RACE
With Emphasis on
SOUTH AFRICA

518 Coloured persons were reclassified as Whitespersons.
1 White person was reclassified as a Coloured person.

From the Government Gazette registration reclassification, 1924.
Learning Outcomes

By the end of this chapter you will be able to:

- understand the concept of race in its complexity as offered by those who come to it from different positions
- apply the understanding of race, ethnicity and racism to historical and contemporary examples within South Africa
- understand the concept of race and its relationship to racial classification and apartheid and their intersections among class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity and identity
- understand the unique and the particular experiences of racial classification and racism within the South African context
- examine the commonalities and differences between the key theorists listed in the chapter
- understand how postmodernity and globalisation influence and affect how race is implemented.

Introduction

Michael Omi and Howard Winant (1986) posit that race is used to signify differences amongst people via racial projects, and how these differences are signified and connected to the organisation of society.

In the context of American society, the concept of race is used not only to signify physical differences amongst people, yet is also used to signify actual and perceived cultural, economic and behavioural differences. By framing racial formation this way, Omi and Winant illustrate that because the way we understand, describe and represent race is connected to how society is organised, then even our common-sense understandings of race can have real and significant political and economic implications in access to rights and resources.

Concepts, unlike definitions, provide guidance and assistance with understanding a subject. As such, many concepts are interconnected and are only understood when the nuances that inform these interconnections are unearthed; some concepts are therefore better understood by means of examples that illustrate their significance.

In this chapter we will focus on nine core concepts and their relationship to secondary concepts, which have developed alongside one another. Where necessary, case studies and/or examples within the history of South Africa will be utilised to illustrate the relationship between and among concept, context and implementation.

Race

CORE CONCEPT 1: RACE refers to a system of classification used to categorise human beings.

The categorisation of human beings is based on notions of biology and social construction (Cashmore et al., 1996). Whilst the classification of race is based on notions of biology and dates back several centuries, it is only since the twentieth century that social construction came strongly to the fore to counter the biology argument. In the latter part of the 1940s, after the Second World War, existential sociologists and philosophers argued that biology and social construction remain key factors in how race exists. This was followed by the post 1960s argument that the concept of race has to be understood within the larger context of the economic and material factors under which it is lived; in other words, the ways in which race is materialised. To fully understand a core concept like race we will briefly look at the context and application, and how race and lived experience has gone hand-in-hand in South Africa.

Race and ‘Race’

Even the spelling of the word race is a matter of debate, as it offers a particular understanding of the concept. Race without the inverted commas is often used to refer to an acceptance of biology, as though race is naturalised and
thus, when written in this way, indicates an acceptance that race exists. The second school of scholars who utilise the term as indicated above are those who consider themselves critical race theorists. They work from the point of departure that whilst race is constructed, it exists in very real ways as to the construction of identity, and as such because of its materiality, has very real consequences and manifestations. Race with inverted commas ('race') is used by scholars who claim that the inverted comma spelling is necessary to indicate that it is not real but a social construction and as such needs to be written in this manner. For the present let's return to the three components that allow for our understanding of race.

- **Biology.** The discussion of race as biology takes us to the concept of biological determinism, which is also referred to as racial naturalism. This is the argument that asserts that various populations are by the similarity of their anatomy – physical features, hair type, skin colour, eye shape and colour – part of one race (Cashmore et al., 1996). This notion of race should not be confused with ethnicity, which is centred on shared cultural heritage rather than similarity of facial features. Biological determinism is also based on the belief that human behaviour is controlled by genes and gene pools. Sociologists have disputed this argument time after time in favour of a theory of social construction.

- **Race as a social construction as a means to justify inequality** is what sociologists put forward in opposition to the notion that race exists and can be explained on the basis of biology or justified because of it. Race as a social construction is taken up by Ghanian Sociology Professor George Dei, of the Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, an affiliate of the University of Toronto. He writes using the term race without inverted commas noting that his experience of race is real and he does not need to indicate that it is constructed because it suggests that both his experience and his awareness of that experience is a construction (Dei and Lozdan, 2013). African American historian Henry Louis Gates Jr. agrees with him about race being a social construction but differs with him on the matter of writing the word, as is evident in the introduction to 'Race', Writing and Difference, that one has to indicate that race is a construction because any other representation suggests that it is naturalised (Gates, 1985).

- **Race as materialised can also be linked to those who understand race as a socio-political construction, suggesting that human beings experience their identities within a socio-political context. As such, it is not only a question of sociality, but one where social norms and values are established as part of a system – race being one of them – based on the perpetuation of the political system and sub-systems. These in turn determine how race is experienced by people from the various socio-economic groups. This position argues that race is experienced; that one is socialised and conscientised by the material conditions of oppression and domination operating within society – all of the social and the political factors construct one's racialised identity. And therefore, as such, it is not biology that determines race but rather the justification of it in the form of the social conditions that are put in place in order to further racial inequality.**

- **Race as lived experience is also known as the materiality of race** (Mills, 1997; Maart, 2014a; 2014b). Scholars who support this position use the word race without inverted commas to suggest that they do not experience it as a construction because it is already constructed. Arguments that situate materialism are, for the most part, borrowed from Marxists, as a means of addressing historical materialism, vis-à-vis race, and as such locate race as materiality itself. In other words the material conditions under which one lives out the race experience, determines one's experience of race – where you live, how you live, the space that is claimed (whether borrowed, owned, legal or illegal) within which you being is contained and as such where you are 'raced'.

Whilst there are three main areas of conceptualisation as to the operation and functioning of race, scholars have over the past few decades positioned themselves in accordance with their beliefs, and as such situated themselves in response to how race has been identified within their lives. These are discussed here in no particular order:

- **Essentialism** refers to the belief that an entity – a person, population group, animal or object – has a set of attributes described as its essence, which are both crucial and central to how its identity functions. Perhaps one of the first known entries into social and political thought comes from Plato and Aristotle. Plato argued that all known things have an essential reality whilst Aristotle postulated the centrality of substance – that we are who we are by virtue of our substance. In the last fifty to sixty years, stemming from the 1960s decade of resistance to racism world wide, essentialism has received overwhelming attention among social scientists. A key race theorist is Ghanaian-British scholar Kwame Appiah, who resides in the US. He asks, 'Is race actually a biological concept? Or do we just suppose it must be, because we think in essentialist terms ...' (In 'Race and Psychological Essentialism'; see also Appiah, 1996).

- **Existentialism** refers to the discussion over humanity, and claiming humanity as central to sociological debates where race is not the focus but the experience of how humans exist as human is foregrounded instead. As such, social experience, a central concern for sociologists, becomes the focus when attempting to understand the human subject – not the racialised subject
but the acting, feeling, living subject, both as an individual and within a group. The focus in this position is not only that we exist in the world, but how we exist in the world. Many scholars would argue that they do not believe that race exists but that they understand the argument of race through the scholarly work on existentialism.

- Non-essentialism refers to the belief that there are no specific traits or characteristics that any entity possesses or must possess in order to exist as such an entity. This group includes philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre (1956) particularly known for *Being and Nothingness*, and sociologists like Bauman (1996) as is evidenced in his book, *Contesting Culture*. Let’s look at an example within the South African context: in other words, those who situate themselves as non-essentialists believe that there are no specific traits or characteristics that any person, for example, who calls him or herself Coloured, possesses in order to exist as a Coloured person. Whereas, those who take a position as anti-essentialist refuse to call themselves White, Black, Coloured, African-American, Indian, heterosexual, gay, amongst others, taking the position that they do not possess any particular essence of a kind that would identify them in any particular way other than human. Whilst these are useful and important, as they allow us to be acquainted with a broader spectrum of ideas and positions on race, it is still important to point to examples within South African history.

As we proceed to the second concept, it is important to be aware of some of the colloquial phrases pertaining to race that are in circulation; these can be positive or negative but speak to the ways in which race is discussed, used as currency for a discussion, argument or debate, however contested. One such phrase that has become very popular is the ‘race card’.

The ‘race card’ or ‘playing the race card’ is a commonly used expression in contemporary South African society, drawn from the United States experience, which is more suggestive of an accusation than an observation. It is similar to Critical Race Theory, which emerged in the United States as a consequence of legal theorists trying to establish how to bring race into the courtroom, when its consequences are clearly evident in how the law is used to criminalise Black people. The ‘race card’ was first popularised during the OJ Simpson case when the defence team was accused of ‘using the race card’ to suggest that racism fuelled the charges against a Black man like OJ Simpson who, as it happens, was married to Nicole Brown Simpson, a White woman, and stood accused of killing her. The expression ‘the race card’ is therefore used in reference to those who use racism to their advantage, and also those who exploit racism for social, economic or political gain.

### Apartheid

**CORE CONCEPT 2: APARTHEID** (see also Chapter 13) was a system of racial segregation in South Africa imposed upon the oppressed masses from 1948 until 1994. It was enforced through laws and legislation devised to facilitate, perpetuate and maintain a system of White domination already put into place by usurpation, colonialism and racial classification.

Apartheid is important for the study of race in South Africa; without it one cannot fully grasp how race operated prior to the first democratic elections nor understand the remnants of apartheid two decades into the new democracy era.

### A History of Apartheid

Racial segregation did not start in 1948 but was introduced during colonial times under the Dutch East India Company (DEIC) and further entrenched when the British took over the governing of the Cape in 1795. What needs to be noted, as the concept of apartheid is unravelled, is that various legal measures were implemented according to the core belief of apartheid: that European settler colonials needed to be separated from the natives (as in the indigenous peoples) to preserve the culture and languages of each. The term apartheid is an Afrikaans term which, when translated into English, means: (i) the state of being apart; (ii) separateness. In essence it means and was argued as the belief that people who are from different races cannot live together and need to live apart. This particular argument was taken to the highest extremes; separateness also meant a separate world of privilege for the European settler, and a separate world of homelessness and the forced removal from land for the usurped masses.

Apartheid slowly developed from the 1930s into the 1940s, bearing a strong resemblance to the policy of segregation, which it replaced. Daniel Francois Malan was South Africa’s first apartheid Prime Minister from 1948, the year of its implementation, until 1954.

Policies were put into place at the end of the 1940s and more formally in 1948. It can be argued that the process by which the majority of the population were oppressed, exploited and subjugated, happened from the time of the country’s usurpation and colonisation in 1652, which set the foundation for apartheid. While the term apartheid was regularly used by Afrikaner Nationalists when addressing questions of race prior to its 1948 implementation as a policy, it later became the chosen word when talking about the need for White domination in South Africa.

As gold and diamond mining intensified in the country, and the global economy was being led through a new industrialisation era, concern among the Afrikaners
developed as to whether the labour power of Black workers in South Africa would bring additional challenges. Urbanisation and industrialisation simultaneously brought about a greater determination to have laws and regulations in place that would legalise apartheid and make those who broke these laws criminals. The ideological basis for apartheid was put forward as a noble altruistic gesture – asserting that different races in South Africa needed to be separated in order to preserve their culture, language and identity. As such, and as per the categories of race discussed in concept one, biological determinism (also referred to as scientific racism) accompanied the belief that Afrikaners, considered a deeply Christian group, could not live side-by-side with non-believers. This became the rallying point – from the pulpit to the biology textbook, to the court of law – to bringing apartheid into the lives of all South Africans.

It is important to understand apartheid and its manifestations: that it was not just a system of division based on racial classification with all of its structural, systemic and institutionalised components designed to privilege the lives of the White population. It also had severe consequences for the lives of Black people upon whom it was inflicted and who suffered through its operation and functioning in all areas of their lives. Stephen Bantu Biko, one of the founder members of South African Students Organisation (SASO) and the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania (BCMA), expressed his position when offering an understanding of apartheid in a paper he wrote for the SASO membership in the early 1970s, later collated in I Write What I Like:

Apartheid – both petty and grand – is obviously evil. Nothing can justify the arrogant assumption that a clique of foreigners has the right to decide on the lives of a majority (Biko, 1978, p. 27).

How race operates depends on the mechanisms at its disposal. The system of apartheid, based on racial classification, ensured the perpetuation of racism and how it played out, thus ensuring the operation of White domination. But it was the particular apartheid legislation that allowed the system to function at its best. We now turn to some of the key legislation that allowed the functioning of apartheid.

In order to secure apartheid’s life, the Nationalist government had to ensure that sexual relations were prohibited between people who were classified as separate, and hence, a series of legislation known as ‘petty apartheid’ was introduced, first of which included the Prohibition of Mixed Marriages Act of 1949 that prohibited marriage between people of different races. This was followed by the Immorality Act of 1950, which made sexual relations with a person of a different race a criminal offence. The first major apartheid act to follow on from the Immorality Act was the Population Registration Act of 1950, which formalised racial classification and introduced an identity card for all persons over the age of 18, which had to specify the designated racial group of the person. The Pass Laws Act of 1952 made it compulsory for all Black South Africans over the age of 16 to carry a passbook. Because the passbook, for which Black people had to make a special application, determined where they could live, where they could work, it was colloquially called the dampas, the English translation meaning a dumb pass – the metaphor was suggestive that it was carried by someone considered unintelligent and ignorant. Without the passbook Black people would be arrested immediately; with the passbook, and with incorrect information for the location of where the person was found and questioned, it also meant that the police had grounds for arrest. It is important to note that the Asiatic Registration Act (an extension of the pass laws) of the Transvaal colony, was brought into effect in 1906, and required that all Asian people (Indian and Chinese) had to carry an identity document bearing the thumb-print of the person, and be able to produce it to the police on demand. Despite protests, with a lobby under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi, it was re-enacted in 1908.

The second pillar of grand apartheid was the Group Areas Act of 1950. Until then, most settlements had people of different racialised groups living side by side. The Group Areas Act put an end to diverse living in social areas and determined where one lived according to one’s racial classification. Each racialised group was allotted its own geographical area, which was used in later years as a basis for forced removal.

The Prevention of Illegal Squatting Act of 1951 allowed the government to demolish Black shanty towns and force White employers to pay for the construction of housing for those Black workers who were permitted to reside in cities otherwise reserved for White people. The Suppression of Communism Act of 1950 banned any party subscribing to Communism. The act defined Communism and its aims so loosely that anyone who opposed apartheid risked being labelled a Communist.
law specifically stated that Communism aimed to disrupt racial harmony. It was frequently used to gag opposition to apartheid on an individual and a group basis. Education was segregated by the 1953 Bantu Education Act, which crafted a separate system of education for African students and was designed to prepare Black people for lives as a class of perpetual labourers.

The Natives Resettlement Act No. 19 of 1954 formed part of the apartheid system of racial segregation in South Africa. It allowed for the removal of Black people from any area within and next to the magisterial district of Johannesburg. This act was designed to remove Black people from neighbourhoods desired by the White population and/or those seen as a threat to the apartheid government for its social, cultural and political climate; it enabled them to remove people from communities like Harfield Village near Claremont, District Six, the old slave quarter in Cape Town, Sophiatown and Soweto in Gauteng, and Cato Manor, Mayville and Clairwood in Durban. There are several examples of forced removals around South Africa (see http://overcomingapartheid.msu.edu).

From 1960 to 1983, forced removals were rampant and the apartheid government forcibly removed 3.5 million Black South Africans in one of the largest mass removals of people in modern history. The reasons for forced removal ranged from the government's fear that integration was taking place faster than they could contain it, to their fears of a growing dissent among these integrated communities: this also came to be known as the breeding ground for socialism and the already growing trade union movement. District Six and Sophiatown both fit the description above.

In addition to these Acts that were passed, and through which apartheid, a system of legal racial segregation operated, sign postings on public amenities further ensured that the process was upheld at every occasion.

A toilet area for women where a sign indicates that the facility is for ‘Non European Women’.

People on the beach with a sign posted in English, Afrikaans and isiZulu that reads: ‘Under Section 17 of the Durban Beach By-laws, this bathing area is reserved for the sole use of members of the White race group’.

The image above shows people on the beach with a sign firmly posted in English, Afrikaans and isiZulu. The posted sign cites the Section of the law to which racial segregation applies, notifying onlookers that the beach is reserved for ‘members of the White race group’. The term race is used here in its naturalised sense to indicate that White is a race group, much like Black would be considered a race group within this particular legal articulation. Whereas the White person who enjoys the privilege of the beach does not have the responsibility of enforcing apartheid – the law does – and as such, the same White person does not necessarily understand that this particular act is one of White privilege.

A sign posted at a beach in the Cape, is indicative of how apartheid functioned – to secure the social privileges of those classified as White.
Racial Classification

CORE CONCEPT 3: RACIAL CLASSIFICATION was the cornerstone of apartheid in that it was a system devised to classify people according to their physical appearance and already racialised identities.

Racial classification was also the psyche of apartheid because its focus was the body and physical appearance; and as such it represented the embodiment of apartheid as well as the manner in which racialisation was internalised. Alongside racial classification, apartheid legislation was introduced to effectively ensure that the system of apartheid functioned.

Racial Classification in South Africa

Racial classification in South Africa began prior to European usurpation and colonialism. In fact, it is precisely because of the racist depictions of Africans through voyager accounts that the Dutch East India Company (DEIC) insisted that its paid voyages usurp and colonise South Africa in order to set up a half-way station. This would serve as a resting place en route to India, its main objective at the time.

Ethnic and language distinctions were utilised for many centuries, such as Khoi, San, Griqua, etc., to offer an indication of a person's particular lifestyle, language group and/or place of origin. Meanwhile, racial classification was the direct attempt by the South African Nationalist government to classify a person on the basis of his/her racialised identity informed by appearance; firstly by describing the person as 'non-White' that is, a non, a negation, a non entity, then to cast that non entity at the backdrop of the White experience - the standard of being human. The purpose of classification was to inflict inferiority onto the oppressed masses, which were classified by appearance such as physical features and skin colour at the backdrop of the White settler experience.

The population was classified into four groups: White, Black, Indian and Coloured. The Coloured group was classified on the grounds that they were people of mixed descent, and as such included Bantu, Khoi and San, European, Malay (indentured labourers and enslaved people brought from Malaysia to the Cape by the Dutch East India Company), Indian, Madagascan and Chinese descent. The Griqua, a population group upon whom the classification of Coloured was bestowed, developed as a direct result of the union between the Dutch population and Khoi and San peoples. As such, the Griqua adopted the Afrikaans language as their language of communication.

Racial categories, useful and necessary for the enforcement of apartheid, were often conflicting and brought great humiliation within a family as one member could be classified as White and another Coloured or Black.

The Population Registration Act came with a set of criteria as to how the classification would work. Coloured people were housed in Coloured townships and people classified as Black were housed in Black townships, for the most part. Shanty towns and squatter camps, also known as illegal settlements, emerged despite the measures of population control the South African government instituted. The issue of control was quite central to how the Group Areas functioned. This was also evident, for example, when designing Black and Coloured townships, which often had one entrance into the township, and the same entrance as the only exit. By definition this is the meaning of the term ghetto although with derivation in fourteenth century Venice among the Jewish population who lived in rather unfavourable conditions both socially and economically. As such, the term ghetto had a greater significance than merely being the one and only point of entry and point of exit for residents, but also represented a containment, and a barring from socially transitioning outside of one's class and social status.

Indian South Africans were often classified as Black or Asian but never as White, irrespective of how fair-skinned particular groups of Indian people were. If their heritage was traced to India or the Indian diaspora, they were classified as Indian or Asian. Immigrants from Japan, Taiwan and South Korea on the other hand, were classified as honorary White due to the fact that South Africa maintained diplomatic relations with those countries and sought to act on the economic benefits of these relations.

Chinese South Africans, mostly descendants of migrant workers of the nineteenth century in the gold mines of Johannesburg, were classified as Coloured until 1984 when they were afforded the classification honorary White and were spared from the Group Areas Act legislation.

We now turn to an example of classification and reclassification.

The Story of Sandra Laing

A modern-day account of racial classification and reclassification can be seen in the story of Sandra Laing who was born in 1955 to Sannie and Abraham Laing in Breereton Park, a rural area close to Piet Retief. Both were staunch Afrikaner Christians who supported and believed that the apartheid government had served them well. Sannie and Abraham were shopkeepers who raised all of their children as White despite each child looking decidedly less White than the parents who birthed them. Sandra Laing was born with curly hair and darker skin than her White Afrikaner parents. When her brother Adriaan was born nine years later, he was lighter in skin colour with the same curly hair she had, and resembled her quite strongly. When she was ten years old her parents sent her to an all-White boarding school, which was in keeping with parents of their time and generation. Many White parents favoured
a particular kind of private education, which in addition also provided their children with a social network. Sandra was ridiculed and humiliated by her peers and her teachers on a regular basis from the time she arrived despite her parents’ intervention. The parents of her peers insisted that she was not White, petitioned for her to be removed from their children and she was expelled from school. The principal, with support from the teachers, referred Sandra’s case to Home Affairs because it was argued that parents wanted their children to be in the company of White children only. During this time, in addition to a blood test, which was administered and determined that she was the daughter of Sannie and Abraham Laing, the pencil test was also administered, which meant that a pencil was inserted into her hair: if the pencil fell out, she would retain her classification; if the pencil remained in her hair, which in her case it did, she would be classified Coloured. The authorities at Home Affairs reclassified Sandra as Coloured in 1965. Sandra’s father fought the matter in court and eventually won the right to have his daughter reclassified as White in 1967. What this meant, given the criteria of the law, which indicated that a person was classified as White if both their parents were classified as White, Sandra was then reclassified as White. The process her father undertook in a court of law was called a reclassification: this meant that whilst she was classified White at birth, she was then reclassified as Coloured, and with new legislation classified as White again, for a second time. From the time of Sandra’s expulsion until her father won the court case Sandra was kept at home and as a result fell behind in her schoolwork. What is notable about Sandra’s story is that her parents’ ancestry was never put into question but instead her skin colour and curly hair were treated as a problem – her problem. Scientists have put forward the notion that when a child is born with facial features and physical characteristics that differ from their parents, referred to as a genetic throwback to earlier African ancestry, they treat this as a condition called, atavism. Later in her life, at the age of 26, having eloped with a Black man with whom she had two children, Sandra had to undergo reclassification again as Coloured in order to have her children live with her. Sandra’s story was later narrated in a film called Skin (2009) directed by Anthony Fabian.

Reclassification was undertaken on a regular basis across South Africa. In 1975 South Africans of Chinese ancestry were classified as ‘non-White’ yet they were able to buy and rent properties in areas designated for White people. In 1979, South Africans of Chinese ancestry were offered a change of status to honorary White, which was declined by the Chinese Association of South Africa. Many Chinese South Africans applied for reclassification as White despite the Chinese Association of South Africa’s position. The term foreigner was afforded to newly-arrived Jewish immigrants from Europe at the time of their arrival but that soon changed as the term White was extended to them.

Jewish South Africans are divided into two main groups: The Lemba people, who mainly reside in Venda, in the province of Limpopo, are considered part of ‘the chosen people’, descended from one of the ten tribes of Israel (or Palestine). The Lemba trace their history to 2 700 years ago when they migrated from the eastern part of Israel into Yemen, Eritrea and down into the Southern African region. They maintain all of the Jewish cultural and religious ceremonies and consider themselves to be part of the Jewish community world-wide. The second group, the European Jewish people, migrated to South Africa after the 1880s and in bigger pockets as the First World War drew near, and as anti-Semitism rose and concentration camps filled up in Germany and the surrounding areas. Many Jewish people identify as Jewish due to their cultural heritage whilst others identify as Jewish on the grounds of their religious beliefs, and the religious beliefs of their parents and ancestors.

Racial Classification and Language

Racial classification and language in South Africa were not simple matters during the apartheid period; many South Africans who were classified as Black do not share the same cultural and/or linguistic group. The term tribal, now outdated, was used to refer to what is now called ethnic group
identification. For example: The Zulu, Xhosa, Basotho, Bapedi, Venda, Tswana, Tsonga, Swazi and Ndebele all speak ‘Bantu’ languages, yet each with a distinct vernacular, and each with distinct cultural practices. It is estimated that about 500 distinct languages, from the central region of Africa down to the southern part, are classified as ‘Bantu’ languages.

Racial Classification and Identity

South Africans were also classified under the umbrella term 'non-White', which included Coloured people, Indian people and Black people. This process of shifting power, and breaking racialised groups into smaller groups was a strategy; it was called divide-and-conquer or divide-and-rule. It was employed by the apartheid government to prevent racialised groups from joining to fight their common enemy and instead focused their energies on whatever little power they believed they yielded over another oppressed group that formed part of the same category. Many South Africans who were classified as Coloured, Griqua and Indian people, for example, identify as Black people. This is not to deny their cultural or ethnic identity but rather to see it as secondary or part of their larger identification as Black people for a number of reasons:

1. Those who were raised and educated during the Black Consciousness period, and who during its intense period of conscientisation were influenced by the analysis of Steve Biko, who addressed how South Africans were racialised as Black and from which they were also shamed. Biko and the Black Consciousness ideologues spoke openly at rallies about the divide-and-conquer tactics of the apartheid regime and why calling oneself Black was part of a positive calling that came with a particular kind of responsibility to grapple with internalised racism: how the racialisation that was inflicted became internalised and used as a measure to harshly judge oneself and judge others according to how one has been treated.

2. Those whose heritage clearly spoke to Black identity but whose knowledge and information were kept from them in order to ensure that division and separation was entrenched, thus furthering the aims of apartheid.

A common occurrence, talked about extensively among people who identify as Coloured, is when asking about their identity they would note in verbal conversation that they had European ancestry, or would refer to a great-grandmother who was White, but very seldom noted their African and/or Black ancestry. This particular form of narration about European heritage, abundant in these sorts of conversations on identity during apartheid, was also encouraged by the White bosses who employed Coloured people and to whom the Coloured population was encouraged to seek similarity in opposition to Blackness. The lack of knowledge of African, indigenous and/or Black ancestry is a common occurrence and speaks to the desire to seek similarity with, and association to, European heritage, which was cultivated during the early apartheid era.

Several years ago, President F.W. de Klerk’s first wife made a remark that shocked South Africans, when she announced, much against her husband’s chagrin, that Coloured people were ‘oorkepsels’, which is a derogatory term that suggests that Coloured people do not have an identity, are the unsavoury and unwanted remains of identities that are solid and legitimate, and as such, the illegitimate formation of sexual relations that were conducted under illegal and/or immoral grounds. The term oorkepsels is also suggestive of a belief that Coloured people do not have anything (read: identity) of their own but rather the remains of what other identities do not want and which, as a result, Coloured people have inherited. In addition, the term oorkepsels also speaks to the remains of food that is offered to dogs and other four-legged animals.

You know, they (Coloured people) are a negative group. The definition of a Coloured person in the population register is someone that is not White and not Black, and is also not Indian in other words a non-person... They are left-overs... They have no history of governing themselves. They must be supervised. (Scheper Hughes, 1994)

(See full article on the site: http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/publications/hongkong/scheper.htm)

Ethnicity

CONCEPT 4: ETHNICITY refers to social characteristics and traits that are shared and upheld by a population group within a particular geographical and physical space, who also share a history, ancestral and/or geographical location, language and most times dialect.

There are several elements that determine who is part of a particular ethnic group: one of these is the social aspect of identity to which we often use the term culture and refers to such aspects as food, dialect, manner of speaking, accent, along with social values. But more importantly, unlike with articulations of race, ethnicity speaks very directly to belonging and claiming others as part of your ethnic group due to noticeable characteristic traits in manner of speech, accent, language, cultural activities or food.

Ethnicity and Race

Ethnicity speaks to a sense of belonging, which race does not always do, and allows membership based on a shared history with all of the above noted characteristics. Whilst race, however contested, refers either to biological traits or social and
material phenomena under which racialisation has taken place, ethnicity refers to social and cultural factors. In addition, members who claim their ethnic identity do so with others, openly, as part of a practice of embracing their shared culture and heritage. For example, it is not unusual to hear someone identify themselves as Black and Indian simultaneously, suggesting that Black is their racialised identity and Indian is their ethnic identity. In other words, identifying racialised identities and ethnic identities and merging them, or making cross-reference to them in conversation, as well as speaking to regionalised identities, is not unusual within the South African context. For example, to hear someone say: 'I am Black, I am also Coloured, and I am from the Cape', is not an unusual statement. This process of how ethnicity informs identity and what is referred to as identity politics was a common practice during the apartheid period and less common since the first democratic elections took place.

Racism

CORE CONCEPT 5: RACISM is an act of aggression, however subtle, that is carried out by an individual, a group and/or person or body representing an institution who considers themselves/its superior; being part of the group holding power carrying out a justifiable act against someone with little to no power, with the intent to humiliate, debase and belittle the person/s based on the concept of race and centred on a system of beliefs with a particular ideology — that of supremacy. An Ideology is a system of beliefs, thoughts and ideas that form the foundation of a theory. White Supremacy as an ideology is based on the belief that White people are superior to any other racialised or ethnic group and should dominate socially, culturally, politically and economically.

There are many ideas about what racism is and what it is not. Some would argue that racism can be indicted by any person irrespective of their racialised identity; that when one person discriminates against another person on the basis of race, such an act is an act of racism. Others argue that an act of racism is not carried out in isolation and that it needs various systems in place in order for it to have effect. In other words, an act takes thought, consideration, an understanding that the actor is assured that their actions are in keeping with what is upheld by the dominant group they form part of — all extracted from the society within which the act emerges. It also takes place with the knowledge of its ripple effects — socially, psychologically and politically. The systemic, structural and institutionalised components of the society within which racism operates to perpetuate the system of domination serves the agents of domination — those who enact it, uphold it (knowingly or unknowingly) and thus ensure that it is maintained and reproduced.

It was Stokely Carmichael (later known as Kwame Ture) who first coined the term institutionalised racism, asserting that inequality based on race is also evident in public and private institutions, which formed part of the larger society within which racism operates, and through which collectively it functions to oppress, debase and humiliate people because of racialised identities, colour, ethnicity and culture (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1992).

In South Africa, much like in the United States, the reference to the history of racism, stemming from the usurpation of native land, removal, separation and exclusion of native people to reserves (as in the United States) or the creation of homelands (as in South Africa), were crucial in establishing the foundation of colonialism. In addition, the acquisition of enslaved Indigenous and Native peoples to serve the economic foundations of capitalism, served to set up the two countries — distinct and similar in very particular ways, based on the ideology and principle of White supremacy. As such, in South Africa, when one speaks of racism there is an understanding in view of the country's history, that one is speaking of structural, systemic and institutionalised forms of racial discrimination against Black people, all of which are interconnected and relied on legislation in order to function effectively. The term Black is used here in reference to people who have been historically discriminated against: described as 'non-White' by the apartheid government, described as African by the Pan Africanist movement and Black by the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pan_Africanist_Congress_of_Azania).

White supremacy has several tenets, one of which is the belief that only White people can rule because 'non-White' people do not have the ability to rule themselves. The term 'non-White' is used here with intent as it situates the term in view of the understanding of the belief of White supremacy: that is, that everyone who is not White should be viewed, examined, assessed, treated and seen at the backdrop of the White experience of being human. White has been treated as the standard of humanity and the superior form of being human. Everyone else who is not White is afforded the term 'non-', which in itself is a negation. A negation describes the person (the 'non') by what he or she is not — 'non-White' — not for who he or she is, as was indicative during apartheid racial legislation.

Many scholars in South Africa who emerged within the Black Consciousness Movement and the Pan Africanist Movement openly rejected the term 'non-White'. In I Write What I Like, in a paper he produced for the SASO leadership training in December 1971, Stephen Bantu Biko asserts the significance of a process of self-identification as Black as part of a larger process towards emancipation. Biko (1977) notes:

We have defined Blacks as those who are by law or tradition politically, economically and socially discriminated against as a group in the South African society and identifying themselves as a unit in the struggle towards the realisation of their aspirations.
This definition illustrates to us a number of things:
1. Being Black is not a matter of pigmentation – being Black is a reflection of a mental attitude.
2. Merely by describing yourself as Black you have started on a road towards emancipation, you have committed yourself to fight against all forces that seek to use your Blackness as a stamp that marks you out as a subservient being. (Biko, 1977, p. 48)

Biko's concern at this time, in the early 1970s, was with building national consciousness of the ways in which apartheid and racism operated. He accomplished this through various short papers, which he used as a basis for workshops and discussions among his SASO peers. It is this particular period, post 1968, where the term Black was used to describe identity, came to play the most significant role in South African history.

Jamaican American Charles Mills (1997) writes of the omission of White supremacy from textbooks as being part of an invisible racial contract. In The Racial Contract, he alludes to something more than simply the failure to include the term White supremacy into textbooks; it is about who has written textbooks, who has historically had access to the means of knowledge production, and as such how this unexamined privilege, which he asserts has been held by White people, has re-privileged White supremacy by not even including it or alluding to it as the ideology which sustains and supports racism.

Discussions of race and racism in South Africa did not take place in isolation. If we look at the early 1960s, as well as the events leading to world-wide protests in 1968, the year that the Black Consciousness Movement of Azania emerged under the auspices of the South African Students' Organisation (SASO), we see a whole series of protests fuelled by anti-racist and anticolonial movements. At the time racism, colonialism, state power and repression take centre stage. South African political movements were influenced by events of the 1950s on the African continent as African countries gained independence from their colonisers. As such, critiques of race and racism that developed started to take on a critique of language focusing on how the coloniser's language forges the process of colonialism. Addressing racism in speech, writing and protest politics meant that organisations which formed part of the anti-apartheid and anti-capitalist movement (jointly known as the national liberation movement) were constantly transformed by speakers who brought their experience of racism to the public platform, and as such their own language with which to reveal the multi-faceted operation and functioning of racism. The 1950s and the 1960s on the African continent, in particular, injected the discussion of racism with an analysis of colonialism. The ground-breaking ideas of Ngugi wa Thiong'o in Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature (1986), although first published in English in 1981, was in circulation during the 1960s and the 1970s. Ngugi's generation was influenced by the era of the Négritude movement (Négritude, translation: the state of being Black) writers before them, and their key successor, Frantz Fanon.

Frantz Fanon was born in Martinique in the Caribbean, a colony of France. He trained as a medical doctor in France, specialised in psychiatry and through his work in Algeria (another colony of France), came face-to-face with how colonialism determined the condition of the mind and the lived experience of the oppressed masses. Fanon's work as a psychiatrist opened his eyes to the realities of racism and colonialism that medical textbooks did not offer and he refused to be silent about it. Fanon's first book was called Black Skin White Masks, which grappled with how the Black man and the Black woman had been colonised by the French; it is also an account of his experience of racism, which he documented and reflected upon on a day-to-day basis. The first chapter in Black Skin White Masks is entitled, 'The Negro and Language', for, as noted earlier, in order to fully grasp the complexities of racism, one has to ask oneself what kind of language one uses to conduct such a discussion. Fanon offers us his insights here:

Every colonised people – in other words, every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its local cultural originality – finds itself face to face with the language of the civilising nation: that is, with the culture of the mother country. (Fanon, 1970, p. 14)

If we think about South Africa in terms of language, we know that English, the language of one of the colonisers in South Africa, is considered the first language: it is the language of instruction, it is the language medium in which debates are conducted in parliament, and it is also the language that we read, mostly, and as such the language with which we form our ideas. The crucial question then is: If we think within a language, how can we think outside of it? This is not to suggest that one has to think in another language, for example, Portuguese or Spanish, but rather that one has to question how one uses a particular vernacular or discourse within any language to talk about racism. Language determines our ability to think, to question, to imagine, to analyse and to critique the world we live in. Fanon did not develop his analysis of French racism in isolation from what was happening in other parts of the world – he mentions South Africa on several occasions.

Fanon alludes to his knowledge of how the world of coloniser and colonised is divided. And whilst in France there was no policy of apartheid, like in South Africa, he uses the example to illustrate how separation was based on racialisation. It is therefore important to understand that the ways in which language, words, phrases and as such any analysis develops, is through engagement, interaction, the exchange of ideas, the reading and awareness of a subject. Biko makes reference to Fanon on several occasions as well as to the Négritude writers like Senghor, Césaire and Damas in I Write What I Like. It is clear that Biko is
enormously influenced by Fanon as per the references he makes to Fanon’s work. Biko, much like Fanon, spent a great deal of his time pointing to the ineffectiveness of apartheid language, and challenging it by injecting it with his own vernacular to discuss racism and apartheid. Maart (2014a) summarises this as follows:

Many of us still remember, whether through the enacting of the Steve Biko trial or by reading the transcript from I Write What I Like, that Black Consciousness language stood trial because Judge Boshoff tried to convict Steve Biko by referring to the language that Biko used, which Boshoff found unusual and an affront. Biko’s words were chosen with care and historical precision; he connected the act to the actor. He did not only call White people settler-colonials, he also called them agents of White domination and beneficiaries of racism and apartheid. Biko situated the agent alongside his agency and insisted on naming agency in accordance with the ability to maintain the system. (Maart, 2014a, p. 74)

Pumla Gqola (2001) takes up the question of language in the period after apartheid, asking how to move towards critiques of apartheid when we are limited by the very language to discuss apartheid by what apartheid itself had set up.

Although a free South Africa is unencumbered by many of the manifestations of apartheid, apartheid language continues to determine the manner in which we speak against its discursive construction. The language of apartheid definition and control had always been challenged by the liberation movements so that, in South Africa, at least, the parameters of language have always been contested terrain. The Black Consciousness Movement, for instance, recognised instantly that apartheid was predicated on division and the enforced legitimation of these disunities through language. (Gqola, 2001, p. 95)

It is perhaps the depth of discussion about land, usurpation and who are the beneficiaries of apartheid are, for which Biko was questioned and stood trial, because he sought to examine the ways in which privilege and power operated in South Africa. In I Write What I Like, Biko asserts that the act of racism has to have effect, and because Black people do not have the system of power in their favour (as in historical, political White power), nor the aspect of privilege (the historical, social and economic White privilege) – two necessary ingredients for the functioning of racism – Black people cannot therefore be racist. What he argues is that Black people can be prejudiced and can discriminate against others but that racism requires that one be situated within the very power structure within which one’s racist attitudes and behaviours have a direct benefit to one and for which, by its continuity, one is rewarded.

Over the years racism came to be used synonymously with the word apartheid. The rest of the world soon referred to the term apartheid to express their disapproval of the system of racial segregation, of which racism was its product. Racism can only survive within a system that sustains it; that system has to have structural and systemic laws and regulations in place in order for it to operate effectively. Racism is only possible when there is a system of power in place that allows its beneficiaries the possibility of reaping the benefits that the system has set up, and its recipients to suffer the consequences of its impact.

In other words, if one is wealthy and Black, one can still experience racism; economic wealth does not necessarily mean that one will gain access to social and political privilege, both components of White privilege, or that the entire system of White domination, with its structural, systemic, institutionalised and systemic components, worldwide, will suddenly act in one’s favour. When one has particular privileges because one is White, it is called White privilege. White privilege is often invisible to those who enact it because White people have not been socialised to see or understand that their existence – and how that existence is lived out and as such the benefits which are afforded to White people because they are White – is a privilege, because these invisible aspects of White identity is privilege itself; it is privileged at the expense of Black people, Indian people, Coloured people and Asian people. (See below for references on White privilege, especially Peggy McIntosh’s infamous article on White privilege.)

The contents of Peggy McIntosh’s paper, White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack has informed consciousness raising among White feminists studying anti-racism, in particular, over the past three decades. This has been primarily in the US, but also around the world subsequently since its publication in 1989 (see link given in the references). It has only recently made its appearance within public discourse in South Africa. Whether due to its repetitive citation by characters in popular Hollywood cinema or by comedians who assert it when they feel it is necessary to shame White identified Hollywood, its usage as a term in 2014 and 2015 in South Africa has been used with regards to the depiction of colonial statues being symbols of White privilege. (See for example the link, http://www.citypress.co.za/news/end-white-privilege-say-students-who-defaced-statue-at-ukzn.)

Whilst power and privilege – two ingredients of White domination – are considered the combination of what it takes to have the ability to be racist, there is also the matter of agency. The term agency is used to convey an understanding of the body as a vehicle, as one that has flesh, blood and thought, and therefore movement, and as such one that can enact what it thinks, feels and believes. To say, ‘one has agency’, suggests that through one’s body, through one’s flesh, one can enact what one believes. Agency is often used in reference to making claims about victimhood; over the past one hundred years, the term agency has been used to indicate the possibility to bring about change singularly and, when joined with others, in a group. So, whilst one can be raised and socialised as White, one’s agency – how one situates and/or locates oneself – can also be in
opposition to what one has been taught to uphold. This, however, takes self-interrogation and self-examination, as it requires that one understands the components of racism before one refuses its place within one’s life.

Tunisian scholar Albert Memmi in *The Coloniser and the Colonised*, places great emphasis on agency, noting that there is always a coloniser who accepts but there can also be a coloniser who refuses. In view of the above mentioned, when reference is made to agent, this means the person who is situated within a system of domination and benefits from that system of domination because they uphold that system. One has to remember that it is through agency that systems function, therefore through agency that one can refuse to participate in that system, and as such refuse to maintain it and reproduce it.

All systems of domination rely on the individual, the communal and the group, who then form part of the dominant in society and are socialised to enforce its beliefs, to carry out its objectives. Whether knowingly or unknowingly, those who maintain the systemic, structural and institutionalised aspects of racism are its agents. They work for and alongside the system of racism whether they realise it or not.

Systems of domination are only able to perpetuate, maintain and reproduce the components necessary to sustain the system through the participation of those who uphold the system. The people that benefit from a system of domination are the people that make the system work; in other words those that through their actions uphold the system. Such person/s are referred to as the agents of the system as they follow the social, cultural and political steps that are laid down for them by their parents and peers and/or people they identify as part of their social and political group (again, both knowingly or unknowingly). The latter aspect of agency has been asserted throughout this chapter on the ground that most people who contest their participation in racism and other forms of oppression have articulated this contention as though they were not aware of their enactment. Yet, whilst there is a lot of discussion about the rising Black middle class in South Africa, class privilege should not be confused with White privilege. Many White people do not even know that they have White privilege; this is precisely what Peggy McIntosh, a White feminist scholar, asserts in her work. This is not a question of its presence being invisible but rather that systems of domination are designed so that the agents of the system simply act in accordance with how they have been socialised.

When one is born, your parents, family, social setting and immediate environment teach you, raise you, educate you, socialise you and equip you with a set of behaviour patterns that you take as your cue for how to be in the world. This does not happen overnight; it is a process and it is called socialisation. At birth, girls in most cultures are dressed in pink and boys are dressed in blue. Girls are given dolls to play with and encouraged to look pretty whilst boys are given toys that encourage their aggression.

Then later, when it seems that they have learnt these characteristics based on what they have been exposed to, society calls it, in the case of boys, masculinity. In South Africa this socialisation has taken place in racialised forms; children whose parents and grandparents are descended from Europe are socialised to uphold the values of their parents and grandparents, and consequently then racialised as White.

In the past three decades, Whiteness studies emerged with the focus of examining ways in which race and ethnicity come together. For the most part these were looking at being White as a performance, which situates the ways in which the social construction of White identity takes place. There are a number of scholars who work in this area: see the work of Melissa Steyn, Richard Ballard, Kevin Durrheim and Michelle Booth, among others. Michelle Booth is among a group of scholars in South Africa who credits British scholar, Richard Dyer for inspiring him towards a critique of Whiteness. Richard Dyer tackles the question of White people being seen as the human norm, in Paula Rothenberg’s *White Privilege: Essential Readings on the Other Side of Racism* when he states the following:

There is something at stake in looking at, or continuing to ignore White racial imagery. As long as race is something only applied to non-White peoples, as long as White people are not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm. Other people are raced, we are just people. (Paula Rothenberg, 2005, p. 9)

During the apartheid years, White people lived separately from Black people and most only interacted with Black people who were maids or paid subordinates. Children raised in these contexts often developed close relationships with their maids and housekeepers. When these bonds were visibly noticeable, a parent would intervene ensuring that the child knew where his/her loyalties lie. As soon as the very same White child reached a certain age he/she would carry out the very act of domination towards his/her Black maid, even though he/she was witness to how his/her maid was treated when he/she was a child. Racism ranges from staring someone down to making that person invisible – by not looking at them or pretending that they are not there so that you do not see them and as such they do not matter. Also in assuming a position of power and authority over people, speaking down to them, verbally insulting them, treating them as insignificant and/or irrelevant, operating from the belief that you are superior in every way and that they are not and that you know best.

Steve Biko and members of SASO were accused of being racist because they felt that they could not let White students in NUSAS speak for them or on their behalf. In response to this accusation Biko says:

Even today, we are still accused of racism. This is a mistake. We know that all interracial groups in South Africa are relationships in which White people are superior, Blacks inferior.
So as a prelude White people must be made to realise that they are only human, not superior. Same with Blacks. They must be made to realise that they are also human, not inferior. (Boston Globe, 25 October 1977)

When reference is made to people who are capable of espousing the same racist views as their oppressors and using it against others like it has been used against them, this is known as internalised racism – that is racism that has been internalised and used as a means by which the recipient uses the racism of her oppressor against herself, and others like herself.

Black on Black crime is the expression that is used when discussing ways in which internalised racism operates in the form of violence perpetrated against Black people by Black people. We do not hear about White on White crime or Asian on Asian crime and this in itself speaks to the fact that the agency of Black people, most often than not, are depicted as those who are the perpetrators of violence.

The term non-racialism always seems to emerge in discussions pertaining to race, democracy and transformation, when discussing what South Africa should aspire to – a society that upholds non-racialism. The latter is due to the term being used in the Freedom Charter (1955) and the Constitution (1996) and treated as a basis for living, as envisaged by the African National Congress at the time of its inception more than 100 years ago. What it suggests is that South Africans ought to be non-racist, that is, not believe in racism and not endorse racism.

The term anti-racist is used to describe a person’s beliefs and position that demonstrates an active stance against racism; it also describes those individuals who go out of their way to address racism in forms that are known to the person. To be anti-racist therefore means to believe that racism exists and to actively oppose it. The term is also used when discussing approaches to teaching and learning, where scholars would note that they have an ‘anti-racist approach’ in their teaching, which means that selection of course material, content, analysis and discussions where discussions on approaches to addressing racism are central is key to how the course is set up. An anti-racist approach also means not tolerating racist comments or behaviour, as the term applies to indicate workplace issues. Anti-racist politics refers to taking an active stance to oppose and protest against acts of racism in a public forum or space, and to openly challenge acts of racism.

**Resistance**

**CORE CONCEPT 6: RESISTANCE** is the act of opposition, a refusal to participate in the very act/s that oppresses and subjugates you.

Resistance is considered a stand that one takes; to resist means to oppose, not to accept what one is facing and/or experiencing. Resistance is firstly conceptualised as refusal then as action directed against the force or body that subjugates and/or oppresses you. Resistance can take place on an individual level, a group, a community and a national level. Resisting racism was crucial to the fall of apartheid. National resistance on the part of the oppressed masses took place all over the country from the earliest days of colonisation, escalating through each century and intensifying in the twentieth century. Resistance can take many forms: some of these include conscience objectors, religious and moral objectors to those who take their resistance to the streets and the pavements, whilst others recognise armed struggle as a form of resistance.

Resistance to racism was undertaken by South Africans from all racialised groups; the degree to resistance varies from individual to individual. Among the Black population, which constituted 87 percent of the population of South Africa during the early 1960s and late 1970s, resistance to racism was the highest, as is indicative of their experiences of racism. Among the White population resistance took the form of those who joined the South African Communist Party, the African National Congress (ANC) and those who became conscientious objectors and refused to do their compulsory military service. Whilst conscientious objectors date back to the First World War, the South African Defence Force (SADF), an important leg of the apartheid government, was in operation from 1957 until 1994, during which time they made conscription to the military compulsory for White men; Coloured and Asian men, however, were allowed to serve as volunteers. White men who objected to conscription, whether on religious or moral grounds, had to have solid documentation to prove their position, which often required letters from priests, parents, schools, medical certificates and sources considered reliable and legitimate, as determined by the apartheid government.

The ANC was started in 1912 in view of the full recognition of what the discovery of diamonds and gold meant to the country. As a result of legislation, this curbed and controlled movement intensified against African workers. Whilst challenges were faced as the ANC conscientised the masses across the country, resistance grew on many different levels.

The Freedom Charter, considered one of the ANC’s most important documents, and later one of South Africa’s most visionary, did not come about without opposition. When it was adopted at Kliptown in 1955, the Africanists among the ANC members felt that this was a betrayal of the struggle. This is due to the fact that the Africanist grouping disapproved of the wording of the Freedom Charter, especially its introduction: “South Africa belongs to all who live in it, Black and White, and that no government can justly claim authority unless it is based on the will of all the
people' (see copy of Freedom Charter at http://www.anc.org.za/). At the Transvaal provincial congress of the ANC, the Africanist members were not allowed to enter the hall. This group of people, led by Robert Mangoliso Sobukwe, resolved to break away from the ANC and form their own party. On 6 April 1959, ironically on Jan Van Riebeeck's Day, the Pan Africanist Congress (PAC) was formed at Orlando Community Hall in Soweto. On 21 March 1960, the PAC launched an anti-pass campaign across South Africa encouraging members to leave their passes at home, gather at police stations and present themselves for arrest in as peaceful a manner as possible. There was a large turnout of workers and students, particularly in Sharpeville and Langa. In Sharpeville, the police opened fire killing 69 people and injuring 180. In Cape Town 30 000 Black people marched in a peaceful protest to the centre of the city, whereas rebellion erupted in rural areas such as Pondoland. The apartheid government outlawed the ANC and the PAC through force and brutality, arresting 11 000 people. It was following this period that both the ANC and the PAC established armed military wings: the ANC Umkhonto we Sizwe and the PAC, Poço (meaning 'pure'). Both the ANC and the PAC now pursued an armed struggle, asserting its relevance for the fight for freedom. A new phase of resistance began in 1973, almost five years after the establishment of SASO with Stephen Bantu Biko and Barney Pityana (1983) as the leaders of SASO and with the Black Consciousness movement officially inaugurated in 1972. When Afrikaans was introduced as the official language of instruction in 1976 alongside the already entrenched English language, this forced the two languages to constitute 50 percent each within all schools. An estimated 20 000 high school students took to the streets to protest on the morning of 16 June. At Phfeni Junior Secondary School, a group of 30 students started singing the Sotho anthem as a means to show that they would continue to speak their mother tongue. The police shot at the students within minutes, killing Hastings Ndlovu, the first victim of the day; at the time no one knew his name. As the police shot among the crowd, 18-year-old student Mbuyisa Makhubu, marching in the crowd on the corner of Moema and Vilakazi Streets, picked up the boy who fell at his feet, and along with the boy's sister Antoinette, aged 17, ran toward the car where photographer Sam Nkima was stationed. The death of Hector Pieterson, along with several others who were shot and killed that day, has marked 16 June as the day of the Soweto uprising. Since the democratic elections 16 June is now known as Youth Day.

During the 1980s, exiled ANC leader Oliver Tambo, Nelson Mandela's former law partner, led an international movement to free Mandela. Many countries imposed sanctions on South Africa for its apartheid policies, with the exception of Britain and the United States. Despite their reluctance, the rest of the world spoke solidly that apartheid was not welcome in the world.

The path toward resisting apartheid was streamlined in two distinct ways: one, what is referred to as the anti-apartheid movement; and two, the anti-capitalist movement composed primarily of trade unions. The cooperation of both these two movements is referred to as the national liberation struggle. Many who were active in either one or both would often refer to 'the struggle', which became a catchphrase to mean the struggle for liberation.

The anti-apartheid movement was strong among student organisations. South African high schools have a history of having a Student Representative Council (SRC) which acts as the body representing the interests of the students at places of learning such as schools and universities. Student leaders are often chosen because of their knowledge of the country's history and their ability to fight for the rights of students.

The struggle for national liberation in South Africa was the struggle for freedom. What does freedom really encompass? Is it about rights or is it about power? When one talks about freedom, one acknowledges that the right to speak, to think, to act, to write as one wants without fear or restraint are all crucial to how freedom is conceptualised – based on how it is lived. To live in freedom is also to live free from subjection to harassment, domination or control; it is also
On February 11th 1990, Nelson Mandela was released from Victor Verster prison. The image above captures the manner in which, with raised fist, he greeted those who awaited his arrival, announcing that freedom was finally here.

about the awareness that one cannot be punished for one's racialised identity, and cannot be enslaved, imprisoned or punished for one's history of identity, and as such enjoy all privileges that do not inhibit one's lived reality.

In South Africa, the concept of freedom is very closely linked to the release of Nelson Mandela from Robben Island, and his walk from Victor Verster prison towards the masses that lined the streets of Cape Town to wait for the doors of Victor Verster to be opened. Freedom in the South African sense, signals a departure from apartheid legislation, which includes not being imprisoned for speaking up against the system of apartheid as was previously the case.

Prejudice and Stereotypes

CORE CONCEPT 7: PREJUDICE AND STEREOTYPES
Prejudice is an attitude employed by a person or group and can be both positive and negative, seen and unseen, directed against a person or group for reasons that range from fear to hostility of others based on the unknown and/or notions of difference; based on physical features, cultural attributes, social status and religion. Prejudice is often referred to as a concept of mind and attitude – not one that leads to or causes violence and/or aggression, but which perpetuates social and personal shunning and humiliation. Whilst this may be true in terms of the aspect that speaks to attitude, prejudice can also be the precursor to xenophobia and other forms of violence. Prejudice is sometimes exerted against another person on the basis of combined beliefs and value judgements, whether true or false, with both positive and/or negative assumptions. Prejudice is a form of inequality that can be racially, culturally and economically motivated, not to be confused with discrimination, which is the practice of inequality based on prejudice. This does not mean that people do not act on prejudice – they do, even if they are fully aware that their feelings are unfounded. Discrimination is the behaviour or actions, usually negative, directed towards an individual or group of people, on the basis of race, class, gender or presumed economic position, with the distinct thought that the person does not deserve the treatment associated with the practice of equality.

A form of prejudice that is considered common practice in South Africa is colour prejudice. Colour consciousness, although similar to colour prejudice, suggests that equality under the law and among people who are considered part of the same racialised group, also takes place among that group to set up hierarchies based on skin colour. In the Cape, for example (although not exclusive to the region), hierarchies within the same racialised group can also extend to other aspects of physical appearance such as hair texture, face shape, nose shape, lip shape and size. Although colour prejudice is common among all racialised groups it is more commonly known as part of the spoken discourse among the Black population. This suggests that people who are considered Black within the constitutional sense, due to their histories of apartheid, assert their colour prejudice onto others, using the light-skinned/dark-skinned dichotomy to make reference to their own internalised racism and therefore projecting what has been done to them onto others. Maart calls this pigmentocracy:

Pigmentocracy is a term I devised to express the extent to which a hierarchy of pigmentation operates in Black communities, and in Coloured communities in particular, where divide and conquer strategies, as a consequence of our troubled relationship to White supremacy, gave rise to narratives of light-skinned/dark-skinned dichotomies dominating conversations escalating to a point to determine logic that can only be described as perverse and traumatic. (Maart, 2014b, p. 15)

Prejudice with regards to light-skin dark-skin dichotomies are also prevalent within Indian communities, known as caste, where issues of class, caste and skin colour work simultaneously to indicate social stratification. The caste system, based on what is supposedly hereditary classes, started off as a practice of discrimination based on the occupation of ancestors and speaks directly to class and to skin colour; therefore, as per the practice, the darker the skin colour, the lower the caste. Vinay Lal and Goolam
Vahed (2013) address this in their paper, *Hinduism in South Africa: Caste, Ethnicity and Invented Traditions, 1860 – Present*, noting how the practice of caste prejudice operates within South Africa, with particular emphasis to Durban where they carried out their research. It is Frank de Swart (2000) who draws our attention to the origins of the caste system in India, still upheld in Indian communities within South Africa and the Indian diaspora, noting that caste was constructed in India during the British raj, which dates from 1858 to 1947. As such, much like in South Africa, the strategy of divide-and-rule were also employed in India by the British over their colonised subjects. And, whilst prejudice are thoughts and ideas about people, stereotypes operate on the grounds that various beliefs are fixed, already established, and cannot be contested or verified and thus serve the purpose of enforcing these ideas about particular groups of people. The attitude is usually focused on behaviour and social performance, assuming by one gesture, that all people who are part of a particular group behave the same way.

**Xenophobia**

CORE CONCEPT 8: XENOPHOBIA (See also Chapter 12) is considered to be a culturally-based fear of outsiders rather than a racially-based fear. In South Africa xenophobia has been exercised against people from other African countries, which because of the former is acted out in a number of different ways, some of which include shunning and other forms of social practices aimed at exclusion, showing an outright disregard for the person who is identified as foreign, and sometimes inflicting violence against the person.

It is important to note that the reported incidents of xenophobia in South Africa have not been directed towards Black South Africans, but rather against African nationals - against whom the accusation of 'taking South African jobs', have been levied on a regular basis - who migrate into economically poor communities in South Africa; this is as opposed to communities where there is an abundance of economic resources. As such the fear element speaks to the possibility of those with limited resources, fearing that these resources will be utilised for people for whom it was not intended.

Whilst several incidents of xenophobic attacks have been noted, all of these depicting the hostile and violent treatment of foreigners, all show that it has been African nationals who have experienced xenophobia and not foreigners from Europe, the United States or Scandinavia, for example. This has led a number of South African scholars to question whether these attacks against Africans are to be viewed as Afrophobia - the fear and hatred of other Africans, or negrophobia - the fear of Black people in general. This has been depicted throughout the history of slavery and colonialism, in the US in particular, where the word negro, first borrowed from the Spanish colonisers (meaning black, the colour) and then appropriated by the English colonisers, began a process of depicting Blackness and Black enslaved people as perpetual slaves, with no civilisation to whom one does not offer any self worth, finally giving birth to the term nigger.

This becomes apparent in an article published in *The Times*, on 30 May 2013, entitled, 'Diepsloot residents deny claims of xenophobia', reporting on stores being looted and store owners denying that the attacks were motivated by xenophobia. 'This isn't xenophobia, people are just jealous of the businesses making money and want to steal. They don't hate foreigners, they are just criminals', Agnes Tshavengwa, Zimbabwean national and long-term resident of Diepsloot said. Approximately 80 small-scale shops and informal retailers were looted following the killing of two Zimbabweans, allegedly at the hands of a Somali shop owner (*The Times*, 30 May 2013).

**Democracy**

CORE CONCEPT 9: DEMOCRACY by definition means one person one vote. It means that every adult person, in most countries defined as someone over the age of 18, has the right to vote for social and political representation and thus enjoy the same rights as everyone else; this is also known as equality before the law. It is often said that democracy and freedom go hand in hand - that without democracy there is no freedom, and without freedom, there is no democracy. There are those who argue that whilst Black South Africans were able to vote for the first time in 1994, equality before the law does not happen by the act of voting alone. If those previously disadvantaged had endured oppression and exploitation for 342 years (their usurpation and colonisation setting the basis for such an experience), can equality therefore exist when such a foundation has not been set, but the previous one still informs how adults interact with one another? Is democracy declared at the moment when the first democratic vote takes place in a country? It has also been argued that the process of transformation is meant to address some of these historical struggles and prepare the individual to experience democracy, which also means that the person has the right to enjoy the full benefits of democracy - that is, the ability to enjoy the privileges of his or her democratic rights without the impediments which caused her/his oppression. See, for example, [link provided for additional reading](http://www.parliament.gov.za/content/3How%20our%20democracy%20works.pdf) to understand the history of the term democracy and its operation vis-à-vis the South African constitution.
As a result of what the first democratic elections offered, Bishop Desmond Tutu coined the term *rainbow nation*, to refer to the period after the fall of apartheid to the period of the first democratic elections. Bishop Tutu was so elated in repeating the phrase at each opportunity that President Mandela in his first month of office also continued to use it.

Each of us is as intimately attached to the soil of this beautiful country as are the famous jacaranda trees of Pretoria and the mimosa trees of the bushveld – a rainbow nation at peace with itself and the world.

Today, the South African Constitution grants equal human, political and social rights to all individuals regardless of race, ethnicity or language and all adult South African citizens have the right to vote and hold office.

**With Democracy Comes the Question of Rights**

Most South Africans today are aware of their democratic rights and if pulled over by the police and treated in a manner that they consider offensive, they would assert, 'I live in a democratic society. I know my rights!' This is due to the fact that prior to democracy a new constitution was drafted in order for citizens who were about to vote for the first time in history to understand their relationship to the country, the state, their fellow citizens and the society in which they live. Most citizens believe that rights offer them protection, and the security of human treatment because a democratic society makes that possible. In other words, their ability to vote for whoever they please ensures that they can expect fair and equitable treatment. The concept of democracy, in the context of South Africa, requires a discussion of an interrelated concept, which is *transformation*. The period during which the release of Nelson Mandela was negotiated included a discussion of democracy and transition. The latter is a concept, which suggests the period in-between; in other words the period between the end of apartheid and the integration of democracy as a lived experience among those who were oppressors and the oppressed. The question of transition was seen as necessary due to the fact that it was an unequal society: that 13 percent of the population enjoyed privileges at the expense of 87 percent of the oppressed population. This meant that both the privileged and the less privileged needed to address the process by which they would enjoy rights and privileges in the same country under which apartheid functioned. Immediately after the first democratic elections took place in 1994, President Mandela’s first cabinet tabled for discussion a process of transformation, writing several papers to indicate how they envisaged such a process. Transformation, which refers to a society as a whole, is often referred to as social transformation, which is more focused on the individual and the individual’s place in civil society. Social transformation is focused on social behaviour: it is the process by which an individual with socially ascribed social status and/or privilege, transform their behaviour in accordance with a new expectation of equality that has been meted out and/or legislated as law, and as part of the country’s constitution. This process is seen as crucial to the overall practice of democracy as it has been suggested that in order to address previous inequalities and allow for the possibility of democracy where individuals enjoy equal rights and equal opportunities before the law, social transformation is necessary and in fact crucial to the process of democracy.

**Transformation is a Secondary Concept and Linked to the Concept of Democracy**

After the Mandela government took office in 1994, a discussion of transformation started to take place immediately upon the establishment of his cabinet. There was an acknowledgement by former president Mandela that the historical past should not determine the path toward the future for those who had suffered during apartheid. As such, a committee was set up to address transformation in all aspects of social life: for the purpose of our discussion here, it is important to know that higher education received very particular attention.

However, in 2008 an incident took place at the University of the Free State, where a group of male White students, as part of an initiation prank, coerced Black women workers to eat food drenched in urine and run on the race track. This occurrence led to universities drafting and adopting Transformation Charters, spearheaded by the Minister of Education as a means to address the historical apartheid past and pave the way for an ANC version of non-racialism, as noted in the Freedom Charter. It suddenly became very clear to those who wrote about the incident, that 14 years after the first democratic elections, the country had not achieved its objective of non-racialism. This incident was now viewed as the mind-set of freedom and equality among a generation of White students that the process of democracy, by virtue of it being the long awaited event of the country, had hoped to erase. An active stance was now put forward in the form of the Minister of Education instructing all of the 23 universities to address transformation via a transformation document.

**Race and Racism Today**

Children born in the year 1994 and after are referred to as the ‘born free’, a generation that were born free of apartheid, as the saying commonly goes. Those who are now within the university system will say that segregation does not stop because apartheid as a policy has ended, because children at schools and young people at university have generally organised themselves primarily in terms of their racial identities. At universities you will hear students refer
Working for Change: Lack of Black Professors at SA’s Universities

City Press, 3 August 2014
City Press reveals today just how few Black South African professors are teaching in our country’s universities – and attempts to understand why so few Black people occupy senior academic positions.

Fewer than one in ten of South Africa’s university professors are Black. Only two of the country’s formerly White universities, as classified by the apartheid government, have more than 10% Black South African-born professors – the University of KwaZulu-Natal (14%) and the University of Johannesburg (11%).

Rhodes University has the highest number of White professors (94.3%), followed by the University of the Free State (92.6%) and the University of Pretoria (86%).

...to ‘the White café’ and ‘the Black café’, referring to the kind of food sold at each and the patrons who frequent these two eateries. A series of postings on this matter can be viewed on the University of KwaZulu-Natal Facebook page.

Racism and Democracy in Universities in South Africa

If one looks at the 23 universities in South Africa, a small percentage of Black academics are professors. Some of the difficulties that academics report are indicative that almost all of the White professors currently within the university system have never been taught by a Black professor. Because of this, most White professors do not believe that Black professors can teach them anything and that they are still in charge, teaching the European canon with the erroneous belief that it is the best when in fact it is the only one that they know.

Within academic institutions, one still finds that White professors are dominant in the university. As such, most are not aware of the analysis, critiques and critical tools employed by a generation schooled outside of the country on African scholarship or at predominantly Black universities inside the country, who have critically engaged with the established White European canon as a means to establish African scholarship. It is not uncommon to have White professors assume a position of authority within an academic setting or to walk past a Black female professor and assume that she is a cleaner or someone who does not teach. These forms of institutionalised racism are not going to disappear overnight as there is much work to be done in addressing these matters. See the ‘Working for Change’ box for an article published in City Press in August 2014 regarding the lack of Black professors at South Africa’s universities.

Summary of CORE CONCEPTS

CORE CONCEPT 1: RACE Race refers to a system of classification used to categorise human beings. This categorisation is based on notions of biology and social construction. Whilst the classification of race is based on notions of biology and dates back several centuries, it is only since the twentieth century that social construction came to the fore strongly to counter the biology argument.
CORE CONCEPT 2: THE CONCEPT OF APARTHEID Apartheid was a system of racial segregation imposed upon the oppressed masses from 1948 until 1994. It was enforced through laws and legislation devised to facilitate, perpetuate and maintain a system of White domination already put into place by usurpation, colonialism and racial classification.

CORE CONCEPT 3: RACIAL CLASSIFICATION Racial classification was the cornerstone of apartheid in that it was a system devised to classify people according to their physical appearance and already racialised identities; it was also the psyche of apartheid because its focus was the body, physical appearance, and as such it represented the embodiment of apartheid as well as the manner in which racialisation was internalised. Alongside racial classification apartheid legislation was introduced to ensure that the system of apartheid functioned effectively.

CORE CONCEPT 4: ETHNICITY When we speak of ethnicity we refer to social characteristics and traits that are shared and upheld by a population group within a particular geographical and physical space; those who also share a history, ancestral and/or geographical location, language and most times dialect.

CORE CONCEPT 5: RACISM is an act of aggression, however subtle, that is carried out by an individual, a group and/or person or body representing an institution who considers themselves/itself superior; being part of the group holding power carrying out a justifiable act against someone with little or no power, with the intent to humiliate, debase and belittle the person/s based on the concept of race and centred on a system of beliefs with a particular ideology - that of supremacy. An ideology is a system of beliefs, thoughts and ideas that form the foundation of a theory. White supremacy as an ideology is based on the belief that White people are superior to any other racialised or ethnic group and should dominate socially, culturally, politically and economically.

CORE CONCEPT 6: RESISTANCE Resistance is the act of opposition, a refusal to participate in the very act/s that oppresses and subjugates you. Resistance is considered a stand that one takes; to resist means to oppose, not to accept what one is facing and/or experiencing. Resistance is firstly conceptualised as refusal then as action directed against the force or body that subjugates and/or oppresses you. Resistance can take place on an individual level, a group, a community and a national level. Resisting racism was crucial to the fall of apartheid.

CORE CONCEPT 7: PREJUDICE Prejudice is an attitude employed by a person or group and can be both positive and negative, seen and unseen, directed against a person or group for reasons that range from fear to hostility of others based on the unknown and/or notions of difference; based on physical features, cultural attributes, social status and religion. Prejudice is often referred to as a concept of mind and attitude, not one that leads to or causes violence and/or aggression although it can.

CORE CONCEPT 8: XENOPHOBIA Xenophobia in South Africa is considered to be a culturally-based fear of outsiders rather than a racially-based fear. In South Africa xenophobia has been exercised against people from other African countries, which because of
the former is acted out in a number of different ways, some of which include shunning and other forms of social practices aimed at exclusion, showing an outright disregard for the person who is identified as foreign, and sometimes inflicting violence against the person.

CORE CONCEPT 9: DEMOCRACY Democracy by definition means one person one vote. It means that every adult person, in most countries defined as someone over the age 18, has the right to vote for social and political representation and thus enjoy the same rights as everyone else; this is also known as equality before the law. It is often said that democracy and freedom go hand in hand – that without democracy there is no freedom, and without freedom, there is no democracy.

Recommended Reading

**Race Theorists in South Africa**
They are many to list; this is a short list and does not include all of the theorists in this area:
Stephen Bantu Biko
Andre Keet
Rozena Maart
Joel Modiri
Mabogo More
Melissa Steyn
Ryland Fischer
Pumla Gqola

**Race Theorists in Africa (Selected)**
These are listed in alphabetical order:
Frantz Fanon, Martinique (also Algeria)
Albert Memmi, Tunisia
Ngugi wa Thiong’o, Kenya

**Race Theorists in the United States (Selected)**
These are listed in alphabetical order:
Kwame Anthony Appiah
Stokely Carmichael (later known as Kwame Ture)
Kimberle Crenshaw
Tommy Curry
Angela Davis
Henry Louis Gates Jr.
Lewis Gordon
Leonard Harris
Patricia Hill Collins
bell hooks
Charles Mills
Cornel West
Patricia Williams
Malcolm X

**Race Theorists in Europe (Selected)**
Jean-Paul Rocchi, France
Mathia Mosdel, Hungary
Francis Burgess, France
Stuart Hall, UK
Paul Gilroy, UK

Tutorial Activities

1. Divide into small groups. Ask everyone in the group how they identify themselves and why: the person to their right, the person on their left and talk about how you identify yourself.
2. Make a list of the process above and look at the reasons that have been offered by each participant for how they identify and what informs this process of identification.
3. Discuss what this process has taught you by tackling aspects that speak to justifications, and reasons why identity is necessary and/or useful in order to live in society.
4. Discuss ways in which this process can be different and/or can be transformed by offering the steps that you would take to live in (a) a country, and (b) the world, free of identity with the suggestions that you offered.
Exam Questions

1. Discuss the definitions of race that the author has presented and argue for and against each of their use.
2. Critically discuss the definition of racism that the author utilises; offer examples to support your position.
3. Discuss the following: Do you think people still classify themselves according to the system of racial classification used during the apartheid years and if so why?
4. Critically discuss the following: How is understanding one's agency (one's ability through your physical presence of the flesh to act in accordance with what you believe, rather than in accordance to an assumed racialised understanding of who you are and what you do) important in combating racism?
5. Discuss this statement: One can legislate for and against racism but one cannot legislate attitude. True or false?
6. Use the work of Joel Modiri to discuss whether the law is adequate in combating racism.
7. If you think within a language, how can you think outside of it? Discuss Rozenda Maart and Pumla Gqola's views of how the discussion of race in South Africa is determined by the vernacular/language/discourse that is utilised to conduct it. In addressing your question think of the many ways in which discussions of race vary and whether the analysis of race in South Africa is primarily determined by the words with which one addresses it.
8. Discuss this statement: If we study race in South Africa we have to study Whiteness. True or false? How has the work on Whiteness by Michelle Booth and Melissa Steyn contributed to the discussion of race and racism in South Africa?
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