
I: Ja
M: Ek dink so
I: Um..
M: Want ek meen, toe Adam 'n vrou gekry het, het hy nie 'n ander kleur vrou gehad as wat hy was nie. En die here het sy ele ribbe-been gebruik om vir hom 'n vrou te maak, so, dit is die selfde - jy kan maar sê, die selfde kleur.
I: Mmm. 61
M: Ek meen, dis logies as jy dit so vat. Sy vrou was 'n deel van hom, so sy moes die selfde kleur gewees het.
I: Ja. En sê nou met mense wat nou klaar gemeng het, wat nou kleurling kinders het - of weet jy van mense wat dit al gedoen het?
M: Ek ken nie een van hulle persoonlik nie, maar ek het al gesien, by winkels, en waar hulle in die straat loop...
I: En hoe lyk hulle? Gewoonlik, gelukkig, of meskien dat daar probleme is? Met ander woorde ek vra, sê nou as wit en swart trou, dan kan hulle eindlik gelukkig wees of nie? Of dink jy daar gaan definetief probleme wees later aan..meskien met die kinders...?
M: Ek weet nie, daar is seker 'n moontlikheid wat hulle gelukkig kan wees, soos ek se, ek ken dit nie...persoonlik nie, so ek sal nie kan se, maar dit is seker moontlik...75...maar kyk, nou gaan 'n Christen onder trou met 'n Moslem, of met 'n Hindu, een van daai...Nou daar kleur verskil soos dag by nag" (C).

What is emphasised in the last section is the link betwe race and religion. Although it was not stated in precisely these terms, some of the other participants stressed a spiritual dimension to the *Volk*. God ordained the races and set them in stone for all eternity. To mix the races is to tamper with Gods creation *and* the natural world. Seen in terms of the Adorno and Horkheimer concept of repression, one could argue that this particular sin is one that is to be avoided at all costs. By tampering with nature, and the sacred, one stands in danger of destroying oneself. Technically speaking, to allow the irrational Id impulses (our animal nature) to take control of the Ego is to open the possibility for complete Ego disintegration (loss of self), and a break with the established reality principle (one that is linked with the economic base, and is what enables us to live a

individuality, one's lonely prison (high up above the other inferior beings) as a bourgeois type. One could also establish links between this and the issue of race as personalised and taken as a part of ones individual identity (discussed earlier). Here, religion can be seen as playing a strong role in the dissemination of moral values, and injunctions to behave oneself (and be normal). It could thus be strongly implicated in the domination of self (as Ego) over one's self (as the Id). This projection could also be directly related to prejudice, where, for example, some of the participants expressed resentment over their perception of blacks as being community orientated. In the section that follows ("Blacks as children"), the first transcript sample outlines one of the middle class participant's views that blacks are racially determined children, and that even where they have attained any achievements it is not through their own efforts, but only with the help of a whole community of people (teachers, parents, community, or through affirmative action). One might regard this as being evidence of a lonely, competitive, bourgeois individual who hates community oriented blacks. The hatred is particularly intense as it concerns blacks' inability to be "Godlike", or like the "One God" a projection of the white master who holds dominion over nature.

Also evident in the transcript above, is the conflation of nation with race. This is in accordance with the HAT definition.[21] What is suggested by the usage in the above transcript is that each nation consists of individuals who are racially identical (and pure) and who have similar interests, characteristics, and traits. D.F. Malan, head of the "*gesuiwerde*" (purified) National Party, and first Nationalist prime minister in 1948, is remembered for his famous dictum: "Bring together those who belong together by inner conviction."[22] This can now be understood in a more sinister way - and one that was probably closer to his original intention, as implying an organic unity of *Volk* that included not only language, religion and culture, but also *race* and *character traits*. Bourdieu's concept of cultural capital and the subtle coding that enables members of a class to transmit

---

[21] Nasie, (s). 1. Groep enkeling wat tot dieselfde staat behoort, wat 'n politieke eenheid vorm; elke willekeurige versameling mense wat onder dieselfde politieke organisasie staan *Die Switserse nasie omvat gedeeltes van verskillende volke. Ras is 'n biologiese eenheid, volk 'n kulturele eenheid, nasie 'n politieke eenheid.* 2. (*dkert*) Groep mense of diere *Vroumense - dis 'n moeilike nasie!*...(HAT, Odendal *et al*, p727). It is also interesting to note that this definition specifies that "Ras is 'n biologiese eenheid", as the definition of *ras* itself does not specify this explicitly, emphasising instead some of the more *social* implications of the term in Afrikaans.

[22] Van Schoor *et al* further state that: "This dictum proved to be relevant not only in the political sphere but also in economic and cultural affairs and seems to have been the reason for the morally strengthening effect the Voortrekker Centenary Festival, with its symbolic ox-wagon trek, had on the National Party" (Van Schoor, *et al*, 1976, p130).

9.3. Appendix C: Sample Transcript of an Interview with Couple C

Interview with couple:
M: = White, Afrikaans male, approx mid 55 years. Employed (garage mechanic).
F: = White, Afrikaans male, approx mid 50s. Housewife.

I: Is daar 'n groep mense in SA (of enige plek in die wereld) wat julle voel dat u aan hoort?
M. Nee...
I: Mense waarmee julle voel julle kan identifiseer...U is Afrikaans-sprekend? - Voel u soos n Afrikaaner wat in daai sin 'n lid van die Afrikaanse nasie is ...
M: Ek werk saam met swartes, kleurlinge, engelsprekendes, en alles - dit pla my nie. Maar, ek dink nie dit is reg, dat wit en swart, ek meen onder mekaar trou en daai tiepe van ding nie - swart ma...wit pa...watse kinders kry jy?..
I: Watter soort kinders dink jy *sal* jy kry?
M: Nou kyk, as wit en swart meng, dan kry jy kleurling kinders. Ek glo n Wit nasie moet wit bly, swarte swart...dis hoe ek dit sien.
I: .Mm..
M: Nou kyk, wat dit nou aangaan, die wit man gaan heeltemaal verdwyn in die' land. [58]
I: Is daar dinge omtrent wit mense wat anderse as swart mense is...is daar eits omtrent wit mense wat hulle anderse maak?
M: Kyk, die swarte het sy kultuur, en die blanke het sy kultuur..hulle dink nie die selfde nie. Hulle leef ook nie die selfde nie. ... <?>[Says something about interracial marriages] Hoe sulke huwelike uitwerk nie weet ek nie.
I: En, is meskien die meeste van jou vriende Afrikaans-sprekend.
M: Nee, Ek het Engelse vriende, ek het hollandse vriende, ek het Duitse vriende, almal.
I: En hoe voel jy omtrent die veranderinge in die land - voel jy dis 'n goeie ding.
M: Wel Ek dink die land [sak?]. Hy gaan af, van dorp se kant af - kyk hoe lyk die strate, kyk hoe lyk die geboue. Die land gaan defnerie af.
F: Ja maar nou moet jy dit so vat nê, dit 's nou *voor* die swartes oorgeneem het dat die geboue gelyk het met die wit mense <?>, Die witte het die plek opgepas. Die swarte het gekom en nou is dit 'n gemors. Kyk hoe lyk dit vandag.
M: Hy sal met sy arm op die vuilgoed drom staan en gooi hy die papier net daar op die grond, nie in die drom.
F: Ja, en waar *jy* dit nie sal doen nie. Ja, daar *is* 'n verskil. Kyk net hoe lyk dit hierso, dis ?blikkies, dis koddrankblikke, dit is babadoeke, dit is karton pakke, dit is you name it. En jy kan daar skoonmaak maar hy gaan dan weer daar gooi.
I: En hoekom dink julle is dit so?
F: Wel, As jy nou vir my vra hoekom *ek* dink hoekom is dit so, gaan ek vir jou reguit sê dis morsigheid. Want ek laat my nie vertel dat 'n witmens so gaan mors nie soos swarte nie. 100
M: <?> "interjections"
F: Dis onmoontlik, ja jy kry van hulle, maar dis... Ja, presies dis die selfde, die swartes and dit wittes hulle is van die selfde. Ek kan nou hier uitstap, ek kan nou 'n papier hier buite or 'n blik hier buitekant gaan gooi. Dan gaan jy omdraai en sê dis die swartes wat so mors, maar nou kan die wittes ook. Hulle is *tiepies* die selfde, *tiepies* die selfde. 105 Daar was ek in die hospitaal opgeneem. Ek het tussen twee swartes gelê. Hy't reguit vir my gesê: "Ek betaal wat jy betaal, jy betaal wat ek betaal"...ek kan niks maak nie, ek moes gelê net. Gaan kyk hoe lyk die badkamer wat ek moes gedeel het, ek moes die toilet gedeel het. 113 Sê ek nou vir jou as jy 'n swarte is, jy's 'n swartgat, dan gaan by my doodmaak. Ek moes dit maar net *aanvaar!* Ons land gaan ag-ter-uit. Ons het nie meer 'n land wat ordentlik en netjies is. Ons het nie so eits. Maar kyk hoe bly die swartes hierso. Al wat hier langs my bly is wit mense. Van hierdie huise af hierso reg om tot om die hoek is almal swartes, gaan kyk.
M: Die nuwe Suid Afrika!
F: Ja, sien.!
M: Maar wat ek probeer om uit te vind is hoekom voel julle - is swartes meskien, 'n swart volk, is hulle nasie meer diere? 127
F: Nee ek sal sê hulle besmet 'n deel Victor? Hulle besmet <?>
I: Wat is besmet?
F: Hulle, hoe kan ek nou se, hulle ok van die wit kant ook
M: Ja jy kry wittes ook, maar ek meen hierso die nagte moet jy hoor partykeer.
F: Ja, *eintlik* ja!
M: Dis twee van hulle wat klink asof dis twee dosyn. Hulle loop hierso met mekaar en praat dan klink dit asof hulle daar <?>
I: Is dit wit mense waarvan jy praat?
F+M: Swartes!
I: Maar dink julle dat hulle so gebore is, hulle nasie, of wat? 139
M: Man, ek dit dat dit *is* hulle nasie..nou kyk, as hulle selfs preek ook, ek dink dis hulle geloof. Dit is hulle standaard van praat dink ek. Maar hier by swartes hier oorkant, en hierso by wit mense - dis een huis [they live in a semi-detached

4. What are the communicative *sources* of such conversations: To which persons or media do people refer when they account for their information or justify their opinions?
5. What are the real or possible *effects* of prejudiced talk, and what strategies do people follow in the *persuasive communication* of their beliefs, opinions, and feelings about members of other racial groups.
6. What are the *social contexts* of such talk: What type of interaction is involved, who are the participants, what are the social functions of prejudiced conversations, and which relations of power are at stake, or what role is played by the elite and the media in this kind of informal reproduction of racism?

Source: van Dijk, 1997, p 384. Although originally aimed specifically at examining *prejudice* phenomena, the schematization can nevertheless be applied productively to racial phenomena.

9. Appendixes

9.1. Appendix A: Open-ended questions used as a guide in the interviews

The first part of the interview is geared at getting the respondent/s to feel comfortable and at ease. For this reason, a "chatting" session may be used to start off. The researcher may describe the university and the courses that he attends, for example. It is also expected that the conversation will drift occasionally, and this should be allowed as it would enable the respondents to feel more at ease.

How long have you lived in this area? What is it like living here? Do you ever have any problems with the neighbours? What are the municipal services like in this area? What is the crime rate like in this area?

What are conditions like at work? Do you find that you get on well with your colleagues? Do any of your colleagues live in the same area as you? Do you often get together outside of working hours?

What do you think about conditions in South Africa at the moment? Do you think we are heading in the right direction? Do you think things are better now than they were before? How do you feel about your future in South Africa? *The respondents will probably mention problems like unemployment, crime and violence. They will be asked if they could think of any solutions, or what they thought was the cause of the problems.*

What was life like in the "old" South Africa? Do you prefer things now, or were they better then? How did you feel about the former government? What did you think of *apartheid*? What do you think about Eugene Terreblanche? Why do you think the world was against the South African government before the ANC was unbanned?

In the course of asking these questions of this sector of the population, it can be expected that "racial issues" will arise. These will then be pursued. For example, if the respondent mentions one of the conventional South African racial categories like "Whites, Blacks, Coloureds or Indians", then they will be asked to explain that idea further and in great detail. Other words or ideas that will be pursued will include: *Volk*, nation, group, people (if they refer continuously to "our people", or "people like us").

9.2. Appendix B: van Dijk's Levels of Discourse Organisation

1. What do they actually say? What are the contents of such talk? This aspect can be accounted for by means of a semantic or topical analysis. This is concerned with the broader *thematic* material that emerges. It is thus more at the *macro* level of analysis.
2. *How* do they talk about "them"? This question requires further discourse analysis of narrative and argumentative structures, local semantic "moves," style, rhetoric, and other conversational features of spontaneous talk.
3. What, and how does such talk *express* or *signal* underlying structures and strategies of prejudice in social cognition? This is concerned with the *micro* level of analysis, where attention is paid primarily to strategic features of talk, such as semantic moves of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, as well as stylistic, rhetorical, and conversational properties (van Dijk, 1987, p 385).

Paton, A. 1965. *South Africa's Tragedy: The life and times of Jan Hofmeyr.* New York: Scribners.
Paton, A. 1979. The Afrikaner as I know him. In Munger, E.S. (Ed.). *The Afrikaners.* Cape Town: Tafelberg.
Phillips, D. 1971. *Knowledge From What?* Chicago: Rand McNally.
Renkema, J. 1993. *Discourse Studies: An Introductory Textbook.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Rex, J. & Mason, D. (Eds.). 1989. *Theories of Race and Ethnic Relations.* Cambridge: CUP.
Sampson, E.S. 1989. Foundations for a textual analysis of selfhood. In Shotter, J. & Gergen, K.J. (Eds.). *Texts of Identity.* London: Sage Publications.
Sayer, A. *Theory, observation and practical adequacy.*
Smith, E.R. & Mackie, D.M. 1995. *Social Psychology.* New York: Worth Publishers.
Thiele, G.A. 1988. *Stereotipering onder Blankes en Kleurlinge in die RSA.* Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
Thompson, D. (Ed.). 1995. *The concise Oxford dictionary of current English: Ninth Edition.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Thompson, K. 1993. Social Pluralism and post-modernity. In Hall, S., Held, D. &McGrew, T. (Eds.). *Modernity and its Futures.* Trowbridge: Redwood Books.
Van Dijk, T. A. Kintsch, W. 1983. *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension.* New York: Academic Press.
Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). 1985. *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Volume 2, Dimensions of Discourse.* London: Academic Press.
Van Dijk, T. A. 1987. *Communicating Racism: Ethnic Prejudice in thought and talk.* Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
Van Schoor, M. C. E., Coetsee, A. G., Lambrechts, H. A., Oberholser, J. J., & Pienaar, K. J. 1976. *Senior History for South African Schools: Standard 10.* Cape Town: Nasou Limited.
Weber, M. 1971. *The Protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism.* London: Unwin University Books.
Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. 1992. *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation.* New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality: an Introduction (Vol. 1).* London: Penguin.
Foucault, M. 1986. The subject and power. In Dreyfus, J. & rabinow, P. 1986. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Stucturalism and Hermeneutics.* Brighton: Harvester.
Gaitet, P. 1992. *Political Stylistics: Popular Language as Literary Artefact.* London: Routledge.
Gordon, L. 1984. Paul Willis - Education, Cultural Production and Social Reproduction. In *British Journal of Sociology of Education.* Vol. 5, No. 2.
Gramsci, A. 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Habermas, J. 1985. Modernity: an incomplete project. In Foster, H. (Ed.) *Postmodern Culture.* London: Pluto Press.
Hall, S., Held, D. &McGrew, T. (Eds.). 1993. *Modernity and its Futures.* Blackwell Publishers: Polity Press.
Hall, S. 1993. The question of cultural identity. In Hall, S., Held, D. &McGrew, T. (Eds.). 1993. *Modernity and its Futures.* Blackwell Publishers: Polity Press.
Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. 1983. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* London: Tavistock Productions.
Handambos. M. 1990. *Sociology, Themes and Perspectives.* London: Unwin Hyman.
Keeves, J.P. (Ed) 1988. *Educational Research, Methodology and measurement: An International Handbook.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Laclau, E. 1990. *New Reflections on the Revolution of our Time.* London: Verso.
Laclau, E. 1997. The death and resurrection of the theory of ideology. *MLA,* 112, pp297-321.
Leach, G. 1989. *The Afrikaners: Their last Great Trek.* Johannesburg: Southern Book Publishers.
Louw-Potgieter, J. 1992. Language and identity. In Foster, D. & Louw-Potgieter, J. 1992. *Social psychology in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Lexicon Pub'lshers.
MacCrone, I.D. 1937. *Race attitudes in South Africa.* London: OUP.
Mercer, K. 1990. Welcome to the Jungle. In Rutherford, J. (Ed.). *Identity.* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
Miles, R. 1989. *Racism.* London: Routledge.
Miles, M.B. & Huberman, A.M. 1994. *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* Townsand Oaks, CA: Tage.
Morris, C. G. 1988. *Psychology: An Introduction.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
Mouton, J. 1988. The philosophy of qualitative research. In *HSRC: "Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods.* Pretoria.
Mynhardt, J.C. 1976. *Etnosentrisme, 'n tussen-kulturele sosiaalsielkundige ondersoek.* Unpublished Masters Dissertation, Rand Afrikaans University, Johannesburg.
Mynhardt, J. & Du Toit, A. 1992. Contact and Change. In Foster, D. & Louw-Potgieter, J. 1992. *Social Psychology in South Africa.* Johannesburg, Lexicon Publishers.
Niewoudt, J.M, Plug, C., & Mynhardt, J.C. 1977. White ethnic attitudes after Soweto: A field experiment. *South African Journal for Sociology, 16, 1-12.*
Odendal, F. F., Schoonees, P. C., Swanepoel, C. J., Du Toit, S. J. &Booysen, C. M. (Eds.). 1985. *Verklarende Handwoordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal.* Johannesburg: Perskor-Uitgewery.
O'Meara, D. 1979. *Class, Capital, and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934-1948.* Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Sussex, May 1979.
O'Meara, D. 1983. *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital, and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism, 1934-1948.* Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
Park, R.E. 1964. *Race and Culture.* London: Collier-Macmillan Limited.
Parker, I. 1992. *Discourse Dynamics: Critical Analysis for Social and Individual Psychology.* London: Routledge.

8. Bibliography

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., & Sanford, R.N. 1950. *The authoritarian personality.* New York: Harper.

Adorno, T.W., Horkheimer, M. 1973. *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* Cumming, J. (Trans.). London: Verso.

Adorno, T.W. 1973. *Negative Dialectics.* New York: Seabury Press.

Allen, T.W. 1994. *The invention of the White race: Racial Oppression and social control, Volume 1.* London: Verso.

Althusser, L. 1969. *For Marx.* London: Allen Lane.

Althusser, L. 1969. Ideology and Ideological State Appar ses. In *Lenin and Philosophy and other essays.* London: New Left Books, 1971.

Arato, A. Gebhardt, E. (Eds.). 1978. *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader.* Oxford: Basil Blackford.

Aronowitz, S. 1992. *The politics of identity: Class, culture, social movements.* New York: Routledge.

Billig, M. *Social psychology and intergroup relations.* London: Academic.

Blundell, V., Shepherd, J. & Taylor, I. (Eds.). 1993 *Relocating Cultural studies: Developments in theory and research.* London: Routledge.

Boudon, R. 1974. *Education, Opportunity and Social inequality.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture.* London: Sage Publications.

Bozzoli, B. (Ed.). 1987. *Class, Community and Conflict: South African Perspectives.* Johannesburg: Ravan Press.

Brown, G. Yule, G. 1991. *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: CUP.

Bryman, A. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research.* London.

Burgess, R. 1993. *In the Field.* London.

Cock, J. & Nathan, L. (Eds.). 1989. *War and Society: The militarisation of South Africa.* Cape Town: David Philip.

Cortazzi, M. 1993. *Narrative Analysis.* London: The Falmer Press.

Coulthard, M. (Ed.). 1992. *Advances in Spoken Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

De Saussure, F. 1959. *Course in general linguistics.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Duckitt, J.H. 1990. *A social psychological investigation of racial prejudice among White South Africans.* Thesis presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg.

Duckitt, J. H. 1992a. Prejudice and Racism. In Foster, D. & Potgieter, J. (Eds.). 1992. *Social Psychology in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Duckitt, J.H. 1992b. Psychology and prejudice: A historical analysis and integrative framework. In *American psychologist: October 1992. Vol. 47, No. 10, 1182-1193.*

Du Preez, P. 1987. Cross-cultural psychology of identity. InMauer, K.F., & Retief, A.J. (Eds.). *Psychology in Context.* Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council.

Elphick, R. & Giliomee, H. (Eds). 1979. *The shaping of South African society: 1652-1820.* Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.

Fanon, F. 1967. *Black skin, white masks.* New York, Grove Press.

Foster, D. & Potgieter, J. (Eds.). 1992. *Social Psychology in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Foster, D. & Nel, E. 1992. Attitudes and related concepts. In Foster, D. & Potgieter, J. 1992. *Social Psychology in South Africa.* Johannesburg: Lexicon Publishers.

Foucault, M. 1967. *Madness and Civilisation.* London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* New York: Pantheon Press.

Finally, Foucault, Adorno and Horkheimer's claim that the existing order can only be subverted through the aesthetic realm was also discussed in this report. As far as the possibilities for resistance go then, one might conclude by returning to Foucault's prescription that we should refuse what we are, and that we should refuse the kind of individualisation that is presently the norm. Putting this is terms that are more directly relevant to this study, we should begin to refuse what we are racially, attempt to reclaim the aspects of ourselves that are split-off and projected onto members of perceived other racial groups. South Africa at the present time presents unique opportunities for alternative conceptualisations of identity, unique avenues for expressing the hitherto unexpressed, and unique means of experiencing that which has for so long been denied. These options are fraught with dangers at all levels (for example, the psychic, social, material and economic levels). The future cannot even be imagined. But if it is to be radically different to the present, it will have to be both quantitatively *and* qualitatively different to everything that is now familiar. Hence the importance of creative new beginnings, peeks through the cracks, and perhaps yet another great leap of faith into the abyss.

"damned" (by God) are impoverished through various mechanisms of exclusion, separation and division (from the *Laager*) so that they become literally "damned". Their subsequent impoverished state then becomes justification for hating them even more - as their state confirms what was believed about them originally. This loathing can also be seen as a dread of the negative aspects of the self (that are projected onto members of perceived inferior groups). It serves as evidence of what happens to those who have not mastered themselves, their nature, have not individuated sufficiently, nor attained sufficient Ego integration. Members of perceived inferior racial groups thus serve as a reminder of the parts of the self that are denied to oneself, and similarly as reminders of the denied whole self. Some examples provided included a participant's view that blacks were unable to stand on their own feet, and could achieve nothing without help from others. Many other examples were provided where participants described blacks as being childlike, or backward. The childlike comments are particularly revealing, given Foucault's view that in Modernity the child is more individuated than the adult.

Economic factors were also examined. Particularly the role of the successful Western economic model, which was shown to be taken for granted by most of the participants as being the only way to progress. This was done in such a way that suggested that bourgeois instrumentalism, rationality, individuality and competitiveness were timeless, immutable and universal - those who did not bear these qualities were deviant, defective, backward or otherwise guilty. The participants' frequent injunctions (interpellations) for blacks to "take responsibility as we did", "build themselves up as we did", and to "stand on their own feet and stop blaming others for their situation" provided some evidence of this phenomena. These injunctions were often coupled with statements to the effect that blacks were incapable of attaining "our high standards" anyway.

The new political arrangements in South Africa were examined critically, where it was shown *inter alia* that the "New South Africa" can also be shown to be bringing about new forms of racism. As democratic freedoms are tempered with self-discipline and responsibility, this was shown to have the potential for enabling new opportunities for the exercise of (racial) power in areas that were not previously regarded as being legitimate, partly due to the failed hegemony of the apartheid state. Some examples included the legitimation of racial criteria for seeking employment, holding positions of authority, and marriage.

in which they can be seen as being subjected to various external forms of control and dependence, as well as to their own identities and self-knowledge's.

Importantly, this study has shown that racial identification is supported by (and supports) a number of institutions. Firstly, it has shown the role of the family and socialisation in producing a personalised racial consciousness and identity. The existing "culture of race" is perpetuated in the symbols that individuals internalise as they partake in them (further disseminating them). Examples provided included one participant's statement that the death of the *apartheid* state has left her with nothing for herself. Another participant refers to her situation prior to the rise of apartheid ideology as being one where she didn't know what she was. It was also pointed out that these examples of this dimension of racial identification could be regarded as extreme cases. They demonstrate that rather than being about abstract groups, ones' race is a personalised matter, and one that has great emotional significance for individuals.

This study has also shown that this personalised and individualised notion of race can be associated with a projection of idealised aspects of oneself - the Super Ego in particular - onto an image of "One God". A God that is punitive, jealous and calls on his chosen people to destroy the heathens and barbarians. The negative aspects of the self, on the other hand, are repressed and projected onto blacks. This includes fantasies of blacks as dangerous, threatening, sexually promiscuous, lazy, childlike, dependant, unable to stand on their feet like responsible adults, and inferior. This is in contrast to the image of self as One God, a master who has dominion over nature, which exacerbates the anger and vengefulness felt towards blacks - on whom all the previously mentioned negative aspects of the self are projected. The guilt that arises from the surfacing of threatening material was also discussed in relation to issues of social control by the self, normalisation and the functioning of disciplinary regimes through the production of docile bodies. The matter of the participants' conflation of race with culture and nation, and racial properties with character traits was also examined. This was also related to their notions of racially determined character and behaviour traits, and linked in turn with notions of a chosen master race.

Racism itself, as an institution was also examined. It was shown that structuralised racism has important effects, whereby those members of other races who are deemed to be

7. Conclusion

The model adopted as a framework for this research project has been based on Foucault's ideas about the functioning of disciplinary power in modern societies, as well as Adorno and Horkheimer's ideas on the socio-cultural and psychic dimensions of prejudice and racism. The main thrust of the data analysis has therefore been to attempt to establish whether the dynamics they describe in their work can be found to be operating in the interviews that were conducted. The emphasis of this study has been a critical evaluation of some of the popular views on "liberation", "race", "racial identity" and "development".

It is important to note that even based on the material presented in the transcript samples, this study is not in any way a final and comprehensive reading of the data. What has been attempted has not been intended to be either final, nor generalisable. A study such as this will inevitably attempt to condense and summarise some of the main themes that emerged from the interviews. Thus, it must be realised that any of the ideas reflected are based on what are already gross generalisations - taking the words of one participant, and using them as examples that best represent what all nineteen people said during the course of the interviews. No doubt, even if the participant whose talk was analysed to illustrate idea were to read the report, they would immediately be anxious to clarify what they really meant in the original interview. Even though a standard disclaimer was issued to the effect that this project is not attempting to generalise to the population at large, the implication remains that this is typical of racist talk in South Africa today. This is, of course, entirely without any scientific basis when viewed in terms of the old research paradigms, and not the object of the present study.

The main contribution of this study is possibly that it has demonstrated that even when non-racist and enlightened people discuss members of other racial groups, they may be using the very strategies and techniques identified and explored in this project - which have the effect of perpetuating structural racial inequality. Phenomena surrounding the status of the researcher as being neutral was also examined very closely in this study.

This study has also attempted to reveal some of the contradictions between the surface explanations of the participants, and the reality of their effects and functions. This is so not only in terms of the negative consequences for those perceived as outgroups, but for the participants themselves as subjects. This study has demonstrated some of the ways

the struggle is over, because as soon as one situation of dominance is overcome, the new arrangements take shape and it becomes apparent that they bring with them new relations of dominance and control. New subject positions and new modes of subjectivity bring with them new modes of subjugation. Along these lines, one might ask what the cost is of being a regular guy? What is it that has had to be repressed, or sacrificed in order to function productively in the modern world? Has buying into the system and playing by the rules made us any freer than we were before? Lastly, what are the consequences of this on those that surround us who may not be in such a favourable po. tion, and what are the consequences for the rest of the environment?

IMF guidelines in countries like South Africa, the researcher is not suggesting that there are any other known alternatives. Indeed, there does not seem to be any other way of "getting the country going" other than the conservative route currently being pursued by the government and Reserve Bank - the *Macroeconomic Strategy for Growth, Employment and Redistribution* (GEAR) model. As far as we know, these policies have been shown repeatedly in almost all contexts around the world to be ones that work that is, "put money in the pocket". It is hoped that South Africa will lead a new "[illegible]ce" that will enable Africa to take a great leap forward in development. In spite of this report being critical of these kinds of values and arguments, there does not seem to be any better way that African people will be able to create a better quality of life for themselves. Perhaps more importantly, economic progress in Africa will go a long way to dispelling the current discursive climate where Africa and Africans are regarded as being "backward" and "useless". Most likely, a strong economy in this country and rapid growth of a black middle class will make the "African" subject position more attractive to those who currently imbue it with negative stereotypes, and go a long way to moving away from racial compartmentalisation.

In criticising the current explosion of talk about race and racial identity, the researcher is not suggesting that there could have been any alternative routes to "liberating" South Africa. The black consciousness movement in South Africa certainly put "black" issues on the agenda, so much so that this country was able to achieve its miracle transformation, and there can now be little doubt that we live in a far more open society than ever before. Similarly, one could argue that the appropriation of racial categorisation systems has led to a relatively favourable shift away from negative stereotyping . By means of this appropriation, terms (labels) that were previously held to be pejorative are used to raise consciousness and mobilise those who are disadvantaged by the negative stereotypes that are held of their group. Thus, there is a "new black". One who is presented as being different to all the stereotypes discussed in this paper - a regular guy who happens to be black.

Foucault is not suggesting that there can be no relatively favourable vantage points or strategic positions. It is rather that every relation, every liberation movement, contains within it the seeds of another form of domination. All relations have power dimensions to them - that is, they all have a political dimension. One can never sit back and assume that

9.6. Appendix F: Coding of the Transcripts of the Recorded Interviews

CODING OF THE TRANSCRIPTS OF THE RECORDED INTERVIEWS	
Code	*Indicates:*
...	Hesitation, or the sentence trailing off, or interruption.
,	Short pause
<?>	Indistinguishable word
<??>	Indistinguishable sentence/s.
[pause]	Tape recorder switched off (eg. If the interview was interrupted by a phone call, or visitors arriving).
Italicised Text	Indicate emphasis (eg. Where the participant stresses a word audibly)
156	Bold numbers within the text are references to the tape counter. I.e. the place on the cassette tape where the surrounding text can be located. These were not inserted according to any specific plan - so their presence does not indicate anything specific.
[Text in square brackets]	Indicates material that was not in the original interview (eg. Comments, clarification of what was said, or to describe body language, gestures, facial expressions, etc.).
I:	Interviewer. Used throughout all interviews.
M:	Male participant in the interview. Used in all interviews.
M1: or M2:	More than 1 male participants in the interview. Used in all interviews.
F:	Female participant. Used in all interviews.
F1: or F2:	More than 1 female participants in the interview. Used in all interviews, except Interview D, where G: denotes the grandmother.

M: You can't trust them. *I know* I can trust a white person. I can always trust a white person, but not a black - I don't trust a black. [tape fades out]
[123]
I: Your friends?
M: English, Afrikaans and Portugues.
I: Who would you say your forefathers are?
M: Scottish, Jewish, Dutch...
I: Do you still see your identity, yourself, that way, or is it different now?
M: No, me I am a boer, a plat Afrikaner.
I: So you wouldn't think of going to live in England or something if things got really bad here?
M: I've been offered places in Australia and all, that. But I was born here, and I'll stay here.
I: Ja. What happens if things get really bad though?
M: I've got kids...I will get my sons [tape fades out]
I: Do you think there would ever be a civil war or something?
M: If there is, white people will be on my side. [tape fades out]
[140]
I: Do people ever talk about that sort of thing?
M: [tape fades out]
I: Jan van Riebeek, Great Trek etc?
M: Yes it's all part of our history. But everything that happens is history. It all becomes history. History is in the making. Even what we are doing and talking about now.
[tape fades out]
I: Do you think there is a genetic difference between blacks and whites? For example, with intelligence?
M: Nobody, in life, [?] God made us all. People were created with a soul, so we must accept that ...he created everything, he created us...
I: But now are you talking seriously? I mean, when we started out you said you hated blacks, and were a racist? What about your friends then, would they agree with what you just said? I mean, do you think we *are* equal then?
[163]
M: I, can't keep company with them because of the way *they* behave. I will keep company with *anyone*, any white people, and many black people, but don't ask me to go and stay in their house with them, and *don't* ask them to come and stay here in *my* house.
I: But now is this because of cultural differences, or are there genetic differences?
M: No, they believe in what *they* believe, and we believe in what *we* believe.
I: What about ....[tape fades out]
M: Its like the difference between a pit bull, and a pavement special.
I: So you think that people are like that as well? The different races?
M: Ja...
I: And is this what a lot of the people you know think as well?
M: Ja.
I: So do you think that even if everybody went to the same schools, and had the same opportunities and everything, that there would still be big differences between us?
M: Ja, but they can *build* on it.
[186]
M: Look, I don't hate them. I don't hate nobody, like her, I don't hate her [indicates young black girl walking with some white kids through the garden]. She's done nothing to me. Leave me alone, and I'll leave you alone. You steal from me, and [tape fades out]
I: What about the Volk? [tape fades out]
M: I believe we've never had a volk. [tape fades out]
Barend Strijdom should have been hung, for obstructing justice, going against the law. That's *one* thing, we *have* to all obey the law - that's what it's there for. Today, they don't care, just go against the law. I believe that treason...Mandela should have been punished by death, for *treason* - he was found guilty by the court! Barend Strydom, ...if you killed whites, or blacks, it should be punishable by death. There's only *one* way.
[tape fades out]
[216]
[End of interview - 230]

9.5. Appendix E: Sample Transcript of an Interview with man E

Interview with man: Age = approx. 35

M: = Man, married, with children. Lives in "impoverished circumstances". Occupation - security work.
Before the interview started, the interviewee told me that he was the right person to talk to about race - and that he knew everything that there was to know. Also, that he was a racist. He had been mugged 7 times. Said that he'd hated blacks since he was 7 years old. Implied that he'd had some kind of bad experience then, but didn't elaborate and looked uncomfortable when asked. He asked me if I was English, to which I replied yes. He then said that he was half English so we should speak in English, which I agreed to.
Unfortunately, the tape was very poor quality, and most of the material is completely inaudible. Partly because we were sitting outside in the wind, with neighbours revving their cars, kids playing cricket, etc. He told me he was teaching his oldest son to play cricket so he could get on the school team, and ultimately get somewhere in life. Mentioned that he'd never had the opportunity. Was drinking beer while we were talking.
Once permission had been obtained and the tape recorder switched on, he toned down the overtly racist talk. The interviewer later confronted him about this fact.

M: White people have been forced out of their jobs. They've become victims - you should have seen them the other night in the soup kitchens on TV. These people in this area have *always* suffered. They've always been undermined.
I: Like none of the people in power now really care either?
M: Ja, the government doesn't care...especially about the whites. They should be there to help. They should force people to study until they are 18. All they are doing now is caring about black people. They are not concerned...they don't care about us.
I: So its almost like having racism now, but this time with blacks doing it to whites?
M: Mmm
[tape fades out]
I: Do you think blacks are born different. [46] Do you think it's something in-bred?
M: I don't believe that they are inferior. They can be equal, but, they must learn to accept [?] What they've been taught, maybe it comes from feeling inferior. But its not. We've been taught, *they* must be taught. So its *for them* to realise.
[tape fades out]
And what we know, they know.
I: So its like they just haven't had the opportunities. Do you think that if they had the same opportunities as us that there would be very little difference? Or would there still be like, some difference?
M: ...Can they cope? ...[58] They must ask themselves if they can cope. Before they accuse us...*they* must ask themselves if they can cope.
I: Cope? In what way do you mean cope, like with what sort of stuff?
M: If they can bring themselves to the standards where we are.
I: Ja..
M: What we do...can they do? I mean, Can they bring themselves up to our standards? From the education system [tape fades out]. Bring *them* up to where we are, don't drop the white education. Bring the black children *up* to the white education. The way I feel, hey, my standard 8 is their standard 6, you see? Now that's not right. Let him go and write the same education as I wrote, and get the same marks as I got, then he will be equal. He must be equal. If he becomes equal, it must work *both* ways.
I: Why do you think that they don't?
[tape fades out]
M: I'll tell you why. The death penalty - you take the death penalty away and look what you get. Some women on TV the other night said, but ja, think about the people...think about *us*. But you must think one thing: An eye for an eye. You kill somebody, you must get killed. If you've done something, and you've killed someone, you are getting off *lightly* just by going to jail. But if you've shot somebody...that's the way the equilibrium of law works.
I: Ja
M: Somebody shoots you, [tape fades out] somebody shoots your neighbour. [tape fades out]
[90]
I: What about the other people around here? Do you think there are a lot of "racists" around here.
M: The people around here, they can't do anything.
[tape fades out]
M: People are people. If you don't understand another person...you want to...and that person doesn't want to come onto the same ground...
I: Do you have a lot of problems in the area?
[tape fades out]
I: What about those friends of yours who work in the security business you mentioned?

G: Geel is seker maar kleurling, of "something" ek weet nie...So nou, hulle sê "daar is nie werk vir julle nie". Toe sê hulle, nee ons sal maar "paint". H < <? > >

I: En hierdie, buurt, dit was tot nie lank gelede almal wit mense wat hier gelewe het?

F+G: Ja...

I: En hoe voel julle sê nou...

F: Kyk, hier's nie swartes wat hier bly nie.

G: J' hier is!

F: Net daar, in net daai een huis [indicates a nearby house].

F: Dis net *kleurlinge*, maar soos ek se, ek het nie 'n probleem met 'n kleurling nie. Hulle is, jy weet,...

G: *Netjiese* mense!

F: Netjies, en...

G: "Don't worry", Jy kan by hulle huis eet *nie* hulle borde uit. Tee drink, dis baie netjies. Die wat hier by ons bly is heel *netjies*. Maar ek was nog nie by hulle maar my een kind gaan by die een huis hier oorkant.

F: Ja, en hy kom hier na ons huis toe ook.

G: Hy's netjies...

F: Net soos ek ook, ek het 'n vriendin, Allison, sy't saam met my gewerk toe ek in Johannesburg was. Toe was sy in Florida gewees. Ek het elke oggend na haar huis toe gegaan en ons het saam met haar werk toe gery, want ons het al twee in Florida gebly. 79

G: Nee, wel, hulle's ...

F: En met my Pa se dood was sy ook by my pa se begrafnis gewees alles. Jy weet, ons bel mekaar nou en dan en hoor hoe gaan dit, en sulke goed, jy weet,...

F: ...Wat is die verskil ma?
M: Die een is 'n bobejaan en die een is wit! < <laughter> >
I: Of *is* daar 'n verskil?
M: Ja, wel hulle sê hulle is < <?> > want hulle het nie 'n kroointjie nie...dis wat hulle se. 18
G: Maar die swarte, sy vel is maar net swart, en ons'n is wit.
M: En hulle't bietjie kop en is 'bietjie in die donker.
G: Nee man, ...daar's nie..
M: Daar's wat slim is, maar hoe't hulle slim geword, wie't hulle slim gemaak - die wittes het hulle slim gemaak.
G: Ja, maar, hou nou op - daar is slim - daar's baie slimmes van hulle. Is mos die meeste vat, die wat nog so die ou lewe se kant volg nog.
M: Hulle sê die swart...
G: Maar nie in vandag se tyd nie - daars baie van hulle wat...
M: Hulle sê mos, die swartes was mos eerste hierso op die aarde...en voor ons. Dis wat hulle...
G: Adam en Eva was die eerste op die aarde
M: Ja maar hulle se, ja maar onthou hulle's...maar hulle sê die swarte was voor ons. Daai tyd het hulle 'n spiel gegee vir sewe koeie, of wat, of tien koeie, lat hy homself nie in die spieel kan sien dan is *sy* "happy". Dan gee hy jou *tien* koeie - vir 'n spieel
G: <laughs>
I: En hoekom, ek dink jy't gesê hulle was dom, of eits....?
M: Ja hulle's dom, hulle's plat koppe jong.
<laughter and exclamations>
M: A- is hulle slim ja. Maar nie almal nie.
G: Baie van hulle, meeste van hulle is slim, en hulle is, hulle's "smart", en hulle's skoon mense, dis skoon in hulle's... netjies, ek sal baie van die swart mense se huise ingaan en ek sal daar 'n koppie tee drink. Want daars "smartes" van hulle nou, en selfs die kleurlinge - almal daai. Hulle's "smart", hulle's netjies in hulle huise. Maar nou nie soos hierdie wat jy kry, wat *suip*, en "worry" nie oor hulle self nie. Jy weet, van daai swartes, en daar's baie wittes, wittes is ook die selfde. Jy kry, jy kry altyd, jy kry goeie swart mense, jy kry goeie wit mense, jy kry slegtes, en jy kry....ons almal is nie eeners nie!
I: Mm. En sê nou, daar is sekere verskille, meskien is hulle dommer of wat-ookal, is dit omdat hulle so gebore is, of ...[M laughs audibly]...is dit omdat hulle nie, meskien by die selfde skole as ons was, en nie die selfde geleenteede gehad het, en so aan...39
F: Ja,... Nee, dit is definetief hoor. Soos ek se, hulle word mos heeltemaal anderse as ons grootgemaak en... kyk, vandag het dit heeltemaal begin verander. Kyk hulle is in die selfde skole as ons nou, maar die standaarde en goed het baie gedaal, teen die tyd toe *ons* in die skool was. Ek meen, ... wat nou ek, toe ek op skool was. Daar was hoër graad, en standaard graad, en laër graad, en al daai goed, en. U weet, dit het heeltemaal verander, ek meen, toe ek op skool was, jy moet, jy weet al twee jou tale slaag, vandag is dit nie eers meer 'n vereiste nie hoor. As jy een van jou tale druip dan kan jy maar te minste, jy weet, jy kan... so die standaarde het heeltemaal gedaal.
M: Hulle't dit makliker gemaak vir hulle.
F: Die standaarde het baie gedaal. 48
I: En, wat, hoe dink jy gaan dit wees in so vyftig/veertig jaar se tyd?
F: Ons hoop dit gaan beter gaan.
M: Dan is daar nie meer wit mense nie! Dan is dit net swart!
F: Ons hoop dit gaan beter, want niks het verander nie, alles is maar nog die selfde.
I: En, dink jy daar gaan nie meer wit mense wees nie?
M: Hulle sal maar uitvloei...
F: Nee! Ons gaan lewe soos wat hulle geleef het...
M: Hulle teel daagliks sulke honderde van die goed uit...
F: Ek sê jou, ons gaan lewe soos wat hulle geleef het...
M: Ons gaan mielie pap en goed eet, hulle gaan lekker "chops" en elke ding eet. Ons gaan hulle midlie pap oorvat.
<Laughter>
G: Ja, 'n mens kan dit verstaan. Kyk hulle word opgelei, hulle doen die wit me...hulle gaan die werke doen wat 'n wit man nou vandag doen, en <?> 58
F: En soos, as jy jou personeel aanstel. 50% van jou personeel moet swart wees, en 50% moet wit wees. Waar, onder andere, jou kleurlinge en jou Indieers, en so aan onder jou wit personeel gaklassifiseer word. So, hoeveel werk is daar oor vir wit mense?
I: Mmm..
G: Ja, wel ek het een dag 'n vrou, sy't jare gewerk by hulle werk - toe is hulle afbetaal. Toe soek hulle nou weer werk toe sê hulle vir haar "is jou vel geel?" Toe sê sy "Nee, dis wit" Toe sê hulle "Nee want dan is daar nie werk vir jou nie".
I: Ja....

9.4. Appendix D: Sample Transcript of an Interview with Family D

Grandmother & Family
G: = Grandmother (over 65yrs)
F: = Female (her daughter - approx 23)
M: = Male (her son - approx 20).

I: En, sê nou, is daar...voel julle julle hoort aan 'n groep, sê nou, wit mense, of Afrikaners of eits.
F: Nee. Ons hoort nie aan 'n groep nie. Soos wat bedoel jy? Soos die AWB, en sulke tiepe goed?298
I: Ja, nie noodwendig 'n bestaande organisasie nie, maar net een met wie julle identifiseer - sê nou 'n klomp mense? So as eimand van Mars afkom, en hulle sê vir jou: "Luister, Jy moet by jou mense gaan", Waar gaan julle kies om te gaan? Gaan julle by wit mense gaan, Afrikaners, of net jou familie, of wat?...Of sê nou hy vra jou "Wie is jou mense?" of "Watse soort mens is jy?" Hoe sal jy meskien antwoord?...
F: Ha...'n wit Afrikaner...307 <laughs>
I: En dan as hy jou vra "Wat is dit?"
F: Nee, ek weet nie wat sal ek vir hom sê nie. [soft laughter]
F: Nee, ek moet gaan waar hulle tussen die wit mense gaan hoor < <?> > ...Ek sal nie tussen ander nese...312
I: En, as ek nou vra, sê nou as hy sê "Van waar af kom daai mense? Weet jy...jou voorvaders en ...Wie voel jy is jou voorvaders?
F: Jan Van Riebeek.
I: En voor hom?
F: Voor hom...voor hom weet ek nie. [laughter]
I: En wat van u? [to grandmother]
G: Jan Van Riebeek, en "watever", nee.
F: Dis mos ons voorvaders - Van Jan van Riebeek af. ...Maar ek weet nie wie nog voor dit nie..
G: Van die ministers of wat?
F: Nee!
G: O nee, nee dan weet ek nie nog van Van Riebeek en...weer nie na hom nie...
I: Um, en wat van ander Europeese lande - sê nou Holland, of Duitsland, of eits. Voel jy op 'n manier hulle is ook deel van jou mense, of...meskien deel van jou volk of ...is hulle heeltemaal anders?
F: Nee, hulle's nie heeltemaal *anders* nie.
I: Dink julle, sê nou van die Hollandse mense, is hulle meer soos jy as wat 'n swarte is?
G: Ja! Hollanders...
F: Ja, hulle's < <?> > 337
G: Hollandse mense....uh...
M: Hulle's die selfde as ons.
G: Umm...
I: Um...En nou wat van geloof?
M: Geloof, ons almal glo aan een, een, een, een God af. Daar nou, ander wat nou meskien aan eimand anderste glo...soos God wat nou heletemaal verander is deur Satanisme en...goeses wat hulle aan bid en...aan glo. Almal glo nou maar nie in die selfde...
I: Ja. Um, want sommige van die Afrikaanse mense wat ek met gepraat het ges' hulle dink, sê nou, hulle is Afrikaans, of hulle's wit, en hulle is eindelik soos, um, God het ons so gemaak vir 'n spesiale doel....spesiale volk
[End of tape]
F: Nee hulle sal nie sê ons is '*n spesiale* volk nie...
I: So jy sal nie eindlik sien jou geloof saam met jou ras... en identiteid ...
F: Nee, nee....
I: Um, En dan, wat van julle vriende? Is die meeste van hulle wit, of...e
F: Ja, almal is wit. Soos ek nou, jy weet, ek kommunikeer by die werk...ek werk saam met almal. Ek werk by die bank, so...
I: En hoe vind jy dit om met mense van ander groepe te werk...is dit 'n lekker'e meer "stressvol", of
F: Nee...
I: Is daar kleur verskille...?
F: Nee, nie 'n probleem nie. Glad nie... Kyk ek werk saam met hulle en dis dit, maar ek sal nie saam met hulle gaan...partykie hou, en, by hulle huise gaan kuier of so eirs nie.
I: Mm. So, sê nou, dink julle, wat's die verskil sê nou, tussen 'n wit persoon en 'n swart persoon? ...Ek weet dit klink baie snaaks, want ek is "wit" en ek weet ook nie die antwoord self...Dis [illegible] ek stel belang om jou idees te hoor. En dit is nie 'n reg of 'n verkeerd antwoord, so jy kan maar net sê wat jy voel.

nou , as jy eimand ontmoet, kan jy gewoonlik, sê as hulle wit of swart of kleurling, of eits is, sonder 'n probleem?... met ander woorde, ek vra, is dit redelik eenvoudig om te sien?
M: Ja..
I: ...of,...um...ja...En meskien...
M: ...dis baie maklik om te sien.
I: ...die hare en die manier waarop hulle praat is ook seker...
M: Ja...
I: Um...en die ding wat die, ek dink, met Verwoerd, ek dink, deel van sy... argument was dat God het ons eindlik so gemaak, met wit velle, en meer intelligent, en daai tipe ding...dink jy dit is die geval? Dat ons meskien, sê nou, dat ons God se gekieste ras is of eits? U weet, wat is die woord in Afrikaans?, die..
M: Ja,...
I: God se "special people, or whatever you want to call it"... chosen people?
M: Kyk, as die here net een nasie wou gelad het sou hy net een nasie gemaak het. Nou hoekom moet hulle nou onder mekaar gaan uitbas er...tussen wit en swart en, al daai - dan jry jy nou weer 'n ander nasie...So as swart en wit trou, dan skep hy 'n ander nasie. 49
I: Ja...
M: Die selfde as met Wit en Indieer, of <?> gaan trou...kyk almal van hulle se hare is swart. Party se hare is redelik lig van kleur, maar sy hare is nog swart.
I: Ja.
M: Dis nie 'n blanke nasie nie.
I: Dink us dis 'n soort van 'n sonde as mense van verskillende rasse gro . ., inmeng, soos, trou, en...
M: om te trou?
I: ja
M: Ek dink so. Want ek meen, toe Adam 'n vrou gekry het, het hy nie 'n ander kleur vrou gelad as wat hy was nie. En die here het sy ele ribbe been gebruik om vir hom 'n vrou te maak, so, dit is die selfde - jy kan maar se, die selfde kleur. 61
I: Mmm.
M: Ek meen, dis logies as jy dit so vat. Sy vrou was 'n deel van hom, so sy moes die selfde kleur gewees het.
I: Ja. En sê nou met mense wat nou klaar gemeng het, wat nou kleurling kinders het - of weet jy van mense wat dit al gedoen het?
M: Ek ken nie een van hulle persoonlik nie, maar ek het al gesien, by winkels, en waar hulle in die straat loop...
I: En hoe lyk hulle? Gewoonlik, gelukkig, of meskien dat daar probleme is? Met ander woorde ek vra, sê nou as wit en swart trou, kan hulle eintlik gelukkig wees of nie? Of dink jy daar gaan definetief probleme wees later aan...meskien met die kinders...?
M: Ek weet nie, daar is seker 'n moontlikheid wat hulle gelukkig kan wees, soos ek se, ek ken dit nie...persoonlik nie, so ek sal nie kan se, maar dit is seker moontlik...75...maar kyk, nou gaan 'n Christen onder trou met 'n Moslem, of met 'n Hindu, een van daal...Nou daai kleur verskil soos dag by nag.
I: Ja. Is daar enige eits anders waarvan julle dink is belangrik? Soos ek se, hierdie is nou een van die eerste keere wat ek onderhoude voer, ek probeer om soort van 'n prent op te bou. Ek is mos Engels en ek stel belang in Afrikaanse mense se..."views".
M: Kyk, ...as 'n wit vrou nou met 'n swarte trou, sy kom daar by sy familie, ek weet nie of hulle dit sal aanvaar nie. Party sal seker, maar daars anders wat dit nie sal aanvaar nie. Nou, my ma lewe nog. Nou as ek met 'n swart vrou by my ma aankom, of by my familie - hulle gaan dit nie aanvaar nie. Net so min as wat ek gaan aanvaar as my seun hier inloop met 'n swart vrou. Dis glad nie aanvaarbaar nie.
I: As u nie omgee as ek eits vra?...sommige m nse... het gesê as hulle 'n baie mooi swart vrou sien... dat hulle die kans sal vat, as sy beskikbaar is. ...Hoe voel u hieroor?
M: Nee ek sal glad nie...definetief nie. Ek meen, daars genoeg wit vrouens waar u kan gaan 100. ...Nou as jy met 'n swarte sex hê dan kan jy net so wel met haar trou ook.
I: Ja..
M: ...Kyk, daars geen aantrekkingskrag vir enige swart vrou...sy't geen aantrekkingskrag op my.
I: Dink jy hulle is eindlik vuil, of het hulle kieme of wat...of is dit net dat jy stel nie belang nie?
M: Glad nie, ek stel glad nie belang nie. Ek het nog nooit een gesien wat ek nou enige gedagtes sal oor kry.
I: Ok, baie dankie vir julle tyd, ens. 120.
[end of interview]

I: En wat van, sê nou, Jan Van Riebeek en die Voortrekkers en daai hele deel van Suid Afrikaanse geskiedenis- voel u dis deel van jou geskiedenis?
M: Van Duitse geskiedenis?
I: Nee, net joune as...is hulle meskien, op jou ma se kant, sê nou die mense van die Groot Trek, is hulle, sê nou, jou voorvaders ook?
M: Nee, ek sal nie so sê nie.
I: Ek vra net, want met baie Afrikaanse mense, as ek vra van dinge oor hulle voorvaders, dan sê hulle Jan Van Riebeek, die Groot Trek, en hulle identifiseer met daai gebeurtenisse, die mense. <?> of is joune meer met die Duise of Europiërse?
M: Nee, kyk, my voorouers het in die land in gekom in 1800 eits, nou hulle het Suid Afrikaners geword - ek is hier gebore en is 'n Suid Afrikaner...Om eerlik te wees, ek kan omtrent nie in Duits meer praat nie, ek praat Afrikaans.
I: Het jy nt' bietjie Duits met jou pa gepraat, toe jy jonger was?
M: Ja,...in die Vrystaat is alles meerendeel Afrikaans, is omtrent al taal wat jy praat daar. Ek het partymaal net eenmaal in die jaar nodig gehad om meskien Engels te praat met eimand wat probleme met sy kar gehad en by die garage gekom het - en hy was Engelsprekend - maar dit was meskien net eenmaal 'n jaar. Daar was ander Duitsers ook gewees, die oudste een kon nog met die oumense so 'n bietjie Duits praat, so op 'n manier, maar die ander praat almal Afrikaans - die pa en die ma is duits. 547
I: Wat van...het u kinders wat by die skool is?
M: Nee, die jongste was die een wat nou hier was.
I: Hoekom ek vra, is, hoe sou jy meskien voel as jy nou kinders by die skool gehad het, terwyl daar nou, sê nou, 'n klomp swart kinders by die skool is?
M: Wel die mense wat netnou hier gekaap het, kyk vroeer jare was het jy vir skool geld betaal? Kyk wat moet jy nou betaal...Jy moet die swartes subsideer, want hy betaal nie. Al kan hy betaal, hy weier net eenvoudig om te betaal en, *that's it*. Soos hulle weier om water en ligte te betaal.
I: Ja, dan maak hulle dit seker moeiliker vir almal wat wel betaal?
M: Ja, kyk, as hy hemel toe gaan, sê nou jy stuur 'n duisend van hulle hemel toe, hoe lank gaan dit wees voor hulle begin om ontevrede te wees, dan begin hulle om ook daar te begin toyi-toyi!? Dit is so, jy sal hom nooit tevrede kry nie. Hy sit liewerste sonder werk, as om vir die selfde salaris te werk as hy <??>. Kyk wat nou net in Germiston gebeur het by die *mine*. 1200 sonder werk, hulle wou meer geld gehad het maar die myn kon nie meer betaal het - hy sit liewerste sonder werk. Dit wys jou hoe ver dink hy. Hy kon werk gehad het, inkomste gehad het, maar hy wil meer geld hê. Hy sal liewerste sonder 'n *job* as om vir daar salaris te werk.
I: En wat van geloof? Gaan julle kerk toe...
M: Ja
I: En, is daar swartes wat by die kerk bywoon?
M: Nee, kyk, baie blankes is daar teen. Kyk, as hy 'n Christer wil wees, hy kan een wees, en hy gaan kerk toe...en hy is bereid om met my taal 'n lid van 'n Afrikaanse kerk te wees, en hy praat Afrikaans, hy sing psalmlid/gesangliek [?], en hy's 'n Christen - ek het niks daarteen nie.
I: En, sê nou, ek dink u het gese, u voel u is 'n Afrikaner?
M: Ja.
I: Nou wat van, nou's daar hierdie hele kwesie van Kleurling Afrikaners...in die Kaap sê nou...hulle sê hulle is ook Afrikaners...voel jy nou hulle is op die selfde vlak as jouself, of is hulle maar ook Afrikaners, maar nie in die volle sin van die woord nie?
M: As hy hom kan gedra soos 'n blanke Afrikaner...dan sal ek sê ek sal saam met hom lewe.
<<End of Tape>> <Couple Interview: Side 2:>
M: ..Maar onder trou, glad nie. Ek glo 'n nasie, 'n blanke nasie moet 'n blanke nasie bly. 'n Swarte moet swart bly.
I: Nou, hoe bedoel u nasie? 18 In watter sin 'n nasie?
M: Kyk, 'n Wit man kan met 'n Engelse vrou trou, of met 'n Duitse vrou, of 'n Hollandse vrou, of 'n Franse vrou - sy's blank, die kinders sal blank wees - hulle gaan nie basters wees nie. So die Swart nasies, as hy onder mekaar trou, dis 'n ander swart nasie - hulle lyk buitendien omtrent almal die selfde, daars nie 'n verskil nie...swart met swartes. 23
I: Soos Khosas, Zodoes, kan trou, want hulle is die selfde mense, soos met Duitsers en Engelse..
M: Ja, as hulle onder mekaar trou. Ek meen, dis 'n wit nasie, - wit kinders - jy gaan nie...basterkies daaruit kry nie.
I: wat van...sommige mense sê dis baie moeilik om te sien...daar watter ras 'n mens aan hoort. Stem u saam met dit, of dink dat jy kan altyd sê as eimand swart, kleurling, blank, en so aan?
M: Wel, jy kry ligte kleurlings, en jy kry wat donker is, en jy kry wat swart is...Maar, as jy die swart nasie vat, en jy kyk hulle so, hulle lyk maar die selfde. Party se neus is maar 'n bietjie plat as die ander s'n.
I: Ja...nan...ja want sommige mense sê dat, sê nou in die 50 en sestiger jare, teen die tyd wat apartheid ernstig begin het, hulle het mos, dinge gedoen soos: hulle sit 'n potlood in die mense se hare en as dit uitval dan weet hulle sy's wit, want die swartes se hare is krulleriig en die potlood sal nie uit val en daai tipe van ding...so hulle moes daai toetse doen...Maar

F: Hy [her son] werk by die gevangenis...Hulle wou hom reeds geteek met 'n mes by die werk. Daar is dit baie gevaarlik. Baie gevaarlik. 322

I: Wat van voor, sê nou 20 jaar gelede? Hoe was dit dan? What was it like under the previous Government? Did you feel that it was your government etc. ?

F: *Daar* kon jy gelewe het - *Beter!* - hahaha! Nou is dit net reip en verknegting, diefstal, hobos; Toe kon jy in die stad gebly het.

M: Moord en doodslag, werkloosheid - Hulle beplan nie 'n gesin nie. <?> Hulle dink nie daaraan dat die land word nie groter nie, die mense word meer, en oorbevolking, en werkloosheid neem toe., nê, dis logies, maar hulle dink nie daaraan nie.

F: En dan het die mense nie sonder werk gesit en daar was nie so hobos nie. twintig, dertig jaar terug nie. Nou volop, nou's hy heel volop <?>

M: Werkloosheid...

F: Toe kon jy reg in die stad gebly het.

M: Die werkloosheid, veral onder die blankes neem baie toe. Nou sit hulle 'n swarte in - of hy die werk kan doen of nie, 'n swarte moet daar wees.

I: En sê my, in daai tyd, daar was mos 'n wit regering, daai? Nou het julle gevoel dit was jou regering wat jou belangstelle in ugring gehad het.

F: Ja, eindelik ja, dit was *my* mense, dit was *my* regering, dit was *my* land gewees...tot dit nou begin het om te "mix" het. Nou het ek nie 'n regering nie, ek het nie 'n wit land nie, ek het niks vir myself nie. Want die blerrie ding hy loop hier langs die pad en se: "Hullo my liefling!" <?>...

M: Nee, Ek dink die probleem is ook, die wit mense moes, toe hulle die land ingekom het, moes hulle die swarte al meer geleer het, jy weet. Hulle moes meer opvoeding gegee het... 370

F: ... Maar ek dink hierdie probleme van ons het begin toe hulle vir Nelson Mandela uit die tronk verlaat het - het dinge begin skeef...dis *tog* so, *hulle* mense praat daaroor.

M: Kyk Verwoerd het die regte idee gehad...voor hulle hom dood gemaak het...Kyk daai Swarte, dis sy land daai, en hy kan hier werk in die Wit man se land. En die Wit man kan in daai land gaan werk as hy wil. Maar, die Swarte het sy *eie* land en sy eie regering....

F: Kyk wat het Nelson Mandela gedoen, sê dit vir hom! Dit was op die TV gewees. 'n Ander vrou het vir Nelson Mandela gebel en hulle het 'n afspraak gereel, en sy't haar afspraak nagekom met Nelson Mandela. En daai Nelson Mandela het vir haar 'n hele huis vol meubels met kos en goed uit eie Raap gekoop. Nelson Mandela het dit vir haar gedoen. Dit was 'n ou vrou, sy was in die tagtigs. Hy't dit vir haar gegee. Dit was op die TV gewees.

M: Kyk, was sou goed gewerk het is 'n federasie van state soos in Amerika. ...Die Xhosa sy eie regering, die Zulus, die Blankes. Al die rasies, elke een sy eie regering. Dit sou gewerk het, maar hierdie storie! ....

I: Ja, Maar hulle sê vandag dat daar geen verskil tussen die verskillende groepe, dat ons almal die selfde is?

F: ...Ons moet saam lewe...Ja, dit is, jy's reg.

I: Wel dis hoekom ek vra...ek wil net van mense weet, wat *is* hierdie verskille. Ons as wit mense, hoe is ons anderse as die swart mense?

F: Jy kan nie anders maak nie, jy moet saam met hulle lewe. Jy gaan saam met hulle in 'n hospitaal le, jy gaan saam met hulle eet in 'n restaurant. Nou moet ons alles deel.

M: Kyk, die verskil is...die swarte sal jou dood maak vir 'n paar rand...

F: ...maar die Witte nie...

M: Laat ek dit so stel, hy sal jou keel afsny, en die kleur van jou bloed is <?> ...al het hy *nie regtig* eits nodig nie. En hy kom hier aan <?> ...dit is instink, sy natuur. Kyk hoe maak hulle die ou mense dood. Nou as hy wil gaan steel, as hy nou regtig werkloos is, en hy ly honger, hoekom mense seer maak en dood maak as hy net wil steel. As hy by my kom en hy wil steel, vat wat hy wil hê..nou hoekom mense dood maak? Maar as hy 'n mes by hom het dan gaan hy dit gebruik, as hy 'n vuurwapen het dan gaan hy dit gebruik, of dit nodig of nie nodig is, hy *sal* hom gebruik.

I: Die ander ding wat ek wil vra...die ding van, sê nou, van jou voorvaders - wie is hulle, wie was hulle, en as jy terug gaan oor tyd en jy dink wie die eerste mense is wat, sê nou, jou voorvaders was. Wanneer sal jy sê dit het begin?

M: Kyk, my oorlede pa is gebore in 18-honderd en eits, dit was sy 95 verjaarsdag in 1972. Nou, sy pa, hulle het van duitsland af hier gekom..

F: Jou oupa met ander woorde.

M: Ja, hulle het in hierdie land het hulle geveg hierso...daai tyd in die Boere-Engelse oorlog het hulle geveg hierso.

I: I Het jou pa uit Duitsland gekom spesifiek vir die oorlog?

M: Nee, hulle <?> ...

I: En hoe voel jy teenoor die Duitsers, voel julle dat hulle van die selfde ras is, voel julle 'n soort van identifikasie met Duitse mense, of is hulle te anderse as Afrikaners? 479

M: Ek sou se, die meerstes van die Duitsers is die selfde as wat Afrikaners is. Daar is verskille, maar groos en deel, hulle is soos Afrikaners, so ook die Hollanders - hy's onwankelik <?> 'n Afrikaner.

house], jy hoor alles wat hulle hierso praat. ...Jy hoor alles. Hulle staan hier by die busstop hier waar ek by, my kamer venster is by die busstop, jy hoor alles wat hulle daar praat.
M: Tog jy kry swart bure...
F: Ja, jy kry *vantastiese* swart bure dink ek ...Ja...Wat baie netjies en vriendlik en nooi jou vir koffie en koekies en dit, maar aan die ander kant draai jy dan om en dan is dit maar dan 'n ander sake. 151.
M: Maar *hierdie* area...
F: *Woe*l Hierdie area van Newlands, Clarmont af reg deur Johannesburg stad toe - dis 'n helse dingetjie! Ek sê vir jou.
M: Ek sê jou, jy moet op party nagte kom hoor hierso, veral op naweke.
F: *Ja!* By ons is dit glad nie stil nie. Dit is ek nou eerlik met jou. Dit is in hierdie straat nie stil nie, dit is hierdie straat nie stil nie, en dis in daai straat nie stil nie. Want jy weet presies, wat hier oorkant aangaan, jy weet presies wat hier aangaan, jy weet wat hier aangaan, wat daar aangaan - all over. Ek sit hier in die handjie van die gat. Ek weet presies. Van Maandag tot Sondag weet ons alles. Ek kan 'n boek skryf oor alles wat hier aangaan, en wat hier al gebeur ook.
I: En gebase- op al die goed wat julle gehoor het, dink julle hulle is baie anderse as, sê nou, wit mense, soos ons? Hulle lewenswyse, en hulle...
F: Ja, ek sal sê hulle is anderse ja.
I: Soos watter soort goed?
F: Kyk, *ek* sal dit nou so stel. Ek gaan eerlik wees met jou. Ek het nou die dag 'n swarte hierso by die paal gevang hierso by my huis, en hy wil sy "lullu" uitgehaal om to pee. En hy drink, en ek het hom toevallig van die hek af gesien, maar hy het my nie gesien nie. En ek het toe afgehak en ek het vir hom gese, listen here, this is not a toilet. If you got a pieppie, go to the toilet. Nou ja, hy't toe hierso omgedraai en hy loop oorkant na die ander vrou se hek gestaan en pee. Toe kom daai man uit, to slat hy die swarte. Toe dog ek toe vir myself, nou hoekom slaan hy die swartman. As *jy die* nood het kan jy nou moet kyk, waar om jou nood uit te haal. Ek meen, 'n mens is maar 'n mens. As jy daai nood het en jy kan nie maak by 'n toilet nie dan gaan jy maak waar jy kan. Maar, jy weet hoe naklik is 'n ruik as jy geppipple gelos get. Nou wil hy hier reg voor my deur kom pipple...ek sê loop, dis nie 'n toilet nie. ...Hulle*moet* anderse wees, hulle nak nie aan die wittes nie, *genuine*.
M: Hierdie paal hierso, hulle slaan gereeld water hierso.
F: Hier is dit al dieper ingetrek, jy *ruik* dit eintlik, hierso gaan dit *wrot* hierso - *jog*!
I: Hoekom?... is daar baie mense wat in hierdie area bly, of is dit net in die stad?
F: Nee, ag Here man, as jy weet die swartes wat hier bly. Gaan hier op, gaan hier af, gaan kyk hoe lyk hulle.
I: [Asks about crime in the area]
F: Ja, Here man, hulle steel 'n mens bankrot hierso. Een more vroeg het hulle by die neibours ingebreek. Hulle het jewellery en klere en goed gesteel. Die drie swartes het nuwe jaste aangehad. Die eienaar het vinnig op die walkie-talkie die poliesie geroep. Die poliesie het hulle net hier by die robote gekeur met die klere. Hy'd die een kaffer se broek afgetrek, toe gee hy hom 'n klap op die gat. Toe het hulle al drie van die swartes gevat en in die boot van die poliesie van gesit. In die *boot* hoor!
I: <!>
F: Ja, in die kar in die boot. Hy keer hulle voor, net hier.
I: Julle is gelukig! Gewoonlik kom die diewe weg, selfs roep jy die poliesie...
F: Ja baie kom gereeld heirna toe. Hulle het nou, 'n rukkie terug... maar wat ek nie kan verstaan nie, een aand toe kom ons terug die mense hier langs my het gesê - hulle sluit nooit hulle voordeur - dis die mense wat die tatoos op mense uitwerk - hulle's gawe mense, *stil* mense, mens*hoor* hulle nie, jy *sien* hulle nie. Ja maar toe sê hy vir my: 'n swarte klop op sy deur en loop in sy huis in. Hy vra vir die kaffir wat wil hy hê ...hy kyk die spulletjie so. Die kaffir sê hy soek sy vriend. Toe staan hy vir hom oor die hek. Nou ek wat in die dag alleen is en die man werk, nou dit gebeur hekler in die dag ook. Nou sê hierdie ou "ja, as die volgende kaffer weer kom, dan gaan hy sorg dat hy besig is met sy vrou...laat die swarte hom kan sien". Nee dis 'n lelike area hierdie, *genuine*, jy kannie eers dorp toe gaan nie. Nou een dag ook *suur* hy [her husband] my bank toe, en ek verloor 900 rand! Maar *in* my beursie, ja, dis my rent geld, maar hy't swartes wat ook vir hom werk, maar ek weet nie wat het met my gebeur nie. Ek het om die hoek gekom, ek 'set my hand in my sak gesit om die sleutels te kry en seker die beursie laat val. Hier kom die shop ou hy roep "mevrou mevrou mevrou!' maar ek hoor hom nie. Toe ek oor die pad gaan toe kom hy, hardloop hy en tik my op my skouers. En vra vir my "mevrou is dit jou beursie hierdie?" En ek sê, Here waar *kry* jy hom? Hy sê hy't hom daar by die deur opgetel. Ek kyk so, *Al* my geld, *met* my id boek. Toe het hy *niks* gevat nie. Dit wys jou net wat se nasie dit is. As dit 'n swarte was dan het hy dit gevat. Hy het die beursie, die boekel weg gegooi en die geld gevat!
I: Het julle ooit gedink om die land te verlaat? ...As dinge rerig sleg word?
F: Ja, hy wil platteland toe gaan. Hy wil daar gaan boer.
M: Hy bedoel die land verlaat...
I: Enige *ander* plek buite Suid-Afrika?
F: Nee nie sommer nie, dis nie die moeite werd nie.
< <Pause> > [Son arrives and stays briefly. 300]

Author: Binnell B
Name of thesis: A discourse analysis of racial talk and identity construction of a group of working class afrikaans speakers

PUBLISHER:
University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
©2015

LEGALNOTICES:

Copyright Notice: All materials on the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg Library website are protected by South African copyright law and may not be distributed, transmitted, displayed or otherwise published in any format, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.

Disclaimer and Terms of Use: Provided that you maintain all copyright and other notices contained therein, you may download material (one machine readable copy and one print copy per page)for your personal and/or educational non-commercial use only.

The University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, is not responsible for any errors or omissions and excludes any and all liability for any errors in or omissions from the information on the Library website.