

https://dspace.org/

Argentine South Africans ways of speaking about social responsibility in South Africa

Hamity, Ayelen

2016-01-28
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/19380

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

University of the Witwatersrand

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Department of Diversity Studies

Argentine South Africans ways of speaking about social responsibility in South Africa

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

March 2014

Student: Ayelen Hamity

Student Number: 925858

Supervisor: Prof Melissa Steyn

Contents

ABSTRACT 3
DECLARATION 4
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 5
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 6
1.1. Background 6
1.2. Rationale 8
1.3. Aims and objectives 9
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW 12
2.1. Whiteness, Hierarchies of Whiteness and White Privilege 12
2.2. Liberal Discourse: opportunistic stagnation 16
2.3. Discursive practices 22
2.4. Studies on White Immigrants 25
2.5. Argentine Identity: introducing the research subject 27
2.6. Hierarchies of Whiteness 29
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL POINT OF DEPARTURE 31
3.1. Discursive Theory 32
3.2. Identity 37
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY 40
4.1. Methodology 40
4.2. Participants 40
4.3. Ethics 42
4.4. Data collection 43
4.5. Data Analysis 44
4.6. Evaluation of Research 46
4.7. Reflexivity 47
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS 54
5.1. Fluid Identities 55
5.2. Business above All 60
5.3. Afrikaners 70
5.4. The Family 75
5.5. Bolstering the Cage 81
5.6. Education 83

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION 91
Bibliography 95
APPENDIX A: Interview Schedule 99
APPENDIX B: Participant Information Sheet 100
APPENDIX C: Consent Form 102

ABSTRACT

Despite the end of apartheid, South Africa remains a grossly unequal society. This has meant that the current social order must again be challenged. One of the tasks faced in post-apartheid South Africa is the philosophical and moral interrogation of white privilege. This research investigates the ways of speaking of Argentine immigrants living in South Africa. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and analysed by making use of Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory as well as Melissa Steyn's characteristics of "white talk". It was found that Argentine immigrants living in South Africa aligned themselves with the ways of speaking of white South Africans. These are largely informed by and embedded in Eurocentric discourses; in particular liberal ideology. In line with the agenda of Critical Whiteness studies, this positionality was exposed and theoretically interrogated.

Keywords: whiteness, immigrants, discourse, Laclau and Mouffe discourse theory, white talk, racism, identity, liberalism

DECLARATION

I, Ayelen Hamity (Student number 925858), declare that the research report is my own unaided work. It has been submitted for the degree of Masters in Diversity Studies, to the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before, for any other degree or examination, to any other university.

_____

Ayelen Hamity

16 March 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project would have not been possible without the help of a number of people and organisations;

My supervisor, Professor Melissa Steyn, thank you for your persistent guidance and patience. It is not every day a person can say they work under someone they admire, thank you for giving me that opportunity.

The DST-NRF National Research Chair in Diversity Studies. Thank you for funding this research.

Gerrit Strydom for providing me with the encouragement and instrumental support I needed to carry out the research.

Mamá Mónica, muchas gracias por acompañarme en este proceso. Te quiero mucho

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

In 1994 the first democratic elections were held in South Africa which officially signified the end of the apartheid government as well as the first steps on a new venture into nation building (Steyn, 2004). Desmond Tutu coined the term "rainbow nation", which was meant to illustrate the new South African identity as one that is a part of a society made up of people of all creeds and colours. The Truth and Reconciliation commission was an attempt to formally symbolise the new democratic state that is built on a sense of national unity and forgiveness as opposed to revolution and retribution. Despite South Africa's best efforts to move towards the ideal of national unity, the nation remains grossly unequal, resulting in some colours of the "rainbow nation" remaining in their disadvantaged position (Hook, 2011a). This reality has meant that the current social order must, again, be challenged and interrogated.

A particularly important critical interrogation must be that of whiteness. The American fiction writer David Foster Wallace (1993), has stated that the job of good fiction is to "disturb the comfortable and comfort the disturbed". I believe that this phrase can be extended to good research. In a country that is experiencing deep inequality, comfortable places (like the general lived reality of the white demographic) must be investigated and challenged[1]. By extension, it is important to interrogate the social organisation that allows for the continuance of these comfortable spaces; liberalism and its economic counterpart;

[1] A report published by Statistics South Africa (2014) reveals the racially determined inequality in South Africa (Statistics South Africa, Poverty Trends in South Africa: An examination of absolute poverty between 2006 and 2011, 2014).

capitalism (Hook, 2011a; Peck, 1993).

Having positioned my work within the critical whiteness study agenda, which will be explored in greater depths later, I decided to focus on white immigrants living in South Africa. On commencement of my literature review I came across a large volume of research on immigrants. However, the majority of this research was dedicated to xenophobia and intra-race conflict (Commey, 2014; Gebre, Maharaj, & Pillay, 2011; Kayitesi & Mwaba, 2014). Only a few articles were dedicated to white immigrants living in South Africa which invites the following question; what about the white immigrants[2] in this country?

White privilege is not a phenomenon that attaches itself only to those involved in the legislative mechanics of apartheid or those who directly benefit from it. It is insidious and ubiquitous, it is never blatantly requested and it is impossible to renounce. Here we can refer directly to the words of Steve Biko (1978, p. 66)[3]:

> *It is not as if whites are allowed to enjoy privilege only when they declare their solidarity with the ruling party. They are born into privilege and are nourished by and nurtured in the system of ruthless exploitation of black energy.*

This means that all white people living in South Africa benefit from the injustices of the past, whether they were involved in the perpetration thereof or not. This immediately broadens the scope of civic responsibility. Do white foreigners recognise their white privilege? Are they critical of their privileged positions? How do they position themselves in the scope of civic responsibility? Do they show elements of collective responsibility in aiding

[2] By "white immigrants" I am excluding British immigration which has been the focus of study for multiple scholars such as Conway and Leonard (2014), and Lambert (2009) to name a few.

[3] This quote was cited from Samantha Vice (2010), "How do I Live in this Strange Place?"

in the positive transformation of a country who benefits them in implicit and explicit ways by virtue of their whiteness?

1.2. Rationale

The reason for my focus on white Argentine immigrants is twofold, firstly, as I mentioned above; there seems to be a lack of research on white foreigners living in South Africa, particularly within the context of critical whiteness studies. Secondly, in line with the agenda prescribed by critical whiteness studies, I wish to interrogate the comfortable position that whiteness occupies (Powell, 1999). The term "critical whiteness studies" is an umbrella term for a large body of interdisciplinary literature that aims to displace the authoritative position of whiteness (Steyn, 2004), a position that asserts itself as the standard for all spheres of society to aspire to. In other words, it aims at challenging the power of whiteness (Powell, 1999, Steyn, 2004a, West & Schmidt, 2010). It is important to note that the purpose of this study is not to re-centre whiteness but rather, given the discursive formation that privileges, normalises and secures the western subject and his culture (I use the word 'he' to purposely denote the primacy of males in the rhetoric), whiteness studies challenges these discourses by making them visible (West & Schmidt, 2010). I do not only wish to make them visible but rather, to also look at, and evaluate the implications of taking on these discursive practises. Derek Hook (2011a) criticises the position that whiteness needs to be made visible as he expresses that whiteness is only invisible to those who inhabit that position. It is for that reason that this paper is concerned with both projects. It will expose these discursive practises as well as challenge them theoretically by looking at their material consequences.

Argentine people are an interesting group to investigate for a number of reasons. Firstly, they harbour a deep adoration for European culture and have internalised European discourses (Ray, 2011; Salvatore, 2008). This is exemplified by contemporary popular culture's fixation on "Europeanness" and the country's general exclusion of indigenous people (Ray, 2011). This discriminatory behaviour is justified by appeals to European superiority (Ray, 2011; Salvatore, 2008). Secondly, given their emotional affiliation with Europe, Argentine identity occupies a space of uncertainty as the geographical distance between South-America and Europe serves as a subtle reminder of just how un-European Argentines might actually be (Ortiz, 2002). At the same time, there is a rejection of the land they find themselves in (Ortiz, 2002; Salvatore, 2008). Lastly, there is a relatively large community of Argentines living in South Africa due to economic and political turmoil in Argentina that has led to the emigration of a large number of people (Ortiz, 2002). Given the fact that the majority of the Argentine population is white, they occupy social positions of South African whiteness and benefit from this identification. It is this positionality that will be explored; the ways in which white Argentines fit into and negotiate their whiteness and their links to Europe in the South African context.

1.3. Aims and objectives

This research was guided by a desire to identify the ways in which Argentines living in South Africa understand their social positionality in relation to the issues facing the country. In an attempt to answer this question; other questions were addressed; is an identification with Europe evident in the discourse of Argentines living in South Africa? If so, how does it mediate their sense of engagement with South African issues? To which

groups within South Africa do they align themselves socially and politically? Does this alignment influence their willingness and capacity for socio political engagement, and if so, how? Finally, how do Argentine immigrants articulate their role in the socio political landscape of South Africa?

The aim of the research can be stated as follows:

- To unmask the discourses embedded in the talk of the Argentine immigrants used in this study.
- To examine the possible functions and effects of these discourses in contemporary South Africa. The discourses the participants draw on will be evaluated according to their repercussions; do they function to challenge or maintain the current social order?
- To challenge the ways of speaking that are used to maintain power relations in Society.

This positionality was exposed and will be theoretically interrogated in the chapters to follow. It is important to note that the work presented does not wish to provide a prescriptive ethics or correct the respondents' answer into more desirable ones. This would be arrogant on part of the writer and implies a distancing from her own whiteness (a position that I will theorise in a later section is not possible). Instead, problematic discourses that aim at the preservation of privilege will be exposed. Furthermore, the work of multiple scholars will be presented and theorised to provide an alternative to the ways of speaking that aim at the preservation of the current social order.

1.4. Chapter Organisation

CHAPTER 2: Reviews the literature in order to position this study within the context of whiteness and immigrant identity. Whiteness is theorised by looking specifically at white privilege and the ways this position is articulated in South Africa. To narrow the field of enquiry, previous research on white immigration as well as studies and literature on Argentines is explored and theorised.

CHAPTER 3: locates this study within the theoretical framework of Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory. The ontological and epistemological assumptions of this theory are uncovered. A section is dedicated to theorising identity which lies at the heart of this research.

CHAPTER 4: provides an overview of the research method utilised in order to conduct the study. The sampling technique, means of data collection, data analysis approach, and the way in which the research should be evaluated are described and supported with theory. Ethical considerations and limitations of research are also discussed. A section is dedicated to reflexivity to account for the researcher's constitutive role in the research process.

CHAPTER 5: presents the results of the analysis. Nodal points, common themes and ways of speaking were identified and theorised by making reference to the arguments put forward in the literature review.

CHAPTER 6: concludes the research report with a summary of the findings as well as provides an overview of the implications of the research.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review will serve to inform the reader of previous studies conducted, as well as theories that have informed both this particular research, as well as my general argumentative position. In the following paragraphs I will firstly investigate whiteness and white privilege, both as concepts as well as in their particular articulations and manifestations in South Africa. Secondly, I will explore a prominent discourse in the formation of a white identity namely; liberal discourse. This discourse will be evaluated and critiqued based on its structural repercussions. I will then use the critical whiteness framework as a vantage point from which to look more specifically at the discursive strategies that have been employed by white South Africans in an attempt to maintain their position of privilege in society[4]. Studies dedicated to the investigation of white immigrant identity as well as the ways in which these concepts manifest in the context of South Africa will then be investigated. I will then narrow the study down by introducing the reader to the Argentine subject by drawing on the work of Dujovne Ortiz (2002) and Lesley Ray (2011) and further situate Argentine immigrants in South Africa by drawing on statistical information. Lastly, I will look at the concept of "hierarchies of whiteness" within the context of South Africa to identify into which discursive terrain argentine immigrants have emigrated to.

2.1. Whiteness, Hierarchies of Whiteness and White Privilege

[4] These are largely informed by liberal ideology which is why a section has been dedicated to liberalism.

As was discussed earlier, this study is firmly situated within critical whiteness studies and as such, aims at destabilising the power of whiteness (Powell, 1990; Steyn 2004; West & Schmidt, 2010). Before continuing further, a definition of "whiteness" must be provided. Melissa Steyn (2005) defines it as, "an ideologically supported social positionality that has accrued to people of European descent as a consequence of the economic and political advantage gained during and subsequent to European colonial expansion" (p. 121). Steyn further explains that this position depended on the construction of "race". Due to the fact that race was construed as a natural trait, this ascription masked the political and economic dimension that "race" was based on. Race became a marker of entitlement, it supported the fiction that unequal relationships were due to genetic inequalities between "races". From this we can conclude that whiteness is a shared social position where political, psychological, cultural and economic dimensions of a privileged positionality are normalised and remain largely unchallenged (Steyn, 2005). In other words, whiteness refers to a cultural identity that is characterised by positions of privilege in society (Sasson-Levy, 2013).

A "privileged positionality" or "privilege" refers to an instance in which a person actively or passively acquires a reward by virtue of group membership as opposed to something that they have earned (Johnson, 2001; Powell, 1999). In the case of a racialised society, these unearned benefits attach themselves to whiteness. They come in the form of economic, social and political advantage (Vice, 2010). White privilege is not something we choose but rather something we are born into, it is not about what one does but rather who one is (Vice, 2010). That being said, whites are on the morally questionable side of domination and oppression and thus need to be critical of their own position in society (Vice, 2010).

One of the tasks faced in post-apartheid South Africa is the philosophical and moral interrogation of white privilege (Hook, 2011b). Multiple scholars have attempted to address the responsibility of white South Africans in post-apartheid South Africa. In an essay titled 'How do I live in This Strange Place*'*, Samantha Vice sought to answer a question she set out for herself as a white South African, namely, "what is the morally appropriate reaction to one's position of privilege?"(p. 323). In other words, she set out on an ethical venture to try and determine what the moral and political role of a white person is in a country with a racist history whose socio economic structures continue to benefit a select few (Hook D, 2011b). Vice identified the appropriate affect to be shame, guilt and "agent-regret" and the appropriate response to those emotions lies in cultivating humility and political silence. In other words, for white people to refrain from being involved in political discussion and to allow "blacks" to "remake the country in their own way" (Vice, 2010, p. 335).

In an article published by the City Press in 2010 titled "White South Africans must take a stand against Racism", a group of white South Africans take a different approach to the issue of white responsibility in post-apartheid South Africa. Although not directly addressing Vice's work, this article challenges "political silence" as it emphasises that silence may be interpreted as sympathy for the perpetrators of racism. Instead, the authors urge white South Africans to make a public stand against racism, to evaluate their feelings of superiority and entitlement and interrogate values, beliefs and attitudes that undermine the dignity of black people. The reader is reminded by the authors of the article of the serious nature of the forgiveness generously granted by black leaders during 1994 and so, white South Africans are encouraged to acknowledge and appreciate this act by engaging in daily acts of reconciliation and starting an authentic conversation with black people (City Press, 2010).

It is clear from the above that [some] white scholars are concerned with their position in post-apartheid South Africa; how does one deal with the racist past that is still residual in the current socio-political landscape in a constructive way? Both the above prescriptive moral positions leave room for critique. Both approaches were criticized (either directly or indirectly) by Derek Hook (2011a; 2011b), for (amongst other things) being too concerned with the alleviation of their own negative affect to confront the deep discomfort that whiteness necessitates. Their positions seem to be preoccupied on some level with an attempt of white people to distance themselves from their whiteness, an attempt to reaffirm to the public that "I am not *that* white" and/ or "I am a different *type* of white" (Hook, 2011a; 2011b). This is neither possible nor is it enough to really address the ethical failure inherent in "whiteness"; the heir to a history of "brutality, inhumanity and capricious violence" (Hook, 2011a, p. 7). Instead, Hook (2011a) argues that, "something more unsettling, more genuinely destabilizing is required in the analysis of whiteness" (p. 7).

Hook (2011a) makes use of the contrapuntal method theorised by Said (2003), to transpose Steve Biko's philosophy to critique current day whiteness, as well as whiteness' attempts to deal with itself. In other words, texts about black consciousness are retrieved to disrupt normative assumptions that underlie the conditions for current ways of understanding (Hook, 2011a). This is possible because Biko's philosophy does not only speak to the explicit forms of violence in the apartheid era, it also addresses ideological forms of violence and structural oppression. Biko directly responds to capitalistic modes of dominance that have historically served to preserve the comfortable and secure the position of whites. Hook argues that there is a strategic forgetting on part of the white liberals in contemporary reading of Steve Biko's philosophy. This can be attributed to the fact that Steve Biko's critique of

"white liberal ideology" is as relevant, and as poignant today as it was during the height of apartheid. By revisiting some aspects of Biko's philosophy, one can improve on current arguments in critical whiteness studies (Hook, 2011a). It is here that I must turn to liberal ideology; its philosophical assumptions and limitations. It is through teasing out this ideological system that one can understand why the two approaches presented above fall short of the massive emotional and structural work required of white people who wish to confront whiteness in a sincere, meaningful and non-self-indulgent way.

2.2. Liberal Discourse: opportunistic stagnation

According to Dubow (2014), South African liberalism extends over two centuries making it the longest continuous tradition in the country. Given its long history in South Africa, liberalism has been a point of contestation. One of the major objections to liberalism can be attributed to its association to its economic counterpart, capitalism. Due to this coupling, liberals are critiqued for aligning themselves with economic domination as opposed to notions of liberation (Dubow, 2014). Although a valid critique, Dubow (2014) argues that ahistorical conceptualisations of liberalism overshadow the positive stands that liberals have taken in South Africa, such as their persistent opposition to the apartheid regime. In fact, Dubow extends his argument by saying that liberalism in South Africa has been more concerned with, "interventions in the spheres of morality, the defence of free political institutions and in associational life" more so than advocating "the free market of globalised capitalism" (8). An example of this positive history is that of the liberal party of the nineteenth-century. The Liberal Party revitalised principles of non-racism and common citizenship during that time. Although this party was anti-communist, it did not have a pro-

capitalist position (Dubow, 2014). In fact, many sided with the poor and were involved in campaigns against passes and against the Group Areas Act during the 1950s and 1960s. Despite this egalitarian political history, for many involved in the liberation movement, liberalism has come to represent a spineless political movement with failed attempts at opposing apartheid as well as an active advocate in racial capital domination (Dubow, 2014). To go further into the history of liberalism in South Africa extends the scope of this report, the above simply serves to avoid demonization of liberalism and the role the liberal movement has had in South Africa. I will now turn to its critique by discussing how liberal ideology lends itself to the conservative agenda of defending historic privilege. Adopting this discourse has meant the preservation of underserved privilege for whites in South Africa. It is for this reason that I have decided to term this section "opportunistic stagnation" as I will argue that it is liberal discourse that perpetuates white supremacy.

In post-apartheid South Africa, "liberalism" has become the dominant public ideology (Hudson, 2010). According to Powell (1999, p. 423), a "dominant public ideology" refers to a system of beliefs that have been constructed over time and maintain a given social order. Apartheid's dependence on "race" as a marker of worth was replaced by a world of equal opportunity for all. A country structured around a meritocracy i.e. the individual (irrespective of demographic characteristics) will receive his/her just reward (Peck, 1993).

Liberalism stands on the following taken for granted assumptions: firstly, the primacy of the individual; an autonomous rational being (Peck, 1993); secondly, each individual is believed to be motivated by his or her own self-interest. In order for an individual to be able to pursue his or her own goals and aspirations within a truly liberal milieu, two things must

be guaranteed: firstly, the existence of human rights that secure for the individual a set of freedoms (Peck, 1993); and secondly, the economic order must be capitalism to allow for the unmediated pursuit of an individual's interest (Peck, 1993).

Given the historical legacy of exclusion, subordination and marginalisation to which liberalism was employed as a political antidote, one can surely appreciate the shift from a feudal socio economic system to one that focuses on a morality based on human rights and individual freedoms. However, this masks the fact that one dogmatism was replaced by another with its own set of negative repercussions. Although liberalism attempts to move away from racial thought, a few things are overlooked (Boler & Zembulas, 2003). For one, it tends to overlook the structural inequality inherent in a society built on a legacy of exploitation (Boler & Zembulas, 2003). Secondly, by denying difference one denies cultural heritage and this is often coupled with an unconscious expectation that the subordinate culture assimilate to the dominant culture which sets the "norm" (Boler & Zembulas, 2003).

In addition to the fact that liberal discourse masks structural inequality or expects an assimilation on the part of the subordinate culture to the dominant norm, there is a further negative repercussion in uncritically adopting liberalism as the sole system from which to arrange a society. Peck (1993) conducted research on the Oprah Winfrey show in an attempt to investigate how racism was problematized and handled in a thirteen episode series dedicated to racism in America in 1992. What she found was that three discourses largely embedded in the Western tradition continuously came up, namely; liberal, therapeutic and religious frames of meaning. Discussing all three of these discourses goes beyond the scope of this research paper but instead, I will outline their most prominent similarities. All three of

these discourses treated the "individual" in isolation. In other words, the "self-contained individual" had been naturalised. By framing racism as an individual problem, one frames its solution as one that is dependent on individual change (Peck, 1993). The argument can be explained as follows; if enough people change their individual ways of being then there will no longer be racism in society. This emphasis on individual experience allows one to overlook concrete reality; a world structured along lines of material inequality (Peck, 1993). In summary; by subordination of institutionalised practises and social structures to individual perception and choices, the status quo remains unchallenged (Peck, 1993). This serves as an indication of one of the massive flaws inherent in liberalism, namely, it decentres the role that history had on the current social order by focusing solely on the individual (Peck, 1993). That is to say, claims to individualism and liberalism serve those who are already in an economically dominant position.

In light of the above we can see how liberalism perpetuates white supremacy in the context of South Africa. In the case of South Africa, liberalism has provided whites with a moral justification for enjoying undeserved privileges at the expense of black livelihoods (Hook, 2011a). It is for this reason, Hook (2011a) argues, that the "white capitalist regime" (p. 10) became one of the targets of the black consciousness movement. According to Steve Biko, the issue lies in how liberals defined the problem of South Africa. Here it is worth quoting Biko (1978, p. 90) directly;

> *The basic problem in South Africa has been analysed by liberal whites as being apartheid. They argue that in order to oppose it we have to form non-racial groups. Between these two extremes, they claim, lies the land of milk and honey for*

> *which we are working … for the liberals, the thesis is apartheid, the anti-thesis is non-racialsim, but the synthesis is very feebly defined. They want to tell the blacks that they see integration as the ideal solution…*

Although Biko is speaking directly about apartheid, this quote is applicable to present-day South Africa as liberalism still defines South Africa's solution as depending on non-racialism. The above quote, as well as others cited in Hook (2011a), disturbs the rainbow nation ideal and its insistence on a multicultural model of integration. According to Biko (1978) the inherent arrogance of liberalism is exposed in its persistence that the solution to the problems of the country must be solved through the involvement of both black and white people as opposed to just identifying whiteness as the problem.

If one identifies the problem of South Africa as "whiteness" and its racism, one forecloses the possibility of re-centring whiteness through their heroic acts of anti-racism (Hook, 2011a). The issue with acts of anti-racism is that the white liberal has a lot to gain but nothing to lose (Hook, 2011a). The majority of these acts allow for the alleviation of guilt without having to renounce any privileges and are therefore more self-serving than they appear. Hook (2011a) argues that it is not difficult to admit one's privilege or confront one's unavoidable racism but rather, to abandon any type of narcissistic and symbolic rewards that are procured by these acts. The actual work of anti-racism involves the realisation that equality and redress means that the privileged will lose something without getting any form of reward. There must be a wounding of the narcissistic enclosure of self-contained identity where acts are done as a means to inflate one's ego (Hook, 2011a). Whiteness must involve the opening of a wound that doesn't heal (Hook, 2011a).

Latent in the poetic, emotionally loaded position of Hook (2011a) lies the practical solution to reach the goal of social justice. Mwaniki (2012) points out that Western societies structured on ideals of liberalism and capitalism seem to be overlooking that if society is committed to ideals of social justice (in which there exist equal opportunities for everyone) then in an unequal society, justice could only be achieved by imposing restrictions on the behaviours of some individuals i.e. going against the liberal structure presented above. It is exactly here where the issue lies. Although the provision of equal opportunities for the less advantaged group(s) seems uncontroversial, restricting the opportunities of the middle and upper class have proved to be a political challenge that governments don't seem to be willing to undertake (Mwaniki, 2012). This can be attributed to the government's fear of marginalising the electorate (Mwaniki, 2012). Another possible explanation is that the people who wield most power in a society feel no need to examine the mechanisms that acquire them that privilege (Alexander, 2004).

Peter Hudson (2010) extends this argument by looking at the paradox inherent in a liberal democracy. The idea that a liberal democracy is a neutral political system that enables people to challenge power democratically is a false conceptualisation of what a liberal democracy entails. It also perpetuates South Africans' reluctance to critically engage with transformation (Hudson, 2010). The main issue, Hudson points out, is that although a liberal democracy is defined as a form of collective self-determination, it tells us little about the people as a collective political subject. This is due to the fact that multiple social issues are removed from political discussion (such as the redistribution of wealth) in the name of individual freedom. Due to the fact that society posits individual freedoms at its centre, the will of the collective must be kept within limits compatible with the individual freedoms of

others or else run the risk of being delegitimised by the "totalitarian" label (Hudson, 2010). The problem with a liberal democracy seems to lie in that it gives people the illusion that the collective's desires will be represented and triumph, as the will of every individual will be taken into account. The collective will is disregarded when it poses a threat on an individual (Hudson, 2010). This makes it difficult to fully align and commit to the ideal of an equitable society governed by notions of social justice. What is in fact needed is a reformulation of the system that arranges society coupled with the "class suicide" of the middle class white South Africans (Alexander, 2005).

Having discussed Liberal ideology, its problems and a proposed solution (in the form of structural redress and emotional discomfort for whiteness), I now turn to the discursive practises employed by white South Africans to secure their position of privilege.

2.3. Discursive practices

In addition to the social organisation of liberalism (and by extension capitalism) that continues to privilege whites in South Africa, white South Africans make use of informal dynamics that aim at protecting their position of power and privilege (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009). These informal dynamics do not necessarily take the form of blatant racism but rather hide in narratives or ways of acting that maintain whites in positions of dominance but that do not explicitly look unjust e.g. indifference or laziness. The state of indifference is of particular concern as it means that the person does not feel as an agent that has played a role in the maintenance of injustice. In an article by Melissa Steyn (2012), 56 narratives from the Apartheid Archives project were investigated. Close examination of the work exposed "ignorance" as a tool employed by people of different races as a means to maintain a society

structured on racial hierarchy. This is termed as the "ignorance contract". Despite the fact that whites determined the terms of this contract, both black and white people abided to its rules for different strategic reasons (Steyn, 2012).

Apart from this volition to not question, whites also protect themselves by that which they explicitly say. In post-apartheid South Africa white South Africans occupy an uncertain terrain. The collapse of the political force that kept white identity in a privileged position has meant that white South Africans have had to employ strategies to negotiate this adjustment (Steyn, 2005). In an attempt to keep their economic and cultural privilege, white South Africans have implemented discursive strategies.

Melissa Steyn (2005) refers to these discursive strategies as "white talk". These new narratives bring to the fore the diasporic dimension of whiteness. Since the change of government, white South Africans have an ambivalent relationship to the power of the state and, as such, they confront a diasporic dimension in their positionality; a small minority that feels separated from their homeland. This puts whiteness in a risky position. While de-centered in their local context, their whiteness links them to international power meaning that they draw toward white people elsewhere (Steyn, 2005). These new discourses are diasporic in nature as they draw on the Eurocentric assumptions that white people are entitled to privilege and are in a superior social standing, while being physically located in another context. It is the euro-centric expectations of privilege that bonds South Africans to whites elsewhere. Both the vulnerabilities and strengths of being thus situated are managed by "white talk". The discursive strategies are termed "white" as they are concerned with preserving privilege as well as slowing down change toward a democratic, multicultural society (Steyn, 2005).

Here are some characteristics of "white talk", most of which are embedded in liberal discourse; firstly, it promotes itself as African so as to gain legitimacy in the new order by presenting itself as open to mixing with other cultures. So, it adopts a strategy of anti-essentialism. Secondly; Eurocentric norms are seen as the framework for legitimacy. Thirdly, the global is privileged over the local meaning that whiteness draws on discourse of internationalism and globalisation. That being said, it is more sympathetic to issues of the West rather than the African people. "White talk" contains imperial undertones claiming to objectivity.

Fourth, white talk denies the past, this is dependent on "ignorance" discussed above. Fifth, it employs western reactionary discourses, those that aim at preserving white privilege e.g. colour blindness. By denying racial hierarchies, one can be in opposition to social justice without seeming racist (Ansell, 2006). According to Applebaum (2010), this form of viewing the world is informed by Eurocentric ideals. Liberalism, which is seen as the epitome of social order, means that every person will be judged on their own merits and thus, race does not play a pivotal role in how we appraise one another (Applebaum, 2010). Modernist ways of conceptualising morality and responsibility depend on liberal models of "blameworthiness" meaning that a person can only be held accountable if they did the act (Applebaum, 2010).

Sixth, "white talk" links to established institutional practises; the country's infrastructure is still infused with white interests, values and customs. Seventh, "white talk" privileges business discourse meaning that the market takes precedence over discourses of social justice, ethics or morals. Eighth, it is linguistically plastic i.e. languages of being

progressive are used to perpetuate racial privilege. Ninth, it utilises discourse of afro-pessimism. Tenth, it reconstructs whiteness as a victimised positionality and uses the demographics as rationale for the claimed victimisation. Eleventh, it legitimizes and rationalises denial so as to avoid feeling emotions needed to move beyond assumptions of exclusivity that underpin whiteness. By reaching into its diasporic dimensions, the power of whiteness is maintained.

2.4. Studies on White Immigrants

Having discussed the discourses adopted by white South Africans to negotiate their new positionality, we turn to the question of immigrant identity. According to Allen (1994), the construction of identity is a political act. Just as there is not a direct isomorphic transfer between languages but rather, during intercultural communication there is an exchange and circulation of cultural meanings, the translation of identity is not merely translating oneself in a direct way but rather means cultural transformation (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009). Any immigrant must undergo a processes of transmission where there is an exchange of meanings between cultures. During this process, the "self" is constructed by drawing from a repertoire of possible representations of self (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009).

Allen (1994) explains the political nature of these processes by claiming that Europeans who purposefully move to North America or South Africa assimilate to the "white race" not due to simple genetics but rather as a political act. Inherent in this political dimension lie economic and civic interests. Race is not a transcendental phenomenon but rather something that acquires meaning due to a specific culture (Allen, 1994). As Johnson (2001) explained; differences are meaningless until they are recognised by a culture as being

meaningful. It thus follows that the ascription of meaningful difference is always linked to privilege and power (Johnson, 2001). Due to the racialised nature of South Africa, Argentine identity is translated into South African whiteness, irrespective of relative social standing in their home-country.

The positionality of white immigrants living in South Africa has been explored in an article by Drzewiecka and Steyn (2009), in which the strategic articulation of Polish people's identities within changing narratives of South African whiteness were investigated. It was found that Polish people made use of strategies of exoneration to negotiate their identity and belonging to South Africa to deny their implication in Apartheid legacy. Furthermore, the research subjects all adopted at least one version of the narratives of whiteness identified by Melissa Steyn in her book "Whiteness just isn't what it used to be" (2001).

The constructed nature of identity and its inherent political dimension is further exemplified by an article written by Sasson-Levy (2013), where it was argued that constructing boundaries is not enough to maintain hegemonic ethnic groups in privileged positions. Through the discourse of Ashekenazi Jews (a version of white Israeli's) the author discovers that not only do boundaries need to be created but they must also be flexible and thus hold an ability to blur and be erased. This act of marking and unmarking boundaries preserves hegemonic groups in privileged status. Marking a boundary by making use of discursive practises allowed Ashekenazi Jews to distinguish themselves from Mizahim and thus replicated a western versus non-western hierarchy. The ability to erase boundaries allowed them to take the form of a transparent, unmarked social group and in this way perpetuated their status of the universal norm (Sasson-Levy, 2013).

2.5. Argentine Identity: introducing the research subject

Both Alicia Dujovne Ortiz (2002) and Lesley Ray (2011) have grappled with the idea of argentine identity. According to Ortiz (2002), argentine identity cannot be understood without investigating its transnational dimension. Since colonisation, Argentina has been a country of immigration, being host to multiple Europeans and in the latter part of the twentieth century, home to an influx of immigrants from poorer Latin-American countries (Ortiz, 2002). On the other hand, in the years surrounding the economic crises of 2001, it was estimated that 750 000 argentine people left the country with little intention of returning (Ortiz, 2002). According to Ortiz (2002), the lack of desire to return to Argentina is due to the fact that the argentine population has had difficulty with its geographical location, more specifically, with its physical distance from Europe. According to Leslie Ray (2011), Argentines represent a very particular case of Europhilia as their continuous adoration for Europe has resulted in an estrangement to their own land (Ortiz, 2002). That being said, European ways of being are in the centre of the dominant class in Argentina. Ray (2011) argues that the disproportionate amount of "European" faces occupying the pages of argentine magazines (as well as an obsession with plastic surgery and artificial blondness) serve as proof of this fact. In contrast, these magazines have a small percentage of indigenous people, usually used to evoke a sense of pity and humour by either taking the form of a joke or an advertisement for charity (Ray, 2011).

The contemporary situation of Argentina is largely due to its long and cruel history with indigenous people, a history that has been strategically forgotten in the psyche of Argentines (Salvatore, 2008). This history is not unique to them as most territories that were

part of Europe's expansion share similarities in conquest and subsequent cultural stratification (Steyn, 2005). However, Argentina's retelling and contemporary depictions of this history sets them apart from other countries. Like most colonised countries, the indigenous or native people were "conquered" by the West during brutal battles. Whereas countries like Chile hold the heroic indigenous chiefs in high esteem, Argentina does not (Ray, 2011). Instead, it focuses on the triumphant West, a noble victor. The landscape of Argentina serves as proof of this adoration as most central squares will have some or other intellectual or statesman to represent European cultural superiority (Ray, 2011). These concrete manifestations of Europhilia are the result of a history full of Europhiles that encouraged immigration from Europe to Argentina in the nineteenth century fuelled by a desire to build a nation. This desire to build a nation was informed by a Eurocentric vocabulary of "civilization" and "superiority" (Ray, 2011; Salvatore, 2008). Salvatore (2008) emphasises the role that the United States of America as well as Britain played in bolstering the egos of Argentines. In the late nineteenth- early twentieth century, both places perceived Argentina as a "land of promise", this was attributed to the large amount of white Europeans that were living there (Salvatore, 2008).

According to Ray (2011), modern argentines have internalised these Europhilic discourses. This has resulted in argentines with European ancestry occupying higher social standings than indigenous people in society (Ray, 2011). Narratives of argentine identity and cultural discourses centre on an impossible desire to close the geographical distance with Europe (Ortiz, 2002). This desire is justified by appealing to cultural sameness. Ironically, Europeans feel both a geographical and cultural distance from Argentines (Ortiz, 2002). Argentina enters the European radar through war, sports, as well as political and economic

catastrophes and as such perpetuate stereotypes of primitive, fiery, irrational or unfortunate Latin-Americans (Ortiz, 2002). Argentines are made aware of this cultural gap when they themselves relocate to Europe or through historical instances like the Falkland war where they are forced to realise just how un-European they are perceived to be by Europeans (Ortiz, 2002). This has resulted in an uncertainty surrounding argentine identity as argentine discourse is dominated with a potent fantasy of racial as well as cultural proximity to Europe and geographical distance as the only culprit in their difference. Yet, they are not included in the narrow definition of what constitutes and classifies as "European".

As explained above, Argentina has experienced a mass emigration of people due to financial instability and economic turmoil. Surrounding the year of the economic crisis in 2001, argentines have immigrated to all parts of the world, particularly to Europe, in an attempt to close the geographical gap. Although there are limited statistics on argentines living in South Africa, a report published by StatsSA (2012) revealed that between the years 1994 and 2003 there have been 127 self-declared emigrants residing in South Africa from Argentina[5]. A large Argentine population is also evidenced by the existence of a social club called "the Argentinean Association of South Africa" located in Johannesburg. It is important to note that demographically argentines are 97 % white with the remaining being a mixture of white and indigenous people known as "mestizos"[6].

2.6. Hierarchies of Whiteness

[5] Statistics retrieved from Statistics South Africa (http://beta2.statssa.gov.za/)

[6] A report published by Marketline (2013) titled "Argentina In-depth PESTLE insights" provided this statistic.

Up until now, “whiteness” has been discussed as a category to include all people of a particular social positionality. It is important to now move away from this position and introduce the idea that there does not exist a homogenous group of “whiteness” but instead, there are hierarchies of “whiteness”. Asserting this argument here is necessary if one is going to grapple with white identity in South Africa. Melissa Steyn (2004) refers to the process of appraising people based on who owns the correct type of whiteness as “Intra White rivalry” (pg. 147) Whiteness in South Africa has had a long history of such rivalry. For example; Afrikaner nationalism has been understood as a reaction to the defeat of the Boer forces by the British in the Anglo-Boer war of 1899-1902 (Steyn, 2004). Furthermore, Mads Vestergaard (2001) explains how, prior to Apartheid, Afrikaans-speaking whites occupied a lower economic status than those of English-speaking whites. As a result, Afrikaners had to compete with blacks for jobs in the cities (Vestergaard, 2001). That being the case, apartheid has been argued as a means to solve the intra-white social, economic, and political conflicts between the English and the Afrikaners (Vestergaard, 2001). Steyn (2004) argues that Afrikaners’ appropriation of land and black labour has been an attempt to win their "right" to their own brand of white supremacy.

Due to the Afrikaners continuous struggle to enter the realm of the “correct whiteness” with all of its privileges, Afrikaners can be regarded as occupying a subaltern whiteness. English South African whiteness is more powerful and normative due to its links to Europe, at a global level they have Anglo ethnicity and therefore are afforded the category that has been theorised as “normal” “whiteness” (Salusbury & Foster, 2004). In contrast, Afrikaners constructed an identity in South Africa by making use of an ethnic/ nationalistic discourse. Afrikaans people retained little attachment to their European homelands. That

being the case, Afrikaners may be legitimately called Creole (Steyn, 2004). Like all whiteness, Afrikaners have had to rearticulate their position in the new South Africa in ways that preserve privilege. However, unlike other groups, Afrikaners have had to undergo more existential work (Steyn, 2004). Although all white social groups benefited from the regime, Afrikaners cannot deny that they are they were the protagonists of the Apartheid (Steyn, 2004).

It is into this hierarchical terrain that argentine immigrants move into. As has been mentioned, identity construction is a fluid and political act where aligning oneself with a particular group may have social benefits. Likewise, aligning oneself with a particular type of whiteness may have negative social repercussions given the hierarchical nature of social groupings. It is with this lens that that the discourses of the participants of this study were analysed.

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL POINT OF DEPARTURE

In order to interrogate the position that Argentines occupy in South Africa we must first locate this study within a theoretical framework. This study will make use of Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory as the main point of departure for interpretation. Discourse theory, as well as notions of white privilege and discursive practises explored in the literature review, will provide the conceptual backdrop that will give meaning to the research at hand. In the following paragraphs I will explore discourse theory by uncovering its ontological and epistemological claims as well as defining the vocabulary employed by Laclau and Mouffe. After which, I will explore how identity is theorised within discourse theory.

3.1. Discursive Theory

As the name suggests, discourse theory emphasises the role that discourses play in the construction of reality. In opposition to the modernist paradigm which states that an objective reality can be discovered through rigorous investigation, reality here is understood to be discursively constructed and therefore, never objective (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Social and physical reality come into meaningful-existence through the meanings provided by a discourse. This does not negate the existence of things outside our discursive understandings but rather that these things acquire meaning through discourse. Laclau and Mouffe (1987) make this point by using a "mountain" as an example;

> *[…] the mountain will be protection from enemy attack, or a place for a touring trip, or the source for the extraction of minerals, etc. The mountain would not be any of these things if I were not here; but this does not mean that the mountain does not exist. It is because it exists that it can be all these things; but none of them follows necessarily from its mere existence […] outside of any discursive context objects do not have being; they have only existence (85).*

Discourses are to be understood as socially organised frameworks of meanings that provide people with a repertoire of things that can be said and done in a particular domain (Burman, 2008).

In extension to what has been said, Sara Walton and Bronwyn Boon (2014) list four ontological assumptions on which Laclau and Mouffe's rest;

1. The discursive field is not limited to words. All material objects have a physical reality outside of discourse. However, it is through discourse that meaning is ascribed

to said object. Therefore, all social phenomena (the linguistic and non-lingustic) is included in the process of "meaning-making" within a particular discourse.

2. Secondly, due to the fact that identity is not intrinsic, there will inevitably be a battle over identity. In different contexts, a particular word (a signifier) may be used to ascribe meaning to an object. But even so, this word does not contain an essential meaning as it is not referring to something inherent in that object. As Laclau and Mouffe (1987) have stated; "objects are never given to us as mere existential entities; they are always given to us within discursive articulations" (85).
3. Thirdly, meaning making is always contingent as meaning is dependent on the oppression of other forms of interpretation. Being a poststructuralist theory, Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory rests on two premises; one, that signs acquire meaning through their difference to other signs. Two, these meanings are not fixed as these signs can take on different relational positions depending on the discourse in which they are embedded (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). For that reason, objectivity is never fully constituted but rather, always partially threatened. There will always be a conflict between the identities of a floating signifier. Within each discourse articulation, different strategies are employed to secure meaning (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).
4. Lastly, the struggle for fixity of meaning never reaches an end.

In order to understand discourse theory, clarification of the vocabulary used by Laclau and Mouffe must be provided. This clarification will also serve to position this theory within its ontological and epistemological assumptions.

> *[W]e will call articulation any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice. The structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice, we will call discourse. The differential positions, insofar as they appear articulated within a discourse, we will call moments. By contrast, we will call element any difference that is not discursively articulated. (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985, p. 10)*

The above quote (cited in Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002) introduces the reader to the vocabulary used by Laclau and Mouffe and will be systematically explained in the lines to follow. All signs in a discourse are known as moments and they acquire their meaning through their relation to other signs (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). A nodal point is a privileged sign around which other signs are arranged. Whenever a sign is given a particular meaning within a given discourse, other possibilities of meaning are being oppressed. The world of the excluded possibilities of meanings is known as the field of discursivity. The field of discursivity serves as a threat to the believed fixity of meaning ascribed to a sign. "No discursive totality is absolutely self-contained […] there will always be an outside which distorts it and prevents it from fully constituting itself" (Laclau & Mouffe, 1987: 89). Elements are signs that have not been fixed yet and thus have multiple meanings. The purpose of a discourse is to transform elements into moments (Walton & Boon, 2014).

Articulation refers to the actual process in which signs are positioned in relation to each other (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). It is only through discursive articulations that objects are given meaning (Laclau & Mouffe, 1987). Floating signifiers are elements that are open to multiple forms of meaning depending on the discourse in which they are framed. This

results in a continuous struggles over the structure of a discourse, which discourse should prevail and how meaning should be ascribed to signs (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Given that a discourse relies on excluding other possible meanings, there is a political struggle between discourses where there is an attempt at hegemony. Hegemony occurs when one discourse is common sensed without having to resort to violence or coercion (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). During articulation, signifiers are linked to make chains of equivalence and in so doing, the signifiers get meaning based on their relation to each other (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Bearing this conceptual field in mind; neither subjects, group formations or society are fixed entities. A person's identity will depend on how a given discourse positions a subject. Master signifiers refer to nodal points of identity (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Chains of equivalence link signifiers to establish a unified sense of self. The discourse provides prescriptive behaviours; e.g. men are rational, strong, and aggressive, while, women are passive, docile and emotional. Through this cluster of signifiers around a nodal point, identity is created (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Group formation occurs when some possibilities of identification are put forward as relevant where others are ignored. We get temporary closure where other possibilities of identification are excluded. In our language we make use of totalities which ascribe an objective content. A floating signifier that refers to a totality is known as a myth (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

I would like to explain this further by making use of an analogy I am borrowing from Walton and Boon (2014, p. 354). Within a hypothetical discursive horizon, a word functions as a cup in which meaning is poured into. This meaning is contingent as the types of liquids

one might pour into a cup are vast and depend on the discourse which one is working from. A discourse is an articulatory practise i.e. it is the process whereby agents ascribe a particular meaning to a word. For the sake of our analogy, it is the process whereby agents promote a particular liquid to that signifier "cup" (Walton & Boon, 2014). By so doing, other alternatives are ignored.

The meanings provided by discourses are contingent, however, when a discourse becomes firmly established so much so that its contingency is forgotten we call this "objectivity" or ideology (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In this case, a discourse becomes common-sensed or naturalised and thus reaches a state of hegemony in which one does not need to resort to force to reach organised consent (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Objectivity is the outcome of political struggles and processes and, as such, is a sedimented discourse. The process from political conflict leading up to objectivity passes through hegemonic interventions whereby different ways of understanding the world are surpassed, leading to the naturalisation of one single perspective (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

The productive force that allows this phenomenon to take place is power. Power constructs the social in particular ways and this construction depends on the exclusion of alternative possible meanings (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). The phenomenon of excluding other possible meanings is known as politics. It is through discursive and political processes that meanings are constructed and these serve to sustain power relations. In other words, any sign can be interpreted in multiple ways depending on which discourse is being employed. Powerful discourses will become common sensed or naturalised and, as such, oppress other forms of interpretation. A dislocatory event or dislocation occurs when meaning is disrupted

and reveals the contingency and associated antagonism of meanings (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Any solution proposed to a particular conflict would result in a hegemonic fixing of meaning of a floating signifier (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). It is important to pay attention to the politics of signification involved in articulatory practises. The meanings we ascribe to social phenomena are never fixed but rather constantly changing through discursive strategies of negotiation and conflict (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

3.2. Identity

> *I want to make clear at the outset that my reflections will be inscribed within an antiessentialist theoretical framework according to which the social agent is constituted by an ensemble of subject positions that can never be totally fixed in a closed system of differences. The social agent is constructed by a diversity of discourses among which there is no necessary relation but a constant movement of overdetermination and displacement. The "identity" of such a multiple and contradictory subject is therefore always contingent and precarious, temporarily fixed at the intersection of those subject positions and dependent on specific forms of identification* (28).

The above quote by Chantal Mouffe (1992), highlights the main ontological assumptions of discursive theory. This theory is relevant for this study because its theoretical domain focuses on the conflicts and struggles linked to identity formation (Walton & Boon, 2014). Although this struggle is often triggered by a dislocatory event or a crisis of meaning, it rests on the ontological assumption that social relations can never achieve an objective identity (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002; Walton S & Boon, 2014). By extension, the existence of

any identity depends on two conditions; the antagonising absence and presence (Walton & Boon, 2014). In line with derridean thought, whenever we understand something in a particular way, we deny alternative possibilities of understanding. This means that understanding is a political act as it defines the inside and outside, what will be spoken, how it will be framed and what will be excluded (Derrida, 1976). In sum; discursive theory is used to identify the strategies of signification or meaning-making employed by agents as they struggle to fix the presence of a particular identity of an object, subject or practise (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

Within the framework of Laclau and Mouffe subjects are understood as occupying "subject positions" within a discursive structure. A subject is never a unified entity but rather, is positioned differently within different discourses. Overdetermination refers to the process by which conflicting discourses are simultaneously trying to position the subject in different ways for example, a woman can be both a feminist and a mother (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Each of these categories will have their own prescriptive behaviours. Despite this fragmented nature, subjects are continuously trying to "find" a unified sense of self. Identity refers to the moment in which a subject identifies with the subject position offered by a particular discourse. That being said, identities are created through discursive process of refusal, acceptance and negotiation (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002).

In extension to what has been said, identity is not to be conceptualised as a unified, static sense of self but rather is in constant flux, never reaching completion. It is a process of establishing boundaries between "me" and "not me" and these boundaries change depending on the context (Yuval-Davis, 2010). Departing from a functionalist approach of adaptation

models, immigrant identity has been conceptualised as produced through culturally informed discourses within power structures. There is a process of transmission in which meanings are exchanged between cultures (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009). It is through this process of transmission that the immigrant self is constructed. The invented nature of identity results in a political dimension in which certain aspects might be erased or emphasized in the transfer of meaning from one culture to the next. This conceptualisation of identity can give us insight to understanding the relative positioning of argentine immigrants in South Africa.

CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

4.1. Methodology

Given the theoretical point of departure, the following research will focus on the quality and texture of meaning, and a qualitative research design will be used (Willig, 2008). I will be making use of an exploratory research design. This means that a problem has been identified which must be explored to gain more clarity. In other words, the purpose of this study is to get a better understanding of a situation (Brown & Suter, 2012).

4.2. Participants

As my research question states, this study concerns Argentines living in South Africa. My focus was on Argentines who have a South African citizenship and therefore have been living in South Africa long enough to be aware of its social and political landscape. Due to the fact that I have particular objectives in mind when collecting my sample, I made use of purposive sampling (Palys, 2008). This means that I followed predetermined criteria of who my participants would be. Due to the possible difficulty attached to finding argentines living in South Africa I made use of convenience sampling, meaning that I made use of participants that are easily accessible who met my criteria (Gravetter & Forzano, 2012). These participants were selected at random from a mailing that I, as part of the argentine community living in South Africa, have access to. Emails were sent to the participants asking them to participate in the study. Five participants of different genders, with an age group of over thirty so as to reach an age group that was born during the Apartheid era, were identified and

interviewed. These participants were contacted via email. To follow is a short description of the participants of this study.

1. Laura Garcia

Laura Garcia is a 55 year old industrial psychologist working in Pretoria. She is currently divorced and lives with her youngest son who is studying BSc Biological Sciences. Despite now living in Pretoria, of the 22 years she lived in South Africa, 17 of them were spent in a small Afrikaans city on the outskirts of Pretoria. The interview took place in my home where Laura showed up in her red and black Range Rover. She had just come from a meeting and was wearing her work attire. Her clothes were risqué (for a typical South-African work environment), and sharply contrasted with her often hyper-conservative opinions.

2. Maria-Emilia Luna

Maria-Emilia Luna is a 62 year old retired trip advisor who lives in a security Estate in Midrand. She is happily married and expecting her second grandchild with great anticipation. All her children were born in South Africa. She moved here more than 30 years ago, shortly after getting married. The home in which the interview took place is decorated with traditional African artefacts. During our interview, her black South-African domestic worker came into the kitchen to fetch a handful of eggs.

3. Paublo Suarez

Paublo Suarez is a 64 year old businessman residing in Johannesburg who works for an import/export company in Pretoria. Considering the strong influence that

"business" has in Paublo's worldview, and the extent to which much of our interview seemed to gravitate towards this topic, the interview was appropriately conducted in an empty conference room in his office block. His wife, Natalia, has never worked in South Africa and as such, prefers to associate with other Spanish speaking people, a trait that Paublo does not share with her.

4. Monica Botha

Monica Botha is 37 years old and is currently working as a secretary in Pretoria. She only moved to South Africa 15 years ago but has assimilated well to South African culture. Her husband is English South African. Her ancestors, interestingly, were Afrikaners who moved to Patagonia Argentina in the early 1900s. Her English is fluent, and has a slight North-American inflection which is probably a phonological souvenir from her years of studying in the United States.

5. Lorena Donofrio

Lorena Donofrio is a 64 year old quality Surveillance Manager. She often has to travel to other parts of Africa for work. After the death of her partner, she no longer feels that South Africa is her home despite having lived here for the most part of her life. She feels that the political situation in South Africa as well as her confrontations with crime have made her question whether she wants to spend her old age in South-Africa.

4.3. Ethics

In order to keep an ethical standard there were a few procedures that were done prior to commencement of study. Firstly, informed consent was attained. This means that participants were informed about the nature of the study and given the right to withdraw at any point (Willig, 2008). Consent to use an audio recorder was also attained prior to commencement of study. Participants were also informed about the anonymous nature of the study and confidentiality (Willig, 2008). This means their personal information was hidden from the readers by making use of pseudonyms and replacing any identifying characteristics. After completion of the research, participants received an electronic copy of their transcripts. With this electronic transcript they were given an opportunity to give feedback if they feel it is necessary (Willig, 2008). I informed them that they were allowed to make any corrections if they felt they had misrepresented themselves or were allowed to add anything they felt was left pending. With the exception of one, none of my participants made use of this opportunity.

4.4. Data collection

In opposition to the positivistic approach to data collection which promises a "neutrality" on part of the researcher and in so doing, undermines the complexity of human interaction, Fontana and Frey (2005) propose the process of empathic interviewing in data collection. This requires that the researcher acknowledge the creative/ constructive aspect of an interview where both the interviewee and interviewer are involved in the production of knowledge. This has meant a new direction in qualitative interviewing where sensitivity is given to the position of the interviewer (Fontana & Frey, 2005). A section will be dedicated to personal reflexivity.

With the above in mind, this research made use of semi-structured interviews to allow space for spontaneity of discourse and flexibility of discussion. This means that an interview agenda was followed containing questions that triggered and guided the interaction between the interviewees and the researcher. All participants were given an opportunity to add anything they felt was relevant to the research. Semi-structured interviews are largely used in qualitative studies due to their lack of logistical difficulties (Willig, 2008). Interviews took place in a location of the participants choice, this was done so as to put minimal logistical strain on the participants as well as to ensure that the interviewee felt comfortable.

Discourse analysis requires a precise focus on language meaning that responses must be transcribed verbatim (Willig, 2008). An audio recorder was used followed by a session of transcription in order to make the interviews conducive to analysis. Given the uncomfortable nature of being recorded, strategies were used to reduce any form of discomfort. Some strategies included; reassuring the participant of the importance of being recorded for the purpose of the study and a "mock interview" was done in some cases so that the participants got accustomed to the device and got a chance to raise any concerns. Lastly, all the participants received an electronic copy of their interview transcripts and were given a chance to make any changes they felt were necessary. These changes were used as additional information (Willig, 2008).

4.5. Data Analysis

Emergent themes and narratives that constituted the Argentine immigrant subject were analysed. The analysis was guided by Melissa Steyn's eleven characteristics of "white talk" and informed by Laclau and Mouffe's theory of discourse. As was mentioned above,

meaning ascribed to social phenomena is in flux and can never be ultimately fixed (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Instead, the social field is understood as a web of processes in which a signs meaning is created through temporary fixity and its relation to other signs (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). This results in a constant struggle between possible definitions of society and identity. Unlike the positivist approach to research which aims at identifying an objective reality, the purpose of the analyst within this conceptual framework is to identify the process in which the reality comes to be constructed as objective (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In other words, to identify these struggles and their attempts at fixity. That being said, Laclau and Mouffe's theory relies on deconstruction. This means that taken for granted structures will be analysed.

Interview transcripts were analysed by reading them carefully and identifying the chains of signifiers and nodal points which fixed emergent themes. Themes were then compared and contrasted with narratives of "white talk" identified by Steyn (2005). These themes were compared within each interview, looking for contradictions/ inconsistencies. After which, themes were compared across interviews in an attempt to understand the logics, contours and dynamics of the collective discourse of argentine identity. Common themes were then read against themes that appeared only in a few interviews to understand the discursive horizon and the possibility of its transgression. Counter arguments within the narratives were also identified and served as proof of the contingency of meaning. Discursive theory was used to map out the discursive possibilities for meanings around a particular topic by identifying signifiers and how they are linked (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009).

Drawing on the work of Jorgensen and Phillips (2002) the following will serve as a toolkit for empirical analysis;

1. Identification of key signifiers; nodal points, master signifiers and myths.
2. How are these organised discursively. This requires an investigation into how these signs are organised in relation to each other. In other words, plotting chains of equivalence. Through investigating chains of meaning, one can begin to identify discourses.
3. Through development and identification of chains of meanings one may begin to investigate the individual, collective identity and the social space. How are these entities established relationally? Identification of what and who a particular discourse excludes.
4. Do conflict analysis by identifying floating signifiers, antagonisms and hegemony.

4.6. Evaluation of Research

Due to the qualitative nature of this study evaluation of this research does not rely on quantitative notions of reliability and validity (Willig, 2008). However, the quality of the research must be maintained by following a number of guidelines. As discourse analysis falls within the tradition of social constructionism (which emphasises contextual and linguistic nature of reality construction), it is largely relativist (Willig, 2008). This is because it rejects the notion of an objective truth and rather contextualises knowledge. That being said, the quality of its research does not depend on the positivist need for research to correspond to reality but rather must be evaluated on its own terms. This means that what is important is quality of the account (is it coherent and persuasive?) and not whether the results reflect reality one-to-one (Willig, 2008). This, however, does not

mean that all demands for validity must be ignored (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). The research, instead, must further be judged on its ideological implications; whether it serves to challenge or maintain power relations in society (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). In other words; the results of this research must be evaluated based on their consequences. Although social constructionism firmly rests on a belief in relativism, this does not mean that all statements about the world are morally acceptable (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Discourse analysis must be a critical enterprise and be used as a means to critique and unmask ideology. Ideology in this instance refers to taken-for-granted and dominant understandings of reality (Jorgensen & Phillips, 2002). Since this research study depends on the researcher and interviewee shaping the object of enquiry by identifying discourses and conducting the interview respectively, a section must be devoted to Reflexivity.

4.7. Reflexivity

Since the researcher plays an important role in the construction of the research, one must get insight into the researcher herself. That being said, reflexivity involves the identification of personal biases and assumptions (Willig, 2008). Another aspect of reflexivity involves unmasking the power relations that exist between the researcher and the participants of the study. Multiple aspects may influence the responses gathered from an interview such as; gender, race, class, age etc. (Fontana & Frey, 2005). All of these elements must be taken into account in order to accurately position the narratives that are articulated during the interviews. In the following few lines I will write a personal account of my motivation for the research topic as well as the initial assumptions I had before the commencement of the study. I will also discuss the difference between insider epistemology

and being an "outsider" in the research process. In order to allow for the preservation of the complexity of both similarities and differences between myself and my respondents, I will argue for a dialectical approach that dismisses the dichotomous nature of the "insider/ outsider" perspective. Lastly, I will look at personal concerns I had with regards to my age and gender.

> *Of course, the "I" who writes here must also be thought of as, itself, "enunciated". We all write and speak from a particular place and time, from a history and a culture which is specific. What we say is always "in context", positioned (Hall, 1990, pg 222).*

As the above quote suggests, we are always necessarily positioned in a particular time and place. As to why I chose this particular topic I will borrow from Stuart Hall (1990), in saying "the heart has its reasons" (p. 223). As part of a family who emigrated from Argentina in the time surrounding the economic crises, this topic is close to my heart. Despite being born in Buenos Aires, I have spent most of my life living in South Africa. My late father, an engineer, found a job in South Africa in 1996. Needless to say, we emigrated, forcing my mother to abandon her job as a dentist to take care of her children in this foreign terrain (her words not mine). To contextualise, we moved to South Africa in the brink of the new democracy, I started grade one in a racially diverse class room. The fact that my mother didn't work and her English had remained impoverished meant that I was able to retain my native language; Spanish, as well as a lot of elements of my Argentina heritage. I have, unequivocally, lived a dual life and this afforded me a lot of privileges (as well as disadvantages). I will not go into the disadvantages as the point of this reflexivity section is not to sympathise with a young girl trying to find her feet in this new, sometimes hostile

place. Instead, the advantages are of necessary importance. At the time I did not realise but as I got older and got a vocabulary for it, it became clear how easily my family and I blended into white South Africa and all its privilege. I always felt argentine, always a little different but with time, my accent dissolved into your average pretorian-johannesburgian dialect and with that, all other traces of my foreign heritage had disappeared. The systemic privilege attaching itself to whiteness in South Africa latched on to my family as my father ascended in his work quite rapidly and our economic lifestyle got exponentially better over the years.

As I got older, better read, more informed as well as started harbouring an empathy for South Africans and an estrangement to Argentina; I became more and more uncomfortable with my surroundings. It became explicitly clear to me that the "new South Africa" had residues from the apartheid state and these residues were still privileging whites. Due to the fact that my mother almost exclusively socialised (and still socialises) with Spanish speaking immigrants, I got more and more exposed to the ways of speaking of that group. I was continuously exposed to a large number of the discourses explained above; Europhilia, animosity towards the politics in South Africa yet exoneration of guilt and responsibility due to foreign origins etc. I find this positionality and the discourses it draws on completely intolerable as I feel that it is opportunistically slowing down any prospects of real transformation in South Africa. That's why when the opportunity came to do a master's thesis I felt that this is a good place to expose those discourses so that they may be challenged. Despite the sensitivity I have to these topics and the critical disposition that I have accrued, I cannot exonerate myself from my whiteness; I too live a life of white privilege in South Africa. That is precisely why my research must start here; as a critique of

the self. As Fay (1996) has stressed that it is through others that we come to know ourselves; "There is no self-understanding without other-understanding" (p. 241).

With this in my mind, I came into my research with multiple assumptions due to the fact that I have grown up in the midst of these discourses. I, however, do not think that removes merit from my research. Just because I knew what I was walking into does not dismiss the fact that these narratives had to be exposed and critiqued. In the same breath, as much as I found my respondents predictable at times, they still managed to surprise me; uncovering new information and ways of speaking that have challenged my preconceived notions.

The question now arises; am I an insider or an outsider when I investigate argentine immigrants living in South Africa? An "insider approach" refers to an instance when a person is conducting research on a population group to which they also hold group membership (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). This means that the researcher and the study participants share an identity, language and experiences. This position both has benefits and disadvantages. A very obvious benefit is that the shared group membership might mean that trust and in-depth interviews are more easily established (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). However, being an "insider" might prevent respondents from elaborating on their experiences or opinions as they may assume similarity of experiences or opinions with the interviewer (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). I found this to be the case with multiple of my respondents where my desire for them to elaborate were dismissed with a "you know?" attitude. A further risk of being an "insider" is that one can interpret the data by assimilating a role other than researcher (Dwyer & Buckle,

2009). I think the last point can be avoided if the "evaluation" of one's research follows the criteria I discussed under section 6.6 and time is devoted to reflexivity.

It is important to note that although an "insider" may carry personal biases that could shape the research, this does not mean that being an outsider makes one more likely to bracket out personal perspectives and biases. As has been mentioned before; we are all necessarily positioned. Having explained what an "insider" is and in its definition implied that of the "outsider", I must assert that I am neither an insider nor an outsider. This dichotomous presentation not only seems trivial but also falls short of the complexity of humans and intersectionality. According to Dwyer and Buckle (2009), the outsider/ insider status is unimportant, instead, one should focus on being honest, open and interested in the experiences of one's respondents and in their accurate representation. In a similar vein, Fay (1996) dismisses the notion that one must share group membership with one's respondents in order to "know" the experiences of that group. Having had a similar experience does not mean one "knows" it as knowing refers to ones capacity to identify, describe, and explain (Fay, 1996).

This dichotomous approach to research must be replaced with a dialectical approach. This proposed approach allows space for the fluid and multi-layered complexity of human experience. It refreshingly emphasises that having group membership does not mean complete homogony of experience within that group. Neither does it mean that those who are not of the same group are completely different (Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). I am neither an insider nor an outsider. In many ways I am similar to my respondents, in other ways we differ. Like my respondents, I am an argentine living in South Africa. I am white, can speak

both English and Spanish and I am from a middle-class background. Unlike my respondents, I am in my twenties and moved to a democratic South Africa. Majority of my respondents moved during the last years of apartheid. I cannot know my respondent's personal struggles as they do not know mine. However, this research is not about personal struggle, it's about identifying and exposing discourses that serve to maintain the current asymmetrical social order.

There were two elements of myself that worried me on commencement of my research; the first was my age and the second was my gender. As is the case in research, being of young age can be both a positive or negative thing - positive in that one may be perceived as nonthreatening, and negative in that a person of an older age has an increased social status that may mean that the quality and areas of inquiry are more fruitful (Punch, 1994). My gender also concerned me. As a woman, I was scared my credentials would be questioned and my capacities as a researcher more readily interrogated (Johnson, 2001). A further concern was being objectified by male respondents and running the risk of sexual stereotyping (Punch, 1994). Due to the fact that I felt gender was not an important factor in the research at hand, the majority of my respondents were female. This was done so as to avoid a gendered dynamic. There was not much I could do about my age, that's why it is mentioned here. The answers presented by my respondents must be read with that fact in mind; I am much younger than them. Their tone was often paternalistic and many assimilated advisory roles.

My motivation for this research is to destabilise a very comfortable and often overlooked positionality; the white immigrant. By no means am I trying to demonise

Argentines living in South Africa but rather to produce work that will start a conversation around the topic. In a grossly unequal society, social research must have an activist agenda and be motivated with a desire to see social change (Fine, 1994). As Melissa Steyn (2004) has stated; "There is a relationship between exposing whiteness and decolonizing the imagination of both the oppressed and oppressors" (146). This must be coupled with a necessity to see structural change. By exposing powerful positions and the mechanisms which they employ to maintain the power as well as critiquing them, we move closer to a just society.

4.8. Limitations of Research

Interviews were conducted in English as opposed to Spanish. For multiple argentine people, English is not their first home language and, as such, the quality of the interviews may have been compromised. That being said, the English proficiency of the participant was explored prior to commencement of study in an informal, conversational manner. A further limitation is that only one researcher performed the data collection as well as interpretation of the transcripts, this could jeopardise the quality of the study, however, personal reflexivity and biases have been explored and theorised. Lastly, time constraints limit the depth of analysis and the number of participants in this study (Maree & van der Westhuizen, 2009).

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Argentine immigrants interviewed for this study all spoke multiple versions of the narratives of "white talk" identified by Melissa Steyn (2005). As mentioned before, a necessary characteristic of "white talk" is an unwillingness to challenge white privilege. The research subjects configured an identity that fell within the discourses appropriated by a large number of contemporary white South Africans. As a result, Argentine immigrants occupy a positionality that they are not critical about. The participants did not, however, explicitly announce commitment or interest in full assimilation into their South African identity. All participants made efforts to make a distinction between themselves and the "real" South Africans. It was often difficult for the participants to negotiate the positionality of their national identities, and the narratives moved between assertions of their South African identity as well as a denial of being fully South African. Using Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, four nodal points were identified; "business", "the family", "Afrikaners" and "education". These arranged elements to form chains of equivalence that constructed the Argentine immigrant as culturally superior to both people living in Argentina as well as South Africans. Links to Europe and "cultural superiority" were arranged around two nodal points namely; "the family" and "business". As a means of setting themselves apart from South Africans, the participants often used the nodal point "Afrikaner", towards whom general animosity was displayed as well as efforts to assert cultural difference. "Education" as a theme came up less frequently but was theorised due to its prominence in South-African socio-political discourse. In the following section all the above themes will be explored in depth while making references to the interview transcripts.

First, I will explore the ways in which the Argentine subjects constructed a fluid identity, one that depended on the assertion as well as the blurring of boundaries. Internal contradictions within a particular transcript will serve as an indication of the constructed and contingent nature of Argentine immigrant identity in South-Africa. I will then elaborate on the nodal points identified above namely; "the family", "business", and "Afrikaners". All of the aforementioned will be analysed through a critical whiteness paradigm, specifically using "white talk" as a point of reference. A special section will be dedicated to showing the ways in which Argentines unapologetically partake in the same discourses as white South Africans. Lastly, I will draw upon a discourse that was presented less frequently; education. It is important to note that these themes should not be understood as separate from each other, but, instead be read as interwoven into the same fabric which positions Argentines and the objects around them in particular ways. As such, all things are linked in the same web of meaning and are only separated for analytical reasons.

5.1. Fluid Identities

"*Foreigner who has adapted to a South African way of being*"- Laura Garcia

The construction of the Argentine immigrant's national identity has presented itself as a fluid one. The participants do not completely take on a South African identity, but rather tentatively describe themselves as a "foreigner[s] who has adapted to a South African way of being". As such, they can rather opportunistically shift between a South African, and a European, or "foreign" identity. Their European, or foreign identity serves as a way to legitimise their superiority, objectivity and detachment when speaking about South African

issues. Their South African identity on the other hand serves to legitimise opinions on South African issues as well as their residency and privileges in the country. This fluidity of identity construction meant that different elements of identity were strategically called upon at different times depending on the context; depending on what they could gain or what they might risk losing. Siyanda Ndlovu (2012) has argued that although it is largely accepted that we are produced through the intersections of multiple identities, there are contexts where certain aspects of our identity are made more prominent than others in the articulation of who we are. Having said that, identity depends on the social, political, economic and ideological aspects of a person's situation (Ndlovu, 2012).

Laura Garcia, exclaims that she feels she is a South African. When interrogated as to why, she responded;

> *Why? Because…. I developed my life career-wise in South Africa, my children are here and then I realised that when one week when I was stranded in Argentina because of all my passport issue and then uh… I didn't feel at home. I was missing my home…*

Later when discussing her relatedness to Europe she had this to say;

> *Even if I was born in between umm lots of American*[7]*, Inca culture, Bolivian culture, the culture is a bit…Uhm… like an antique, kind of thing. Like you go back in time. And you, like, when you are with them, you go back in time. You go back to "mystery" and lots of esoteric things. And… A lot more PURE things but we are a bit more*

[7] By "American" Laura is referring to South American communities of people

advanced than them and that's why I identify myself with the Europe culture and not the American culture.

In the above examples, Laura is constructing an identity for herself; one that is both South African and European. The construction of her identity also depends on the construction of "not me" categories where she frames the other Latin American cultures as well as indigenous Argentine cultures as an "antique", "mysterious", "esoteric" and "pure" whereas the "we" that she defines herself under, the European "we" is more "advanced". Contained in those lines is the superiority complex of Europe which self-defines as both progressive and modern (Salvatore, 2008).

According to Ndlovu (2012), when a particular element of identity wins over another we must ask ourselves; who has been defeated and what was the prize to be won? What did Laura gain by setting herself apart from other Latin American cultures? Any identification is therefore always an articulatory practice where connections are made by appealing to sameness with particular groups, while simultaneously crafting disconnections by emphasising differences. No form of identification is essentialist. It rather manifests as a constant struggle, a continuous production (Hall, 1990; Ndlovu, 2012).

After an entire interview of having to negotiate and re-articulate her identity in different ways, Laura had this to say;

I do not believe in boundaries. I don't believe in country boundaries ... I believe boundaries are just something that people put there just to manage things easier. Ok, fine, fair enough. But if it's a fight about a boundary then I move away from it. Then I

don't consider myself an Argentinean or a South African, I consider myself a living being of Earth and then, I feel comfortable wherever I go.

This new act of engaging in the blurring of boundaries (which is in sharp contrast with her earlier attempts to assert her own identity through the delineation of social and cultural difference to preserve ethnic hierarchy; European superiority and the dismissal of relatedness to Latin American cultures) allows Laura to remain transparent; an unmarked social category. These two mechanisms work together to solidify social power and privilege (Sasson-Levy, 2013). The privileged repercussions of having a dual status are exemplified in an anecdote presented by Monica Botha, when asked whether South Africans can rectify the racial problems in South Africa. It is important to bear in mind that a couple of moments earlier she had defined herself as a South African and South Africa as her "home".

Yes, of course, if they wanted to. The thing is, I don't know if they want to. I meet uh… for example there's this black guy um, who can speak Afrikaans perfectly and is always fighting with this Afrikaner woman because she expects him to speak Afrikaans because he can and he refuses and he will tell her "no, because your people oppressed my people so I don't want to speak your language" so there's still that thing…

Interviewer: Who do you think is right or wrong there? In that situation…

I don't think you can judge it. And you know? Even the… I don't think it's fair that I come from Argentina and I came like 15 years ago um, I can't come and say to an Afrikaner "you're bad because you're, you know, you think you're better than the blacks". Because I didn't grow up like the Afrikaners did, I wasn't there so how can I

judge them? […] I don't know if I have a right [to judge them] or not I'm just not interested in it.

The above quote brings to light one of the moral dilemmas in liberalism. Liberalism rests on an insistence that an individual has rights and these rights must be protected. One of these rights is a right to one's property (Peck, 1993). According to Peck (1993), in liberal ideology an opinion is one's property and has the right to be expressed without infringement. It is within this paradigm that it becomes increasingly difficult to challenge ways of speaking that one can appraise as morally inadequate. This fact as well as Monica's blurred positionality has allowed her to opportunistically take a step back from moral debates about who's right or wrong.

In line with modernist thought, morality and responsibility are conceptualised as depending on liberal models of "blameworthiness" (Applebaum, 2010). This means that accountability is dependent on whether the person did the actual act or not. Monica takes a neutral stance to describe the above situation. Despite her reluctance to entertain my moral question, it was clear from her tone and the paradigm in which she is firmly situated (Liberalism) that she sided with the white person and blamed the black person for being stubborn (for bringing up a past that she feels is irrelevant). In many ways I feel this is an apparatus of whiteness; how it insidiously throws a certain tone at you (assuming you're white), seeing if you'll bite, in an attempt to get some kind of morally reprehensible solidarity to bolster up an even more morally reprehensible positionality. By playing the "ignorant interviewer" she was unable to gain the solidarity expected and took on the neutral moral stance presented above.

5.2. Business above All

And we need to grow the economy fast in order to bring in the people that were left out, before. And if we don't do that, then there will be a challenge because that will impact in economy, politics, uh, security etc. **- Paublo Suarez**

"Business" and discourse of a "failed state" were brought up continuously throughout the interviews. This is not uncommon to "white talk" as one of its characteristics is that talk about business is preferred over discourses about social justice and what might be good for society. This is exemplified in the quote above where the solution to the problems in South Africa is framed in terms of the economy. All of the narratives have ideologically liberal undertones that serve as the basis for justifications of opinions on the new South Africa.

Since the political decolonisation of Africa in the twentieth century, there has been a reformulation of the vocabulary that centred on the now tabooed notions of "race" and "civilisation". The ideal of a liberal state is now used as a means to justify the West's appraisal of Africa. As Stuart Hall (1992) has mentioned, a Western society is one that is developed, urbanised, capitalist, secular and modern. All these characteristics are conceptualised as the norm and thus, desirable. This means that ontological differences between the West and Africa are now based on their effectiveness to govern. As such, "race" and "civilization" have been replaced by terms like "state failure" and "good governance" (Branwen, 2013). Argentine immigrants have adopted this framework to appraise countries. South Africa has been a country that has provided Argentine immigrants with hope for the liberal democracy they want. Where Argentina has failed, South Africa has been conceptualised as a land of opportunity;

Paublo Suarez describes his reasons for leaving Argentina;

> *uh, on the one side there was the instability of Argentina making it very difficult for us, um, to predict and to understand what was going to happen in future so, instability means you don't know exactly what is your position in society, your economical status, what education you can give your children so it makes it very difficult to make a plan.[…]*

All Argentine immigrants interviewed displayed similar versions of this narrative. Leaving Argentina was always framed in terms of finding a better way of living. In addition, all immigrants interviewed framed their love for South Africa and their sense of belonging along the careers and lifestyles they were able to live here that were not possible in Argentina. As was mentioned above, a country's success is determined by how closely it lives up to the Western liberal model.

Pauble Suarez;

> *So, as I said I travel in Africa and I see uh, different countries with 40, 50, 60 years after independence and what I see there is something that nobody in this country would like. Not even the poorest of the poor would like that model in their… so I think is a challenge, I'm not saying that will… is not something that is… fatal behaviour. It doesn't necessarily mean that it will happen but the risk is high. No, we will never be Zimbabwe or, we will never be Malawi um, Malawi has 40% of the GDP coming from international donations. So, all out of what they use, they only produce 60 % the rest is a "give away". So, you can't build a country like that. Uh, when you look at all*

these places there's no infra-structure, there's no um, trade! The banking… um, community is very small… so, is vaster gaps between that and other countries.

Paublo Suarez appraisal of other African countries is void of historical contextualisation. This ahistorical approach to analysis is entrenched in liberal ideology and renders the discourse of a "failed state" an empty term since a state's capacity to govern cannot be fairly examined in isolation from global relations and historical formations (Branwen, 2013). The "business" discourse was used to position South Africa as well as Argentina in particular ways. In the eyes of the immigrant, Argentina was often referred to as a decadent land as it now fell short of the European ideal they valued so much. This I will refer to as the "de-Europeanisation" of Argentina. In contrast, South Africa was imagined as the land of "opportunity" as it presented a safe, liberal democracy wherein their "European" personalities could thrive. However, there is instability and fear in the conceptualisation of the new South Africa, which is now falling into the same "instability" as Argentina; a corrupt state. Although post-apartheid South Africa has been verbalised as a positive change, the optimism on part of the Argentine immigrant largely depends on the country's capacity to stick to the ideal of a liberal democracy, one that will continue to preserve their privilege (Hook, 2011a; Peck, 1993). Concerns about South Africa's ability to maintain the liberal democracy that has been promised were raised by Lorena Donforio, when she discusses "reverse racism".

[…] there is definitely a reverse situation… whereby in the past… um, there was, you know? People of colour were excluded from many places. Now I notice that there is a lot of people that they are of a lighter colour where the reverse is happening. That doesn't make it… two wrongs doesn't make a right!

Interviewer: um-hum. So you think maybe a more… meritocratic, more liberal…

YEEEESSS! Of course … is more important to, to have somebody who can do the job, no matter who the person is and their attitude to that job, than whether they have to fill a quota.

As Melissa Steyn (2005) rightly predicted; participants dwelled on certain themes as an indirect way of confirming black "incompetence" and corruption. In the narrative presented above, Lorena justifies her veiled complaints about black incompetence by appealing to meritocracy as a point of appraisal. As has been mentioned, a precondition of liberalism is its protection of individual rights and an insistence that everyone be treated equally (Peck, 1993). It is this common-sensed way of speaking that informs Lorena's narrative (Peck, 1993).

The above illustrates how the discourse of "business" as well as the ideal of a liberal state has been used to appraise South Africa, Argentina and even other African countries. The nodal point of "business" was also used to position different groups of people in particular ways. For example; Laura Garcia has this to say about people in South Africa;

The one that I related… the… which I don't find much similarities but I like learning from them is the Anglo Saxons. The Germans and the… English. I admire them, I think they are very advanced. But… they lost a lot of humanity on the way. They are very good in business, they are very good in new inventions, and they're very good in DOING things. But they lost a lot of human touch and feeling and all these things. That I find that more, the Indian… they are a lot more… I don't know… spiritual…

[…] The African cultures… they are a lot behind like the American[8] ones, related to… different "knowing" things. You have a very high level of African culture, they know a lot, but is a small percentage. Very small percentage. If I had to say of 10 million black people from different… Zulu, Sotho, Xhosa and all that. Uhhh, I will say, 10 000 of 10 million are in the level of understanding business and ethical ways of managing and how to improve themselves and all that. That, an English or a European community would be… it doesn't make them less it just makes them, primitive on a level. Put them in different levels, they are more interested in, trying to find identity. Than to… get there. And they are more interested to "I want that" but they are not interested on to know how to get there."

There are a lot of things happening in the above narrative which I will systematically deconstruct in order to tease out the themes that give "logic" to the blatant racism presented above. Firstly, we can see that cultures are being positioned in a hierarchy depending on their capacity to function in the business environment; forming chains of equivalence that construct the discourse from which Laura is working. The "Anglo Saxons" are "admired" for being "advanced" and good at business but cold, and in this way, dissimilar from Laura. The African cultures are constructed as "Behind like Latin American cultures", "primitive" and incapable of understanding "business" and "ethics".

The racialised discourse that is being drawn on here depends on a set of binary distinctions. On the one hand is "civilization" (white) and the other is "savagery" (black) (Hall, 1997). These are polarised into extreme opposites. This racial discourse makes assumptions in terms of intellectual development. The white race being refined, containing

[8] By "American" Laura means indigenous cultures of South America

developed institutions and a restraint in their emotional and civil life. All of these things are associated with "culture" (Hall, 1997). The black culture is seen as emotional rather than intellectual, lacking civilized refinement. This is, in turn linked to "nature". Despite Laura's appeal that this does not make black people any "lesser" only "primitive on some level", it is important to note that, from the paradigm she is working, she does perceive black people or Africans as "lesser". According to Hall (1997), one element of power is ethnocentrism where one applies the norms of one's culture to that of others. This was done where black people were appraised based on their capacity to successfully partake in the "business world" according to Western norms and standards.

The theoretical point from which this study is works, requires a reiteration of the importance of "difference" in the construction of meaning. However, Stuart Hall (1997) argues that although we need difference, binary oppositions run the risk of being too reductionist and over-simplified. Jacques Derrida (1976) has argued that there is no such thing as a neutral binary but instead, all of them portray a relationship of power between the dominant and subordinate. In this case, the dominant "white" and subordinate "black".

When asked why she felt that black South Africans were the way that she had just described them, Laura had this to say;

> *Because they were oppressed and they think we just got it from nowhere. Whatever they want they thought "wow" we just got it because of the colour of the skin. It's not like that… we didn't get things because of the colour of the skin, you have a lot of lighter skin people who are suffering needs. And… what we have is probably persistence and fighting and character inside us that makes us grow and we wanted to*

grow… they were very comfortable for centuries. They got everything they need and, they feel comfortable. And they didn't understand we fought for that, or we work for it. Not that there is really fighting but we work for what we have and that's where the gap comes. They are a bit demanding but they are not working for it.

There are multiple things informing the logic of Laura Garcia[9]. For one, she is drawing on stereotypes. Stereotyping is the act of reducing someone to a few essentials or simplified characteristics. This is done in order to maintain the social and symbolic order (Hall, 1997). Stereotyping occurs when there are asymmetrical power relations (Hall, 1997). Further, Laura naturalises the differences between black and white people by saying that white people have a "persistence and fighting and character inside us". Here, the white person is portrayed as a hard worker constructed next to its opposition; the demanding, comfortable and "nonworking" black. This narrative draws on a popular representation of black people; the subordinate status and laziness of blacks who are stubbornly unwilling to work in ways that are profitable (Hall, 1997). By naturalising this difference it becomes fixed and secured forever, foreclosing the possibility for modification (Hall, 1997).

Another thing operating in the discourse of Laura is the notion of "internalised dominance" which blames black people for their own oppression by rendering them "comfortable" or "passive". Constructing this position has two functions; it secures the comfort of the dominant party by a belief that the other is happier in their position of being dominated. It further functions to make the other responsible for their own domination. This was later more blatantly verbalised when discussing black people in South Africa;

[9] It is not necessary for me to reinstate liberal paradigm that underpins her logic

But they are too quiet, too submissive probably. But that's why they had the Apartheid because they were just too submissive. They were too comfortable.

Although multiple theorists have engaged with the notion of "internalised dominance", Mtose and Bayaga (2011) explain that this literature runs into problems due to its myopia. By interiorising racism and making it a psychological phenomenon, the structurally racist environment of South Africa is rendered unimportant. What is missing is a focus on the external environment; politics, history, and economics in the troubling nature of Blackness (Mtose & Bayaga, 2011). What is also missing is an interrogation of whiteness and by extension, the position of privilege white people inhabit in society (Sasson-Levy, 2013).

In addition to positioning people in a hierarchy according to their capacities to assimilate to Eurocentric norms, Argentina has also been appraised according to its capacity to provide a particular standard of living. Argentina is no longer the Argentina it "used to be". What this means, as has been mentioned, is that Argentina no longer feels like the European country it once was. This is blatantly expressed in a narrative by Laura Garcia, but also comes up in the narratives of Paublo and Maria-Emilia. In Laura's narrative, Argentina is described as a "fast paced", "competitive" place where people are neither "friendly" nor "happy". She attributes this to their poor economic situation and contrasts it to Italy, which she felt resembles the Argentina she grew up in due to its "happy" environment.

Laura is equating happiness to one's economic status. Argentina has failed to provide Argentines with the economic security that a liberal capitalist society promises. Italy, which in Laura's mind represents a European ideal, is portrayed as a happy place. It is important to note that Italy is currently in the midst of an economic crisis (Schlamp, 2014). However,

Laura went to Italy as a tourist, which also suggests that she had some money and time for personal. This means that her image of Italy might be a disconnected representation of Europe today.

Having moved from Argentina "before it was too late" the participants, of course, retained all the best of Argentina. They retained aspects of the old Argentina, the "European" Argentina; a place of "values". Having self-ascribed this superiority, the Argentine immigrant has taken upon itself to be the "saviour" of South Africa; where it has defined its role in the transformation of South Africa as one involving themes of "empowering others" and "leading by example". This is a feature of "white talk" as discourses found in South Africa have been theorised to make use of "strategic anti-essentialism". This discourse both expresses an openness to multiculturalism as well, ironically, constructs itself, the west, as a source of change (Steyn, 2005). What I will call the "western saviour".

> *Just empower people. Just empower them and let them understand who they are. That they are not different to anybody else or to any other place in the world because of the colour. They are not different because of the circumstances of the past, the past is the past. They have to concentrate on what they can do today, not in the past.*

I feel it is of value to interrogate the above by bringing in Steve Biko (1978) who has stated that the main problem in white liberal ideology is their framing of the "solution" to South Africa's problems as "non-racialism". "Non-racialism" implies the necessity for both blacks and whites working together to solve the problems of South Africa, however, Steve Biko (1978) frames "white racism" as the problem. A "racism" that attaches itself to all whites due to the structural and institutional alignment to white interests. Therefore the problem becomes "whiteness" (Hook, 2011a) I will also make use of the contrapuntal method proposed by Said

(cited in Hook 2011a) to speak directly to the words of Laura by making use of Biko (1978, p. 66);

> *Not only have they kicked the black but they have also told him how to react to the kick.*

The narrative of Laura falls into a problematic discourse that frames the black person as a passive recipient of knowledge by the West (Hall, 1997). Furthermore, this is one of the ways in which a characteristic of "white talk" was employed as Melissa Steyn has identified that white talk "refuses the past". This was true for all the participants as Apartheid was minimised or not acknowledged unless prompted by an interview question. Melissa Steyn rightly emphasises that this prevents one from engaging with issues of collective responsibility. It also prevented the participants to engage with their own culpability.

In the narrative above, another prominent theme came up that was present in all the interview transcripts. All the narratives of Argentines made use of reactionary discourses from across the Atlantic (Steyn, 2005). These discourses work well to preserve privilege elsewhere and are thus appropriated in the context of South Africa. An example of this is the colour-blind discourse presented above where "skin colour" is argued to be unimportant. This is power evasive as it demands no reflexivity in terms of the beneficiary of privilege (Steyn, 2005). When discussing the ways that transformation can happen in South Africa, the above mentioned discourses were employed and the argentine immigrant positioned itself as the teacher of the discourses.

5.3. Afrikaners

"Afrikaners" as a nodal point came through as a means to make distinctions between South African whites; as well as the Argentine immigrants. "Black people" were positioned in relation to "Afrikaners" in such a way that constructed an alliance between the black people and the argentine immigrant. By making a distinction between Afrikaners and themselves, the participants were able to make a distinction between the perpetrators of Apartheid and themselves; the victims of the "reverse racism" that is taking place in the new South Africa. This reminds one of the narratives identified by Melissa Steyn (2001), "a whiter shade of white" which denies any implication, whether present or past, in the racial order. In the following paragraphs, the above themes will be explored in more detail.

> *Laura: and the Afrikaners, are very closed, they are very conservative. Ok, you have differing levels, Ok? But the ones I related to, the ones I related to they are very very closed people, they don't open themselves to other cultures. They kind of, I think they have, a bit of insecurity, they don't know where they are coming from. Because they created the culture. It's not a natural thing that has been there forever. And… it might come as an arrogant culture but I think in reality it is an insecurity. Because they adapt what they feel is better from different things. And they are still working on it, they are trying to find their own identity.*

In Addition, Lorena had this to say;

> *Lorena: ya, I don't gel with [Afrikaans people]… I never had that problem with the English people… funny enough… most of my friends are British… and, most of them, I mean, I got a friend that is in America, I mean, we have been friends with him for 28 years and we are friends! True friends, no problem. […] but, I never had any problem*

with them. Even people that I met while I'm in here. Never had any… Although they are different to what I am, we are still, we still got more in common… than… than… um, in any other way. Maybe is because the two of us are stranger in here. Who knows? Or maybe because the two of us are Europeans and we got more in common that what I have with people here.

In the above two narratives we see how Afrikaners are constructed as an "other". Different from Europeans. Laura has constructed Afrikaners as being "conservative", "arrogant", "insecure" as having "created the culture". By so doing, she constructs herself (having European ancestry) as secure, humble, and modern as well as occupying a naturally developed culture. Lorena more blatantly embarks on a discourse involving hierarchies of whiteness as she finds more similarities with English South Africans than with Afrikaans people. These similarities she attributes to the fact that they are both of European decent. This is ironic as it obscures the fact that Afrikaans people are also of European decent. They have been deliberately excluded from the category (Salusbury & Foster, 2004; Steyn, 2004). This reaffirms the existence of a hierarchy of "whiteness" and the policing of who is given admission and who is not.

Monica has a more difficult task in setting herself from Afrikaners as her surname is "Botha" and she is of Afrikaans descent. In her narrative she explains how Afrikaans people become distant when they realise that despite her surname being "Botha", she cannot speak Afrikaans. On the other hand, she explains how black people become relieved.

Monica: […] Without going as far as involving the surnames. Just because I'm white! But when the black people notice that I'm not an Afrikaner… things change!

Interviewer: So when people see you're white they have an idea of what you're like but then when you start speaking they change because they hear you have an accent?

Monica: Yes… yes… well, when they, you know? For example at work. With the drivers for example. The drivers are black! And in the beginning, you know? They'll treat like they would treat any Afrikaner. But then, I suppose, there are differences that are perceived. And then I can notice they don't treat me the same way they treat the Afrikaners. They open up a lot more with me! But I suppose is both ways? I suppose I also open up a lot more than the other guys […] I suppose… an Afrikaner person my age will act, you know? Thinking "no you don't socialise with blacks". "Because it's wrong. Black people are bad". So you don't sit in the same table with them you don't share a drink. So… as much as they can try and break themselves from that idea, it's probably not very easy. Because it's engrained through so many years. So it's not easy to break free from all that.

In the above narrative, Monica makes an effort to detach herself from her Afrikaans heritage. Attached with her Afrikaans surname comes a lot of history and ways of being that she does not identify with. By setting herself apart from Afrikaans ways of behaving, she formulates an alliance with black people. In so doing, she constructs herself as liberal. This, however, is not the case as through my interactions with Monica it became clear of her aversive racism. This will be discussed under the section of the "family".

Lorena: […] I believe that they [Afrikaans people] are very xenophobic… (laughs) I'm sorry about that… but I can't tell you anything else… and, partially the blacks learnt from them… in that sense… so, you know? I'm not particular… Particularly

coming from Argentina which is an immigration country! That is not a nice quality! Because that clashes with everything I believe […] and there is also the fact that because the sanction hit the Afrikaner nation very badly, they blame anybody, that comes from outside, for imposing such.

In the above narrative, Lorena constructs Afrikaners as xenophobic and as having taught black people how to be xenophobic. As has been previously discussed, this constructs "black people" as a passive recipient of western ways of being. By doing this, she constructs Afrikaners as the worse of two evils. What was very interesting was how little Lorena engaged with a question I asked about "black" people and whether she felt that they were "accommodating" to her. In her response, she quickly went back to speaking about Afrikaners.

Due to her lack of interaction with black people, engaging with the topic of "black people" would mean drawing on particular stereotypes or falling into the white-logic of binary oppositions. As has been mentioned before, binary oppositions in dominant discourse are reductionist and over-simplified mechanisms that favour the west. Instead of engaging my question and exposing her ignorance, she would prefer to fixate on Afrikaans people, whom she has constructed in such a way that pays homage to her progressiveness. Despite her avoidance of my question, the interview revealed some of her beliefs about black people when she was referring to an incident where she got robbed. She describes the incident as involving "four or five of them*"* who "picked" on her because she is "old" and "vulnerable". Despite her not blatantly referring to black people as a whole, her tone of voice as well as her choice of words was very telling. Furthermore, she explained that society is still polarised and

that the apparent "mingling" between races is a false reflection of what is actually happening in society.

Lorena: […] there is a lot of mingling. That mingling is more… casual… than… deep.

Interviewer: so like a superficial type of interaction?

Lorena: ya, is like a; I'm going to go for a jol with some friends, some friends are from a varied background but when it comes to more serious stuff, those "friends" do not count.

Just because her personal interaction with people of another race does not seem to penetrate a deeper level is no reason to generalise this experience to encompass the experience of all South Africans.

> *Lorena: […] now, the polarisation in the job market it was between I would say 96/ 97 up to… I will say about 5 years ago? Maybe 4 years ago? It was very… prominent. And it was like a reverse to address… any imbalance… and that also is not good because you know? I am not… I didn't abuse of anything… whatever I did, I did working hard. I would've done it in here as I would've done it in the States or in Australia or wherever I was. So… um, that was difficult. That was very difficult… particularly in the last, I would say… ten… twelve years…*
>
> *Interviewer: so, you felt you weren't the perpetrator yet you were feeling the repercussions of the perpetrators?*
>
> *Lorena: yes. Um-hum.*
>
> *Interviewer: did you ever learn Afrikaans or…*

Lorena: no, I refused.

In the narrative above one can see how having constructed herself as different from Afrikaners allowed Lorena to blame them for Apartheid, and in so doing, exonerated herself from the "whiteness" that is to be held accountable for the injustices of the past. Furthermore, by refusing to learn Afrikaans, she is taking a stance against Afrikaans people, who were both bad to her and the perpetrators of Apartheid.

5.4.The Family

The family was another nodal point employed by the participants in the study. Not only was it used to appraise other groups of people based on how "family-orientated" they were but also as a means to justify a broad range of decisions made by the participants; this ranged from reasons to move to South Africa in the first place to justification for leaving if things got "bad". This last point is exemplified by Maria- Emilia when discussing the future of South Africa;

> *Maria- Emilia: What's going to happen in this country? Is it going to be um, a nice place to… you know? To bring up the next generation because now, from my side I mean I'm thinking already on the… on the grandchildren, you know? So, how is it going to be?*

The above narrative was not uncommon to the argentine immigrants where a majority of decisions were justified by invoking the trope of the "family". Before continuing further, I must clarify that from my interactions with the participants it was clear that they had all been informed by the western ideal of the "nuclear family". According to Burman (2008) the ideal of the "nuclear family" has been constructed by the west, and given legitimacy through the

"science" of developmental psychology. Like all discourses, they are a function of its history; the social movements in which it participated and in which it arose. The goal of this discipline has been to create norms by making use of measurement procedures driven by a desire to regulate, compare and control different groups. The "norm" has been created around western masculinity that aspire to ideals of the western state (Burman, 2008). It goes without saying that the content of the ideal family has been termed along gendered lines, ascribing the role of the "breadwinner" to the father and "caregiver" or "homemaker" to the mother. This has meant that families serve a particular function and as such prioritised to be a universal and basic social unit. A place where tasks can be divided and shared; (along gendered lines) which is in the best interest of everyone (Burman, 2008). This brings the theme of naturalising; where a particular social order is legitimised (one that oppresses women) by drawing on a practical explanation. In the "nuclear family" the child has been constructed to represent potential and developmental psychology as the guiding voice in fashioning a future citizen; one who is a democratic worker and consumer. The below narrative by Paublo serves as an example of how "children" and their capacity to function in a particular way are used as a means to appraise both Argentina and South Africa.

> *Paublo: And there is a lost generation, when I look at my children and I look at the children of my friends or my family, I see two different people. These are developed guys and they push and they can take the world, the other ones are quiet, they go in the train, go to do a job, come back stay at home, tomorrow go do a job… and, not because my kids are any special, they were as, just like the other ones, it's just that they had an opportunity and the other ones didn't. And I think that that is what we*

need to (clears throat) try to work and try to, to fix. I think you are part of the generation that benefit out of this change

South Africa, again, has been constructed as a place of opportunity where Paublo's child was able to "develop" and "take on the world". The discourse of the "nuclear family" was also used to arrange different groups of people in different ways. Being "family-orientated" was seen as a positive thing whereas leaving one's child to go and work was demonised.

Laura: Indian people they have a strong sense of family, orientation, getting together and staying together and in Argentina it is very similar. African, black people... uhm… they have a different way of dealing with family. Their mothers go and work, they send their children's away... to the grandparents or whatever and… we don't see that in Argentina as often and here is a common thing…[…] But yes, I feel a lot more related to Europe and to probably to the Indian traditional life of family and… that's how I feel, yeah…

Laura is making use of the model of the "nuclear family" to construct an identity for herself and others. Black people are constructed as "irresponsible" for not raising their children with their mothers, whereas Indian people and Argentines are constructed as "family-orientated" and in that way superior. It is interesting that later on Laura makes an effort to make a distinction between herself and Indian people by reiterating that their sole similarity is the way they conduct themselves with their families. This is done so as to keep her construction of herself as European and avoid being perceived as anything other.

From the above it is clear that the predetermined frame of what a family should be ignores cultural and historical context which result in having a false view of what families

actually comprise of. Through this refusal of acknowledgment, the idealised model of the family perpetuates inequalities, ignores conflicts and stigmatises those unable to conform. Burman has discussed multiple ways in which families do not fit into this particular mould; single mothers, economically active women, divorce etc. In fact, the nuclear family seems to be an almost unattainable ideal that very few people manage to conform to. Bray, Gooskens, Kahn, Moses, and Seekings (2010), state that the nuclear-family household is far from the standard as less than half of the children living in Cape Town live with their biological parents. One cannot appraise the arrangement of family households in South Africa without looking at the role that Apartheid played in orchestrating households and its residual influence on the arrangement of families in the new democratic South Africa. Although the demise of the apartheid state meant that families could now legally stay intact, unemployment and poverty continue to contribute to the arrangement of family life (Bray et al., 2010)

A further example of the negative repercussion of upholding the "nuclear ideal" is that this popular discourse of the nuclear family as the correct environment for children to grow up allows little space for imagining alternatives. Burman (2008) has argued that the nuclear model ignores collective forms of child rearing. In the above narrative, Laura judges black South Africans based on the fact that they leave their children with their grannies or "whatever" in order to go and work. What is problematic that these interactions with "extended family" are overlooked or dismissed as inferior. By having a prescriptive account of who should fill the role of "caregiver" i.e. the mother, other people who are just as capable of providing a child with continuous love, support, warmth go unnoticed (Burman, 2008). A further example of how the "family" was used to appraise South Africans can be seen below;

Lorena: […] but it is a different culture! There is no doubt about it. I mean, um, even the way you raise your kids… um, I mean, in my case, I wouldn't work if I had a child… I cannot leave a four months old baby… with a nanny… or in a crèche. Five… four months old… to me is still attached to me… you know? I can still feel the umbilical cord. And I think that the first years of their lives is very, very important… and I found that when I came here that was very serious and that it still is.

The above narrative is used by Lorena to judge South Africans based on their capacity and choices when it comes to raising children. It is interesting that she makes use of the word "attached" as she is being directly informed by the Attachment Theory of the mid twentieth century. Attachment theory has been used to influence theory and policy and has been used to evaluate and regulate mothers. Although Attachment theory claims to be rooted in positivism, contextualisation of the theory exposes its particular historical agenda. During the 1950's women had taken over the jobs of men who were at war and as such, investigations into children were largely guided with the desire to put women back in their place; the home (Burman, 2008). Here we see how a discourse is always historically situated and carries a particular agenda.

I would also like to show how the family was used as a means to justify aversive racism. Aversive racism occurs when negative evaluations of racial/ethnic groups result in the persistent avoidance of interaction with that group. For example, when Monica was asked why she only socialises with white South Africans and not black South Africans she had this to say;

Monica: You know? I have to work so much and with the drama that is going on in my life, having small children you know? Also um, limits you a lot.

Even if one does not have enough time to socialise as a result of personal turmoil and "small children", why would that demarcate the race of the people you do choose to spend time with? Having mentioned that she does have English, Afrikaans friends and Latin American friends, as well as mentioning that there are black people working in her place of work, it makes little sense to attribute lack of socialisation to lack of time. In addition, the notion of a school having a "family" environment was used to justify her putting her children in an Afrikaans school as opposed to an English school. This is telling, as Afrikaans schools in Pretoria are predominantly white.

Monica: I don't know, it felt more protected in this Afrikaans school. More like a family environment. Although it's of a respectable size for a school but it felt more like a… like a family. Like at home, you know?

Lastly, an interesting narrative was articulated by Paublo Suarez who framed South Africa transforming in terms of "inter-racial" relationships;

I think that the, in future, um, there will be integration at maybe family level or relationship level. When you will see white, Indians, coloureds and everything getting into relationships and thereafter uh, the stress and the tension has to go because now is in my family! Is no longer in my country or in my community, it's in MY family.

This further emphasises the importance the family has in the discourses drawn by the argentine immigrants interviewed for this study. Although Paublo was the only one to frame the transformation as depending on the mixing of races in a profound and intimate way, all

argentines articulated the importance of the family in multiple different ways for the justification of different actions and choices as well as to position others in complex ways; always favouring themselves as they fit-in to the "self- imposed" criteria of the western nuclear family and the "superiority" that that implies.

5.5. Bolstering the Cage

The narratives explored in this section appeared often in the transcripts but were not a particularity of the argentine experience. Rather they represent the re-articulation of already established narratives that white South Africans reproduce to maintain their privileged position. In other words, they resemble the ways of speaking of white South African's and are not anchored by making use of "nodal points" in ways that are unique to the argentine immigrants. I must reiterate that aligning with white South Africans and their ways of speaking is not a "chance" occurrence where pigmentation objectively demarcates which group you will align to. Instead, as has been mentioned, identity construction is a political act; where one's assimilation into the "white race" will have both economic and civic advantages (Allen, 1994). During intercultural communication, one does not merely develop a "new" adapted identity in a direct way but rather, the immigrant will be presented with a repertoire of possible representations of self (Drzewiecka & Steyn, 2009). Just like there is the possibility to align with white South Africans, there also exists the possibility to align with other groups in South Africa. However, that would mean forfeiting certain privileges awarded to the white race. In other words, adopting the narratives that will be discussed below is an intentional, political act. Some of these themes have been interwoven into the

narratives above but will again be mentioned here to emphasise the Argentine immigrants' compliancy to South African whiteness.

Firstly, all participants refused the past. Either Apartheid was not mentioned or if mentioned, it was shortly dismissed or minimised. Secondly, participants fixated on themes such as; crime, violence, corruption, dropping standards etc. (Steyn, 2005). This is a characteristic of "White talk". Implicit in these themes is a belief in black incompetency as well as a persistent denial of the role that apartheid played in orchestrating the present. Thirdly, many participants took on victimised positionalities either by drawing on the narrative of "reverse racism" or by discussing their "humble beginnings". Having started from a "shack" (as was the case for Laura) and ending up in the higher economic bracket served to prove the 'colour-blind discourse' (and its liberal underpinnings) as success is attributed to consistent hard work as opposed to systemic white privilege. The logic is as follows; if whites were privileged, why would some of them be living in shacks?

"Ignorance" as an important instrument deliberately used by the participants has not been mentioned before but was also unanimous. The narrative of Maria-Emilia below sums up a popular thought;

> *Maria-Emilia: I didn't really know about the implications of… I knew about apartheid but I didn't really know what was apartheid. And, well you know when you're young you also didn't bother very much so… hm. I didn't really have a second thought about it. They offered me a job. But the idea, you know, we never really had the idea to come and stay here we came with the idea that we were young and we're going to work, make money, we're going to travel and we going to eventually go back to Argentina, that was the idea.*

Interviewer: Ok

Interviewee: But then, you know, life is different. Here we came and we worked and then you start buying your first house and then you start planting your roots, you know, and then uh, that's it. 35 years later we're still here, you know, and we never left. So, and it was a good life.

As has been discussed before, "ignorance" has been theorised as a tool that is employed as a means to maintain a social order that privileges whites (Steyn, 2012). In the above narrative, youth is used to justify ignorance. As Melissa Steyn (2005) states; white talk is linguistically plastic and takes on different forms to legitimise and rationalise denial. It is no surprise that apartheid didn't "bother" Maria- Emilia "very much"; as it was a regime structured around the idea of guarding white privilege at the expense of black livelihoods.

5.6. Education

I will dedicate the final section of my analysis to a theme that did not come up frequently in the interviews, yet I feel that due to its prominence in South-African socio-political discourse, it is an important theme to explore. I would like to look at how Maria-Emilia positioned herself and others in South-Africa through blaming the education system for reproducing a societal inequality.

Maria-Emilia […] But um, and of course another big problem in South Africa is education. You know? I really resent this difference in education between the people who lives in the country side and the people who comes to schools in towns, you know? I mean, in the homelands, or not the homelands... On the…

Interviewer: Townships

Maria-Emilia: Townships or… really the location of these people is very bad… and uh, so the if you live in a township or if you live in a, I don't know in… one of the tribal lands, you know in South Africa, you don't have any chance in life. Because at the end of the day, you can hardly write or read but if your parents they got a good enough education or if they got money that they can send you to school in town that's a different story. So, you think that 75% of the population lives in the country so just think on the education of those child, of those children. Education is also a big problem.

Before analysing the above quote, I will give contextual background into the history of education in South Africa. One of the key elements of the apartheid regime was the segregation of the education system, making it extremely difficult for non-whites to attain an education (Beutel & Anderson, 2008; Timaeus, et al. 2013). In the 1950's, Hendrik Verwoerd argued that children should be educated differently depending on race as race demarcated the opportunities that a person would have later in life (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). This meant that children were not only put into different schools according to race but also that different systems of education were implemented. The children from the "homelands" were taught a different curriculum to the children of the rest of the country. This racially-segregated system privileged white children who not only got a higher quality of education but who also benefitted from the money spent by the public (as well as private) sector on the infrastructure and resources of these schools (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). By the

end of apartheid, statistics showed that the mean years of completed schooling was more than double for whites (9.5) as for blacks (3.9) (Beutel & Anderson, 2008).

After the collapse of apartheid, the new South African government wanted to address the problems of the education system with an understandable urgency and tenacity (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). They went about the transformation of the system in a number of ways. A bill of rights was passed which stated that all citizens have a right to basic education (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). The new democratic government merged all schooling systems into one and allocated the same amount of resources to schools and capital for the hiring of staff (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). A bill was passed making school compulsory for all children between the ages of seven and fifteen. Lastly, a larger part of the national budget was allocated to education (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). Despite all these attempts to remedy the injustices of the past, the schooling system remains a prisoner of Apartheid (Beutel & Anderson, 2008; Timaeus, et al. 2013). Many rural schools operate in inadequate buildings and lack resources such as electricity or running water. There is also a shortage of qualified teachers as a number of them received their education during the apartheid-era (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). The picture of rural schools contrasts with that of independent schools. Less than five percent of children go to independent schools. These independent schools have more desirable characteristics such as favourable staff-pupil ratios and overall better facilities. Due to the high fees of these schools, the demographic of pupils is predominantly white (Masola, 2013).

Furthermore, former "model c" schools[10] often take it upon themselves to raise supplementary income from parents in the form of fees and other charges and this allows them to address certain needs such as the hiring of more teachers or the procurement of additional resources. Despite the government implementing a "colour-blind" schooling system that has allocated resources equally among public schools, the quality of many children's schooling has remained low (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013). There is a huge difference in educational outcome between formerly African, coloured and Indian schools, and white schools where the former performs worse than the latter. Former white only schools in affluent areas still outperform former African and rural schools. Reasons for the persistent general underperformance of rural schools are manifold and complex. Obvious logistical reasons include overpopulated schools, physical location as well as lack of resources. Other, less obvious reasons include; the motivation of teachers, management skills of principals as well as the importance attributed to a child's education by the caregiver (Timaeus, Simelane, & Letsoalo, 2013).

Maria-Emilia is right in making a distinction in the quality of education between schools depending on their location as the literature suggests that this discrepancy does exist. However, there is an uncritical element in what Maria-Emilia is saying. My argument is the following: irrespective of the school to which the child goes, there is something fundamentally problematic with the schooling system in South Africa as it perpetuates inequalities through its alignment to the dominant culture i.e. the group with economic, social and political power. One of the main mechanisms which it uses to align itself to the dominant

[10] Model C Schools are located in former "white suburbs". Almost all white children living in South Africa attend these schools.

culture is through language as a large majority of schools in South Africa are run in English, marginalising African languages (Alexander, 2004). This privileges the white minority.

According to Harker (1984), a school will take on the cultural capital of the dominant group as the natural and legitimate form of capital and it will treat all students as if they had access to it (Harker, 1984). This functions as an effective filter which reproduces social inequalities and societal hierarchies. In other words, the social order is maintained. By cultural capital I am referring to one's position taking; the goods and practices one posseses (Bourdieu, 1996). This can range from one's style, language, taste, disposition, social grace etc. All of which are acquired through socialisation (Harker, 1984).

From this it follows that poor academic achievement can be largely attributed to the way in which schools operate (Harker, 1984). In order for one to succeed in a particular school environment, one must appropriate the cultural capital that is endorsed by the school i.e. that of the dominant social group. Harker (1984) refers to this as "embourgeoisement" or "assimilation". By extension, those who are already born into the culture have an advantage in acquiring educational capital, i.e. qualifications. An example of a strategy the schooling system uses to perpetuate inequalities is by its focus on "style" as opposed to "content". When an examiner is focussing on the "style" used by the student he is simply appraising the student on something which is to a large extent simply the product of the habitus[11] of the cultivated classes. This is also something that can never be fully mastered by people who do not have the appropriate background (Harker, 1984).

[11] Here I am referring to Pierre Bourdieu's theory (1996). Habitus refers to the summation of one's resources or capital through the act of social conditioning. It refers to the set of goods and properties which correspond to each class of positions and unified by an affinity of style.

According to Neville Alexander (2005), the most important form of cultural capital is linguistic capital. In the context of Africa, if one wanted to become part of the cultural elite, one had to show a certain level of proficiency in a colonial language. The social and economic benefits of learning a dominant language has resulted in the valorisation of such a language (in the context of South Africa, the dominant language is English). This, however, leads to the marginalization of local languages. Alexander (2005) states that the role model of the South African population is its "middle class" and this results in the monolingual position being desired. This disempowers many people as the modern social and economic systems necessitate certain language competence but opportunities to develop the dominant language are scarce (Harker, 1984).

The schooling system in South Africa takes on the habitus of the dominant class (the white, English-speaking minority), as such, social inequalities are maintained and reproduced. That being said, one of the challenges in South African education is to critically engage with the legacy of intellectual colonisation, racialization and patriarchy (Du Toit, 2000). There must be a serious destabilisation of the principles guiding the educational culture which serve only a minority. Having said that, when discussing issues surrounding South African education, one cannot exclusively focus on issues of access, opportunity and success (although these are all equally important) but also, issues surrounding the institutional and academic culture which is still overwhelmingly Eurocentric.

In light of the above, I feel the need to problematize Maria-Emilia's narrative by exposing what she is implicitly buying into. First level of analysis is the more obvious one; by problematizing the education system and schools in the townships she is inadvertently

blaming the government (something she continuously did throughout our interview). In the statistic she presents; "75% of the population lives in the country side" lies the legacy of Apartheid yet a persistent refusal to admit that apartheid played a role in orchestrating where people should live. Lastly, in tying with the theory above we can see how Maria-Emilia's recommendation for more children to go to schools in "towns" is a desire for more black children to have access to, and attend "white schools" which reproduce the Eurocentric culture. As has been mentioned, this is one of the reasons for persistent inequality in South Africa. Maria-Emilia is constructing the two schools in opposition to each other; on the one hand; the rural school which can't even teach you to "read or write". By constructing the rural schools as inferior; the schools in the "towns" are constructed as superior. Melissa Steyn notes that "White talk" makes links to already established institutionalised practises. The interests, values and customs of the white minority are still infused with institutions such as schooling of a particular quality (Steyn, 2005). The narrative is also void of contextualisation, where reasons for poor quality of schooling in the rural areas could be attributed to the multiple reasons presented above.

I am by no means arguing that the location of the school will have no impact on the quality of education that a child will get in South Africa. However, schooling in South Africa is a convoluted space that requires a deeper level of analysis. We must also ask ourselves another question; "read and write" in what language? Melissa Steyn (2005) emphasises how "white talk" makes links to mainstream whiteness. One of the ways in which this is done is by a persistent insistence that English is the only appropriate language which the country should use to operate in. This is despite the fact that more people in South Africa understand

Zulu rather than English. By prioritising English over other languages, white South Africans are able to secure their privileged positions.

The most telling part of the narrative above is Maria-Emilia's exclamation that if you go to a school in a township "you don't have any chance in life". So the question becomes; you don't have a chance in *what* life? In *what* organisation of the world? The schooling system is reproducing social inequality by aligning itself to the dominant culture, by extension it is underpinned by liberalism and its economic system; capitalism. The above shows how "education" has been emptied out and defined as a very particular thing. It is a nodal point whose "common-sensed" content has been used to position black people in this country in a very particular way. Black people need to assimilate to white culture, if not, they will not "have a chance in life".

CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

The aim of this study was to gain an understanding into the ways Argentine immigrants configure an identity in the context of South Africa. Particularly, the way they position themselves in relation to the issues facing the country. This is done in an attempt to expose the discourses that aim at maintaining the current social order. Argentine immigrants used for this study all crafted an identity that adopted the same discourses employed by other white South Africans. This was evidenced by their employment of the characteristics of "white talk" identified by Melissa Steyn (2005). Constructing a "white identity" was a political act that afforded them the civic and economic advantages of whiteness in South Africa (Allen, 1994).

Despite the similarities in ways of speaking between the participants and the discursive strategies employed by white South Africans, the participants demarcated boundaries between themselves and other social groups. This was done to establish an ethnic hierarchy, positioning themselves (due to their links to Europe) at the top. However, this is not enough to secure the privileged position of a group (Sasson-Levy, 2013). The participants of this study also engaged in the erasing of these boundaries. This allowed them to remain transparent. It is through this invisibility that social categories derive their dominance and power (Sasson-Levy, 2013). Their intersections of national identity meant that their European links were called upon to legitimise their often offensive opinions without critical reflection by appealing to "cultural superiority", their South African identity further legitimised this opinion due to them having established "roots here".

The European influence in the construction of an Argentine identity was very prominent in the ways of speaking of the participants. The participants were entrenched in liberal ideology and unapologetically evaluated people as well as a country's capacity to govern based on its ability to comply with the criteria of a Western state. This is a liberal democracy, economically organised around capitalism; a system that secures them privilege. Analysis of the transcripts revealed three primary nodal points employed by the participants; "the business", "Afrikaners" and the "family". "Education" was later theorised as a nodal point although it came up less frequently. These nodal points were used to create webs of meanings that legitimised their cultural superiority as well as their lack of culpability with the issues facing South Africa.

Due to their liberalism and Eurocentric-informed arrogance, the participants appointed to themselves the roles of "saviour" or "teacher"; of empowering others or leading by example (Steyn, 2005). Furthermore, their "progressiveness", when contrasted with their constructed opposition; the Afrikaner (which they constructed as a blatant racist and the perpetrator of apartheid) meant that they could remain an innocent social group, victimised by the "reverse racism" of post-apartheid South Africa (Steyn, 2005). The gaps in knowledge and faulty logic of the participants made it clear that they were on some level aware of the influence that apartheid had in the creation of the unequal society of today but there was a persistent reluctance to verbalise this as it would mean confronting an unbearable emotional terrain and letting go of undeserved privilege (Biko, 1987; Hook, 2011a). Ironically, these two conditions have been theorised by multiple scholars as being necessary if one is to honestly engage with whiteness from a critical perspective (Alexander, 2004; Hook, 2011a; Mwaniki, 2012).

A further mechanism employed by the participants was intentional amnesia; none of them seemed to remember much about apartheid (although majority moved here during apartheid) and those who did mention apartheid made claims to their "ignorance" about the regime (Steyn, 2012). They all, however, had no problem remembering the economic turmoil in the time they left Argentina. This opportunistic erasure allows them to live in a psychically comfortable place where they construct themselves as having lived a "good" life; a morally correct one, in line with the ethical requirements of liberalism (Hook, 2011a). It was also used to legitimise the "colour-blind" meritocratic arrangement of liberal society by making claims to their "humble beginnings".

It has been mentioned that there's a desire on the part of some white liberals to detach themselves from their whiteness, to prove that they are not like other whites (Hook, 2011a). This is impossible to do, not only because society is too aligned to white interests and customs to even momentarily entertain such a detachment but also because whites necessarily occupy a shared social space. It is this shared space of privilege that homogenises them into a privileged group[12] whose articulations often aim at the preservation of their privilege (Biko, 1978; Hook, 2011a; Vice, 2010).

This paper has, to some extent, theoretically positioned whiteness as the voice or the articulation of a reluctance, but also of a moral inability to materially and theoretically challenge the globalised, liberal status quo. Whiteness articulates itself into non-being, and therefore into a position where accountability is impossible. It articulates itself into a morally constructed stalemate, where material redress and reformation might be needed, but

[12] This occurs in contexts like South Africa and North America where "whiteness" is attached to privileges (Allen, 1994)

unfortunately is impossible without the alienation of (some) universal human rights. In particular, there is an eagerness to enforce the human rights that maintain whiteness in a comfortable position such as; the right to property ownership. The universalisation of a liberal democratic morality has created the illusion that redress is morally impossible, by extension, it functions as a protective discourse of whiteness that enables the status quo to be legitimised and preserved. By exposing the limitations of this hegemonic discourse we are also highlighting its contingency. There exists a field of discursivity with multiple alternative options of interpretation and organisation of social phenomena. It is only by exposing these discourses, the repercussions of these discourses (who they privilege and who they oppress) as well as theorising their contingency that we open a sincere dialogue about meaningful *material* redress and *uncomfortable* emotional work.

Bibliography

Alexander, N. (2004). The politics of language planning in post-apartheid South Africa. *Language Problems & Language Planning, 28*(8), 113-130.

Alexander, N. (2005). *Language, class and power in post-apartheid South Africa.* Cape Town.

Allen, T. W. (1994). *The invention of the white race: Racial oppression and social control.* London: Verso.

Ansell, A. E. (2006). Casting a Blind Eye: The Ironic Consequences of Color-Blindness in South Africa and the United States. *Critical Sociology, 32*(2-3), 333-355.

Applebaum, B. (2010). *Being White, Being Good: White Complicity, White Moral Responsibility, and Social Justice Pedagogy.* Lanham: Lexington Books.

Beutel, A. M., & Anderson, K. G. (2008). Race and the Educational Expectation of Parents and Children: The Case of South Africa. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 335–361.

Biko, S. (1978). *I write what I like.* Oxford: Heinemann.

Boler, M., & Zembulas, M. (2003). Discomforting Truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference. In P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 110-136).

Bourdieu, P. (1996). Physical Space, Social Space and Habitus.

Branwen, G. J. (2013). 'Good governance' and 'state failure':genealogies of imperial discourse. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 26*(1), 49-70.

Bray, R., Gooskens, I., Kahn, L., Moses, S., & Seekings, j. (2010). *Growing up in the new South Africa.* Cape Town: HSRC PRESS.

Brown, T. J., & Suter, T. A. (2012). *Marketing Research.* Cengage Learning.

Burman, E. (2008). *Deconstructing Developmental Psychology.* (2nd, Ed.) New York: Routledge.

Commey, P. (2014). Immigration: Pastures not so green. (cover story). *New African*(542), 16-20.

Conway, D., & Leonard, P. (2014). *Migration, Space and Transnational Identities: The British in South Africa.* Palgrave Macmillan.

(2013). *Country Profile Series Argentina In-depth PESTLE insights.* MarketLine.

Derrida, J. (1976). *Of Grammatology* (1997 ed.). John Hopkina University Press.

Drzewiecka, J. A., & Steyn, M. (2009). Discourses of Exoneration in Intercultural Translation: Polish Immigrants in South Africa. *Communication Theory*, 188- 218.

Dubow, S. (2014). Uncovering the Historic Strands of Egalitarian Liberalism in South Africa. *Theoria: A Journal of Social & Political Theory, 61*(140), 7-24.

Du Toit, A. (2000). Critic and citizen: The intellectual, transformation and academic freedom. *Pretexts: Literary and Cultural Studies, 9*(1), 91-104.

Dwyer, S. C., & Buckle, J. L. (2009). The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 8*(1), 54-63.

Fay, B. (1996). Do you have to be one to know one? In *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: a Multicultural Approach.* London: Blackwell.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the Hyphens; Reinventing Self and Other in Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 70-82). London: Sage.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In N. K. Denzin , & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3 ed., pp. 695-727). Sage Publications.

Gebre, L., Maharaj, P., & Pillay, N. (2011). The Experiences of Immigrants in South Africa: a Case Study of Ethiopians in Durban, South Africa. *Urban Forum, 22*(1), 23-35.

Gravetter, F., & Forzano, L. A. (2012). *Research Methods for the Behavioral Sciences.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/ Cengage Learning.

Hall, S. (1990). Cultural identity and diaspora. In J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: community, culture, difference* (pp. 222-237). London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall, & B. Gieben (Eds.), *Formations of Modernity* (pp. 275-331). Open University/ Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1997). spectacle of the "Other. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (pp. 223-290). SAGE Publications.

Harker, R. K. (1984). On Reproduction, Habitus and Education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 5*(2), 117-127.

Hook, D. (2011a). Retrieving Biko: a black consciousness critique of whiteness. *African identities, 9*(1), 19-32.

Hook, D. (2011b). White Privilege, Psychoanalytic Ethics, and the Limitations of Political Silence. *Philos, 30*(4), 494-501.

Hudson, P. (2010). Mbeki's Legacy: Some Conceptual Markers. In D. Glaser (Ed.), *Mbeki and After* (pp. 42-50). Johannesburg: Wits University Press.

Johnson, A. (2001). The Trouble We're In . In *Privilege, Power and Difference* (pp. 15-41). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Jorgensen, M., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London: SAGE Publications.

Kayitesi, M. L., & Mwaba, K. (2014). South African University Studentd' Life Satisfaction and Perceptions of African Immigrants. *Social Behavior & Personality: an international journal*, 1127-1132.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics.* London: Verso.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1987). Post-Marxism without Apologies. *New Left Review*, 79-106.

Lambert, J. (2009). 'An Unknown People': Reconstructing British South African Identity. *The Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History, 37*(4), 599-617.

Maree, K., & van der Westhuizen, C. (2009). *Head Start in Designing Research Proposals in the Social Sciences.* Cape Town: Juta.

Masola, A. (2013, August 2013). Private schools: Reminders of White Supremacy. *Mail&Guardian*.

Mouffe, C. (1992). Citizenship and Political Identity. *The Identity in Question*, 28-32.

Mtose, X., & Bayaga, A. (2011). The Psychology of Black Identity. *The Journal of International Social Research, 4*(17), 503-515.

Mwaniki, M. (2012). Language and social justice in South Africa's higher education: insights from a South African university. *Language and Education, 26*(3), 213-232.

Ndlovu, S. (2012). "I am More than Just Black": Contesting Multiplicity through Conferring and Asserting Singularity in Narratives of Blackness. In R. Jorrelson, & M. Haraway, *Contesting Multiple Identities: Race, Gender, Culture, Nationality and Roles.* Oxford University Press.

Ortiz, A. D. (2002). *Al que se va.* Libros del Zorza.

Palys, T. (2008). Purposive Sampling. In L. Given, *The SAGE encyclopedia of Aualitative Research Methods* (pp. 698-699). CA: Sage Publications.

Peck, J. (1993). Talk about racism: Framing a popular discourse on race on Oprah Winfrey. *Cultural Critique*, 89-126.

Powell, J. A. (1999). Whites Will Be Whites: The Failure to Interrogate. *Berkeley Law Scholarship Repository*, 419-463.

Punch, M. (1994). Politics and Ethics in Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 83-95). London: Sage.

Ray, L. (2011). A European Enclave in an Alien Continent? Enduring Fictions of European Civilisation and Indigenous Barbarism in Argentina Today. *Bulletin of Latin American Research*, 141-157.

Said, E. (2003). *Freud & the non-European.* London & New York: Verson.

Salusbury, T., & Foster, D. (2004). Rewriting WESSA identity. In N. Distiller, & M. Steyn (Eds.), *Under construction* (pp. 93-109). Sandton: Heinmann.

Salvatore, R. D. (2008). The Unsettling Location of a Settler Nation: Argentina, from Settler Economy to Failed Developing Nation. *South Atlantic Quarterly, 107*(4), 755-789.

Sasson-Levy, O. (2013). A Different Kind of Whiteness: Marking and Unmarking of Social Boundaries in the Construction of Hegemonic Ethnicity. *Sociological Forum, 28*(1), 27-50.

Schlamp, H. (2014, October 6). *Bungle Bungle: Italy's Failed Economic Turnaround*. Retrieved from SPIEGEL ONLINE INTERNATIONAL: http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/matteo-renzi-struggling-to-solve-italian-economic-crisis-a-995558.html

Statistics South Africa. (2012). Pretoria. Retrieved from http://www.statssa.gov.za/publications/sastatistics/sastatistics2012.pdf

Statistics South Africa. (2014). *Poverty Trends in South Africa: An examination of absolute poverty between 2006 and 2011.* Retrieved from http://beta2.statssa.gov.za/publications/Report-03-10-06/Report-03-10-06March2014.pdf

Steyn, M. (2004). Rehabilitating a Whiteness Disgraced:Afrikaner White Talk in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Communicatioti Quarterly, 52*(2), 143-169.

Steyn, M. (2005). "White Talk": White South Africans and the Management of Diasporic Whiteness. In A. J. Lopez (Ed.), *Postcolonial Whiteness: a Critical Reader on Race and Empire* (pp. 119-135). State University of New York Press.

Steyn, M. (2012). The ignorance contract: Recollections of apartheid childhoods and the construction of epistemologies of ignorance. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power, 19*(1), 8-25.

Timaeus, I. M., Simelane, S., & Letsoalo, T. (2013). Poverty, Race, and Children's Progress at School in South Africa. *Journal of Developmental Studies, 49*(2), 270-284.

Vestergaard, M. (2001). Who's Got the Map? The Negotiation of Afrikaner Identities in Post-Apartheid South Africa. *Why South Africa Matters, 130*(1), 19-44.

Vice, S. (2010). How Do I Live in This Strange Place. *Journal of Social Philosophy, 41*(3), 323-342.

Wallace, D. F. (1993). A Conversation with David Foster Wallace . (L. McCaffery, Interviewer)

Walton S, & Boon, B. (2014). Engaging with a Laclau & Mouffe informed discourse analysis: a proposed framework. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal, 9*(4), 351-370.

West, M., & Schmidt, J. M. (2010). Whiteness Studies in South Africa: A South African Perspective. *English in Africa, 9*(13), 9-13.

White South Africans must take a stand Against Racism. (2010, 2 21). *City Press*, p. 23.

Willig, C. (2008). *Introducing Qualitative Research in psychology: Adventures in Theory and Method* (2nd ed.). Maidenhead, England: McGraw Hill/ Open University Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. (2010). Theorizing Identity: Beyond the 'us' and 'them' dichotomy. *Patterns of Prejudice, 44*(3), 261-280

APPENDIX A: Interview Schedule

How long have you been living in South Africa?

What were your reasons for moving to South Africa?

Which country do you consider to be your home? Why?

"Argentine identity has links to Europe", do you agree with this statement? If so, can you elaborate on that? Do you think this link is relevant here?

Do you consider yourself to be a South African?

(If yes) What does "being a South African" mean to you?

Is there a particular group of South Africans you feel closest to or socialise with? If so, why that particular group?

Do you identify problems in South Africa? If so, what are they?

How do you think South Africans can rectify these problems?

What do you feel is your role in the transformation of South Africa?

APPENDIX B: Participant Information Sheet

DST-NRF South African National Research Chair in Critical Diversity Studies

Wits Centre for Diversity Studies

University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

P

articipant Information Sheet

Study Title: Argentine South African's ways of Speaking

Investigator: Ayelen Hamity

Institution: University of Witwatersrand, School of Social Sciences

Contact Details:

Ayelen Hamity (researcher)

Tel: 0842241937 email: ayelenhamity@gmail.com

Prof Melissa Steyn (supervisor)

Tel: 0836351299 email: Melissa.steyn@wits.ac.za

Good day,

My name is Ayelen Hamity, and I am conducting research for the purpose of obtaining a Masters Degree in Diversity Studies at the University of the Witwatersrand. My area of focus is Argentine foreigners living in South Africa.

I invite you to partake in this research study. Your participation will involve an interview conducted in English by me (about an hour of your time) in which Argentine identity, South African identity and the South African context will be explored. This interview will be conducted in the venue of your choice. Please note that the interview will be recorded using a tape recorder. After the interview is

completed, all information will be stored in digital form with all identifying features removed. Before agreeing to participate please read through the following:

Purpose of study

The reason for my focus on Argentine South Africans is that there is a lack of research in the area of immigrants living in South Africa. In line with the critical diversity agenda, I would like to understand the way in which Argentines experience the transition to living in this context. This information will be gathered by making use of an interview lasting about an hour long.

Risks and Benefits

There are no risks in participating in this study. The benefit of this study is that it will generate new knowledge and a broader understanding of foreigners living in South Africa.

Confidentiality

All information gained in this study will remain confidential. Data reported in the research report and scientific journal will not include information that identifies you as the participant. The report will make use of pseudonyms in order to guarantee anonymity.

The right to withdraw from Study

You may withdraw from the study at any given time with any reason.

If you have any further questions please do not hesitate to ask me.

If you agree to the above conditions, please sign the attached consent form.

APPENDIX C: Consent Form

Interview No._____

Interview Consent Form

I, _____ (name), agree that I am participating willingly and voluntarily in an interview with Ayelen Hamity on this day _____ (date) at _____ (place).

I understand that these interviews from part of a research project undertaken by Ayelen Hamity on Argentine foreigners living is South Africa for the completion of an MA degree requirement at the University of the Witwatersrand.

I understand the rationale and purpose of the research and I understand the benefits of my participation

I understand that I will participate in one interview that will last approximately one hour

I understand that I will be given a pseudonym and that my identity will remain anonymous

I understand that the interview will be recorded

I understand the interview will be conducted in English

I understand that portions of this interview may be used in an MA research report, and possibly in further academic outputs

I understand that my interview transcripts will be not be shared with anyone

I understand that I may discontinue my participation at any stage of the research.

I understand and agree to the above terms and conditions.

Signature (Participant) _____

Signature (Researcher) _____