Introduction

"The two defensive logics of black victimhood and white denialism collide and collude, often in unexpected ways. Together, they gradually foster a culture of mutual *ressentiment*, which, in turn, isolates freedom from responsibility and seriously undermines the prospect of a truly nonracial future. Furthermore, the logic of mutual *ressentiment* frustrates blacks' sense of ownership of this country while foreclosing whites' sense of truly belonging to this place and to this nation" (Mbembe, 2008: 7; emphasis original).

The prospect of race relations being defined by a logic of mutual ressentiment is not a promising indictment for the future of South Africa. Unfortunately, Mbembe's (2008) observation is not without warrant and indeed there are an increasing number of public incidents where these two defensive logics can be noticed. This research study thus takes as its central concern, the emergence, development and character of these two logics of 'black victimhood' and 'white denialism' in post-apartheid South Africa. Through reading them as elements of a discourse of racialisation, the notion of 'black victimhood' appears interconnected with that of 'white denialism' and so this study will explore the coordinates for their emergence in post-apartheid South Africa. This study will also pay attention to how the particular social, political and economic climate since 1994, together with the legacies of apartheid discourses and the transition period contribute to the specific appearance of the above two mentioned notions which are characteristic of specific racialised subjectivities. The notion of identity being determined through difference with an 'other' will be used to establish the argument of these discourses foundational dependence on each other and therefore further complement the argument for their particularity or specificity. The general tone of the study is expressive of a worry about the dangers of the discourses and how if not challenged they could come to be dominant.

Hypothesis and Research Question:

The hypothesis of this study is that post-apartheid South Africa witnesses the emergence of two interconnected understandings of whiteness and blackness which are constituted

through the difference with each other and thus divulge a foundational dependence on each other. It is that post-apartheid South Africa has facilitated the move towards different discourses of what it can mean to be black and white that has resulted in the emergence of two potentially dangerous and dominant racialised discourses that are reliant on each other to exist. This study could be seen as an attempt to investigate the discursive interrelatedness of racial subjectivity formation in current day South Africa. It looks at these considerable discourses surrounding blackness and whiteness in South Africa, how they develop and the prospects entailed by them. Therefore the question that is to be answered is**: Based on representations of specific black/white racial identities in post-apartheid South Africa, how can the emergence of 'patriotic black' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white racial subjectivities be theorised?**

Methodology:

Cultural studies

The primary object of this research report is to offer an analysis of what is to be argued are two significant discourses of blackness and whiteness and how they are interrelated. The main method to be utilised here is one based in the transdisciplinary methodological approaches located in cultural studies and discourse analysis. Johnson (1986: 38) names as some of the "main features of (the) cultural studies tradition: its openness and theoretical versatility, its reflexive even self-conscious mood, and, especially, the importance of critique... critique in the fullest sense: not criticism merely, nor even polemic, but procedures by which other traditions are approached for what they may yield and for what they inhibit".

The cultural studies framework provides an opportunity for engagement with a diverse set of intellectual traditions and theories. Cultural studies is also relevant in that it represents an academic tradition in which "popular cultural forms (are) (not) divorced from the analysis of power and social possibilities (Johnson, 1986: 42). How this paper wishes to chart these discursive constructions of blackness and whiteness is precisely

through the use of primary sources such as newspapers, websites, speeches and magazines as well drawing from a secondary literature that takes as its concern the relational nature of identity formation and maintenance as well as the deconstruction of racial discourse. In other words, the characteristics of what will be termed 'patriotic blackness' as well as its dependence on a 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness' and its own characteristics, will be deduced from their public representations in popular cultural forms supported by a secondary literature aiming to theorise their emergence and existence. To quote Johnson (1986: 52), there needs to be "careful analyses of where and how public representations work to seal social groups into existing relations of dependence and where and how they have emancipatory tendency". The specific racial identities analysed in this study are therefore not only reflective of particular realities but are too, productive of realities and this is exactly what allocates importance to the analysis of their emergence. The openness obtained through the reading of such diverse sources of information through diverse theoretical lenses, compliments the complexity of the place of race and racial subjectivity in current day South Africa.

Discourse analysis

Discourse analysis has as its underlying assumption, the notion that more than just actual written texts could be read as text. As Greenstein et al (2003: 66) point out, "the text is anything written, visual or spoken that serves as a medium for communication. It includes books, newspaper or magazine articles, advertisements, speeches, official documents, films or videotapes, musical lyrics, photographs, articles of clothing, or works of art". Discourse then, or a discourse, is the prevalent thread or theme, or a series of claims or claims of truth, inferred from these different texts by the analyst. Of course, depending on the intention of the research, the analysis of discourse could be based on an attempt to merely understand the social interactions constructed through discursive mechanisms. Or too, in order to bring about some sort of change through detailing the threat of particular discourse, or indeed, inspiring, creating or endorsing counter discourses aimed at re-evaluating or deconstructing power relationships.

The idea of 'reading a text' opens up a core aspect of discourse analysis, that of positionality. The discourse analyst usually makes no secret what their position/s is within the discursive terrain, that is, either where they stand ideologically or how their own position in society enables, limits or affects a certain interest in, and viewpoint of, a particular topic. Also, the analysts' positionality in relation to already established relations of power is taken into consideration. In reading any particular text, the analyst not only finds the actual content of the text instructive, but too, the silence of the text, that is, what the 'writer' of the text does not include, intentionally or subconsciously, as well as the assumptions of the text, what the writer takes as given (Greenstein et al, 2003). Taking this into account as well as the 'identity' of the writer and the context in which the text is written usually form important elements of discourse analysis.

Positionality also matters in that it insists on providing the understanding that text, or a text, could be read differently by different readers influenced by their own positionality, that is, their position within the symbolic order. Butler (1993: 16) explains how different interpretations of a particular representation can sometimes emerge because of a "contest within the visual (textual) field, a crisis of certainty of what is visible (readable), one that is produced through the saturation and schematization of that field...". So gripped within their own discursive dispositions, the analyst sees only what it is that they can see which can be different to what others may see. This is one of the ways in which critique is always encouraged because the claim to full-proof certainty is slightly, if anything, compromised not only by the acknowledgment of possible bias but also by the sometimes unashamed admission or acknowledgement of a certain bias or predisposition.

Discourse theory

Although it is stated above that one of the reasons for the employment of transdisciplinary methodologies developed within cultural studies is that it allows for a theoretically versatile approach, there is a theoretical paradigm that frames the whole

study and will therefore be consistently drawn upon. This will be discourse theory as elaborated from a post-structuralist point of view. Discourse theory, as noted by Howarth and Stavrakakis (2000: 2-3), "investigates the way in which social practices articulate and contests discourses that constitute reality" and this is based on the assumption that "all objects and actions are meaningful, and that their meaning is conferred by historically specific systems of rules". What is revealed by the idea that social practices 'articulate and contests discourses' is that "systems of meaning are contingent" and so a field of meaning can never be completely exhausted (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 3). A discourse in discourse theory, is a perception of social reality, everything or every object is of discourse, things do not exist as they are outside a constructed system of meanings, signs and symbols known as a discourse or discourses. Norval adds:

> "...one takes discourse as constitutive and gives attention both to the institution of discourses and to their sedimentation...Discourse here is understood both as language in a narrow sense and as practice. Hence, there is no ontological distinction between the discursive and the non-discursive: every social practice, insofar as it is meaningful, is discursive. Analysing political discourse thus requires attention to the particular articulations that give meaning to specific objects and identities" (2009: 313; 320).

The moment where meaning is allocated to a specific identity is what reconciles the notions of subjectivity and identity in this study. It is what warrants not only a focus on the dialogical, interdependent nature of the particular conceptions of blackness and whiteness but also how it is that these particular identities come about. To further explain this, the difference between subject-position and subject has to be noted. Hudson contends:

> Politics is an ontological category, for Laclau, and social objectivity is produced by political decisions. The concept of the subject is political while that of subject-position belongs to the social- the misrecognised product of the political. The distinction between the political and the social is thus internal to both the political and social themselves. No (political) subject is ever entirely free of objective social determination, while subject-position, as an objective social identity, is the crystallisation of an act of the subject (Hudson, 2006: 304).

The acting subject or the subject-as-agent is distinguished from the subject-position or

the subject-as-relatively-stable. What this means is that the "subject as distinct from itself as subject-position" (Hudson, 2006: 301), actively engages in the constitution of a discursive construction and therefore of a new identity, whereas the subject as subject-position is that which occupies the social category, that is, the social identity brought about by the acting or political subject (Howarth, 1998). The abilities of the self-constituting subject to self-constitute must not be overestimated as it's always influenced by some sort of existing symbolic order comprising of various discourses that it encounters (Hudson, 2006). For example, if an identity requires an 'other' in which to positively self-identify then it should be expected that certain aspects of that identity should be perceived as different from those of the 'other' (Hall, 1996). Perceiving someone as different does not require one to have an actual knowledge of a difference but rather to have imagined that a difference does exist.

This opens up the space for a difference to be constructed or manipulated. What this means is that for an identity to make sense and obtain and maintain some semblance of stability, its 'other' has to maintain the ability to be 'boxed' in a manner that positions it oppositionally (Hall, 1996). So as much as the acting subject has the capacity to construct its own identity, its identity can also be constructed as an 'other' to another identity. However, the political subject certainly enjoys a level of agency not afforded it by the conception of the subject as subject-position.

For Foucault, the subject is the subject as subject-position which entails a "positioning within a discursive structure" (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 13). The subject as political subject appears when this discursive structure is no longer able to satisfactorily allocate meaning to the identity of the subject as subject position. This inability to continue to confer meaning is known as a dislocation and will be discussed in greater detail in the second Chapter. So identity here refers to a relatively stabilised social category based on similarities mostly within the category and differences mostly from without the category. This is not to imply an essence to an identity, in fact it can be argued that from a discourse theory perspective, all identity is revealed to be fundamentally contingent (Sing Ho and Tat Tsung, 2000). Sing Ho and Tat Tsung argue

that:

> "...the very act of identification is a creative process, for it is always an individualised interpretation of a collective name and not a perfect imitation of a social category. There is always a misreading of the so-called pre-existing social category and reinterpretation of what is imagined to be there... Furthermore, when an individual or a group of individuals finds the socially available categories for describing himself/herself inadequate or inaccurate to capture the 'essence' of who he/she is, he/she may appropriate a new name or choose to identify with a different social category by drawing elements from other discursive fields. A new identification is thus constructed in conjunction with other signifiers. This naming and renaming process is political, as it challenges the existing social order and destabilises fixed conceptions of what identity is about" (2000: 135).

The ability for identities to be constructed and continually reconstructed is what is indicative of their contingent nature. This is why the analysis of identity or subject as subject-position in this study is inseparable from the analysis of its formation and emergence. If social identity emerges from the actions of the acting or political subject and this identity is constantly reworked, redefined and re-accepted through its interrelation with other identities, then subject formation cannot be distinguished from processes of social identification. Different positionalities from within whatever social identity further complicates the ability of that social identity to achieve stabilisation, but by no means necessarily precludes or undermines the possibility of the social identity to become stable. So, if the discourse of 'patriotic blackness' is to form the subject of analysis, what has to be looked at is not only how it comes about, how it emerges, but also how once it is fairly stable, it keeps on coming about, it keeps on emerging, it keeps on producing subjects, and how indeed this very contingent stability is reliant on these processes.

If the "naming and renaming process... challenges the existing social order and destabilises fixed conceptions of what identity is about" for the subject that appropriates, then surely it is conceivable that this subject can also name and rename the 'other' in order to digest itself as well as the 'other'. So, with 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness, as will be discussed more fully in Chapter four, the term or title 'liberal' white, which for many was and is a form of positive self-identification, is used in

many instances in the discourse of 'patriotic blackness' to define a negative quality or inclination. So the 'liberal' white is renamed as someone who despite putting forward a seemingly progressive political stance that is interpreted as being liberal, in actual fact demonstrates a deep-seated reluctance to change and racial transformation. Whether the 'liberal' white actually exists is less important than its construction by its 'other', that is, by the subject of 'patriotic blackness'.

The particular focus of this study on the emergence or formation of two particular subjectivities or identities understood as subject-positions, as well as their constant dialogue with each other should not be viewed as two separate focuses, but rather as disclosive of the complexities around the concepts of identity and subjectivity. This study then requires a nuanced interpretation of subjectivity. Therefore whenever subjectivity is invoked in this study it should be understood as subject-position, that is, as social identity. However bearing in mind that it is very much a subject with agency, with capacity to act and give meaning and is thus facilitative of new subjectivities and social identities making it a potentially political subject. The social identities said to emerge in post-apartheid South Africa are exactly the result of political subjectivity.

Discourse theory is thus crucial to this study in that it provides the perspective in which to understand racial subjectivity in post-apartheid South Africa. A range of concepts from this theoretical disposition are therefore introduced and utilised throughout the study.

Brief overview of chapters

The first chapter outlines a conceptual basis for the idea that the formation of a racial subject is a process that requires that subject to have a negative 'other' against which it can positively self-identify. The interconnectedness or interdependence of racial discourses (and the subjects that they produce) on each other is shown to be an essential element in the understanding of racial subjectivities in this study. Chapter two introduces and elaborates on some of the key concepts that will allow the particular

argument, of the interconnectedness of particular understandings of blackness and whiteness, in this study to hold. It also seeks to provide a sense of the line of argumentation and use of terminology that will follow, through offering a relevant background to a particular conception of racial subject formation in South Africa.

Chapter three takes off from the previous chapter through analysing the surfacing of a particular discourse of blackness later referred to as 'patriotic blackness'. The contention is that the particular juncture, that is, what is known as post-1994 South Africa, facilitated the rise of a distinct framing of blackness as authentic and patriotic which will be termed 'patriotic blackness'. The main aspects of this discourse are then analysed and shown to be inextricably connected with other discourses as well as reliant on the existence mainly of a 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness' as its 'other', and too on an inauthentic blackness, in order to give itself meaning. Chapter four takes as its focus this 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness' indicating its specific emergence at the time. Its incorporation of other discourses, as well as its foundational dependence on 'patriotic blackness', are used to reveal its particular character. The conclusion of the study provides a summary of the whole argument and highlights the dangers of these racial discourses. An emphasis is placed on the fact that there are different or alternative racial subjectivities that exist and can exist and therefore stresses the idea of the contingency of all discursive constructions and the ability that subjects have to construct different or alternative realities.

Some clarifications

Since there is an already established scholarship of race, racism and race relations literature regarding South Africa, it would be useful to briefly clarify how some of the terminology, particularly those terms delineating a 'racial group', is used in this study. Since this study locates itself within this existing scholarship, this section aims to briefly outline how I intend to use or write these particular terms given that the literature at times varies in how these words are written and used. Given the fact that I am a black person who is sympathetic to some of the viewpoints espoused Black

Consciousness discourse, blacks in this paper will generally be regarded as all those people vulnerable to systematic racial oppression as a result of white racism, so basically including Indian and coloured people when put in a South African context (Biko, 1978). A capital 'B' however will not be used as this paper makes no differentiation between 'Blacks' and 'non-whites' in the same way Black Consciousness did, instead preferring to use a small 'b' to refer to all those who would be regarded as black under the apartheid governement. The only times when a capital 'B' will be used is when discussing actual notions from Black Consciousness discourse or when quoting or referencing and discussing the ideas of a specific writer who employs a capital 'B' when using the term black. In order to distinguish between different groupings within the black category, particular prefixes will be added to help specify, so for example one would say African black or coloured black.

The term coloured will not be prefixed by a 'so-called' or put into inverted commas because of the realisation that there are many people that self-identify as coloured. The two dominant discourses of coloured/black self-identification, that is, the people classified as coloured under apartheid who either self classify as black or as coloured are thus both acknowledged in this study. Keeping consistent with the terms black and coloured, white will not be used with a capital 'W' or indeed put into quotation marks. Keeping consistent with the term African, the only reason Indian will be used with a capital 'I' is to recognise the origin of the word as a proper noun and not to allocate it any special importance, at least more so than others, as a 'racial group'.

CHAPTER ONE

This chapter aims to provide a brief theoretical foray into what is meant by the discursive interrelatedness of racial subjectivity formation. The notion of identity as constituted through difference will serve as the main conceptual framework in which this position will be outlined. The intention is to examine the foundational dependency that the 'racial categories' black and white have on each other therefore seeking to justify this study's focus on a specific blackness discourse that has as its other a specific whiteness discourse and vice versa. This will be done by firstly introducing the concept of 'frontier' construction which it will argued is fundamental in understanding the use of the binary black/white in this study. The notions of equivalence and difference will then be used to enhance the apprehension of what is meant by frontiers and inadvertently set the template for a discussion of how Black Consciousness discourse employed these aforementioned concepts. What will then follow is a brief discussion on race and modernity, that is, how the development of the concept of race as it has come to be known is indistinguishably linked with the development of the discourse of modernity.

Racial identity and political frontiers

"Blackness only became a racial category with the forced removal of West Africans to the Western Hemisphere. From the start, Black identity has been produced in contradiction. Although there is no biological basis for racial categories (there is no such thing as a 'black', 'white', or 'Asian' gene, and the amount of genetic disparity between persons of different races is the same as that between the same racial category), Blacks in the West have nonetheless had their history shaped by the very concrete effects of Western racism. Unlike Black Africans, who ultimately define themselves through shared histories, languages, and cultural values, Blacks in the diaspora possess an intimidating array of historical, cultural, national, ethnic, religious, and ancestral origins and influences. At the same time despite this range of differences, they are most identified in the West as simply 'Black' and therefore as largely homogenous. Given these contradictions, the attempt to offer an overarching definition of Blackness looks to be a losing game" (Wright, 2004: 1-2).

Winant (2000) argues that race is a political concept, a socially cultivated un-empirical foundation for the allocation of resources and power and any valid analysis of it has to be established and sustained within this framework. If it is accepted that racial categories have no biological or even cultural basis, then Wright's (2004) proclamation of the 'range of differences' within the black category requires a conception of blackness that is not positivist or normative in the sense of defining an unseen or unknown essence, but at the same time recognises the legitimacy of a black identity. Norval (2000: 220) argues that no identity can be determined naturalistically or through "positively attributed characteristics" and therefore "some other way of delimiting identity has to be found". The concepts of antagonism and frontiers become relevant when seeking a way in which identity can be delimited in a way that does not succumb to essentialism. Antagonism is defined by Hudson (2006: 303) as the "subversive presence of an identity in another thus prevent(ing) any social identity from being fully identical to itself", whereas Norval (2000: 220) notes that it is "through the consolidation or dissolution of political frontiers that discursive formations in general, and social and political identities more specifically, are constructed or fragmented". The creation, drawing or determination of a frontier, or political frontier because it requires the actions of the acting or political subject, thus acts as a validation of an antagonism. This however does not necessarily mean that the creation of a frontier follows from an antagonistic relationship, but an antagonism must be presupposed for a frontier to be brought into existence.

This drawing of a frontier is a symbolic gesture that determines the content of one side of the frontier through its juxtaposition to the other side. What makes the presence of an identity in another subversive is exactly the fact that it is unlike that identity, it is what the identity is not, it occupies what that identity lacks. That identity however, is only an identity because of this subversive presence or lack. So that which "prevents a social identity from being fully identical to itself" also acts as that which allows that social identity to exist in the first place (Hudson, 2006: 303). Hence the idea of a constitutive lack, which is not a lack that impedes the development of an identity but a lack that constitutes it, allows it to be. The identities thus have an antagonistic

relationship. They are opposed to each other and it's precisely due to this opposition that each identity is able to differentiate itself from its 'other'. Norval (2000: 220) maintains that "moreover, political frontiers serve not only to individuate identity, but also organise political space through the simultaneous operation of the logics of equivalence and difference".

Equivalence and difference

The creation of frontiers is, put simply, facilitated through the intricate functioning of the logics of equivalence and difference. The logic of equivalence functions through the overdetermining of differences on one side of the frontier in order to portray a unified front in opposition to the other side of the frontier (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000). To go back to the Wright (2004) quote above, how an apparently heterogeneous grouping of people could be seemingly homogenously referred to as Black, is because of the overdetermination of the Black signifier through creating an equivalence with White and therefore instituting a frontier with black on the one side and white on the other. The logic of difference on the other hand involves the breaking down of equivalences and established political frontiers therefore downplaying antagonisms, expanding the facilitation of differences which in turn acts to minimise the destructive potential of differences (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000). What this means is that there is a conscious effort, usually in the name of a larger solidarity or unity, to allocate less significance to differences that exist within, in order to bolster a collective identity. This logic, as will be indicated in chapter three when discussing racial reasoning, can also lead to a silencing of various 'internal' political demands in order to allow the overall frontier to be more effective.

To again go back to Wright's (2004) quote, in order for an equivalence to be created between black and white, all 'internal' frontiers and equivalences have to be dissolved. So for there to be a 'Black', the antagonistic potential of different identities within the diaspora are minimised in order to allow 'Black' to overdetermine. As will be shown in the next chapter, the success of Charterist discourse was largely attributable to its

ability to minimise the differences between a varied group of anti-apartheid organisations and movements, therefore helping establish a strong frontier between those who were anti-apartheid on one side and those who were pro-apartheid on the other.

The logics of equivalence and difference can therefore be said to function simultaneously. Burgos, in elaborating on the concept of overdetermination, indicates the correlative relationship of equivalence and difference:

> "The two basic operations involved in the concept of *overdetermination* are the logics of *displacement* and *condensation*. The former refers to the continuous circulation of meanings and identities between different social movements, agents and agendas. It shows that no identity is pure and uncontaminated, but always involves traces of other identities, thus displaying the relational character of the social. The latter logic involves the precarious fixation that temporarily stops the flow of signification by fusing different elements in a 'ruptural unity'. The logic of condensation thus helps to understand that fixations are never definitive, but result from the welding of diverse elements into precarious units which do not completely eliminate the particularity of what has been condensed". (2000: 88) (emphasis original).

This is not to imply that the logic of displacement is the same thing as the logic of difference. The former refers to a state of affairs, the way things are and are happening, whereas the latter refers to a process that seeks to establish or further manifest the logic of displacement. The same can be said with the logics of condensation and equivalence, with the former referring to a state in which the latter has already established itself. Put differently, the logic of condensation applies when an overdetermination has taken place which was enabled by a logic of equivalence. Displacement and condensation thus somewhat evince the complex relationship between equivalence and difference.

Black Consciousness, frontier creation and 'othering'

Black Consciousness (BC) discourse can serve as a suitable example for a better understanding of the concepts of displacement (by way of difference) and condensation

(by way of equivalence) as well as overdetermination by way of the logics of equivalence and difference. In defying the boundaries of skin pigmentation as well as apartheid racial classifications, Biko (1978), one of the leading proponents of BC, regarded as Black all those who were subject to structural domination by white supremacy and so included the 'racial' categories Coloured, Indian and African. Furthermore being black is distinguished from being non-white; all blacks are non-white but not all non-whites are Black because being Black entails a proactive attainment of Black consciousness, which allows a realisation of the true extent of white domination and a subsequent commitment to its resistance (MacDonald, 2003).

Firstly, through presenting a somewhat normative interpretation of blackness, in the sense of it being a relatively attainable attribute and contingently dependent upon a racialised and racist system and not as being true for all time, 'Black' acts as a 'ruptural unity' through condensing different elements. What, at least partly, ensures its 'rupturality' is that it entails a becoming, it is something people have the option of becoming, and so is inherently fragile because of the possibility that everyone that can be Black can choose not to identify as Black and therefore remain non-white. Also, some people can be prevented from identifying as Black attesting to the 'internal' othering also important in establishing self-identity. The ideas of authentic or inauthentic blackness developed more fully in both chapters three and four, are an example of how this 'internal othering' is important to the establishment of self-identity. The description or representation of one subject as authentic as opposed to an 'other' rejects the supposed commonalities that the subjects share and therefore places value and importance on different elements of that supposedly shared social identity. So for BC, the 'blackness' of one's skin is not nearly as important to what makes one Black, as the attitude that one has towards Blackness and what constitutes racial equality.

Secondly, the fact that what was regarded as being different racial groups could be fused into one indicates the how the frontiers and equivalences between, for example, 'natives' and Indians, had to be dissolved in order to allow an overdetermination of the

signifier Black. This overdetermination does not mean that other identities are obliterated; they continue to exist but not as racial identities thus helping consolidate a logic of constant displacement. In the end an equivalence is created between Black and white, allowing for the political frontier between them to be drawn. The identity Black requires as its stark opposition, the identity white. Non-whites only become Black through adopting a particular stance against whiteness. Indeed, if as Wright (2004) points out that the existence of a plethora of identities question the validity of a Blackness, then being black is either something that people become and/or are said to be in relation to something else because there is no such thing as a given blackness.

Hudson (2006: 303) makes the contention that "no discursive formation... is self-enclosed and self-sufficient but depends on an exterior, a constitutive exterior comprising other discursive formations". Therefore any discourse of blackness, like BC, requires as its other, another discursive formation/s. Burgos (2000) argues that an overdetermination is reliant on a concurrent mystical discourse which infuses it with meaning. So BC's Black as an overdetermining factor, for example, requires a mystical BC discourse that provides an "ordering of representations of the origins, the sense and transcendence of (a) collective identit(y) in history" (Burgos, 2000: 89). Indeed, the notion of a subject being defined by a particular discourse and in turn defining the character of that very discourse is central to this study. To quote Denzin at length:

"Racial discourse thus turns on the repeated performance of those speech acts that name the racial subject... (race) does not exist in nature, in culture, in the group mind, in the consciousness of the prejudiced person, or in stereotypes and racial slurs. The representational and discursive practices of the group constitute race... The discursive construction of race is more than a matter of language; such talk exists within a discursive system. A system of discourse consists of material and representational practices and speech acts that produce knowledge and meaning (Miron and Inda, 2000: 100)... In any historical moment, racial discourse is embedded in a range of texts, institutional sites, and rituals. This discourse draws on preexisting racist beliefs and ideologies. This never-ending discourse produces the racial subject, over and over again. A racial subject, or racial group, cannot exist outside of the performative discourses that produce it. Thus race is a process" (2001: 246).

Race and modernity

Gilroy's (1993) text, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, is a case in point when considering Denzin's (2001: 246) assertion that "in any historical moment, racial discourse is embedded in a range of texts, institutional site and rituals". Gilroy (1993) charts the formation of black subjectivities over a period that goes as far back as slavery through discursive sites such as 'black' literature and music. Gilroy (1993) firmly lodges the black experience within modernity, meaning that the emergence of black subjects as they have come to be regarded can be linked with the emergence of modernity. Race and racism, are therefore adjudged by Gilroy (1993) to be central to the modernity project: "There is a scant sense, for example, that the universality and rationality of enlightened Europe and America were used to sustain and relocate rather than eradicate an order of racial difference inherited from the premodern era" (49). Wright (2004: 27), in the text *Becoming Black: Creating Identity in the African Diaspora*, similarly states that "Blacks in the Americas were deconstructing white Western nationalist discourses celebrating the dawn of democracy" and how "texts such as David Walker's *Appeal* and John Marrant's *Sermon* offered counter-discourses that asked whether the West could indeed claim racial superiority in societies so dependent on Black slaves". Wright (2004), through stating that blackness only comes into being as a racial category through slavery also recognises the genesis of race as occurring concurrently with the modern period.

Firstly, what the points made by Gilroy and Wright corroborate is the idea that blackness and whiteness as modern concepts have always been involved in an oppositional, dialectical and constitutive relation. In other words there was never blackness outside of a conception of whiteness and vice versa. Gilroy (1993) for example, notes how in some American towns 'white people' did not exist as a definable group, they were only immigrants or descendents of immigrants, until the arrival of black slaves. How the concepts of blackness and whiteness, as they have come to be understood should be viewed is as modern constructions partly constituted by and partly constitutive of, other modern discourses such as science and rationality. What made these concepts even more dangerous was the fact that they were inseparable from ideas on nationhood and gender

(Wright, 2004). For example there is an extensive literature on how the act of lynching in late nineteenth century and early twentieth century America was enabled by a racial discourse inseparable from its ideas of nation and sexuality.[i] In chapter three, an analysis of the 'Caster Semenya debacle' will assist in elucidating the connection between race, gender and nation.

Secondly, through reading racial subjectivity from a variety of discursive sites, both Wright and Gilroy note how black subjects have for a long time created counter-discourses that questioned the discourse of the purported purity of whiteness which acted as a powerful mechanism in maintaining white supremacy. Examples of the existence of such counter-discourses are offered in a text by Mullen (1994). In a reading of Ralph Elllison's *Invisible Man*, Mullen (1994) takes interest in a black male character named Lucius Brockway. Brockway is employed at the Liberty Paint Company which produces a paint named "Optic White" whose pure, untainted and perfect whiteness is, according to Brockway, a result of his unique and masterful mixing skills and knowledge of the machinery (Mullen, 1994). Mullen (1994: 76) notes how "Brockway has something to teach the narrator" through how the "elder worker correctly points to the unacknowledged contribution of black men and women to the production (and reproduction) of white America". This lack of acknowledgement is mainly found in white America, because there is certainly a more publically acknowledged knowledge about blackness' contribution to white identity and whiteness' to black identity amongst blacks Americans.

Mullen's (1994) main concern in the article "Optic White: Blackness and the Production of Whiteness" is how in the literature of passing, and indeed in the reality of it, the move from black to white almost always entails a clean separation of the black person passing to or as white, from family or any other markers that might compromise that person's newly achieved status of whiteness. Black people passing as white thus reproduce and produce the supposed purity of whiteness through this act of actual and symbolic severance (Mullen, 1994). This 'hidden' information held by both the black person who does the passing as well as that person's family then becomes a powerful instrument in that its revelation could question the 'racial purity' of a supposedly 'pure race'. The mere

knowledge of the impact blackness has on the production of whiteness can be, and has been, but not always is used as a political tool. Brockway, as Mullen (1994: 74) contends, "has subversive knowledge of the workings of the system but no political motivation to change it". The subversive presence of an identity in another is shown again here to be fundamental to the existence of both the identities involved (Hudson, 2006).

Conclusion

This chapter provided a conceptual framework in order determine how this study approaches the connection between different racial subjectivities. More specifically it aimed to allow a theoretical understanding to how the two distinct discursive constructions of blackness and whiteness, that is, 'patriotic blackness' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness" that this study charts the development of, can be interrelated. The argument was that ultimately all identities require a construction of an 'other' or others that facilitates a construction of self. This other and self both emanate from racial discourses that are produced by and productive of racial subjects. Racial discourses and therefore racial subjects are argued to appear concurrently with other modern discourses and thus firmly situating the appearance of the concept of race as it is has come to be known today, in modernity. The next chapter provides an exposition of some of the other important concepts through an exploration of the particular historico-political contexts, post-Sharpeville massacre and post-June 16 1976 to be specific, in which different black identities have emerged in South Africa.

CHAPTER TWO

This chapter seeks to provide some historical background to what will follow in the rest of the paper. Key theoretical texts will be analysed in order to extrapolate some of the important ideas that are applied in this study. Therefore the intention of this chapter is to provide a historical political context to the emergence of certain black identities during apartheid South Africa which will further assist in setting the conceptual coordinates which will form the bases in which the argument for emergence of 'patriotic blackness' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness' will be made. Following from the previously discussed abstractions, more specifically the difference between the subject as political subject and subject as subject-position, the concept of dislocation will be introduced. A dislocation will be argued to be fundamental to the formation of new discourses and identities and so it will be shown how both Black Consciousness and Charterist discourse with their concomitant identities both appear from the dislocatory experiences of 'Sharpeville' in 1960 and 'June 16' in 1976 respectively. This is all done with the purpose of familiarising the reader with some of the concepts and perspectives that will in the next chapter help posit the end of the apartheid state or '1994' as a dislocatory experience that sees the emergence of certain discourses and their concomitant identities.

Dislocation

It would be most useful to begin with an argument presented by Howarth in the article titled "The difficult emergence of a democratic imaginary: Black Consciousness and non-racial democracy in South Africa''. The contention being made here is that the student protests on June 16 1976 mark a dislocatory experience that triggered a whole period of social upheaval and mass resistance against the apartheid state. A dislocatory experience can be understood as the experience of a dislocation which defines the "moment of failure and subversion of a system of representation (that is, a political ideology, a social paradigm or even a scientific explanation and so on)" (Stavrakakis, 2000: 105-106). If the social is discursively constructed, then dislocation exposes its

ultimate uncertainty, it represents a fracture in what is generally considered the ordinary.

Torfing(1999: 148) defines dislocation as "the emergence of an event, or a set of events, that cannot be represented, symbolized, or in other ways domesticated by the discursive structure- which therefore is disrupted". 'Soweto' or 'June 76' gains its importance in that it is the first event that sets off a series of events that disrupt the discursive structure, therefore prompting the appearance of discourses that sought to represent or symbolise these events in a new symbolic order. So for Howarth (2000: 169), "'Soweto' is best understood as a dislocation of the social. In other words, it was an event that could not be symbolised in the apartheid symbolic order and in the existing resistance discourses". However, the potency of the notion of dislocation does not lie in it necessarily entailing an actual event, but rather how symbolically this event presented an opportunity for a range of discourses and identities to emerge.

In this sense dislocations do exemplify a "radical negativity" meaning that "they do not constitute positively defined factors (they have no substance)", that "they have no positive content in themselves- and cannot be predicted by any kind of teleological philosophy of history" (Stavrakakis, 2000: 106). Even if, as Howarth (2000) points out, there is clear intention by the subjects of a dislocatory experience, in this case of 'June 16' the rioting students aiming to disrupt a sense of normalcy through primarily protesting against what is deemed an unjust school curriculum, the outcome of and the meanings derived from the event itself cannot be comprehensively predetermined. Dislocation then, as an analytical concept, proves retroactive, seeking to explain, and consequently apportion content and meaning to, the emergence of certain discourses and identities.

As Stavrakakis (2000: 106) contends "ideologies do not emerge like mushrooms, or according to any plan of predestination, but constitute responses to particular crises that cannot be known in advance and cannot be administered within the previous ideological configuration". The radical negativity of the consequences of a dislocation

indicate their responsive nature and this contributes to a dislocation, in the sense of an actual event, having the ability to be constructed or maintaining the capacity to being articulated differently. What this means is that there is no fundamental truth to how a dislocatory experience can be understood which opens up the space for it to be interpreted differently. Howarth and Stavrakakis (2000: 13) note that "if dislocations disrupt identities and discourses, they also create a lack at the level of meaning that stimulates new discursive constructions, which attempt to suture the dislocated structure". So a dislocation can be interpreted or be constructed as a dislocation by a certain discourse to convey a specific reality.

Sharpeville dislocation and Black Consciousness

The notion of discourse or discourses is clearly important to understanding dislocation. To quote Howarth and Stavrakakis at length:

"We take *discourse* or *discourses* to refer to systems of meaningful practices that form the identities of subjects and objects... discourses are concrete systems of social relations and practices that are intrinsically *political,* as their formation is an act of radical institution, which involves the construction of antagonisms and the drawing of political frontiers between 'insiders' and 'outsiders'. In addition, therefore, they always involve the exercise of *power*, as their constitution involves the exclusion of certain possibilities and consequent structuring of the relations between differing social agents. Moreover, discourses are *contingent* and *historical* constructions which are always vulnerable to those political forces excluded in their production, as well as the dislocatory effects of events beyond their control" (2000: 3-4) (emphasis original).

Black Consciousness, which to an extent can stake a claim to being one of the most influential factors behind the June '76 protests as well as to being the principal political movement or force in explicit opposition to the apartheid state at the time, can itself be read as a discourse that emerged from a dislocation. Gqola (2001: 120) notes how the "Black Consciousness Movement (BCM) emerged in the 1960s as a response largely to the political vacuum created by the relentless apartheid state repression and bannings that characterised the post-Sharpeville era". Howarth (2000: 169) adds that the 'Sharpeville massacre' provided the opportunity in "which the NP government

managed to unify the power bloc and the state around the 'total apartheid' project of 'separate development'". So the emergence a Black Consciousness discourse was allowed by the occurrence of the Sharpeville incident which provided the apartheid state with the necessary impetus, and therefore the development of a discourse, to further intensify its eradication of oppositional elements.

Given this void, in which for example the African National Congress (ANC) and Pan-African Congress (PAC) which were amongst the biggest political parties at the time were banned, BC was able to develop a unique political idiom, even though it had an array of ideological/philosophical influences, and establish a significant political movement (Gqola, 2001). It must be noted that BC is not presented here as being a "substitute/alternative nor an extension of the exiled liberation movements" but rather having as one of its specific conditions of possibility, the absence of dominant oppositional discourse within the country which happens at a particular socio-political economic juncture.

Perhaps BC discourse's most noteworthy characteristic was its formation of a radical black subject identity. Through the drawing of frontiers such as black as opposed to white, non-white as opposed to Black, and creation of differences such as liberal/leftist white and conservative/nationalist white, BC discourse delineated a black identity that relied heavily on an 'insider' 'outsider' logic as well as the "exclusion of certain possibilities and consequent structuring of the relations between differing social agents" (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 4). Howarth (2000: 185) notes how the period following the Sharpeville event was characterised by "relative sedimentation and stabilisation of social identities". So it is this environment of relatively stable social identities that a discourse explicitly and consciously based on a *political* social identity can appear or gain prominence. If the apartheid state reacted to Sharpeville in a manner that sought to further entrench racial domination, its racial discourse had to be sharper in the sense of clearly marked out racial boundaries.

When the South African Students Organisation (SASO) formed after what it claims

was the realisation that the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS) was not being adequately representative of the specific concerns and viewpoints of black students, there has to have been an idea of what black students' concerns and viewpoints were. So the era of relatively stable social identity becomes manifest in the idea of there being concerns and viewpoints that are peculiar to black students and black people in general, and the era of an absence of any significant black opposition becomes manifest in the disenchantment of there being a lack of space for black "opinions and aspirations" in a white structure (Gqola, 2001: 131). If, as Gqola (2001: 131) argues that "BC ideology found its eloquence in SASO and as a consequence only became fully formulated within and by this student body", then it can be assumed SASO's existence was enabled by the fact that it sought not to replicate, and indeed perhaps could not replicate, at least in an explicit fashion, the ideologies of already banned organisations, and therefore had to be somewhat inventive in approach.

BC's innovation, as well as ambiguity, lay in the fact that it opened up as well as closed off what could be regarded as a legitimate black identity, and also a legitimate radical opposition to the apartheid state. The point is that BC discourse embodies the responsiveness of discourse in that firstly, its genesis can be located from a dislocatory experience, secondly, it draws upon a range of floating signifiers such as 'blackness' and 'liberal' infusing them with different meanings, and thirdly, through being evidently influenced by a difference based or oppositional logic in the way in the way its key concepts are formulated. However, as much as the "relative sedimentation and stabilisation of social identities" was a condition of possibility it also proved to be the one of the reasons why, as Howarth (2000: 185) asserts, BC "was unable to hegemonise different forces and the overall field of discursivity in the post-Sharpeville period".

What tends to get noted as one of BC's novelties was its prioritisation of the idea that the Black racial category was constituted of all those people who were systematically oppressed by the apartheid state. This position suggested a conception of race that clearly exposed it as a socio-political cultivation thus contesting notions of race that

are biologically or culturally predicated. However, as noted above, BC discourse of blackness was laden with ambiguity, which it could be argued was necessary at times, but the problem was that it was either too exclusive or too inclusive. Firstly, it was exclusive in the sense that because it was not clear "whether blackness referred to a common experience of racial oppression under white domination, or whether it designated a peculiarly African consciousness and sensibility" and so there was bound to be "difficulties for the coexistence of racial, ethnic and cultural differences within BC discourse" (Howarth, 2000: 175).

In the creation of the frontier black as opposed to white, that is, the process where an equivalence is created between black and white and differences created within these identities, this frontier was supplemented by an African as opposed to western discourse. This was clearly meant to amplify the contrast leading to an association, at times understated and at times clear, between blackness and 'Africaness'. Despite BC's outright rejection of the Bantustan system and its disavowal of ethnic identification, it is understandable how this slippage could result in the alienation of some black identities particularly of those regarded by the apartheid state as coloured and Indian. Howarth (2000: 176) points out that to "become 'black' for (some) Coloureds in South Africa meant the renunciation of an ethnic, cultural or even national identity, and a consequent experience of loss and dislocation not compensated for by the new discourse". This experience of loss and dislocation by those having to denounce their hitherto identifications together with the persistence of an exclusively African dimension to BC's blackness both indicate the strength of appeal of the social identities of the time.

Secondly, it was too inclusive in the sense that because the signifier Black was prioritised, certainly over other floating signifiers such as class, democratic institutions etc, and opened up to include all those subject to systemic discrimination it meant that all those identifying as black had access to the vocabulary of BC discourse even though their political views were in contradiction with those of BC (Howarth, 2000). Howarth (2000: 177) claims that "as the category of blackness became more widely

available for the various sectors of the black community in South Africa, so it led to some participants in the Bantustan system itself using the language of BC to pursue their interests, even though SASO and the BCM had opposed the Bantustan leaders as collaborators within the apartheid system". Howarth (2000) concludes that the frontier of non-white as opposed to Black was created largely because of the susceptibility of 'black' to being too widely utilised by too wide an array of discourses.

Furthermore, because of the unequivocal delineation of black and white in BC discourse, and in particular the repudiation of 'white liberal' contribution to the BCM, there was always the vulnerability to being charged with 'reverse racism'. Despite the constant reiteration that BC's blackness was a political one, its radical identitarian basis coupled with a general lack of understanding of how this discourse could be reconciled with the idea of non-racialism, ensured that there was always the possibility that it could be interpreted as being unhelpful in the struggle against rigid racial boundaries. It's this perception of BC's upholding of racial boundaries that may explain the National Party's initially favourable reaction to the formation of SASO (Howarth, 1997). BC's critique of 'liberalism', its stress on self-pride and self-reliance as well as SASO's repudiation of white membership in its ranks led the apartheid regime to believe that BC was well in line with the doctrine of separate development (Howarth, 1997).

What this shows is what Howarth (2000: 175) refers to as the "limits of blackness as an empty signifier". Howarth and Stavrakakis (2000: 8) state that "even if the full closure of the social is not realisable in any actual society, the idea of closure and fullness still functions as an (impossible) ideal. Societies are thus organised and centred on the basis of such (impossible) ideals. What is necessary for the emergence and function of these ideals is the production of empty signifiers". Symbolically, the full movement of blackness from being a floating signifier to being to a relatively stable empty signifier was never achieved by BC (Howarth, 2000). For BC, the development of a radical blackness was intended to be that which was to fill the lack of closure of the social, in other words the absence of a certain political black identity was what characterised the

lack of the apartheid social. It's an empty signifier exactly because it signifies the symbolic emptiness of the social.

BC discourse posited blackness as its empty signifier because as Howarth and Stavrakakis (2000: 9) note, "the articulation of a political discourse can only take place around an empty signifier that functions as a nodal point". But because of the difficulties surrounding BC's use of Black it was never fully able to stabilise as an empty signifier and function as a successful nodal point. If hegemonic triumph is determined by the extent to which an empty signifier is (contingently) concretised, that is, its level of success as a stable nodal point or how well a range of differences can be articulated under a general or shared idiom, then BC discourse was unable to achieve a hegemonic grip on oppositional political discourse in the post-Sharpeville era precisely because of the failure of BC's notion of Blackness as an extensively satisfactory and unifying empty signifier. This is why Howarth (2000: 173) contends that BC found it too demanding to "move beyond its status as being a mythical space to becoming a collective social imaginary".

Because BC could not articulate successfully the number of floating signifiers under the empty signifier black, it could not develop from being a myth, which "seeks to construct new spaces of representation that attempt to suture the dislocated space in question", to being an imaginary where a new space of representation has been realised (Howarth, 2000: 15). Although not extensively hegemonising the field of discursivity in the period following Sharpeville, BC discourse did have a prominent presence on the discursive horizon. BC influences can be detected in the June '76 protests and so despite it not being hegemonic, it was in some respects a very influential discourse. Howarth's (2000) main argument in the aforementioned essay has as its particular focus the period following the dislocation of June 76, contending that whereas BC failed to constitute an imaginary both in the period following Sharpeville and in the period following the June protests, the Charterist discourse emerging from this post-76 era was successful in creating a collective social imaginary ultimately leading to the toppling of the apartheid state in 1994.

Howarth (2000: 168) asserts that the "integration of BCM as a leading political force both inside the country and in exile is inversely proportional to the growing importance and power of a series of movements that came to adopt the ANC's Freedom Charter as its guiding document". So June 76 as a dislocatory event allowed for a proliferation of discourses that had the opportunity to construct this dislocatory experience in their own favourable manner and therefore engage in a hegemonic struggle with other discourses. The success of Charterist discourse can of course be attributed to several factors such as the inability of the National Party government to provide a feasible counter-discourse, this in contrast to the relatively effective reaction to the Sharpeville event, and too the various dynamics between the anti-apartheid discourses as Howarth argues:

> Not only was Charterism clearly available to those struggling against apartheid in the post-Soweto period, it was also a viable and credible discourse to signify and embody the various demands that were being made against the system. Moreover, although both discourses can be characterised as populist, the clear limitations on BC becoming a collective imaginary did not pertain to Charterism. Whereas BC stressed racial exclusivity, Charterism was avowedly non-racial; while BC was ambiguous about who constituted the South African nation and people, the UDF stressed that *all* South Africans who were against apartheid could be part of the South African nation, and they drew a set of equivalences along these lines. Moreover, while BC was unclear about its overall political programme, the signifier 'democracy' in Charterist discourse was able to include all social classes, and was able to accommodate numerous concrete interpretations of the nature of democracy" (2000: 185)(emphasis original).

Charterism thus proved a more accommodating discourse able to incorporate elements of BC in reaction to the post-June 76 or Soweto discourse adopted by the apartheid state. Chipkin (2002) instead of using the term Charterist refers instead to a National Democratic Revolution (NDR) discourse, which basically refers to the same discourse as the Freedom Charter was a central document to the theory of the NDR in South Africa. Chipkin (2002: 572) argues that the decrease in the discursive popularity of BC was because of its almost exclusive focus on "the degree to which racial oppression

was defeated as the elementary condition of *Black psychic health*" instead of contemplating the existence and implications of "Black liberation as a state project; that is, as a politics intending a certain kind of Black state". Chipkin (2002) continues in saying that it was exactly this gap in both the theoretical and political stance of BC that fostered the reconciliation of BC language with that of the NDR. So "without its own concept of the state, BC was often (especially within the ANC), and still is, invoked to animate NDR (Chipkin, 2002: 572).

The presence of BC influences within Charterism or the NDR discourse can also be explained by the fact that many of the proponents of BC had joined those movements under Charterism after Soweto 76, whether in exile or within South Africa (Howarth, 2000). This very fact attests to the growing power of NDR discourse to interpellate a wide variety of subjects into a common project. In drawing upon the discourse of BC amongst others, Charterism was able to succeed further than BC in solidifying 'black' as an empty signifier. Chipkin (2002: 572) states that as the "labour movement began to have a greater presence in South African politics the term Black was invested with a new "experiential" referent: that of racial capitalist exploitation" meaning that "apartheid was not simply a racial system. It was rather, and in addition, a system of racial capitalism". What happens here is that the emphasis is removed from the political potential of a radical black subject identity to including a dimension, that of a racial capitalism, that ultimately contests the idea of opposition to apartheid as having to be waged along different racial lines. In other words, the black/white frontier is not as explicitly outlined because of how this blackness has been able to incorporate signifiers such as 'black' (in the BC sense), 'capitalist exploitation' and 'non-racialism' under the empty signifier black (in the NDR sense). In this case the defeat of capitalism co-incides with the defeat of racial oppression in South Africa. This allows for broader alliances in the struggle against apartheid, which is something that was precluded by BC, and hence the NDR "struggle for national democracy through national liberation" (Chipkin, 2002: 573)

Chipkin (2002: 573) puts it thus: "National Liberation was not Black liberation.

Indeed, they implied quite different notions of freedom. The first suggested that the defeat of apartheid was the elementary condition of liberating classes from exploitation. In the second, as we have seen, Black Liberation was a politics of psychological healing". If the intention is national liberation then even those whites who believe that the apartheid system is unjust and exploitative of black people in particular, can be involved in this broader struggle for liberation. Where the frontier is drawn here is between blacks as well as all those loyal to black liberation by way of national liberation, and all those loyal to the apartheid state or who are not committed to the idea and struggle of national liberation. The black/white frontier is thus not as starkly drawn in NDR or Charterist discourse as it is in BC discourse and its incorporation of other referents such as 'national' or 'democracy' or 'the people' introduces new markers of what it means to be black and white, and what it means to engage in legitimate oppositional political action.

In other words being black in BC, so being legitimately or politically black or being Black as opposed to non-white was based on the attainment of a certain consciousness that recognised the extent to which race and racism functioned to oppress black people. So beyond BC being a politics aimed at the apartheid state, it can be said that it was concerned with the subversion of a racial system that denied black people access to their humanity (Biko, 1978). Being white in BC discourse was to some extent already problematic since whiteness entailed a 'birthright' access to privilege that was not accessible to blacks and was dependent on their exploitation and oppression. Even though the difference between conservative and 'liberal/leftist' whites was appreciated, BC discourse generally placed them on the same side of the fence, as beneficiaries of a racial system built upon the disadvantage of blacks. Being black in Charterist discourse did not entail such radical racial delineations. To be Black, in addition to being psychologically liberated, as BC discourse stipulated, also meant to be committed to the struggle against racial capitalism, to be committed to a national democracy and a non-racial future for South Africa (Howarth, 2000).

Being white in this particular discourse of blackness was not necessarily an inherently

problematic 'disposition'. Whether one was considered to be on the one side of the frontier or the other was determined by their allegiance with regard to the ending of apartheid and racial capitalism. The 'liberal/leftist' white was therefore accommodated significantly more comfortably than in BC discourse. The target for Charterism was not a racial system in its entirety, that is, race as a system of meanings, significations, symbols etc, going beyond its visible and vulgar manifestations, but rather a specific system of racial capitalism.

Hudson (1986: 7) points out the theoretical inconsistencies between the Freedom Charter and the National Democratic Revolution and argues that "revolutionary class struggle in South Africa" need not necessarily "assume the form of a struggle for national democracy until the system of national domination has been destroyed". What is important about Hudson's (1986) essay outside of its convincing claims, is that it reveals that in spite of vital conceptual incompatibilities and slippages, NDR discourse was able to function effectively therefore revealing the level of hegemony it was able to achieve. To quote Hudson at length in a paper that is part of a mid-80s debate with well known writer, activist and SACP and UDF member Jeremy Cronin:

> "...there is an imperative need for the constitution and maintenance of a broad alliance in the struggle against Apartheid and capitalism in South Africa; the Freedom Charter plays an extremely important articulating and unifying role in the struggle against Apartheid; the realisation of the demands of the Freedom Charter are not irrelevant to socialist transformation in South Africa but are in fact a necessary condition of it. On the other hand, contrary to the theory of the national democratic revolution, and to the argument advanced by Cronin and Suttner... the struggle for national liberation is not, I argue, intrinsically anti-capitalist and therefore already revolutionary. The struggle for national liberation may be articulated with the struggle against capitalism. This latter struggle may itself, under certain conditions, derive an extra 'charge of negativity' (Laclau and Mouffe, 1985: 132) from such an articulation, or it may develop into it, but it is not in and of itself anti-capitalist" (Hudson, 1987: 55).

The idea that struggle for national liberation was not by default anti-capitalist perhaps accounts for the ease in which capitalists and capitalism could be reconciled within the Charterist discourse. If "hegemonic practices are an exemplary form of political activity that involves the articulation different identities and subjectivities into a common project,

while hegemonic formations are the outcomes of these projects' endeavours to create new forms of social order from a variety of dispersed and dislocated elements", then NDR discourse is a model depiction of a hegemonic formation born of hegemonic practices (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 14). Not only through its ability to articulate a range of political identities under a single umbrella best exemplified by the formation of the multi-organisational United Democratic Front in 1983, but also how possible discrepancies whether ideological or conceptual, were overlooked or reconciled to enable a common project (Howarth, 2000). Indeed Hudson and Cronin's debate is itself indicative of a hegemonic practice in that Hudson (1987), in concluding his response to Cronin (1986), implies that Cronin's primary concern in providing a critique of his initial essay was that Hudson's theoretical inquisitions might put the strategy behind, or better yet, of Charterist discourse at risk. Hudson (1987: 58-59) writes that "(Cronin) appears to believe that all that remains to be done is to think of ways of improving mobilisation around the Freedom Charter", this of course being as opposed to exploring the actual conceptual bases of the political positions adopted by those under Charterist discourse.

Based on Hudson's reply, Cronin's worry and refutation of Hudson's initial argument is therefore an example of a hegemonic practice in that what are regarded as conceptual subtleties or nuances can be overlooked or discredited if they are perceived to put the overall hegemonic formation or its possibility in jeopardy. The fact that these type of debates can occur without doing much to threaten the overall objective of moving Charterism from a myth to a collective social imaginary points to the strength of the discourse and its hegemonic practices and formations (Howarth, 2000).

Conclusion

This chapter intended to provide a useful understanding of some of the relevant theoretical impressions in which the observations that follow will be based. The objective was to offer a historico-political background to the specific ways in which specific black identities have come into existence in South Africa as well as indicate their continual reliance on a whiteness that acts as its other. So, it was explained how

the black of BC as well as the black of Charterism emerged as racial discourses productive of, and produced by, racial subjects after 'Sharpeville' and 'Soweto' or 'June 16', respectively. It is impossible to obtain a nuanced comprehension of contemporary racial discourses and racial subject formation in South Africa without knowing, for example, what blackness and whiteness meant in BC, NDR or apartheid government discourses. The conception of dislocation was also introduced. And if it is true, as Stavrakais (2000: 110) certainly believes, that "dislocation, with all its disruptive power, can be found at the root of all paradigm, discursive and ideological shifts" then it is an indispensible notion when arguing that there is an emergence of new understandings of blackness and whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa. So this chapter initiated a flow of concepts and ideas that the rest of the study carries on from. The next chapter will assess the conditions in which a certain discourse of blackness influenced by past discourses arises, as well as assess its nature. The conditions, in which it does emerge, it will be maintained, are a result of the dislocatory experience of '1994' or the formal ending of the apartheid state.

The past has shown that the assertion of a single national identity has precluded the assertion of others. National identity is invariably defined by the dominant group which excludes others from the locus of power" (Baines, 1998: 2).

In the previous chapter, it was noted how two dislocatory experiences namely the 'Sharpeville massacre' and the June 1976 protests in Soweto resulted in the emergence of specific discourses and practices that attempted to "suture the dislocated structure" (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000). These specific historic conceptions of blackness and whiteness, articulated by and determinant of, particularly political subjects draw upon a range of other discourses thus infusing different signifiers with new or alternative meanings. All this within a specific juncture or time period hence contributing to their novelty as discursive constructions, as myths seeking to transform into imaginaries. This chapter builds on the theoretical and contextual foundation laid in the previous chapter. Through positing the end of apartheid and the South Africa's first democratic elections, or rather '1994', as a dislocatory experience, it will be argued that the discourse on race underwent a change that resulted in the surfacing of a particular comprehension of blackness. The aim of this chapter then is to analyse the character of the particular discourse of 'patriotic blackness' indicating that even though it might still be functioning at the level of a myth, its congruity with other discourses may lead, dangerously, to an imaginary similar to the one imagined by Mbembe's quote at the beginning of this study.

Non-racialism and blackness

It is best to begin with an observation made by Chipkin regarding this post-apartheid blackness discourse:

"Let us start with a paradox of two terms: non-racialism and Blackness. The struggle against apartheid was largely, if not loosely, waged in the name of "non-racialism". The struggle against apartheid was waged in the name of a Black people. Now, if these terms were reconciled during the 1980s (Black struggle and Non-Racial struggle) by way of a third term: National Democratic

Revolution, today Blackness is more and more spinning out of the symbolic fields that once gave it meaning in South Africa. This is in part a sign of the times: the crisis of the theory of the National Democratic Revolution and the declining influence of its political repertoire. Simply put, Blackness is less referenced to National Democratic Revolution. But nor does this mean that National Democratic Revolution has finally been trumped by another always powerful political stream: Black Consciousness. In other words, and despite appearances, we are not simply witnessing notions off Blackness increasingly referenced to Biko rather than to Marx. The meaning of Blackness, and with it the meaning of apartheid, the identity of the anti-apartheid struggle and the legitimate form of the post-apartheid state, is increasingly referenced to a third register. It does not yet have a name, but let us call it Nation Building (NB). What being Black means today is increasingly linked to the production of the South African *nation*" (2002: 569) (emphasis original).

Chipkin (2002) names as a paradox the relationship between non-racialism and blackness. At first glance the relationship between these two concepts is paradoxical; if non racialism, as propounded by Charterism in the 1980s, refers to a "deep popular commitment to eradicating both the practices of apartheid and the system of ideas concerning 'race' on which these practices rested" then surely the existence of any blackness, referring here simply to any racial identity classified as black, is contradictory to its aims (Sharp, 1998: 243). However if one had to take a closer look at Charterist discourse it can be seen how the co-existence of the two can be accommodated. During the transition period, which can loosely be said to be the period of negotiations preceding the first democratic elections, non-racialism as propounded by Charterism was the dominant racial discourse framing the political future of South Africa (Norval, 1996; Sharp 1998). However the idea of economic redress along racial lines in order to foster a more substantive equality was also prevalent (Norval, 1996).

It is in the Freedom Charter, a central document of Charterist discourse, where these two notions are reconciled. Not only did it "presuppose the moderate form of arguments for 'affirmative action' in the public, health, education and housing sectors, in access to and ownership of land, (and) also envisaged a much more radical reconstitution of the economic order", but it also "attempted to eliminate race as a defining feature from the political terrain, while keeping open the space for expression

of cultural- rather than racial or ethnic- diversity" (Norval, 1996: 294). The Freedom Charter allowed for these two currents to co-exist and indeed in the liberation struggle, non-racialism and blackness are inseparable. In the period after June 1976, including the transition, to the elections in 1994, one crucial factor in what determined what blackness was, was the desire to achieve liberation from a racially oppressive state. That is, one's authenticity as a black person could be questioned had that person expressed a desire to not see South Africa liberated from a racially oppressive state. This, of course, would also preclude that person's status as part of 'the people' (Chipkin, 2007). Also, apartheid was "not only a precise and historically determinate mode of social division, but also an identitary logic which attempts to resist the never-ending quest for identification by fixing boundaries between identities for all time" (Norval, 1996: 293).

Although Charterism did not centralise racial identity as the primary medium in which to wage the struggle against apartheid to the same extent that BC did, which in part proved to be the success of the Charterist discourse, it did still obtain an identitary logic which was crucial for its goals. What happens at the end of apartheid and the few years at the beginning of the post-apartheid state, with the intensification of non-racial and reconciliatory discourse, is that blackness as posited by Charterism sheds some of the referents that gave it meaning leading up to 1994. With formal liberation actualised and non-racialism's laboured minimalisation of the relevance of racial identity, it can be seen why the NDR's idea of blackness experiences a loss of some of what were its determinate factors up until that point.

In other words, the tension or the paradox between the concept of non-racialism as popularly understood and the existence of any outwardly brazen black racial identity was papered over by a strong Charterist discourse framed in the setting of an apartheid and apartheid transition state. Filatova (1997: 51), although arguing a different point, contends that the "ethnocisation of politics and political perceptions" had been present before 1994 "but then the stakes were much lower and, more importantly, perception of a common enemy, given the enemy's divisive strategy, played it down within the anti-

apartheid movement". With the removal of the apartheid state, the tensions or paradoxicality are comparatively magnified, a lack in the meaning of blackness is exposed and therefore a dislocation is experienced. However, the dominant impression of blackness, in the sense of what were the expected viewpoints or sentiments of a black person, in Charterist discourse also had another crucial referent, that of the commitment to the overturning of the legacy of apartheid. Southall (2004: 314) contends that the "objectives of the NDR are to overcome the legacy of racial oppression of the black majority and thereby to forge a united nation; to achieve democratization of all spheres of society; and to bring about a fundamental transformation of power relations as a basis for societal equality".

With nominal liberation there is an emergent focus on redress or transformation. Although redress has always been factored into the discourse, it is only after apartheid has ended, that it becomes what properly frames its politics. If during the 80s and early 90s non-racialism was popularly taken as being indicative of a colour-blind society, then after apartheid, towards the end of the transition period, non-racialism more radically comes to refer to "a process in which a commitment to the ending of racial discrimination is complemented by a concerted programme to provide wide-ranging redress for the disadvantages that the majority of South Africans suffered in the past" (Sharp, 1998: 243).

If 'the people' were an inclusive and figurative construction in the face of the apartheid state, then in the post-apartheid state these 'people' have to be sorted in order to facilitate a 'concerted programme to provide wide-ranging redress'. What arises then is the need to recategorise people along racial lines, albeit temporarily, in order to enable the aspirations of overcoming the inheritance of apartheid. Transformation, as Mbembe (2001: 7) argues "'or empowerment' (the set of policies designed by the government and the private sector to redress past racial discrimination and to redistribute wealth and income to previously disadvantaged groups) involves both moral questions of justice and equality and pragmatic and instrumental questions of power and social engineering, it epitomises more than any other post-apartheid project the current

difficulty of overcoming whiteness and blackness". If concerted programmes aiming at redress are based on racial categorisation and what Norval (1996: 295) calls a "hierarchization of the 'oppressed'", then the idea of a prioritisation of certain 'racial' groups is inevitable.

So if 'African' black people were generally subject to a higher level of systemic racial oppression than other black people, then preferential access will most readily be accorded to them first. What this opens up is the opportunity to grade blackness, to distinguish particularly between Indians, Coloureds and Africans. What happens is that not only is racial identity by way of apartheid-era racial category re-emphasised, but if "the 'other' of non-racialism (was) apartheid, a highly overdetermined signifier linking together forms of oppression and economic exploitation", then the 'other' of this post-apartheid (post-transition) articulation of non-racialism is the legacy of the apartheid state which remains effective as a signifier in much the same way as it used to be (Norval, 1996: 293). So from within NDR discourse, the dislocatory experience of 1994 brings about, or rather brings to the fore, different dimensions or considerations of what it means to be black. It is against this backdrop that a new "meaning of Blackness" occurs that has as its accomplice a "dangerous, nationalist politics" (Chipkin, 2002:569). What will now be turned to is a discussion of the contours and characteristics of this particular discursive construction.

The 'patriotic bourgeoisie'

Southall (2004: 326) makes the contention that "the NDR validates the creation of a black bourgeoisie, whose historic function will be to not merely challenge white economic domination but to raise productive forces, thereby providing for redistribution of wealth to the black working class, and the urban and rural poor". As various authors point out, NDR discourse did make provision for the concerns of workers to be congruent with the concerns of the black bourgeoisie, meaning that it was not an absolute anti-capitalist discourse, although maintaining the ability to be popularly interpreted as such (Chipkin, 2007; Hudson, 1986; Southall, 2004). Indeed,

the ANC in its 1997 50th National Conference document "Strategy and Tactics", make the statement that "the rising black bourgeoisie are objectively important motive forces of transformation whose interests coincide with at least the immediate interests of the majority (1997: 10).

With the transformation agenda set in motion by the end of apartheid and more specifically, the introduction of affirmative action and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) policies, the creation or expansion of a black middle strata as well as capitalist class was inevitable. However, taking into consideration the fact the Tripartite Alliance, an alliance constituting the ANC and its more leftist counterparts the South African Communist Party (SACP) and the Congress of South African Trade Unions (COSATU), had obvious non-capitalist elements within it, there has to a suitable referent in order to justify the existence of a black capitalist class. This new referent is a fusion between a racial and nationalist consciousness. Moodley and Adam (2000: 54) express that to "overcome these (apartheid) legacies a new counter-racist consciousness has emerged, particularly among the new black elite". The defensiveness of this racial consciousness could be partly attributed to the fact that the 'poor', 'working-class' signifiers once important to a black identity are gradually losing their authenticating currency for the elite.

Blackness in this case is therefore equated with the best interests of the nation, and if the interests of the nation are to reverse the legacy of apartheid through meaningful transformation processes, then what is facilitated is the emergence of "the authentic bearer of the nation... now (being) a black, bourgeois, individual, male" (Chipkin, 2007: 109). What makes the black bourgeois class different and relatively more cushioned to criticism is the 'patriotism' they are expected to display. A 'patriotic bourgeoisie' is one that is committed to the agenda of the transformation of the nation through demonstrating a social responsibility that incorporates the poor majority in enjoyment of the wealth of the country (Southall, 2004). If a black, particularly African black, elite that is evidently patriotic emerges, it is because of a mixture between an adherence to the NDR discourse as well as a reaction to a loss of some of its important

markers to what constituted blackness.

Africanism and Mbeki

The NDR influenced transformation agenda also has implications that characterise the 'turn' towards Africanism in the ANC discourse. For example, the ANC (1997: 3b), in discussing the support of the organisation by Coloured and Indian people, notes the "comparative privilege that apartheid gave them in relation to African people". What is also noted is that the "African majority (were) the main victims of the apartheid system and (bore) the brunt of the heroic struggle against it, the Coloured and Indian Communities, who, though accorded bigger crumbs from the master's table, were essentially excluded from the court of the privileged..." (ANC, 1997: 11). What happens is that African blacks begin to be more distinguished from other black people as deserving of more attention when allocating resources on an elite level. The various dynamics of Africanism, South African patriotism and increased racial consciousness thus meet and fuse in the black elite. South African patriotism is at its most authentic when displayed by black Africans but this does not prevent South Africans from other 'racial groups' from being genuinely patriotic as well. In other words, if what is being spoken about is a new articulation of blackness, then it is most likely to be found or be most prominent amongst the black middle strata and black capitalist class.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007: 9) notices "the rising tide of Africanism within and outside the ANC and its notion of the liberation struggle (anti-apartheid) as a black emancipatory movement since the departure of Nelson Mandela from active politics". Blaser (2004: 179) echoes a similar view stating that with "Mbeki, the new discourse of nation building, launched at the African National Congress' (ANC) national congress in Mafikeng in 1997, changed towards a more decisive Africanist approach, asserting African hegemony in a diverse nation". Indeed even Chipkin's (2001) notion of Nation Building as being an increasingly indistinguishable characteristic of Blackness, locates Thabo Mbeki as a central figure in its development or popularisation. The rising prominence of Thabo Mbeki both as a public figure and as

an ANC leader who eventually became president of South Africa in 1999, particularly with regard to his African Renaissance agenda best exemplified by the well known and ambiguous 'I'm an African' speech, is noted by these authors as being a crucial element in the formation of a certain discourse that is crucial to the new meaning of blackness in South Africa.[ii]

The rise of Mbeki, coincides with the end of what could be called the 'rainbow period', the few years following 1994 represented by signifiers such as 'the rainbow nation', 'Mandela' and 'non-racialism' and best captured by the swell of nationalist pride surrounding the South African national rugby teams World Cup victory in 1995 and the national soccer teams African Cup of National victory in 1996.[iii] Marx (2002) takes Mbeki's 'two nations' speech as a case in point to indicate this change in tone, arguing that how Mbeki frames the problem then could have been framed differently a few years prior. Whereas what Mbeki's "ethnic-culturalist" discourse sees as the stumbling block towards nation-building the existence of 'two nations' within one country, could have a few years before been attributed to the existence of two classes (Marx, 2002). Mbeki comes to represent a break from the florid language immediately following the end of apartheid, to a much sharper, more 'Africanist' discourse. The ANC as an organisation, the ruling party of the time and the key political force during the transition, perhaps reflective of the rising sway of leaders such as Mbeki, also indicates a distinct turn towards 'Africanism' (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2007). Filatova (1997: 54) asserts that "Africanism is a much more powerful card to play than 'rainbowism'... at this particular moment of South Africa's history a nationalist stance offers a better political potential to the ANC than non-racialism, whether based on class solidarity or on 'rainbow' all-inclusive nationhood".

Although Africanism or African nationalism was a historically established ideological tradition within the ANC, it had taken a back seat during the 1970s, 1980s and early 1990s mostly because of the ANC's association with other movements and organisations with different ideological outlooks. Africanism however, regains its currency in post-apartheid South Africa becoming more apparent as the transition

period came to an end. This Africanism has two main derivatives/traits that will be discussed here, namely nativism and cultural nationalism. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007: 10) sees nativism as the "outgrowth of the resurgence of Africanism within the ANC and in South African society in general" and notes that "it takes the form of black natives asserting and claiming their exclusive citizenship rights and entitlements as a majority constituency in South Africa". In other words the rise of Africanism has as its offshoot what is called nativism.

Nativism and cultural nationalism

Neocosmos (2008: 5) points to the "discourse of exceptionalism" and the "politics of indigeneity" as characterising nativism. The former alludes to the belief in an exceptionalism that is said to be prevalent amongst many South Africans across the board. That is, the belief that South Africa is somehow not really characteristic of a 'typical' African country mainly based on the idea that it is "industrialised, democratic, and advanced in relation to other countries on the continent and also a paragon of reconciliation and political liberalism" and that it is predominantly influenced by a Western "intellectual and cultural frame of reference" (Neocosmos, 2008: 5). The latter refers to the dominant belief that preferential accesses to resources is and should be provided to 'native' South Africans only. These two notions together necessarily lead to "a debate of who is more indigenous and hence to nativism, the view that there is an essence of South Africanness which is to be found in 'natives' (Neocosmos, 2008: 5). Drawing on Fanon, Neocosmos (2008: 1) points out that much postcolonial xenophobia could at least be partly attributed to a "politics of nationalism founded on stressing indigeneity". Indeed Neocosmos (2008) argues that what has been termed the xenophobic violence of May 2008 in South Africa was very much accommodated by this nativist discourse. Although similar, nativism does differ from patriotism in that the former stresses qualities found only in natives and is exclusive of South Africans who are not regarded as natives, whereas the latter is attainable to all South Africans but based on their allegiance to the nation. Nativism is thus the meeting point of Africanism and South African patriotism.

The formation of the Native Club, a Mbeki-endorsed venture aimed at encouraging, elevating, expanding and institutionalising public spaces for distinctly African or 'Native' intelligentsia, in 2006 is seen by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007) as inevitably generating the controversy that it did precisely because it emerges from a nativist discourse. The creation of these spaces was to allow for a native intelligentsia to structure public discourse and provide policy input, therefore challenging the hegemony of white intelligentsia (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2009). Although the Native Club does raise some legitimate and very important concerns, its naming together with the idea that there *are* 'native' South Africans who have specialised knowledge and possible 'native solutions' to what is best for the future of South Africa, does place it firmly as an instantiation of nativism (Ndlovu-Gatsheni, 2007).

Another example of nativism can be read in Mike Stofile's reaction to not being elected president of the South African Rugby Union (SARU) in 2008. Stofile, an African black person, was beaten by Oregon Hoskins who is coloured. Stofile proclaimed that "there is no place for black people in South African rugby and that this is the final nail for black people in this country", that "black people are not trusted" and that "what happened here today is an indictment of what is happening in our country" (Sapa, 2008). Two important issues are raised by Stofile's reaction. Firstly, within the discourse of sports and transformation in South Africa, black as a designated racial category is usually inclusive of coloured and Indian sportspeople. This indeed makes Stofile's claim ridiculous since Hoskins is a black person who self-identifies as black. The black that Stofile is referring to here is clearly African black, so clearly excluding Indians and coloureds from identifying as black.

Leading on from this is the second issue that Stofile's reaction raises, that again within the discourse of sports and transformation in South Africa, rugby more so than any other major sport, is still largely seen by many as a 'white' sport. Stofile's defensive reaction betrays the creation of a frontier where African blacks as black are on one side and those preventing their progress, which can include white, Indian and coloured

people, on the other side. A series of differences are created on the side opposing the progress of 'black' people transforming the meaning of South African rugby from being that which is stubbornly white, to that which is exclusive of 'black' South Africans. This is not to say that Stofile is wrong in calling for more 'African' blacks to be fairly represented in South African rugby in general, or to suggest that SARU and its electoral system are without any flaw, but his reaction exhibits a more nativist influence. What is black is fused with what is African on one side, disallowing the other side of the frontier to fully claim either their blackness or 'Africaness'.

Another offshoot of Africanism and a correlate of nativism is a certain cultural nationalism. Christoph Marx (2002: 54) proclaims that "public discourse in post-apartheid South Africa is marked by the taboo that has been placed on racism, while at the same time racism has been separated from the cultural nationalist and ethicist discourses that were always closely connected with it. In this way cultural nationalism has been liberated from the racist connections it had during the apartheid era, and has become available once again". What this means is that given the always strong cultural nationalist aspects of apartheid racial classification and discrimination, it becomes interesting how Africanist cultural nationalism does not see the problematic relation between cultural nationalism and the creation of firm racial boundaries in South Africa.

A fine example of the link between cultural nationalism and racial identity is the controversy surrounding the questioning of Caster Semenya's sex following the athlete's success at the IAAF World Championships in 2009. In particular, the ANC Youth League's (ANCYL) reaction and contribution to the controversy. In a press statement released in September 2009, the ANCYL writes:

"The ANCYL calls on the IAAF to distance itself from the Australian Media reports, and in line with basic medical ethics illegitimate any test done on Caster Semenya without her concern. Even if a test is done, the ANCYL will never accept the categorisation of Caster Semenya as a hermaphrodite, because in South Africa and the entire world of sanity, such does not exist. The basic, traditional and known method to determine gender has classified Caster Semenya as female and to us she will remain female. The ANCYL is also very concerned by the fact that all media reports about Caster Semenya are generated in Australia, which is the most lucrative destination

for South Africa's racists and fascists, who refused to live under a black democratic government. The maltreatment of Caster Semenya is evidently a coordinated racist attack on Caster Semenya, an African woman whom the racists never thought will represent South Africa with excellence. Mokgadi Semenya is our girl..." (2009).

To begin with, the frontier between Africa and 'the West', characteristic of the sentiments underlying the African Renaissance as well Africanism, is created through the ANCYL's refusal of acceptance of the results of the medical tests performed on Semenya. Through declaring that in South Africa, the concept of hermaphrodite which could have been one of the possible outcomes of a medical test does not exist, together with the showing of faith in the "basic, traditional and known method" to determine the sex of a person, there is a binary drawn between African and Western methods of sex determination. Where this nationalism takes on a more discrete tone is when the ANCYL expresses some disquiet about the fact that the initial reports concerning Semenya being tested prior to the World Championship emanated from Australian media. This is taken to be indicative of the fact that many (white) South African expatriates live in Australia.

What is seen by the ANCYL as the main reason why these predominantly white expatriates emigrated to Australia is that they could not handle the prospects of further living under a "black democratic government". So it is an indictment of the country that provides living opportunities to these alleged racists and fascists as well as most of those 'ex-South Africans' living in Australia. What this means is that the 'attacks' on Semenya are interpreted as attacks on the 'black democratic government' of South Africa. It is presented as a concerted effort to discredit the achievements that the country has witnessed since the predominantly black ANC government took charge in 1994 and is perceived to be in line with the actions of these 'racists and fascists'. This then allows for the questioning of Caster Semenya's sex to be interpreted as a racist attack on "an African woman" whose only fault is that she was successful at a major international event while representing her country.

In all of this, anti-South African sentiment is equated with anti-African black

sentiment. Those who seek to vilify South Africa, like the 'racist and fascist' expatriates, also attack black people since the South African government is black, and those who slander black people also attack South Africa since these blacks are representative of South Africa. It is with this specific claim of a racist motive behind the Caster Semenya controversy that the distinctiveness of this new discourse of blackness as influenced by nativism and cultural nationalism is revealed.

However, there is another aspect of cultural nationalism to be read in the response by ANCYL that is reflective of its boundary raising objectives. The support given to Semenya by the ANCYL operates within the paradox of embracement and rejection that is somehow constitutive of the politics of otherness, that is, the politics of frontier creation, of the delineation of difference (Schumann, 2010). So Caster Semenya is worthy of support and defence as an example or a representation of an 'us', yet because of a patriotism based on heteronormative standards, to be properly one of 'us' she has to fall within these standards, become normalised, be a woman (Schuhmann, 2010). There is a clear reiteration of this in saying that "Semenya is a female, and to us she will remain a female" that she is an "African woman" that Semenya "is our girl". Although through their rejection of medical tests and the refusal to recognise the existence of a 'hermaphrodite', or better yet an intersexed person, the ANCYL could be read to be putting forward a radical stance against normative forms of sexual classification based on scientific discourse and/or societal convention, it seems that this not actually the case (Schuhmann, 2010). What is being reinforced is a binary sex system where Semenya is placed unambiguously on the female side referring to her body and the reliability of a traditional system of classification and not her self-identification to authorise the claim of her being a woman (Schuhmann, 2010). So nativism and its correlate cultural nationalism display foundational tendencies to exclude and narrow down expansive definitions of what people can or want to be.

Patriotic blackness and authenticity

This feeds into a discourse of blackness that is increasingly limited in who can lay

claim to it, and is inseparable from a South African nationalism, a sort of 'patriotic blackness'. It's this 'patriotic blackness' that makes provision for the labelling of some black people as authentically black and others as inauthentically black. To go back to the Stofile/Hoskins affair, if South African rugby is still viewed as being a bastion of white power or maybe a visible remnant of apartheid, then what is in the best interests of post-apartheid South Africa is to stop this being the case. How this can be done is through the transformation of its management as well as its structures down to the grassroots level, which means getting a more diverse and 'representative' racial make-up on all these levels.

Stofile in claiming that there is "no place for black people in SA rugby" is therefore confirming SA rugby's refusal to transform and thus placing it at odds with what is best for the nation. So SA rugby becomes 'un-South African' or against the best interests of the nation precisely because of its reluctance to incorporate black people into its structures. This despite the fact that the new SARU president justifiably classifies as black. What is being contested by Stofile then is the extent to which Hoskins is black, his authenticity as a black person, that is, the extent to which Hoskins is *really* black and this is because Hoskins has been placed on the 'un-South African' side of the frontier. Thus Hoskins is not really black because he is not perceived to be in line with what is in the interests of South Africa.

In outlining the difference between State sovereignty and National sovereignty, Chipkin (2002: 570) defines the former as referring to those "processes and mechanisms that grant state institutions effectiveness on the ground, that is, enable them to govern" whereas the latter is said to be referring to "the control of state institutions by *authentic* representatives of the Nation" this "irrespective of whether or not they are able effectively to control the levers of the state" (emphasis original). Chipkin (2002: 569) is arguing that "what looks like a politics intending equality or empowerment, etc., is really about consolidating National Sovereignty". Any black person who is perceived to be working against the consolidation of National Sovereignty can be designated inauthentically black. This is exactly the case with

Hoskins, even if he does not get accused of actively working against National Sovereignty; Stofile's claim places his authenticity as a black person in question.

One can take as another example the reaction of ANCYL president Julius Malema to the President Jacob Zuma's 2009 ministerial appointments. Malema takes issue with the appointment of "minority" ministers into the key economic cluster positions, while 'African' ministers are dominant in other clusters (Grobler, 2009). Amongst other things Malema states that "we (black people) cannot just be reduced to security and the very important issue of economy is given to minorities" and that "minister of police, minister of intelligence, minister of justice- (they are) all Africans... but in the economic cluster, its minorities" (Grobler, 2009). With regard to the appointment of Gill Marcus, a white woman, as the Reserve Bank governor he states that "we welcome that... but we would have expected once again an African child to occupy that strategic position" (Grobler, 2009). Clearly the fact that Pravin Gordhan and Ebrahim Patel, the ministers of finance and economic development, could be regarded as black is not enough for Malema hence the call for Africans to be put in those economic posts. The bone of contention that Malema has with Marcus' appointment is even more telling in that the previous Reserve Bank governor was an 'African child'. Surely the youth will not think that "because she (Marcus) is white, they (whites) are born like that", that is, born with the innate ability to handle such positions better than Africans at least, precisely because this youth will know or can know that Tito Mboweni, someone who qualifies as an 'African child', occupied the very same position before. If Mboweni had done it before then that clearly shows that 'African children' are capable of occupying such positions. What Malema wants is for authentic representations of the Nation to occupy these key offices in the economic sector and he wages this struggle in the language of equality and empowerment.

This leaves "members of minority groups frequently doubt(ing) whether they are genuinely included in the official political definition of an authentic African, when popular perceptions emphasize cultural African traditions (Moodley and Adam, 2000: 55). If there is an irrelevance of whether the 'levers of the state' are satisfactorily

controlled and the emphasis is rather placed on who controls the 'levers of the state' then the standards of what constitutes valid criticism are altered or changed completely. In other words, criticising governmental performance divulges a fundamental misunderstanding on the part of the critic of what is the more important factor, that of the consolidation of National Sovereignty, which is said to ensure the eradication of the legacy of apartheid. Through showing this misunderstanding, or at least not balancing the critique with a fair amount of praise, the critic is revealed as someone that is not in the know as lacking the perspective that someone in the know would have.

So, if the criticism is directed at an authentic representative of the Nation, then the critic is clearly not authentically representative of the Nation, because if they were they would understand that the authentic representative's mere presence in that position is doing much to tackle the legacy of apartheid therefore rendering their actual performance of duties of secondary importance (Chipkin, 2002). In order to offset, or maybe crudely put, to prevent criticism of governmental performance, this discourse leads to the regular occurrence of the situation where a critique of the South African government is equated with the critique of all black people based partly on the fact that most state officials are now black, that the country is 'run' by blacks. What becomes of this is that "to criticise blacks is to want to preserve the legacy of apartheid, to undermine black rule, to threaten democracy and to insult the dignity of blacks" (Chipkin, 2002: 279).

If the government is black, then the critic who does not balance their criticism with due praise is either white or inauthentically black. Only through an overt display of belief and uncritical loyalty to the South African nation could one be authentically black; and only through the belief or affinity to this patriotic blackness could one be authentically South African. This circular definition encourages the provocative conclusion that the more the South African government fails to deliver on its promises the more of what Chipkin (2002) calls this metaphysical blackness or this sublime object of blackness will be invoked. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2009: 67) echoes this view: "unable to deliver on

its material promises, having lost (or losing) its previous appeal, pushed into the defensive by global pressures, African nationalism fell into cultural nationalism and nativism".

Racial reasoning and the limits of black solidarity

Marx indicates the how the blackness of a black critic is questioned because of how government directed critique had been interpreted in 'racial' terms:

"By deriving its mandate from the concepts of Ubuntu and Africanism, the government is able to interpret any criticism of its actions as evidence of its critics' own limitations. This circular logic has on more than one occasion been employed and with negative effect for the critic: witness the public chastisement by ANC functionaries of Rhoda Kadalie, a leading member of the Institute for Democracy in South Afirca, whose critical attitude towards government, it was suggested, could only be because of her 'coloured' identity. At the same time her 'coloured' identity became the main reason to deny her the right to criticise" (2002: 54).

In writing on the Clarence Thomas/Anita Hill incident where Anita Hill accused Clarence Thomas, then an appointed United States of America supreme court judge, of sexual harassment whilst she was employed by him, West (1993) laments either the silence surrounding, or the uncritical support for, Clarence Thomas in particular, displayed by black commentators in the US. Not only was this the case during the incident itself, but West(1993) also regards as problematic a similar stance taken by these black 'leaders' and commentators when Clarence Thomas was appointed as US supreme court judge despite a confutative professional and personal history.

West (1993) attributes this worrying phenomenon to what he terms racial reasoning. Three factors are given as the basis of racial reasoning in this particular case:

"First, Thomas' claim to racial authenticity -his birth in Jim Crow Georgia, his childhood spent as the grandson of a black sharecropper, his undeniably black phenotype degraded by racist ideals of beauty and his gallant black struggle for achievement in racist America. Second, the complex relation of this claim to racial authenticity to the increasing closing-ranks mentality in black America. Escalating black-nationalist sentiments -the notion that America's will to racial justice is weak and therefore black people must close ranks for survival in a hostile country- rests

principally upon claims to racial authenticity. Third, the way in which black nationalists sentiments promote and encourage black cultural conservatism especially black patriarchal (and homophobic) power. The idea of black people closing ranks against hostile white Americans reinforces black male power exercised over black women (e.g. to protect, regulate, subordinate and hence usually though not always, use and abuse women) in order to preserve black social order under the circumstances of white literal attack and symbolic assault" (West, 1993: 392).

The expected ability and exercise from black critics to somehow be extraordinarily sympathetic to other black people who occupy influential public positions is exactly what is defined by racial reasoning. Rhoda Kadalie, as mentioned by Marx (2002), did not 'racially' reason hence the consequent attack on her blackness. The actual quality of the work of the black person in an influential position is therefore not really a significant factor. So West (1993) notes how many black commentators either opted to remain silent or were too hasty in their offering of support for Clarence Thomas precisely because he is a black person occupying a public position never before occupied by a black person. The patriarchal tendency of racial reasoning is also pointed out as problematic. Crenshaw (1999) argues that in 'black' nationalist discourses whose goal is said to be racial equality, particularly those in countries of extensive historical oppression; there is in most cases an emphasis on solidarity and presenting a united front. In this instance, focusing on the issue at hand which is black liberation or advancement together with having a clear and decisive sense of what blackness is becomes of prime importance. What this means is that other struggles that might be as important to those within the movement or influenced by the discourse are in many cases not given the same space and time.

Black Consciousness for example, despite its novelty in its definition of blackness, also evidenced a level of racial reasoning where the "quest for Black solidarity took precedence over the need to criticise other Black people and organisations opposed to apartheid" and indeed "criticism was identified as a potentially divisive tactic" (Gqola, 2001: 135). This closing ranks mentality thus not only explains the "paucity of women in the organisations of the BCM, but also of the conservative terms of their participation" (Gqola, 2001: 137). This means within movements or organisations

whose discourse is reflective of a racial reasoning, a blind eye can and is usually turned from any misogynous or sexist behaviour to avoid creating divisions and to maintain an orderly and united offensive thus leaving women more vulnerable to violence of all sorts, and systematically denied the opportunity to voice their concerns regarding this (Crenshaw, 1999).

This type of environment also allows and encourages the sidelining and vituperation of homosexuals and homosexuality, or any sexuality that is not firmly heterosexual. McKaiser (2010) points out how South Africa's representative to the United Nations Human Rights Council in Geneva, Jerry Matjila, stated that the defeat of racism had to take moral precedence over the defeat of homophobia arguing that gay rights protection "demeans the legitimate plight of the victims of racism". Basically put, the closing of ranks entails a series of processes where authenticity is determined and reinforced through marking out what is acceptable and not-quite acceptable. The rejection of Caster Semenya's classification as an intersexed person by the ANCYL and its insistence of her classification as a woman, together with the very protective and paternal tone it assumed in 'defending' Semenya (Schuhmann, 2009), is indicative of the heteronormative and patriarchal discourse informing racial reasoning.

What 'patriotic blackness' suggests then is that the "facts are *revealed through belief*", that "only loyalty to the government (patriotism) grants insight into the remarkable and mysterious way President Mbeki (or subsequent presidents) and his government are addressing the vestiges of apartheid" that "knowledge follows from belief... or, access to the truth is only attained through *faith*" (Chipkin, 2002: 583). The proclamation of one's patriotism can thus be seen as the saving grace for white people whose 'racial' identification does not place them in a position to be regarded as black. Believing in the government and balancing critique with praise allows them to see the true benefits of its intentions (Chipkin, 2002). Whereas blacks, in light of racial reasoning, in the most part only have to maintain an uncritical approach to be rendered authentically black, whites usually have to supplement this with some sort of declaration of patriotism in order to be regarded as authentically South African. So, "'whites',

'Indians', so-called 'Coloureds', and others have an equal right to claim an African identity, but only if their allegiance to Africa is life-long, beneficial to the masses, and sincere" (Marx, 2002: 53).

'Patriotic blackness' and floating signifiers

Both cultural nationalism and nativism draw on various floating signifiers in order to bolster their discursive strength. The vocabulary and concepts of both the NDR and BC discourse are invoked to support the discourse of 'patriotic blackness' therefore seeking to increase its hegemonic appeal. For example, the Native Club, as shown by Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007: 49), seeks to enable "African intelligentsia to participate effectively in the processes of decolonisation of the mind". Here the discourse of BC is drawn upon to reinforce nativism. And too the idea of there being a 'black democratic government' whose major function is to correct the injustices of the past is clearly drawn from the discourse of the NDR. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2007: 10) asserts that "the Mbeki orchestrated philosophy of African Renaissance and the popularisation of of the ideology of *ubuntu* all indicates the resurgence of Africanist thought and how the ANC continues to survive by stealing and accommodating any strong ideology that seem to be popular at any given time". Marx (2002) concurs with this viewpoint in fact contending that the reappearance of cultural nationalism takes place in the form of ubuntu.

The concept of ubuntu, popular during the transitionary/reconciliatory period as a normative value stressing the importance of humanity, forgiveness and a people-centred approach, is according to Marx (2002), co-opted by African cultural nationalism to promote a more Africanist, exclusivist and conformist outlook. So already existing notions or floating signifiers such as 'ubuntu', 'blackness', 'Nation', 'decolonisation of the mind', 'democracy', 'empowerment', 'equality' etc., are all used to stabilise 'patriotic blackness' known simply as blackness, as an empty signifier.

Conclusion

A central theme to this strand of blackness is how it seems to be in constant reaction to a perceived whiteness. Whether it's the idea of natives which has as its other, those who are not natives, which one would think includes white South Africans given their European ancestry. Or whether its transformation which has as its primary objective the tackling of the legacy of apartheid racism, which practically put means making sure the distribution of privilege, is more equitable and not just towards white South Africans. Of course the 'enemy' of 'patriotic blackness' are those who are either white or not really black. So it could either be those overtly white racists, whites who are critical of the competence of the black democratic government or indeed any 'black 'run' or owned entity', or its just whites who live some sort of privileged life, whiteness is in some form or the other used as a condition of existence as well as a target of criticism for this strand of blackness. It is this whiteness discourse that the next chapter will analyse.

CHAPTER FOUR

If 1994 could be considered a dislocatory experience in that it opened the path for a new discourse of blackness, a 'patriotic blackness', to surface, then the same dislocation should allow a concurrent discourse of whiteness to come forth given that that, as discussed in the first chapter, blacknesses and whitenesses tend to occur relationally and concurrently. In other words, if "the gap opened by the dislocation of the structure will be filled by the *hegemonic projects* that have the character of myths" then this whiteness emerges as a hegemonic project acting as a myth that has patriotic blackness as its 'other' (Torfing, 1999: 151). This chapter seeks to discuss the character of this particular whiteness, this 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness showing its increased detection to be linked with the development of 'patriotic blackness' hence the discourses' reliance on, and constant interplay with, each other. This of course based on the idea that post-apartheid allows for the articulation of a new whiteness that differs from previous articulations and its emergence is very much influenced by discourses prevalent before and during the transition, such as non-racialism and reconciliation. How this will be done is firstly accounting for how the presence of several white identities or positionalities can be overlooked in order to create the social identity 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white. The discussion will then turn to how the various dynamics of late-apartheid, transition and post-apartheid South Africa contribute to the emergence of 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness followed by a series of examples that outline its character.

The constructed 'liberal'

"So for many of us I suspect the self-perception that 'we are somehow different'- because we are involved, we aren't like 'the others' (eg our parents or whites who were not involved in any way)- and in fact feel quite alienated in lifestyle terms from 'the others' was in political terms 'allowed' to continue unchallenged. That is why I think the 1991 gender conference which allowed for the first time in women's movement terms, the opportunity for just such a direct challenge (ie directly between white and black women), was so confronting, so anger-making, so difficult for those 'committed struggle/activist white women' who simply could not understand how or why they

were being included in the general category/group white. It was unheard of- what is wrong-
'we're all progressive here'. Personally, I had not been involved in the organising committee and
so felt a degree of detachment from the 'accusation', but I had two years earlier been
confronted/challenged by a black American woman- for the first time in my 'race' consciousness-
for being 'more than Michelle', being 'white'. She was not interested in anything about me- who
I was, what work I did, what choices I was making etc- all she could see or hear was 'white South
African'. I had never been confronted quite with this perception so starkly before (and if any of
my UDF 'comrades', had thought this, had perceived this, they had never said so) - and of course
I was horrified, angry, hurt, wounded- all kinds of things- especially because of the context of -
'trust'- which it occurred" (Bennet and Friedman, 1997: 52-53).

In this quote Michelle Friedman, a white woman, is reflecting on some of her
experiences as a white, female activist during the later apartheid years. She honestly
discusses how in spite of seeing herself as a 'progressive' and being somewhat
impervious to charges of racism and indeed to being classified primarily by her 'racial
group', she was unsettled by a black woman thinking of her as simply being a white
South African. She is shocked because for the first time in her life she is forced to
think that "yes I am probably racist and yes I am white and yes I have to face what that
means and hold it- even while continuing with whatever challenges I am making"
(Bennet and Friedman, 1997: 53). One of the things that Friedman realises is that for a
long time, it is possible that regardless of the work she contributed to the liberation
struggle and her personal viewpoints regarding race, she could still be viewed,
particularly by black people, as not being significantly different from the 'other' whites
(Bennet and Friedman, 1997).

This brings up the issue of positionalities and how different manifestations of a social
identity can and do exist. But more importantly it indicates how multiple
positionalities can be overlooked and lumped together into one, in some instances, in
order to make sense of a purpose or agenda. In this particular instance what links
Friedman with the 'non-progressives' in the white category is whiteness as a symbol, a
site and basis of privilege whether economic, political, social or psychological (Bennet
and Friedman, 1997). So for the black American woman, Friedman's character or who
Friedman really is, is not as important at that moment, as what she represents to the

black American woman and other many black people. The point is that although occupying a different positionality within a social category, and therefore potentially contesting that very category, is important particularly if it's for a 'progressive' cause, there is still the possibility that that subject will not be identified by an 'other' in the same way that it might self-identify. As discussed earlier, for BC, the frontier between black and white was further solidified through the construction of a series of differences that rendered white 'liberals' as not being fundamentally detachable from their more conservative counterparts.

The links constructed between multiple positionalities, are in many cases crucial for the establishment of an 'other'. Norval (2009: 314) notes the "practices that bind together political terms, identities and political formations more generally, through establishing connections between elements that have no necessary or natural belonging. Hence it is important that from this perspective elements that are articulated together gain their meaning in and through such practices". Social identities are therefore constantly created through complex processes of self-definition and definition of and by the 'other'. What tends to count is a *perception* of the 'other', and so a range of signifiers are articulated in a manner that seeks to stabilise that identity and justify that perception. The 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white is a result of the fusing together of various elements by the 'patriotic black'. However, this is not to suggest that there is absolutely no basis for the 'charge' of 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness, in the sense that there are white people who display some of the actions or hold some of the sentiments said to characterise this whiteness. There are white subjects that consciously take up positions that are 'liberal/anti-patriotic', although it can be argued that they might not see them as such. It is how these positions are understood that results in them being conceived as being 'liberal/anti-patriotic'. What makes it a construction or an imagined category is that it is the result of a single articulation of varied positions and signifiers, that is, it does not exist as such, and it has no fundamental essence, just like any identity.

What has allowed the development, or at least the perception of the development of

'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness is that in post-apartheid South Africa, given the pre-1994 horrors, whiteness in general becomes increasingly vulnerable to scrutiny. In other words, before 1994 white identities always maintained the capacity to be represented favourably within the apartheid imaginary, at least more so than black identities. With the end of apartheid, this ceased to be the case therefore permitting the appearance of a variety of subjectivities that sought to make sense of white identity in post-apartheid South Africa.

Reconciliation as clean slate

"The theme of reconciliation, which many commentators have felt played too central a role in the ANC's discourse, has been closely associated with the need to address 'white fears'. And the manner in which this was done was in line with the sentiments already articulated in the Freedom Charter: equal rights for all South Africans, irrespective of race, colour, gender or creed, required that 'whiteness' had constitutional relevance only 'in terms of its inappropriateness; it is relevant because it is irrelevant'. 'Whiteness' could be taken neither as justification for privilege and domination, nor as a basis for humiliation and vengeance. Indeed, it is only once white supremacy is destroyed that the true interests of whites as *citizens* can be protected. In this manner the ANC has attempted to eliminate race as a defining feature from the political terrain, while keeping open the space for expression of cultural- rather than racial or ethnic- diversity" (Norval, 1996: 294) (emphasis original).

If dislocations herald the opportunity for new discourses and identities to form, they do so because of the limits that previous discourses and identities have in symbolising and representing the dislocatory experience. Through incorporating and giving new meaning to already existing floating signifiers these discourses and identities are constructed and sutured around a specific nodal point/s (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000). This is exactly the case with the whiteness discourse under discussion here. The terms 'reconciliation', 'non-racialism' and 'equality' acquire an alternative meaning inseparable from the subjectivity that they are defined by and are definitive of.

What reconciliation in a post-apartheid climate basically entails is 'wiping the slate clean', that is, leaving the past in the past and moving towards a unified nation, hence

the 'rainbowism' of the mid-1990s. The appeal of national reconciliation is undeniable across the racial divide as it is seemingly an easy way to deal with the atrocities, pain and guilt of the past and provides the opportunity to start afresh. It can be seen how it could especially be welcomed by many white South Africans who might have feared a backlash of state-orchestrated racial violence hence it been "closely associated with white fears" (Norval, 1996: 294). The spirit of national reconciliation was captured by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), a parliamentary commission set up in 1996.

> "The TRC set out to offer both survivors and perpetrators of gross abuses of human rights the opportunity to give voice, on the one hand to unacknowledged wrongs committed during the apartheid era and, on the other hand, to provide information, express regret and ask forgiveness. A crucial rationale of this process was to foster the conditions under which the articulation of past experiences, losses and traumas could contribute to a transformation of relations between citizens of the new South Africa" (Norval, 2007: 311).

However, regardless of this opportunity to deal constructively with the past and despite the "broad, all-inclusive mandate, the TRC proceedings were ignored by most of apartheids beneficiaries on the grounds that they were biased against 'white' South Africa" (Johnson, 2008: 628). This particular viewpoint constitutes one of the foundational characteristics of a specific whiteness or white identity that emerges in post-apartheid South Africa. The distinct idea that the TRC was a waste of time and somehow prejudiced against whites is very different from the common critique of the TRC, that is, that it only concentrated on particular incidents and failed to adequately tackle the structural crimes of the apartheid regime. The fact that there were such sentiments indicates the development of a whiteness that makes use of the vocabulary of some of the popular discourses of the time. One of the reasons why the TRC, a commission that offered amnesty to the perpetrators of some horrific crimes, can be seen as being 'biased' against white South Africans is that if the country is 'non-racial' and 'equal' and the goal is 'reconciliation' then dwelling on apartheid realities which were mostly racial, unequal and apart, will inevitably lead to the general positioning of whites as perpetrators and blacks as victims. What this whiteness requires then is the erasure of race as political factor and for notions such as equality

and reconciliation to not be influenced by it. Bennet and Friedman make the claim that:

"Many people who are racialised from birth as 'white' get given, among other cultural gifts, access to identity as a 'human being', a being naturally entitled to a space in which bonds to others involve a high degree of choice... One's membership of a racial group- 'white'- offers economic and political community in such a way that as one person, inside one skin, one is encouraged to believe that what one *is*, is an 'individual'- one's 'life' is assumed to be very much under one's own, 'personal', direction... Racialisation as white may mean that, for her, her relationship to the world is often a matter of her own choice" (1997: 51)(emphasis original).

What Bennet and Friedman (1997) point out is that one of the benefits of being regarded as white was the ability for one to always distance themselves from being white to being an individual, to just being a person, a privilege not afforded to those who were not whites who were always defined by their racialised selves. The idea of white South Africans being hostile towards the TRC because of its possible bias validates the notion that there is amongst whites the perceived ability to shed one's racialised self and see oneself as occupying some sort of neutral space. This allows for a position of non-accountability for apartheids structural oppression based on the idea that if one had no direct and explicit role in perpetuating apartheid crimes then there is nothing to be accountable for. If whites could be 'un-racial' individuals then their achievements were attributable to their own hard work and determination and not to a 'racial' system that discriminated against those who were not white (Bennet and Friedman, 1997). It is only in post-apartheid South Africa however that this white subject is fully revealed because for the first time, there is an actual governmental effort to allocate the same institutional support to blacks as whites had received before.

This understanding of whiteness differs from the dominant whiteness under apartheid where the white subject could state its importance and could be more proactive in its assertion of authority and power. Race then was distinctly political and was an influential factor in most if not all political matters, unlike, in particular, the few years following 1994 where the significance of race was minimised. This particular post-apartheid white subject abstains from directly imposing its authority and power and

consciously creates what it regards as differences with blackness therefore rendering any special focus allocated to blackness, in the form of redress measures etc., seem as if it's a violation of equality. The fact that this qualitatively different articulation of whiteness finds it voice in post-apartheid South Africa is mostly ascribable to the dislocatory experience of 1994'.

Genesis of a whiteness

Nutall (2001: 127) notes however, that "there has been in South Africa since the 1980s a public discourse by blacks to the effect that they would rather deal politically with Afrikaners than with the brand of liberalism said to characterise white English speaking South Africans". This generalising attitude was based on the idea that Afrikaners were more forthright and direct with their racist viewpoints as opposed to English-speaking South Africans who were thought to be more subtle in the expression of their racism. Also, the influence of BC discourse in Charterist discourse could partly account for the suspicion of white 'liberals' involved in the struggle. And too, those pro-capitalist whites who despite stating their opposition to the apartheid government, questioned the virtues of NDR's supposed prospective socialism, could also be a reason why 'white liberals' were deemed suspicious. This public discourse referred to by Nutall (2001) is in a sense reacting to a 'liberal' whiteness very similar to the one that is more fully developed after 1994.

Filatova (1997: 54) adds that "strangely, what one hears of is not the racism of the far right-wingers (which is, again, still there all right) but rather racism of 'neo-liberals'... real racists no longer constitute an active opposition or even engage in criticising the government and the only ideological and moral challenge to it among non-Africans comes from liberal political quarters".
It can be argued that this is mainly or partly because the way white power manifests itself in post-apartheid South Africa is not through the legally, politically and physically violent measures taken by the colonial and apartheid regimes, but through a more subtle and nuanced manifestation of power. Whiteness, now more than ever, it is

said, is invisible, difficult to detect, made to seem as the norm. Steyn (2001) points out how historically, from the economic to the social, whites were guaranteed preferential access predicated on the whiteness of their skin. This systemically entrenched privilege has been so normalised that the link between it and the unjust actions of successive colonial and apartheid regimes is almost erased.

Mbembe (2008: 9) contends that whites were "born to positions of enormous social and economic advantage, (and so) they are reluctant to wash their hands of the privileges they accumulated over three and a half centuries". Structures of benefit and entitlement to privilege were fixated around whiteness for so long in South Africa that, as Lipsitz (1995, as referenced by Steyn, 2001: 18) makes the point, white people's advantage becomes naturalised "in such a way that it seem(s) unrelated to black people's disadvantage". Because of this, some white South Africans become "unable to give up their former investment in the psychic and material benefits of whiteness" leading them to "vacillate", or assume a position of uncertainty that is further compounded by the antagonistic position of 'patriotic blackness' (Mbembe: 10). The discourse of white denialism, of an inability to reflect on one's racial positionality and reach the conclusion that the structures of benefit run deeper than may seem, arises from this normalcy of whiteness.

The feeling of being victimised or being on the raw end of a reverse apartheid comes precisely from the feeling that the benefits of being white died with apartheid. Because post-apartheid South Africa is seen as a society where, in a racial sense, the 'playing fields are level' and indeed have been so since 1994, any endeavour aiming at racial redress will obviously be interpreted as a form of discrimination. What has to be understood is that whiteness in post-apartheid South Africa assumes a different form and meaning. The specific discourse of whiteness that is under discussion in this study emerges from this change. The overall change that whiteness goes through is that it comes to represent more patently white privilege whether economic, social, psychological etc. A number of discourses then can emerge in relation to this change, in attempts to construct realities in which these changes can be comprehended and

understood and therefore to present identifications to emergent subjectivities (Howarth, 1998).. This 'liberal' or 'anti-patriotic' whiteness is an example of such an emerging discursive construction.

'Liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness

The concepts of reconciliation, non-racialism and equality are therefore used by this whiteness in a way that is antagonistic to how patriotic blackness uses them. Hence the designation of 'liberals' as being the problematic ones, because the argument that a formally liberated South Africa is liberated enough and already equal without transformation is seen as a liberal argument. Reconciliation for this 'liberal' whiteness therefore means that "blacks should forget about the South Africa's fractured past and move on.... that white youth in particular cannot be blamed for acts of racial discrimination committed long before they were born" (Mbembe, 2008: 9). For 'patriotic blackness', reconciliation means that blacks should not forget about the past and neither should whites, and that what is needed is a clear indication from all quarters of patriotism and the commitment to transformation.

Non-racialism for this whiteness entails a diminishing assignment of importance to racial categories, so the eventual forgetting of race and the espousal of a colour-blindness where people can claim to 'not see race'. Friedman writes: "I think the way the United Democratic Front (UDF) functioned and its emphasis on the 'non-racialism' of the struggle meant that, certainly in my experience, we (whites) were never directly-politically- challenged for being part of the white horror (Bennet and Friedman, 1997: 52). Although Friedman writes this to convey a slightly different point, one can see that the non-racialism of the non-racial struggle meant minimal confrontation of internal racial dynamics and issues. This helped foster a situation where whiteness as a whole was largely never made problematic for whites involved in the struggle thus resulting in a certain perception of what non-racialism and freedom from racial oppression meant. Non-racialism as colour-blindness then is what follows logically from the perception that what was wrong was an unabashed racism and not necessarily

a racial system that assigned privilege to certain groupings at the expense of others. Non-racialism for 'patriotic blackness' on the other hand entails a process whose final objective may be colour-blindness albeit firmly established in a distinctly African trajectory.

Equality for 'liberal' whites assumes that equality before the law and that equality of possibility and of opportunity is enough to render the transformation agenda unnecessary. Transformation here is seen as unlawful and constitutive of a worrying use of law and governmental powers to advantage certain sectors of the society. For example, attitudes opposing affirmative action mostly follow the logic that "because race was used with evil intent in the past, it cannot be used for good intent in the present... any effort to do so, despite its moral content, is a form of reverse racism" (Mangcu, 2001: 19). On the other hand, 'patriotic blacks' regard true or substantive equality as being achievable only through the intervention of transformatory laws and injunctions. The inequalities created and entrenched by white supremacy are such that it is impossible to think of the nominal recognition of equality as being sufficient and so what is needed is a politics that transforms those who were 'least' equal to being 'most' equal. 'True' equality for 'patriotic blackness' is not necessarily prevalent only when a society-wide economic equality is achieved, but also and importantly, when blacks and Africans in particular obtain the opportunities that were previously only available to whites. Moodley and Adam write of how the:

> "...black elite feels patronized. Status-conscious achievers experience the subtleties of condescending white arrogance as a continuing sub-text of superiority and implicit exclusion. While blacks are incorporated for the political possibilities they hold, the unbridgeable cultural divides remain at the subliminal level" (2000: 58).

If one of the tendencies of 'patriotic blackness' is that it is most prominent amongst elites, it is, at least partly, because of the challenges pertaining 'patronising' attitudes that most of these elites encounter in their operations. If as Southall (2004: 135) states that transformation processes in many areas bring about a "need for close cooperation with white capitalists of the old order, whose objective interests (for instance in political stability) may eventually lead to their incorporation into the 'patriotic

bourgeoisie'", then what this occasions is significant contact amongst white and black elites allowing for their respective views about each other to be strengthened or weakened. Indeed, many white South African businesspeople have been integrated into the 'patriotic bourgeoisie' precisely because of their favourable relations with their black counterparts. Most of those who are not integrated come to embody the figure of the 'reluctant' or 'undermining' white.

For these reluctant white elite, the black elite embody the figure of the 'anti-white' and mostly 'incompetent' black. They feel under siege, as if the black elite are being unfairly allowed to benefit from what they worked hard in establishing. These white people then, almost veiled by this whiteness, will obviously feel unwanted opting for a "politics of recrimination, heckling and rancour" (Mbembe, 2008: 10). But it is exactly this reluctance to accept more responsibility of apartheid's benefits and the continued advantaged position of white South Africans as well as the adoption of a politics of rancour that incenses the 'other', leading to the adoption of a politics of demarcation, of an us and a them, of a patriotic blackness where the 'cynical' or 'moaning' whites are the 'them' and where anyone who is not an 'us' might as well be with them. Mbembe contends that:

> "Today, large sections of the South African white population can no longer see the advantages they gained from these arrangements. Indeed, in order to oppose "transformation", they have to mentally erase the past and forget the element of cruelty and brutality it took to maintain white privilege. Whites have to be discouraged from understanding the benefits that still accompany their own skin colour, even in the new democratic dispensation. Instead, in a typically neoconservative move, they are encouraged to absolve themselves from the sins of the past and to perceive themselves as the new victims of a corrupt and incompetent black government that, in addition is "soft on crime" (2008: 13).

Crime and the moaning whites

An example of some of the points that Mbembe raises is that of a white South African being granted refugee status in Canada on the basis that he would be persecuted because of his white skin if returned to South Africa. After being attacked several times

by criminals, Brandon Huntley, claimed that his being a target was based on him being white in a country ruled by a black government and this is indicated by the allegations that he was referred to as a "white dog" and "settler" during some of the muggings (Mackey, 2009). To put aside the actual granting of asylum to Huntley by the Canadian authorities which is problematic in itself, the fact that Huntley did actually regard himself as being a target specifically because he is white is what is relevant here and is demonstrative of a particular discourse of whiteness.

Whether or not his use of the discourse is an example of a slick manoeuvrering designed to get himself a longer stay in Canada or it was something he genuinely believes, he does still draw on an already existing discursive construction. The idea of white South Africans being particularly vulnerable to crime by way of an inadequate approach to crime by the government and police force precisely because of the belief that it mostly affects whites is one of the ways that this whiteness manifests itself in contemporary South Africa. Despite the fact that black South Africans are typically more vulnerable to most types of violent crimes, there is still the perception amongst many white South Africans that they are especially victimised. Both the insecurities surrounding the possibility of revenge attacks by black South Africans for the apartheid past as well as the short-sightedness of this whiteness is what fuels these sentiments. Huntley believes that "there is a hatred (amongst black South Africans) of what we did to them and it's all about the colour of your skin" and that criminal attacks on whites constitutes some sort of 'payback from way back' (Mackey, 2009).

This claim of course is not atypical when considering how the most reactionary and extreme white identities are and have been reliant on the image of the 'black assailant', the 'black peril' or 'swaart gevaar' or indeed the 'black rapist'. Certainly the now banned website/blog *ZASucks.com* relied heavily on such rhetoric and imagery. Its warning of a genocide taking place particularly against white farmers as well as images of white women who had been raped or sexually violated by black criminals is stereotypically demonstrative of white discourses that seek to instil fear and thus maintain power and privilege through the reference of a black threat or black backlash, and through a

patriarchal logic of protection against it. Where it is short-sighted is that there is a general lack of appreciation of the variety of different normalities that other South Africans experience. Moodley and Adam (2000: 58) write how "few whites care about how they are viewed by others" and how "few would attribute their 'natural' self-confidence in daily life to deep-seated colonial status hierarchy". It's an obliviousness to how other people live their lives and struggle with their lives that has almost been institutionalised over the years. In other words, for Huntley to believe that the reason he has been mugged the number of times he has (without reporting it because of his lack of trust in the police force) is because he is white, is to imply either that there are not many blacks who get mugged or attacked as many times as he has been or that there is a substantive difference to the manner in which black people get mugged or experience crime.

It can be that either the crime experienced by blacks is not really crime or that because of the supposed camaraderie between blacks, black criminals tend to be softer or kinder to black victims. This of course is in total contradiction to the reality of black crime victims in the country. This inability to truly believe that crime is a society-wide phenomenon is influenced by a historically indoctrinated ignorance where 'white problems' are allocated prime importance as opposed to other 'group's'. Former Safety and Security Minister Charles Nqakula's comments about those who complain about crime in 2006 reflect the reaction, the 'patriotic black' reaction, to the viewpoints concerning crime of those such as Brandon Huntley. Amongst other things Nqakula stated that opposition party (Democratic Alliance) members, many of whom are white, were for the first time experiencing "the ugly face of crime"; that "apartheid so insulated them, that they did not see crime at all"; and that "they can continue to attack everything we do... and be as negative as they want; in the end it is the people out there who for many years have been crying for peace and stability who determine the rules of this country" (du Plessis and Quintal, 2006).

Nqakula had recently said that those who complain about crime "can continue to whinge until they're blue in the face, they can continue to be as negative as they want

to, or they can simply leave the this country so that all of peace-loving South Africans, good South African people who want to make this a successful country, continue with their work'' (du Plessis and Quintal, 2006). To begin with, although Nqakula does not at any point speak of white South Africans as being the subjects of his address, they are without doubt who he is referring to. The 'them' that apartheid insulated are clearly the white population of which the DA Member of Parliament that Nqakula was reacting to belongs. Where Nqakula's words become more problematic is through his extension of invitation to those who instead of 'whingeing' can just leave the country. To urge the 'whingers' to depart South Africa is not to say that Nqakula would condone the granting of asylum to Huntley, but his reaction betrays much of the same rhetoric used by the ANCYL in condemning the 'racists' and 'fascists' who would not live under a black democratic government.

In declaring that "it is the people out there who for many years have been crying for peace and stability who determine who rules this country" there is a subtle acceptance of the notion that those who complain about crime undermine the ability of a black government, both to handle crime and in general. This again leads to a demarcation or frontier in which those who are loyal, who are supportive, ''who determine who rules this country" and may be regarded as the "peace-loving South Africans" or the "good South African people" are on the one side; and those who are "negative" and can leave the country, on the other.

Although the minister is careful not to use any racial terms as such, he draws on a discourse of white cynicism of a black government in South Africa, or indeed any black controlled entity, which is exactly what fuels 'patriotic blackness'. When Mike Stofile claims that he does not believe that South African rugby "should sort out its own problems" and that government should intervene, he is more so than anything trying to tackle what he believes is an "indictment of what is happening in our country" (Sapa, 2008). In other words, Stofile's problem lies with what he thinks is the perception that an African black person cannot run South African rugby hence his proclamation that there is no place for black people in SA rugby. If in a country where

the competence of African blacks is consistently questioned, in many cases by white South Africans, where "black people are not trusted", then it is obvious that the 'whitest' major sporting code in South Africa will be reluctant to have an African black in charge. It is partly this reasoning that causes Stofile to close rank and regard only some South Africans as authentic.

Similarly, Julius Malema's concern with the appointment of 'minorities' into key ministerial positions is precisely to offset the perception that African blacks are somehow less competent. Malema says that "once a British guy was even saying that (former Finance Minister) Trevor Manuel is white... they never believe a black person can do what he (Manuel) is doing" (Grobler, 2009). Although it could be initially said that Malema has a valid concern, the problem is that genuine criticism of the competence of the African black person can thus easily be interpreted as being cynical, negative or undermining. It is no wonder then that "more often than not the first reaction of the government and of its various representatives to any criticism is the outcry of racism" (Filatova, 1997: 54). What the 'liberal/anti-patriotic white' is seen to be criticising is not the work of the authentic representative of the nation, but the actual representative. Filatova (1997: 54) adds how "remarkably, the further the South African society is on the road of dismantling the apartheid structures and institutions and the firmer the new order stands on its feet, the more the common accusations of racism and the stronger their wording".

'Patriotic blackness' and the white critic

Johnson (2008: 622) however, makes the point the more "democracy succeeds, the more old ideologies are refuted and the greater the need for self re-evaluation by those who were at the top of the 'racial' hierarchy". What Johnson (2008: 622) is suggesting is that many white people when self 'racially' re-evaluating in post-apartheid South Africa realise that the more the country is a democratic success "the worse I look-even in my own eyes" therefore leaving these white individuals looking at the new order and thinking "please don't be too successful... please fail or at least, make some serious

blunders... and my sense of self will not be totally obliterated". So in some or many cases it could be said that 'white criticism' *is* cynically driven and intended to undermine the capabilities of all blacks. But also, in many cases it is not.

The problem becomes that the space for critique in its true sense is thus diminished when dealing with these discourses. Critique by white commentators can be taken less seriously precisely because of the perception that it can be easily infiltrated by those who seek to sustain privilege through incessantly pointing out the shortcomings of a 'black democratic government' and 'black ability' in general. The perception of the ability of blacks, and African blacks in particular, to receive critique from white commentators can be compromised by the often unwarranted and careless charge of racism. For 'liberal/anti-patriotic whiteness' blacks are too defensive and unable to face the reality that in many respects post-apartheid has failed to deliver on its promises. For 'patriotic blackness' whites who criticise are not really South Africans and should make life easier for themselves and real South Africans by just leaving, and blacks who are critical are not really blacks and might as well side with the whites. What happens with the subjects of this whiteness is that "as their former identity unravels and its old symbols crumble, they retire into racially secluded enclaves" (2008: 10). Feeling excluded from being part of the 'new' South Africa, can lead to the hardening of white identities and forcing the situation where they are increasingly drawing upon reactionary markers in order to make sense of whiteness in this context.

'*Liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness: the hardening of an identity*

Dave Steward, the executive director of the FW de Klerk Foundation writes in response to a comment made by President Jacob Zuma where he bemoans the very sparse presence of white South Africans at the celebrations of national events or days such as the opening of parliament:

"There are several obvious answers. To start with, it is a cultural thing. First-world people everywhere tend to be individualists. Many of them feel uncomfortable waving flags, toyi-toying and singing liberation songs. They can think of many better ways of spending their time than by listening to speeches (often critical of themselves) by leaders with whom they profoundly

disagree" (2010: 11).

The idea of listening to speeches that are critical of white South Africans by leaders that they disagree with together with the prospect of singing liberation songs could be seen as fairly standard replies to the lack of white presence at national events when considering the issues discussed up until this point. Referring to white South Africans as culturally being "first-world people'' however seems to hark back to a referent of whiteness that was prominent during the apartheid era and before. Regarding white people as European or of the 'first-world' as opposed to African or of the 'third world' was a significant factor in establishing oppressive and paternal racial relations in South Africa and Africa.

Also, the frontier is further stabilised by invoking the 'individualist' as opposed to 'communalist' or 'community-based' binary through stating that "first-world people everywhere tend to be individualists" (Steward, 2010). The point here is that the more the subject of this whiteness feels under siege, even if its unjustified, the more it will look to maintain and protect its subjectivity through opposing that in which it sees as being its attacker. In other words, if patriotic blackness is characterised by an Africanism which draws on the discourse of ubuntu that stresses the pitfalls of individualism, then 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subject may seek to justify itself and/or its difference in cultural terms as well. This again, opens up the space for a reactionary articulation of whiteness where, for example, a cultural nationalist infused conception of what it means to be white may regain its currency.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the particular characteristics of 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness through showing its emergence in post-apartheid South Africa. The end of apartheid is argued to be dislocatory experience in that the apartheid imaginary can no longer account for the 'natural' privileges allocated to white South Africans therefore forcing white people to seek new racial identities to make sense of their positions in post-

apartheid South Africa. Importantly, 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness is shown to be in constant reaction to a 'patriotic blackness' that it is indeed partly constructed by. This interrelatedness is what provides the space for the production of what could be referred to as 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subjects. Therefore this whiteness need not be the result of a fully self-constituted subjectivity, but rather the result of specific white positionalities interpreted in a certain manner by a constitutive other. The following chapter concludes the study through providing a summary of the arguments presented up until this point.

CONCLUSION

Brief summary

"The contingency of discursive structures is made visible" by dislocations "which shatters already existing identities and literally induces an identity crisis for the subject" (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 13). An identity crisis in this sense should not be understood as a necessarily devastating event because in some instances it presents a positive opportunity for the prevalence of new identities (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000). For example, it could be said that the emergence of some of those features said to characterise 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness is down to the traumatic effect of the '1994' dislocation, where many hitherto white identities were shattered and could no longer continue to exist in the same way as they did prior to '1994'.

'Patriotic blackness' on the other hand can be said to not be the result of a shattering per se, at least in the same way as many whitenesses were shattered, and is more of an example of the necessity of developing an identity that is able to represent or symbolise the dislocation and its effects adequately. In the case of the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subject, it finds itself in a post-apartheid South African context where whiteness in general as an almost natural site of privilege is increasingly scrutinised and questioned by the political subjectivities adopted by many black, and white, people. In the case of the 'patriotic black' subject, it finds itself in a situation where the formal ending of apartheid has to be accompanied by processes that engender meaningful racial transformation therefore necessitating the prioritisation of certain racial groups. As these processes are all in line with the political project in the discourse of the NDR, the 'enemy' moves from being the racial capitalism of the apartheid state to the racial capitalism of the white minority who refuse to give up the privilege allocated to them by an unjust system.

The notions and values of struggling against, of liberating, of resisting are therefore

not lost after formal liberation from the apartheid government and part of what is still being resisted against is a racial system that assigned and assigns particularly material privileges to whites. Erasmus notes how there is "an emergent discourse of African essentialism (and) in its terms blackness is understood in terms of Africanness, and black or African identity is simply associated with authenticity, resistance and subversion, while whiteness is associated with Europe, in-authenticity, domination and collusion" (2001: 15).

 The nature of these two identities is such that what form a fundamental portion of their constitution are characteristics explicitly based on what the other is not. What is then assumed and adopted are defensive subjectivities marked by hostility towards each other while maintaining a clear sense that the 'other' is the aggravator. What the 'patriotic black' subject represents to the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white is an agitator driven by vengeance and an emotional racial solidarity and is hell-bent on not only sabotaging the individual and collective efforts of white South Africans but also on 'teaching whites a lesson'. What the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subject represents to the 'patriotic black' is a pessimist when it comes to the capabilities of blacks to govern, and also a spurious non-racist that is reluctant to accept genuine change and therefore disinclined to go along with efforts that seek to enforce it.

The association that the discourse of "African essentialism", as Erasmus (2001) refers to it, has with authenticity is what allows 'patriotic blackness' to further delimit itself through the exclusion of those deemed inauthentic. The 'inauthentic' black subject then comes to represent either those who sympathise with or are like the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white. The only way to not be considered 'liberal/white' or in-authentically black is either through the embracement of 'patriotic blackness', the rejection of 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness, the adoption of a distinctly post-apartheid South African patriotism, or the acceptance of alternative identities that are, however, expressly Africanist or class struggle orientated (i.e. workers, unionists). What this discourse does then is that it "denies creolization and hybridity as constitutive of African experiences" (Erasmus, 2001: 20). The nuances present in different racial

subjectivities are discarded and lumped into easily defined categories. Perhaps the defensive attitude of the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white in some cases results from this very tendency to not pay attention to the subtleties of identity, that is, the 'liberal/anti-patriotic' white subject acts a certain way as an act of resistance to being unduly typecast or stereotyped as a subject that acts that way. Unfortunately this particular act of resistance will only serve to reinforce the stereotype and in a way justify the initial act of stereotyping.

Alternative subjectivities, alternative realities

As much as the argument in this study has been that the '1994' dislocation heralded the emergence of what could prove to be very dangerous and retrogressive racial identities, it does not necessarily pre-empt a doom-filled future. What 'patriotic blackness' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness indicate is the ability that the subject as political subject or acting subject has in constituting its own identity. Any number of events that continuously take place in South Africa could be constructed as a dislocatory experience that "compels the subject to act, to assert anew its subjectivity" (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000: 13). Of course, this is complicated by already existing power relations and the hegemonic grip that already existing racial discourses have on the representation of certain events as dislocatory. This however does not mean that there are not a range of racial subjectivities that challenge the status quo.

The fact that 'patriotic blacks' have to determine who is authentic and who is not reveals that there a number of blacknesses that already challenge 'patriotic black' understandings of blackness. There is also a substantial scholarship of various and alternative white subjectivities in South Africa.[iv] The potential creativity that is possessed by the political or acting subject to construct their own identities could not be emphasised enough if the idea is to gradually erode the appeal of 'patriotic blackness' and 'liberal/anti-patriotic' whiteness. And if these alternative subjectivities produce and are produced by certain discourses, that means that alternative perceptions of social reality can emerge.

REFERENCES

Adam, H. and K. Moodley. (2000). "Race and Nation in Post-Apartheid South Africa". *Current Sociology.* Vol. 48(3), pp 51-69. London: Sage.

ANC (1997). "Nation Formation and Nation-Building: The National Question in South Africa". http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/discussion/nation.html

ANC (1997). "50th National Conference: Strategy and Tactics- as amended by conference". http://www.anc.org.za/ancdocs/50thnationalconference.html

Baines, G (1998). "The Rainbow Nation? Identity and nation building in post-apartheid South Africa. *Mots Pluriels.*

Bennet, J. and M. Friedman (1997). "White Women and Racial Autography". *Agenda: Race, Idenitity and Change.* No 32, pp 49-55.

Biko, S. (1978). *I Write What I Like.* Johannesburg. Heinemann Publishers.

Blaser, T. (2004). "A New South African Imaginary: Nation Building and Afrikaners in Post-Apartheid South Africa". *South African Historical Journal.* 51, pp 179-198.

Burgos, R. N. B. (2008). "The Mexican Revolutionary Mystique". In Howarth, D., Norval, A., Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 86-100. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Butler, J. (1993). "Endangered/Endangering: Schematic Racism and White Paranoia". Gooding-Williams, R. (ed). *Reading Rodney King Reading Urban Uprising.* New York: Routledge.

Chipkin, I. (2002). "The Sublime Object of Blackness". *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines,* vol 176 XLII-3, pp569-583.

Chipkin, I. (2007). *Do South Africans Exist: Nationalism, Democracy and the Identity of the People.* Johannesburg: Wits Press.

Crenshaw, K.W. (1994). "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Colour".Martha Fineman and

Roxanne Mykitiuk (eds). *The Public Nature of Private Violence.* New York: Routledge.

Denzin, N.K. (2001). "Symbolic Interactionism, Poststructuralism, and the Racial Subject". *Symbolic Interaction.* Vol 24, No 2, pp 243-249.

Erasmus, Z. (2001). "Introduction: Re-imagining coloured identities in post-apartheid South Africa". In Erasmus, Z (ed) *Coloured by history, shaped by place: new perspectives on coloured identites in Cape Town.* Cape Town: Kwela Books.

Filatova, I. (1997). "The rainbow against the African sky or African Hegemony in a multi-cultural context?". *Transformation.* 34, pp 47-56.

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Greenstein, R., Roberts, B., Sitas, A. (2003). "Qualitative Research Methodology" in Greenstein, R. (ed). *Research Method Manual.*

Grobler, F. (2009). "Where are the black economic ministers, asks Malema". *Mail and Guardian Online.* http://mg.co.za/article/2009-08-06-where-are-the-black-economics-ministers-asks-malema

Hall, Stuart (1992) "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power", in Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben, eds. *Formations of Modernity*. Open University/Polity Press, pp. 275-331.

Howarth, D. (1997). "Complexities of identity/difference: Clack Consciousness ideology in South Africa". *Journal of Political Ideologies.* 2: 1, 51-78.

Howarth, D. (1998). "Paradigms Gained? A Critique of Theories and Explanations of Democratic Transition in South Africa". In Howarth, D and Norval, A (eds) *South Africa in Transition: New Theoretical Perspectives.* Pp 182-214. Macmillian.

Howarth, D. (2000). "The Difficult Emergence of a Democratic Imaginary: Black Consciousness and non-racial democracy in South Africa. In

Howarth, D., Norval, A. Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 168-192. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Howarth, D and Stavrakakis, Y. (2000). "Introducing discourse theory and politcal analysis". In Howarth, D, Norval, A., and Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 1-24. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hudson, P. (1986). "The Freedom Charter and the Theory of the National Democratic Revolution". *Transformation.* 1, pp 6-38.

Hudson, P. (1987). "On National Democratic Revolution- A reply to Jeremy Cronin". *Transformation.* 4; pp 54- 59.

Hudson, P. (2006). "The Concept of The Subject in Laclau". *Politikon. 33(3), 299-312.*

Johnson, R. (1986). "What is Cultural Studies Anyway?" *Social Text.* 16, 38-80.

Johnson, W. (2008). "Are 'whites' in South Africa really ready for democracy"? *Social Identities.* Vol 14, No 5, pp 621-636.

MacDonald, M. (2003). *Why Race Matters in South Africa.* UKZN Press.

Mackey, R. (2009). "White South African Claiming Racist 'Persecution' is granted Asylum in Canada". *The NewYork Times.* http://thelede.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/09/02/white-south-african-claiming-racist-persecution-granted-asylum-in-canada/

Mangcu, X (2000). "Notes on Political Morality, Racial Identity, and Cultural Tolerance in the Age of the African Renaissance". *South African Journal of International Affairs.* Vol 8, No 1, pp 15- 22.

Marx, C. (2002). "Ubu and Ubuntu: on the dialectics of apartheid and nation-building". *Politikon.* 29:1, 49-69.

Mbembe, A. (2008). "Passages to Freedom: The Politics of Racial Reconciliation in SouthAfrica". *Public Culture.* Vol 20: 1.

McKaiser, E. (2010). "Does racism trump homophobia?". *Mail and Guardian Online.* http://mg.co.za/article/2010-07-11-does-racism-trump-homophobia

Moodley, K., and Adam, H. (2000). "Race and Nation in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Current Sociology.* Vol 48, No 3, pp 51-69. Sage Publications.

Mullen, H. (1994). "Optic White: Blackness and the Production of Whiteness. *Diacritics.* Vol 24, No 2/3, pp 71-89. John Hopkins University Press.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S.J. (2007). "Tracking the Historical Roots Post-Apartheid Citizenship Problems: The Native Club, Restless Natives, Panicking Settlers and the politics of Nativism in South Africa. ASC Working Paper. African Studies Centre. Leiden, Netherlands.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S. J. (2009). "Africa for Africans or Africa for "Natives" Only? "New Nationalism" and Nativism in Zimbabwe and South Africa". *Africa Spectrum.* 44, 1, 61-78.

Neocosmos, M. (2008). "The Politics of Fear and the Fear of Politics: Thinking About Xenophobia in South Africa". *Courier de la Planete.*

Norval, A. (1996). *Deconstructing Aprtheid Discourse.* London: Verso.

Norval, A (2000). "Trajectories of future research in dsicourse theory". In Howarth, D, Norval. A, Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 219-237. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Norval, A. (2007). "No Reconciliation without redress: 'articulating political demands in post-transtional South Africa". *Critical Discourse Studies.* Vol 6, No 4, 311-321. Routledge.

Nuttall, S. (2001). 'Subjectivities of Whiteness'. *African Studies Review.* 44:2, 115-140.

Quintal, A. and du Plessis, J. (2006). "Nqakula: no crime tsunami". *IOL News.* http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/nqakula-no-crime-tsunami-1.280189

Sapa, (2009). "Stofile: There is no place for black people in SA rugby". *Mail and Guardian Online.* http://mg.co.za/article/2008-03-28-stofile-there-is-no-place-for-black-people-in-sa-rugby

Schuhmann, A. (2010). "Taming Transgressions: South African nation-building and body politics". *Agenda.* No 83, pp 95-106.

Sharp, J. (1998). "Non-Racialism and its Discontents: a post-apartheid paradox". *Unesco.* 156, pp 243-253. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Southall, R. (2004). "The ANC and Black Capitalism in South Africa". Vol 31, No 100, pp 313- 328. *Review of African Political Economy.* ROAPE Publications.

Stavrakakis, Y. (2000). "On the Emergence of Green Ideology: the Dislocation Factor in Green Politics. In Howarth, D and Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 100-118. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Steward, D. (2010). "The 'national question' examined". *The Star.* Tuesday March 16.

Steyn, M. (2001). *Whiteness Just Isn't What It Used To Be: White Identity in a Changing South Africa.* State University of New York Press.

Sweet, J. (2010). "South Africans Exist: Identity, Nationalism, and Democracy". *Safundi.* Vol11 No 1, pp 141-148. Routledge.

Torfing, J. (1999). *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Zizek.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Tsang, A. K. T, and Ho, Y. S. P. (2000). "Beyond being gay: the proliferation of political identities in colonial Hong Kong". . In Howarth, D and Stavrakakis, Y (eds) *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.* Pp 134-150. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

West, C. (1993). "Black Leadership and the Pitfalls of Racial Reasoning." Morrison, T. (ed *Race-ing Justice, En-Gendering Power. Essays on Anita Hill, Clarence   Thomas, and the Construction of Social Reality.* London: Chatto & Windus.

Winant, H (2000). "Race and Race Theory", *Annual Review of Sociology,* 26. pp 169-185.

Wright, M (2004). *Becoming Black: Creating Identity in the African Diaspora.* London: Duke University Press.

Endnotes

[i] See for example: Carby, H. V (1985). "On the Threshold of Woman's Era": Lynching, Empire and Sexuality in Black Feminist Theory"; Davis, A. Y. (1981). *Women, Race and Class;* Wiegman, R. (1993). "The Anatomy of Lynching". For the gendered and racialised nature of nationalism, see: McClintock, A. (1997). "No Longer in a Future Heaven. Gender, Race and Nationalism"; Schuhmann, A. (2010). "Taming Transgressions: South African nation-building and body politics";

[ii] In the chapter "The South African Nation" in the book *Do South Africans Really Exist?* Chipkin provides a compelling anaylsis of the ambiguities in Mbeki's 'I'm African speech, noting how the term African at times seemingly denotes all who live on the continent and at times only speaks of specific 'indigenous inhabitants' as being African. Pp 99-102. See also Hudson (2009: 404) who writes: "The recent vicissitudes of nation and African in this discourse can be invoked as symptomatic of this tension. In-between President Mbeki's 'I am an African' speech and the Broad-Based Black Economic Empowerment Act of 2003, the meaning of 'African' changed from including all South African citizens to including only Africans in the narrow sense. This immediately raises the spectre of 'second-class' citizenship and the closing of the place of power around a pre-political national fantasy".

[iii] See Ballantine (2004). "Re-thinking 'whiteness'? Identity, change and 'white' popular music in post-apartheid South Africa" who notes the break from Mandela-era rhetoric to Mbeki-era rhetoric.

[iv] See for example: Ballantine, C (2004) Re-thinking 'White'identity? Some issues in popular music in post-apartheid South Africa'; Steyn, M. (2001). *Whiteness Just Isn't What It Used To Be: White Identity in a Changing South Africa;* Nuttall, S. (2001). 'Subjectivities of Whiteness'.